

Welfare Reform

Information Binder

MEMORANDUM

TO: List*

FROM: Jeremy Ben-Ami

DATE: December 13, 1993

SUBJECT: Welfare Reform Information Binder

Attached is the preliminary version of the Welfare Reform information binder. The binder is intended to provide background information for the welfare reform initiative to support the work of public affairs, legislation, intergovernmental, speechwriting, public liaison, etc.

The binder is divided into six sections: general welfare reform information, model state profiles, national model programs, national individual profiles, fact sheets, and working group information.

This preliminary version will be updated continuously with additional state profiles, which will include more model programs and client biographies. We are also looking into creating a shared database by state so that we can provide updates "on-line" and track Working Group interaction with individual state programs and officials.

In order to be included in these ongoing updates, please provide Helene Grady at 401-4886 with the name of the person who will keep this binder and to whom she should direct the updates. Please let me know if you have any suggestions for additions or changes to the book.

Thanks. I hope this is helpful.

List*

Mary Jo Bane
David Ellwood
Bruce Reed
Wendell Primus
Ann Rosewater
Kathi Way
Mary Bourdette
John Monahan
Melissa Skolfield
Patricia Sosa
Dan Porterfield
Susan Bender

Introduction

This binder provides basic information about welfare programs and welfare reform for people as speechwriters, surrogate speakers, and legislative liaisons who will be staffing the external relations of the welfare reform effort. It provides information that should enable staff to talk and write about the issue, answer questions, and cite examples of what we are trying to achieve through welfare reform.

The binder is broken into six sections:

- I. General Information - this section will provide the latest talking points and "Q and A's" that are being used by the Working Group.
- II. Working Group Information - this section includes background information on the Working Group, its process, hearings, outreach efforts, etc.
- III. National Model Programs - this section has fact sheets on programs around the country that are models of the sorts of things that we hope to encourage through welfare reform. These can be cited in speeches, interviews, op-eds, etc.
- IV. National Individual Profiles - this section contains brief profiles of individuals who are willing to have their stories discussed publicly or who can be interviewed by the press. Their experiences highlight good or bad things in the welfare system that help make the case for reform.
- V. Program Fact Sheets - this section contains fact sheets on programs that are part of the welfare system such as AFDC, child support, child care and JOBS.
- VI. State Profiles - this section will eventually contain about 20 state profiles with information on model programs, individual stories, press coverage, and key contacts provided for many of the key states we will be focussing on in the welfare reform effort. The model profile for Illinois is attached. Another binder with many more states will be provided in early January.

All of these materials should be kept confidential and are for internal use. The fact sheets, however, are for public use. Additionally, all of the clients whose profiles appear here have given their consent for us to refer the press to them.

The binder will be continually updated with new information, more state profiles, additional fact sheets, etc. Please be in touch with Helene Grady (401-4886) if you have any questions.

1	General Welfare Reform Information
2	Working Group Information
3	National Model Programs
4	National Individual Profiles
5	Fact Sheets
6	Model State Profile
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	

The latest talking points and "Q and A's" that are being drafted for use by the Working Group will be added to this section when they are completed.

2

Contents

- I. Description of the Working Group and List of Members**
- II. Summary of Working Group Outreach Efforts**
- III. Summary of Working Group Regional Visits**
- IV. Summary of Working Group Consultation with Welfare Recipients**

****These materials are not for public distribution.**

The Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence

To fulfill his pledge to "end welfare as we know it," President Clinton announced on June 11, 1993 the formation of a Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence. The Working Group, made up of senior level appointees representing eight different Departments and seven White House offices, is charged with preparing a plan for welfare reform that provides opportunity but also rewards work and demands responsibility.

To accomplish this task, the Working Group assigned staff to issue groups researching background information and developing policy options in the following areas: Making Work Pay, Child Support Enforcement and Insurance, Child Care, Noncustodial Parents, Post Transitional Work, Transitional Support, Private Sector Job Development, Welfare Simplification, and Prevention. These issue groups produced draft issue papers that are being used by the Working Group in formulating a series of proposals for the President.

The Working Group has made public involvement and input a top priority as it develops its proposal for the President. To achieve this, the Working Group has taken several steps:

- * **Hearings/Public Events** -- The Working Group conducted a series of five regional hearings in order to provide the public with an opportunity to present the Working Group with their ideas and opinions. The hearings were held in Chicago, Washington, DC, Cranford, NJ, Sacramento, and Memphis. The Working Group also held several site visits to model programs, county welfare offices, and individual communities.

- * **Meetings/Briefings** -- Working Group staff have held meetings with several advocacy coalitions, including women's groups, the business community, hunger groups, housing groups, religious groups, rural groups, African American organizations, Hispanic organizations, Welfare Rights Organizations, and Native American organizations. These meetings will continue as the Working Group progresses with its proposal.

- * **Working Papers** -- The Working Group will publish working papers to provide information and spark public discussion of the issues underlying the welfare reform effort. These papers will be widely circulated.

- * **Speakers Bureau** -- The Working Group has a speakers bureau that has arranged for Working Group members and staff to speak at over 40 conferences already this year.

- * **Intake Center** -- The Working Group established an intake center for all mail and information requests.

December 13, 1993

Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence

Chairs

Bruce Reed *Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy*
David Ellwood *Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services*
Mary Jo Bane *Assistant Secretary for the Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services*

Members

Michael Alexander *Executive Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture*
Ken Apfel *Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget, Department of Health and Human Services*
Walter Broadnax *Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services*
Michael Camunoz *Senior Policy Advisor, Corporation for National & Community Service*
Norma Cantu *Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education*
Robert Carver *Deputy Assistant Secretary for Returns Processing, Treasury Department*
Andrew Cuomo *Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development*
Maria Echaveste *Administrator of Wage and Hour, Department of Labor*
Chris Edley *Associate Director for Economics and Government, Office of Management and Budget*
Joycelyn Elders *Surgeon General*
Maurice Foley *Office of Tax Policy, Treasury Department*
Thomas Glynn *Deputy Secretary, Department of Labor*
Ellen Haas *Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture*
Elaine Kamarck *Office of the Vice President*
Augusta Kappner *Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education*
Madeleine Kunin *Deputy Secretary, Department of Education*
Avis LaVelle *Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services*
Marsha Martin *Executive Director, Interagency Council on the Homeless*
Alicia Munnell *Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy, Treasury Department*
Wendell Primus *Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Services Policy, Department of Health and Human Services*
Doug Ross *Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor*
Isabel Sawhill *Associate Director for Human Resources, Office of Management and Budget*
Marshall Smith *Undersecretary, Department of Education*
Eugene Sperling *Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy*
Michael Stegman *Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development*
Joseph Stiglitz *Council of Economic Advisors*
Fernando Torres-Gil *Assistant Secretary for Aging, Department of Health and Human Services*
Jeff Watson *Deputy Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs*
Kathi Way *Special Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy*

WORKING GROUP OUTREACH EFFORTS

Public outreach has been one of the top priorities of the Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence. The first stage of the outreach efforts consisted of reaching out to a broad range of organizations with general information about the mandate of the Working Group and the principles on which the welfare reform proposal for the President will be based.

Since the creation of the Working Group, members have met with over 230 organizations in over 95 meetings, including meetings with religious organizations, women's advocacy groups, legal groups, fathers' rights advocates, African American organizations, Native American organizations, child support advocates, social workers, disability groups, hunger groups, housing advocates and Hispanic organizations.

From June through November, the Working Group has:

- * held five regional hearings and site visits at which approximately 150 groups testified;
- * had contact with over 230 organizations in 95 meetings -- 55 of these were between issue group members and the organizations;
- * received and responded to well over 1000 pieces of mail;
- * created a mailing list for welfare reform of over 2300 names of interested individuals and organizations around the country;
- * established a speaker's bureau that has arranged for members of the Working Group to represent the Working Group at over 40 conferences and meetings hosted by numerous advocacy organizations. Examples of these meetings include the annual conferences hosted by the National Association of Social Workers, National Alliance of Business, National Black Child Development Institute, National Council of La Raza, and Women Work (formerly known as the National Displaced Homemakers Network); and
- * begun to set up state-by-state files on welfare reform efforts and key individuals in major states.

From this effort, the Working Group become aware of the range of concerns regarding any reform program. Groups have generally advocated for flexibility within a blanket reform program, for strengthening the current education and training programs, for increasing access to quality day care, for rent reform and coordination of services among agencies, and for a stronger child support enforcement system.

Much of the outreach effort has revolved largely around the business community. The Working Group has held seven meetings with major national organizations representing the business community. The Working Group is seeking the business community's ideas and experiences in order to draft a reform proposal. We are also trying to lay the groundwork for the business community's support for the plan and commitment to providing jobs. As this support is essential to a credible proposal, the Working Group is now planning an intense outreach schedule for the business community for early 1994.

With the question of work after welfare and job creation, the Working Group also considers

labor an especially important player in the development of the welfare initiative. The Group has held ongoing meetings with labor representatives from AFSCME (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees), SEIU (Service Employees International Union), AFT (American Federation of Teachers), CWA (Communications Workers of America) as well as representatives from the main umbrella union of the AFL-CIO.

In terms of the prevention issue, the Working Group has conducted meetings with representatives from children's advocacy and family planning organizations including the Children's Defense Fund and the Center for Population Options. A series of consultation meetings are being planned for early 1994 with a variety of experts on education, youth development and teenage pregnancy prevention.

The Working Group has also outreached aggressively to assure that a diversity of perspectives are heard regarding the development of the child support initiative. Meetings have taken place with child support advocates including the Center for Law and Social Policy, Children's Defense Fund, National Women's Law Center, and ACES (Advocates for Children for Enforcement of Support) as well as the National Children's Rights Council and fathers' rights groups from Iowa, California, New Mexico and Washington. The issue group on Child Support Enforcement and Insurance has also held meetings with legal groups including the American Bar Association as well as elected officials representing the National Conference of State Legislators and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Additionally, the Working Group has outreached to organizations representing minority communities. The Working Group Chairs and issue group staffs have met with representatives of the African American community including representatives from the National Urban League, National Black Child Development Institute, NAACP and the Rainbow Coalition. Meetings have also been held with Hispanic/Latino organizations including the National Council of La Raza and the National Puerto Rican Coalition. In addition, staff of the Working Group have met with representatives of the Native American Employment and Training Coalition and with Tribal JOBS directors at the Annual Conference of the National Congress of American Indians in Reno, Nevada.

Finally, interaction with women's organizations has played a major part in the Working Group's outreach initiative. The Chairs of the Working Group as well as issue group staff have met with a variety of women's groups including representatives from the National Women's Law Center, Institute for Women's Policy Research, Women's Legal Defense Fund, Black Women's Health Project, NOW, NOW Legal Defense Fund and Women Work (formerly the National Displaced Homemakers' Network). Involving women's groups in its process will continue to be a priority for the Working Group, as women are one of the main groups affected by the welfare reform initiatives.

These efforts represent a sample of the major outreach initiatives pursued by the Working Group. The next steps in the overall outreach effort involve meeting with these same advocacy communities to discuss the alternative proposals under consideration by the Working Group.

December 13, 1993

WORKING GROUP REGIONAL VISIT SUMMARY

The Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence conducted five public forums from August to November 1993. The forums were held in Chicago, Ill., Washington, D.C., Cranford, N.J., Sacramento, CA., and Memphis, TN. The Working Group heard from over 220 witnesses, including 24 witnesses who once or are currently receiving AFDC and three witnesses with child support problems.

An essential element of the four regional visits outside of Washington, D.C., was the time spent in the community gathering information. Working Group members went to neighborhoods, visited programs, and met with local residents before each hearing. Overall, the Working Group visited 12 program sites and two private residences, held informal focus group discussions with 66 AFDC recipients, and met with 34 caseworkers. Finally, most members that attended a public forum outside of Washington, D.C., observed an AFDC eligibility interview in a local welfare office.

FORUM SUMMARIES

Each forum had a particular focus. The first three forums centered on three of the President's themes: Make Work Pay, Child Support Enforcement, and Education and Training. The fourth forum explored welfare reform in a rural setting.

Chicago, Illinois August 10-11, 1993

The Chicago visit focused on the principle of Making Work Pay. The Working Group visited Project Match in the Cabrini-Green housing project, where they conducted informal focus groups with staff and participants of Project Match and the New Hope Project of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Working Group members also observed AFDC eligibility interviews and met with caseworkers at four Illinois Department of Public Aid offices.

During the morning session of the Chicago forum the Working Group heard from six AFDC recipients and program directors from Project Match, New Hope Project, Chicago Commons, and the Teen Parent Demo. The afternoon session featured testimony by Mayor Richard M. Daley, Jr., Congressman Bobby Rush, and Illinois Department of Public Aid Acting Director Robert Wright. Overall, 37 witnesses presented testimony to the Working Group in Chicago.

Washington, D.C. August 19-20, 1993

The Washington, D.C. event was a day and a half policy forum discussing the four principles with state and local elected officials, researchers, advocates, and AFDC recipients. The Working Group heard from 66 witnesses over two days. In addition to five AFDC recipients, other notable witnesses included Del. Eleanor Norton Holmes (D- D.C.), Patricia

Ireland, National Organization for Women; Will Marshall, Progressive Policy Institute; Robert Greenstein, Center for Budget and Policy Priorities and William H. Kolberg, National Alliance of Business.

Cranford, N.J.

September 9-10, 1993

The New Jersey visit focused on Improving Child Support Enforcement. The Working Group visited the Parents Fair Share demonstration project "Operation Fatherhood" in Trenton, N.J., where they conducted informal focus groups with staff and non-custodial fathers. The Working Group then met with court, probation, and administrative representatives of the N.J. child support enforcement system. Finally, the Working Group visited the Middlesex County Social Services office and conducted informal focus groups with staff and AFDC participants from The Work Group, a model welfare-to-work program from Camden, N.J..

During the morning session of the New Jersey forum the Working Group held a roundtable discussion with single parents, non-custodial parents and advocates for both groups. Of the 30 witnesses, the Working Group heard from four single parents and three non-custodial parents. Other notable testimony was presented by Governor Jim Florio, Assemblyman Wayne Bryant, William Waldman of the N.J. Department of Human Services, N.Y. State Senator Stephen M. Saland, and N.Y. Dept. of Social Services Commissioner Michael Dowling.

Sacramento, CA

October 7-8, 1993

The California visit focused on Education, Training, and Support services, examining lessons from the California GAIN program. The Working Group visited the Alameda County GAIN office and conducted informal focus groups with staff and participants from both Alameda and San Francisco County GAIN programs. The Working Group then visited the Contra Costa County GAIN program for additional focus group meetings.

The morning session of the California forum was a roundtable discussion of the lessons from the GAIN program. The afternoon session covered the four principles and included an open public comment period. Of the fifty witnesses testifying, six were AFDC recipients. Other witnesses included John Wallace from MDRC, Larry Townsend of Riverside County, and Robert Friedman of the Corporation for Enterprise Development. Elected officials presenting testimony included Assemblyman Tom Bates, State Senator Mike Thompson, and County Supervisor Grantland Johnson.

Memphis, TN

November 8-9, 1993

The focus of the Tennessee visit was on both economic development and service delivery in a rural setting. At the suggestion of Congressman Harold Ford (D-TN), the Working Group

visited Project Self-Initiative at Hurt Village and conducted a community meeting with staff and residents. Working Group members then visited the private homes of two AFDC recipients in rural counties to see and hear about welfare services and living conditions in a rural setting. Working Group members also held a lunch meeting with staff and AFDC recipients in Fayette County, and travelled to Tipton County for additional focus groups and eligibility interviews.

The morning session of the forum discussed ways that a national welfare reform plan could create incentives for job development in a rural setting. The afternoon session reviewed the challenges and barriers to delivering social services in a rural setting. The Working Group heard from 3 AFDC recipients as part of the 39 witnesses testifying. Other witnesses included former Congressman Ed Jones, Congressman Harold Ford (videotaped remarks), Ray Bryant of the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission, Julia Vindasius of the Arkansas Good Faith Fund, and Department of Human Services commissioners from the states of Tennessee, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, and North Carolina.

December 13, 1993

WORKING GROUP CONSULTATION WITH WELFARE RECIPIENTS

The President's Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence has undertaken significant efforts to gain information, insight and suggestions from a wide variety of individuals and groups. The intensive consultation which Working Group members and staff have had with the recipients of public assistance has been especially valuable.

The Working Group has been able to gain the personal views and experiences of welfare recipients through a number of public forums, small informal focus groups, and individual discussions at sites around the country. These efforts complement the Group's ongoing discussions with over 230 advocacy organizations interested in social services and welfare issues.

Public Forums

The Working Group has held several all-day forums open to the public, interested individuals and organizations. At each forum, current and former welfare recipients were assured the opportunity to present testimony, and have furnished moving and constructive information to the Working Group.

- In Chicago, 25 year-old single mother Roxanne B. talked about escaping from an abusive marriage only to find frustration and hardship trying to play by the rules in the welfare system. In March, 1992 she applied for AFDC and was offered full benefits. Since she was receiving voluntary child support at that time, Ms. B. refused the full grant and opted for only food stamps and medicaid. Two months later, however, her husband terminated his child support payments. When she reapplied for a full AFDC grant, she was told the application would take 45 days to process. While waiting for her assistance application to be processed, she was evicted from her home. Fortunately, she was able to find a compassionate landlord willing to let her move in without rent or a deposit based on her promise of the pending welfare check. Her AFDC check did not come until five months and many battles after she had applied. Despite her efforts to play by the rules and seek only the minimum support she needed, Ms. B. felt punished by the system, treated as though she didn't have feelings, children, commitments, ideas or choices. She said "Since then, I have questioned many times my decision to trade one form of abuse for another."
- In Washington, D.C., Patty L., a former welfare recipient, talked about her ex-husband who owes over \$105,000 in child support. Even though he earns \$40,000 a year and has been with the same firm for seven years, the county child support enforcement agency has failed to get a withholding order in place. Through the Montgomery County Family Independence Project, Ms. L. was able to improve her skills and find a job. She is still living in government subsidized housing and supports her two sons on an annual salary of \$15,000. Ms. L. reminded us that it is important to continue to help families after their AFDC payments cease: "Even though I found a job, because the pay is low, we would not have been able to survive

without some type of assistance."

- Sheila W., a current welfare recipient, expressed her frustration that whenever she tried to go to work or improve her education, the system would "pull the rug out from under" her, burying her in red tape and jeopardizing her benefits for independently finding part time work. She said: "The feeling of a job gives you control over your life and makes you part of the human race," but the welfare system discourages "bouts of independence."

Focus Groups

In order to gain a more personal and in-depth understanding about welfare, the Working Group also arranged numerous small focus group sessions with welfare recipients in their own communities. These visits have allowed members to talk in informal and less structured settings with participants in AFDC and other social service programs, exploring their personal welfare problems and concerns.

- In California, Working Group members gained tremendous insight into the pros and cons of the GAIN program through intensive discussion sessions with participants.
- In Chicago, members visited local Public Aid offices and sat in on intake interviews with AFDC applicants. Members also met informally with Public Aid staff and participants in the Project Match program based in Cabrini Green and in Milwaukee's New Hope Project throughout the afternoon.
- In New Jersey, the Group met with participants in the Work Group from Camden and examined the special problems experienced by non-custodial fathers in similar small group discussions arranged with a number of men participating in the Operation Fatherhood program.
- In Tennessee, members met with AFDC recipients and agency staff in Memphis and surrounding rural counties. The Group focused on economic development and ways to overcome barriers to services and jobs that rural recipients confront.

In addition to the activities of the Working Group members, 80 staff visited a dozen income maintenance and human services sites in the Washington D.C. area and met with several hundred AFDC clients. The Working Group ensured that every individual working on the development of the Administration's Welfare Reform plan had the opportunity to visit a welfare or service program.

Advocacy Groups

Working Group members and staff have also consulted widely with advocacy groups representing welfare recipients, low income children and families, program administrators, elected officials, business and labor groups and community organizations.

December 13, 1993



Contents

The following fact sheets, which can be distributed publicly, are included in this section:

1. New Hope Project, Milwaukee, WI
2. Project Match, Chicago, IL
3. Teen Parent Demonstration, Chicago, IL
4. Parents' Fair Share Demonstration, New Jersey
5. Riverside GAIN, CA
6. ASSETS, Alabama
7. LEAP, Mississippi
8. CAP, New York
9. Single Parent Employment Demonstration, Utah
10. Kenosha JOBS, WI
11. Paternity Affidavit Program, Washington

The New Hope Project

CONTACT: Julie Kerksick
414-342-3338

LOCATION: 623 North 35th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53208

The New Hope Project is a model welfare to work program that will test the effect of providing work supports and making work pay on the choices of welfare recipients.

MISSION: 1) to demonstrate to leaders, policy makers and citizens that there is a better, more humane, more cost-effective way to deal with poverty and joblessness than the current welfare system; 2) to bring about changes in federal and state policies.

SUMMARY: The New Hope Project, which represents a unique partnership between private and public sectors, is seen by many policy makers as a significant test of how to make work pay. The Project is a three year demonstration that will assess the effect of subsidizing work for individuals and families who are currently poor. It offers participants: 1) help in finding a job (a community service job if they are unable to find a job after 8 weeks); 2) wage subsidies that assure an income above the poverty level; 3) health insurance; and 4) child care. Benefits are available only if an individual is working at least thirty hours per week.

When fully operating, the Project will work with 650 families either currently on welfare, unemployed but not on welfare, or working but still poor. The questions that will be examined by the demonstration include:

- *Will people currently on public assistance respond to the opportunity to work when disincentives are removed?
- *Are there a sufficient number of jobs within the private sector?
- *Can community service jobs successfully fill any gaps between available private sector jobs and low-skilled unemployed individuals?
- *Do more people achieve economic self-sufficiency through the New Hope Project than through other means?
- *How does the cost of the New Hope Project compare to what is currently spent in direct and indirect costs for social welfare?

PILOT: For the past fifteen months, New Hope has run a pre-pilot program with fifty-two participants. The purpose was to test the procedures and to use the experience to make changes in the program or administration prior to moving to the full-scale pilot of 600 families. When the current fifty-two participants entered the New Hope Project, thirty-four were receiving AFDC, twelve were receiving food stamps only, and four were receiving no help of any kind from the welfare system. As of May 1993, 43 participants are working full-time; 32 of these have regular sector full-time jobs and 11 have community service jobs. One participant is working part-time, four are unemployed/in full-time job search, and four participants are inactive.

FUNDING: The budget for the project is \$20.7 million. To date, New Hope has raised almost \$3.5 million from local and national corporations and foundations (e.g. \$1.7 from the Bader and Ford Foundations to fund the evaluation). The Project has raised \$550,000 from the State in General Purpose Revenues, and \$300,000 from the City of Milwaukee. Remaining funds are being sought from private, State and federal sources.

December 13, 1993

Project Match: A Long-Term Welfare-to-Work Program

CONTACT: Toby Herr
312-266-6464

LOCATION: 1276 N. Clybourn
Chicago, IL 60610

MISSION: 1) to provide long-term assistance to welfare dependent families as they move through multiple career stages toward economic self-sufficiency; and 2) to document and disseminate lessons learned about the process of leaving welfare.

Project Match works specifically with long-term welfare recipients with significant needs for support services. It helps this population move through multiple career stages toward economic self-sufficiency.

SUMMARY: Project Match uniquely understands the difficulty involved in leaving welfare and persistent poverty and recognizes that it involves false starts, setbacks and incremental gains. The program, therefore, makes a commitment of long-term support (3-5 years) to its participants. Its service goals include helping participants enroll in and complete training and education programs, obtain and keep jobs, advance to better jobs, and become quickly reemployed when they lose their jobs.

Participants may move through Project Match in a variety of ways. After receiving an initial assessment, a participant is placed in one or more of a range of activities, including education, training, employment, and community volunteer work. The combination and sequence of activities vary for each participant as does the length of time in the program. Key services include job development (i.e., help to find a job), job and school retention support (e.g., help to keep a job or stay in school), and recognition for attainment of incremental milestones (e.g., working for two months, regularly attending GED classes).

SCOPE: Project Match has worked with more than 740 residents of the Cabrini-Green community in Chicago. Service sites include the Winfield/Moody Health Center, the program's primary service site, and a second site funded by the Department of Health and Human Services at a Head Start in Cabrini Green. Northwestern University's Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research and the Erikson Institute of Chicago serve as research sites.

EVALUATION: A study of participants suggests the relative success of the Project Match approach. The average number of months worked among participants increased by about one month in each of the three years studied, and hourly wages increased by 23% between year one and year three.

FUNDING: Sources include mostly State funds (e.g. Illinois Department of Public Aid and the Illinois State Board of Education) but also a federal grant from the Department of Health and Human Services through their Office of Community Service's Demonstration Partnership Program. The Primary funders of the Project's policy research work include The Joyce Foundation and Woods Charitable Funds. The Project receives other local foundation support and private donations.

December 13, 1993

Teenage Parent Demonstration

CONTACT: Denise Simon, Manager, Youth Services, 217/785-0462

GOAL: to rigorously test on a large scale new policies and programs aimed at reducing the incidence of long-term welfare dependency.

SUMMARY: The demonstration was sponsored by HHS' Administration for Children and Families and Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Beginning in 1986, four-year demonstration grants totalling over \$7 million were awarded through a competitive process to the Illinois Department of Public Aid and the New Jersey Department of Human Services. Under these grants, the states engaged in a one-year program design and implementation phase and three years of full-scale demonstration.

MANDATORY DEMONSTRATIONS: The Illinois Department of Public Aid implemented its program, Project Advance, in the areas served by its Roseland, Auburn Park, Southeast, and South Suburban offices. New Jersey implemented its program, Teen Progress, in two sites -- one serving the City of Camden and the other serving the City of Newark.

The programs were employment-focused and designed to offer universal coverage to all first-time teenage parents receiving AFDC; participation in the programs was mandatory. Under federal guidelines, the demonstration programs required first-time teenage parents to attend school, participate in job training, work, or actively pursue activities preparatory to school, work, or training, or face a substantial reduction in their welfare grant until they complied with program requirements. The programs provided the young mothers with intensive case management, including: in-house workshops on a wide range of topics including self-esteem, motivation, family planning, career choices, and parenting; education, training, and employment services; and child care and transportation services.

TARGET POPULATION: There were a total of 5,962 eligible young mothers in the demonstration service areas during a two-and-a-half year enrollment period and 5,297 (89%) of them enrolled in the study sample. The target population was extremely diverse:

- *average age was 18
- *5% were 15 or younger
- *80% had a child under a year old; 50% had an infant
- *1/3 had completed high school; only 1/2 of those who had not were still in school
- *average reading and math skill level at the eighth grade level
- *1/2 were living with a parent
- *less than 1/3 received any support from the noncustodial father of their child

SIGNIFICANT RESULTS: The demonstration programs are being evaluated by Mathematical Policy Research, Inc. under contract to the demonstration sponsors. A long-term follow-up of the study sample and their children is underway, with results to be released in 1996.

December 13, 1993

The federal Teenage Parent Demonstration program has been very successful in getting first-time teen parents to stay in school, enroll in job training, or take a job. The program was particularly significant because it was mandatory, universal, and successful. Its participants have a 19% higher rate of success than other AFDC mothers. After two years enrollment, 79% of the participants were in school, job training or a job -- compared to 66% of those receiving regular AFDC assistance.

The Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Operation Fatherhood

LOCATION: Union Industrial Home for Children
864 Bellevue Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08618

CONTACT: Barbara Kelley-Sease, Executive Director, Union Industrial Home
609/695-1492

GOALS: 1) to reduce poverty among children receiving public assistance by encouraging and requiring their noncustodial parents to establish paternity and pay child support; 2) to increase the employment and earnings of noncustodial parents who are unemployed and unable to adequately support their children; and 3) to assist these parents in providing other forms of support to their children when appropriate.

SUMMARY: The nine Parents' Fair Share Demonstration programs use a variety of approaches, built around four core services: employment and training, peer support and instruction in parenting skills, mediation, and enhanced child support enforcement. Fathers generally enter the program because they need a job, and they want to become more actively involved with their children. However, they themselves have a wide range of problems, including substance abuse and legal problems over child support arrears. The Operation Fatherhood program addresses these problems in several ways. First, they offer the men job skills sessions and help with the job search. Second, informal group sessions teach the participants more about their role as a single parent. These sessions are mandatory for program participants. Topics for the sessions include:

- *Personal Development sessions cover issues involving fatherhood, manhood, values, communication, decision-making and self-esteem.

- *Fatherhood sessions cover childhood growth and development, behavior and parenting skills.

- *Relationships sessions cover the qualities and types of relationships in general, dealing with anger, and establishing goals to improve relationships.

- *Health and Sexuality sessions cover sexual behavior, family planning and birth control.

SCOPE: Operation Fatherhood works with noncustodial fathers age 16-35 living in Mercer County who are unemployed or underemployed. The program has met its required enrollment level of 300 for the pilot phase which lasts from April 1992 - December 1993. 33 men have been placed into on-the-job training slots and 39 entered unsubsidized employment. To date, child support garnishments were entered for 25 of the participants and collections initiated for 18.

FUNDING: Operation Fatherhood is an initiative of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, and a consortium of foundation partners, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, AT&T and the Ford Foundation. The funding includes \$750,000 of federal money, \$325,00 in State money and \$200,000 in private funds.

December 13, 1993

Parents' Fair Share is the nation's first federally funded program to provide services and support to noncustodial parents. This interesting nine state demonstration, created by the Family Support Act, is a model for service strategies likely to be encouraged in welfare reform.

Riverside County's GAIN Program

CONTACT: Lawrence E. Townsend, Jr.
Director, Department of
Public Social Services
4060 County Circle Drive
Riverside, CA 92503
909/358-3005

MISSION: to return adult AFDC recipients to productive employment through education, training and placement services.

RESULTS: As MDRC reports in its April 20, 1993 review of GAIN, Riverside had the most impressive results for single parents. In the second year, it raised the program group's earnings by \$1,179, or 53 percent over the group average. Its total improvement in earnings, over the first two years, reached \$2,099 per person. The County also saved \$701 in welfare payments in the second year, a 17 percent reduction compared to the amount of payments made to the MDRC control group. Total welfare savings reached \$1,397 per person after two years. These earnings and welfare impacts were the largest in any of the six counties studied by MDRC, and are larger, according to MDRC, than those found after just two years in previous large-scale welfare-to-work programs.

SUMMARY: The GAIN program is administered by each of the 58 counties in California. However, current GAIN statute and regulation provide a significant amount of flexibility to the individual counties. Riverside County has used this flexibility in an interesting way to create a program with very high participation and employment results. Three key program elements differentiate Riverside from other counties: Employment Focus, Participation, and Job Development.

The Riverside program works on the model of placing participants into employment as quickly as possible because it views real job experience as the best training available to clients. Riverside GAIN managers and staff receive a strong and unequivocal message that their responsibility is to assist AFDC clients in becoming employed. The County enforces a minimum job performance standard of 12 placements per month per worker. Orientation focuses on the expectation that all clients will become employed. Job Club is designed as a training ground to help clients understand the benefits of working, how to locate and secure employment, how to sell themselves, and how to use these skills in the future. Then, in Job Search, clients apply what they have learned in Job Club. Clients who are in basic education or training components understand that they are there to improve their skill level so they can effectively enter the job market.

Riverside County GAIN staff extensively market the GAIN program by identifying the benefits of participation for the client and closely monitoring the progress of the client through the various GAIN components. If necessary, immediate and timely action, sometimes resulting in a financial sanction, is taken to obtain a satisfactory level of participation by the client.

With regard to job development, Riverside GAIN staff, rather than rely solely on the client or other agencies to identify potential job placements, are aggressively involved in locating job vacancies and recruiting employers specifically for GAIN clients. This effort includes acquainting prospective employers with the GAIN program and providing services which make it more appealing to hire GAIN clients to those employers.

December 13, 1993

The Riverside GAIN program is the single most effective welfare-to-work program evaluated by MDRC. Its heavy emphasis on getting people into employment from their first day on welfare is an excellent example of the sort of culture change in a welfare office which welfare reform will seek to achieve.

ASSETS: Avenues to Self-Sufficiency Through Employment and Training Services

CONTACT: Joel Sanders or Gudrun Hanson
Public Assistance Division
Alabama Dept. of Human
Resources
50 Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130
(205) 242-1950

ASSETS is a demonstration program that consolidates food stamps and AFDC into a single cash assistance program. Its redesigned service delivery structure is an exciting model for welfare simplification.

SUMMARY: Through ASSETS, the Alabama Department of Human Resources has initiated a fundamental restructuring of benefit programs. The Department has consolidated the Food Stamp program and AFDC into a single cash assistance program. Child support cooperation among recipients is required, and the JOBS program and Food Stamp Employment and Training Services are also incorporated into ASSETS. The program works to:

- * prevent individuals and families from becoming economically dependent
- * provide more accessible and understandable benefits to recipients
- * encourage recipient independence and flexibility in managing their household budgets and stress the expectation that clients can become responsible managers of their lives
- * reduce administrative complexity
- * reduce erroneous payments
- * save administrative funds associated with insuring, transporting and storing Food Stamps
- * permit administrative costs and staff resources to be diverted to the reduction and prevention of economic dependency.

ASSETS uses a case management model utilizing a single worker for eligibility determination and employment and training activities. Under the new program, income is counted the same way for both Nutrition Assistance and AFDC, resources are evaluated in the same manner for both programs, earned income deductions are computed using Food Stamp rules, monthly reporting is eliminated, the requirement for expedited services is simplified and applied to both AFDC and NA, benefit levels are standardized based on income increments, and sanction policies are standardized both within and across program lines. ASSETS also includes a comprehensive Work and Training Services program (WATS) modeled after the Federal JOBS program.

SCOPE: The demonstration program began July 1, 1990 in Limestone County and has since been implemented in Clarke County on November 1, 1991 and in Madison County on January 1, 1991. The project will continue for four years. Waivers were granted for AFDC, Child Support Enforcement and the Food Stamp program in January, 1989. Some of the waivers were granted to conform need standards of AFDC with those of the Food Stamps program and to require participation for more than six months in employment and training programs. Others were granted to cash-out the Food Stamps program and to modify income reporting and budgeting methods.

Abt Associates, Inc. is performing an evaluation through randomly selected demonstration and comparison counties. The final impact report is due in 1994.

December 13, 1993

Project LEAP -- Learn, Earn and Prosper

CONTACT: Dr. Ed Meek, Project Director
601/232-7238

LOCATION: Department of Resource
Development
The University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

MISSION: to eliminate the high rate of adult illiteracy in Mississippi, which is the source of many of the state's social problems, including poverty and joblessness.

Project LEAP is an innovative partnership program that has used satellite technology to increase the accessibility of education programs for welfare recipients in secluded areas of rural Mississippi. It is a premier service delivery model in the JOBS program, which will be a cornerstone of the welfare reform plan.

SUMMARY: Project LEAP is an exciting partnership of education, government, and private industry serving the educational needs of AFDC recipients. LEAP serves as a local service provider in the overall JOBS program. Now in its second year, LEAP uses satellite technology in an innovative way in order to reach 3000 students in 80 sites in 62 counties statewide. It combines satellite, cable television, and computer technology with traditional classroom-based instruction in offering literacy, GED, and job-readiness training.

In its first year, LEAP concentrated on establishing literacy programs in the most rural parts of Mississippi, generally in areas where there were no adult education programs. Sites are located in a wide range of facilities, including public schools, libraries, armories and even what some would describe as rural "shacks." After only six months of operation, the first 668 students served by LEAP achieved the following:

- 79% of upper level have received the GED
- 16% have become employed while in LEAP
- 30% have progressed to a higher learning level (there are 3 levels)
- 13% have entered community college or other training programs;
some have enrolled at The University of Mississippi
- 5% have been removed from public assistance

LEAP's interactive, instructional programs are broadcast five hours a day, four days a week, via satellite and are carried on the Mississippi Cable Training Network. Each educational center is staffed by a teacher and aides. Master teachers, who present a core curriculum, enrich local classroom activities via satellite from studios on the campus of the University of Mississippi. Reception of these signals by the centers is made possible by satellite-receiving antenna or through the Mississippi Cable Training Network. Additionally, two of the nation's most sophisticated mobile learning laboratories, both equipped with 12 computers and powerful instructional software developed in Mississippi, enhance Project LEAP training. Constructed by CENTEC of Jackson, Mississippi, the 30-foot-long mobile labs include a wide range of computer-assisted programs.

FUNDING: Project LEAP is funded through the JOBS program of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Mississippi Department of Human Services, the Governor's Office for Literacy, the University of Mississippi, and in cooperation with the Mississippi Cable Training Network.

December 13, 1993

The Child Assistance Program (CAP)

CONTACT: Mike Warner, Program Manager
518/473-7344

LOCATION: 40 N. Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12243

MISSION: to help families with dependent children gain economic security and escape poverty and to remove the stigma of welfare.

CAP, a model program in child support assurance and making work pay, tests several innovative methods for increasing self-sufficiency through work and family support.

SUMMARY: The Child Assistance Program is a New York State DSS pilot program to provide wage supplements to single AFDC parents who can both work and obtain child support orders. CAP is a valuable model program since it gives parents primary responsibility for their children. Although CAP provides a lower basic benefit level (about two-thirds of the AFDC grant), it provides more favorable treatment of earned income. Overall, the pilot program tests: 1) whether the offer of economic incentives will induce AFDC recipients to obtain child support court orders and earn at least \$350 per month to qualify for the economic and enhanced case management incentives; and 2) whether the incentives will increase self-sufficiency and decrease recidivism.

More specifically, CAP involves a major restructuring of benefit levels and service delivery. CAP benefits are reduced by only 10 cents on the dollar up to the poverty level and then 67 cents on the dollar up to the benefit limit at 150% of the poverty level, whereas AFDC takes away benefits almost dollar for dollar. CAP also pays recipients their benefits, as well as child care support, directly and allows them to manage a personal budget. If recipients need training, it ties directly into JTPA or other pre-existing employment and training services.

CAP is based on a holistic, case management system in which recipients develop their own plan for improving their family's economic and social situation. Case workers have a much smaller caseload, thus they can give more individualized attention and help clients receive necessary services quickly.

Waivers for AFDC, Child Support, Medicaid and the Food Stamp Program were granted in September, 1988. CAP requires AFDC waivers for certain provisions, including: 1) replacing earnings disregards with incentives; 2) eliminating the resource test; and 3) eliminating certain employment rules.

SCOPE: Operating in seven counties since 1988, CAP is available to all single AFDC recipients with children who are able to get a support order on a voluntary basis. The program was implemented in counties between October, 1988 and April, 1989. CAP has been authorized to run through April, 1994 but will most likely be extended through 1998.

EVALUATION: A demonstration group of approximately 4200 participating families has been evaluated by Abt Associates, Inc., whose final report was released earlier this year. According to Abt results, two years after recipients learned about CAP, significant progress was demonstrated. Those clients informed about CAP:

- had earnings from employment 27 percent higher than those uninformed about CAP;
- were 25 percent more likely to have obtained a support order for all children lacking one than those uninformed about CAP;
- were 18 percent more likely to have income exceeding 125 percent of poverty than those uninformed about CAP.

Additionally, the evaluation's cost-benefit analysis found CAP able to achieve these impacts without any increase or decrease in government expenditures.

December 13, 1993

Utah's Single Parent Employment Demonstration Program

CONTACT: D. Michael Stewart
Executive Director, Utah DHS
120 North 200 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
801/538-4001

GOAL: to transform the AFDC program from an income maintenance system to an employment program and to have 70-75 percent of participants achieve an income above poverty in two years, or at least a net increase of \$250.00.

Utah's Single Parent Employment Demonstration experiments with running a universal JOBS program, with no exemptions, in which all AFDC recipients in the project area are expected to be moving toward self-sufficiency.

SUMMARY: On October 5th, 1992, federal agencies approved the demonstration and forty-four necessary federal waivers involving six major programs including AFDC, Food Stamps, Medicaid, Child Support, Child Care and JOBS. Under the demonstration program:

- * Self sufficiency planning is required prior to eligibility determination for financial assistance, with one-time payments used to divert certain applicants from assistance through employment and child support;
- * Child support collection is prioritized for program participants;
- * JOBS exemptions are eliminated. All parents and children not attending school are expected to participate, with a \$100 reduction in the family's grant for nonparticipation. Participation includes employment, work experience, job search, job seeking skills, training, education, or other activities to enhance employment potential;
- * Eligibility and benefit determination are simplified and financial incentives for work are increased, including: raising the resource limit to \$2,000 and the automobile limit to \$8,000; replacing the current disregards with \$100 plus 45 percent; and expanding eligibility for transitional Medicaid and child care services.

SCOPE: The demonstration began January 1, 1993 at the Kearns office which serves part of Salt Lake County, an urban area. In March, the program was started in St. George, a small city, and in Roosevelt, a rural area with high unemployment and a high percentage of Native Americans. The Kearns office contains both an experimental and control group.

EVALUATION: An independent evaluation is being conducted by The Social Research Institute at the Graduate School of Social Work, University of Utah. The preliminary results, as of May 1993, are very positive. 4 to 5 percent of all demonstration participants, including experimental group participants, are securing employment each month. This is double the control group percentage and the state average. The number of experimental group families receiving financial assistance declined by 151, or 14 percent, in the first five months. In comparison, the number of control group families receiving AFDC declined by 5 percent. Despite enhanced work incentive disregards and a \$40 payment for full participation, monthly grant costs for the experimental group declined by \$49,000, or 13 percent, during these five months. Control group grant costs declined by 2 percent. The additional cost above the normal JOBS cost for the experimental group of 1,100 cases averages about \$45,000 or \$540,000 annually. The proposal projected that AFDC grant savings would equal the additional employment service cost toward the end of the second year.

December 13, 1993

Kenosha County JOBS Program

CONTACT: Larry Jankowski
JOBS Program Director
8600 Sheridan Road,
PO Box 4248
Kenosha, WI 53141-4248
414/697-2550

MISSION: to empower participants in public assistance programs to attain and sustain economic self-sufficiency.

SUMMARY: The Kenosha County JOBS Program offers a unique package designed to move welfare recipients into the work force as quickly as possible. The program is based on several assumptions, including: 1) AFDC is intended to be temporary; 2) the AFDC recipient is capable of employment and of reaching economic self-sufficiency; and 3) the AFDC recipient is always better off employed than being completely dependent on public assistance. Its main strategies include a commitment to the integration and consolidation of services, to engaging participants in JOBS Program activities as soon as possible and to the greatest degree possible, and to involving each participant in a progressive series of activities that require the same level of commitment in terms of time and energy as full-time employment.

The Kenosha County Job Center serves as the core of all county services. At the Center, staff from any one participating agency are not seated together in the general work space, but commingle with other agency staff to provide for maximum communication and to facilitate the building of common caseloads among groups of related staff. The Job Center includes classroom space as well as a professionally staffed, on-site child care room for children of participants who are involved in Job Center activities.

The Program's WorkFirst initiative engages AFDC applicants in JOBS Program activities before the receipt of the first welfare check. WorkFirst strives to provide at least 32 hours per week of JOBS Program activity for the first 23 weeks of mandatory or voluntary JOBS participation and to place all new AFDC applicants into a work situation within eleven weeks of application. The Simulated Work Week engages JOBS program participants in employment and training activities that require the same level of commitment as full-time employment.

Economic Support and JOBS Program intake are done sequentially on the same day, and the applicant is told that receipt of AFDC is conditioned on continuous involvement in Job Center activities for at least the next twenty-three weeks. These activities begin with a two-week Motivation Workshop and a two-week Job Seeking Skills Workshop. If a full-time or a part-time job is not found by the end of the sixth week of Initial Job Search, a Community Work Experience, On-the-Job Training, or Work Supplementation slot is assigned to begin the Monday of week eleven.

RESULTS: In 1992, the JOBS Program provided service to 2,933 AFDC recipients. 85 percent of all mandatory and voluntary participants received services. This compares to a 16 percent participation rate nationwide and a 32 percent rate for Wisconsin. In 1992, Kenosha participants had a placement rate of 32 percent compared to 20 percent statewide. An average of one out of every three participants reported earned income due to employment each month.

December 13, 1993

The Kenosha County JOBS Program works to break the cycle of welfare dependency by placing clients in employment situations as early as the first week on welfare. Additionally, the program's innovative physical and administrative design serves as a model for reinventing the structure of the welfare system.

Washington State Paternity Affidavit Program

CONTACT: John Hoover
Support Enforcement Officer, Paternity
Affidavit Program
(206) 586-3555

LOCATION: PO Box 9162
Olympia, WA 98507-9162

MISSION: Washington State has a focused initiative to persuade new fathers to sign paternity establishment forms, in the hospital, at the birth of their children.

Washington State has a statewide Paternity Affidavit Program designed to persuade new fathers to sign paternity establishment forms, in the hospital at the time of birth. Washington is the first state to run a focused in-hospital paternity establishment initiative.

SUMMARY: While many states provide the opportunity for new fathers to establish paternity at the hospital, Washington has a focused initiative which includes carefully informed consent, training for hospital social workers and midwives and timely follow-up with the father to establish and enforce the support order. Since July 1989, Washington law has required the attending physician, midwife, or their agents (the hospital) to give the unwed father a chance to acknowledge paternity of his newborn. They are given ten days from the birth date to do so, and for each signed and notarized affidavit, OSE pays the agent "finder fee" of \$20. Before signing the paternity acknowledgment, both parents are given written information about the benefits and responsibilities of paternity, including the duty to support and support enforcement services. The hospital sends a copy of the acknowledgement with its invoice to OSE.

Once the Office of Support Enforcement receives its copy of the acknowledgment, it serves the father with a notice of parental responsibility. If the mother and child are on welfare, support enforcement begins when the state authorizes financial and medical assistance for the new baby. If the mother applies for public assistance at the time of birth, the order for support is initiated at the same time.

SCOPE: About 100 hospitals in the state are participating and staffs at 50 of them have received training in the new paternity consent process. OSE also did extensive training with local vital statistics registrars.

EVALUATION: The number of affidavits received has increased each year since the program began. In 1990 6,500 were received and in 1992 the number rose to 10,000. Cases have moved quickly from order establishment into enforcement, and few if any of the original acknowledgments have been contested.

FUNDING: Washington State Department of Social and Health Services

December 13, 1993



National Individual Profiles

The individuals profiled in this section have agreed to speak with members of the press or others interested in their personal experience with the welfare system. This is an initial list, divided by issue. We will be updating the list continuously and will eventually have divisions by region and by issue. We will also be adding a list of quotes from letters that we have received from people who cannot be reached by telephone. These quotes will be for the use of speechwriters and others, but not the press.

Contents

Child Support Enforcement and Insurance

Erin Hunter, Linden, NJ
Letitia Rutherford, Lodi, NJ

Making Work Pay

Laura Holdren, Homosassa, FL
Carol Jackson, Des Moines, IA
Kathy Price, Freeport, IL

Welfare Simplification/Service Delivery

Carol Judy, Clairfield, TN
Teresa Grandberry, Stanton, TN

Child Care

Emily Monge, San Pedro, CA
Sherri Smith, San Pedro, CA

Transitional Support

Janet Price, Edison, NJ
Evelyn Parish, San Jose, CA
Margaret Gray, Hayward, CA

Work/Private Sector/Economic Development

Tinley Kent, Albion, CA
Beatrice Lynn Hardy, Chicago, IL
JoAnn Kyle, Chicago, IL

Issue: Child Support Enforcement and Insurance

Erin Hunter
1812 Mildred Avenue
Linden, NJ 07036
Work: 908/241-7005
Home: 908/486-3326

Erin is an example of a mother who, because of a lack of child support and an inter-state case, is struggling to maintain her self-sufficiency and to stay off of public aid.

Erin is a 40-year old mother of two children, ages 13 and 10. She has never been on AFDC because she does not qualify. However, because of a lack of child support, Erin has struggled to maintain her self-sufficiency. She has her high school degree and one year of college and currently works full-time as a medical assistant at the Urological Group of Union County. She has been divorced since 1985.

At the time of her divorce, in May 1985, Erin's ex-husband was ordered to pay \$60 per week in child support for his two children. However, in November of that year, the father left New Jersey and moved to Florida. Erin managed to track him down through the mail system, with no help from the probation office. Erin received a court order through Florida for only \$10 per week per child. This order was not reevaluated until later in 1986 when it was increased to \$12.50 per week. According to the State of New Jersey, the father owes over \$40,000 in arrears.

Erin does not qualify for public aid because her salary is too high. However, her mortgage payments take over half of her annual income, and she is constantly behind in her utility bills. Erin is very frustrated with the child support enforcement system and fears losing her security and independence.

Letitia Rutherford
B801 Bel Vista
Lodi, NJ 07644
201/478-9111

Letitia's story illustrates the difficulty that single mothers often have with the child support enforcement system as it currently operates.

Letitia is a 45-year old mother of two sons, ages 16 and 9. She is not on public assistance but has had trouble maintaining her family's self-sufficiency due to a problem in collecting child support. Letitia has been separated from her physically abusive husband for approximately eight years. Initially, the court ordered him to pay \$100/week in child support. During these years, she has only received a child support payment two times, after her husband had been arrested for nonpayment. She has had much trouble with the

enforcement system. In one year, Letitia went to court six times, with six days off of work, and the father never showed up. After five years, Letitia found out his work address in Hackensack, NJ and notified the Sheriff's office, but the father left the job before they caught him. He now lives in New York, and Letitia has given his address to the authorities. Because he is out-of-state, there is nothing they can do with it.

Making Work Pay

Carol Jackson
1518 5th Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50314
515/288-6010

Carol's story illustrates the need for provisions in welfare reform that help working poor families earn enough money and benefits so that they can be free of the welfare system.

Carol has had extreme difficulty trying to obtain gainful employment. Carol wants to work and spent the last four years in school developing her skills. She has been on welfare for 17 years. Carol is married, her husband has a college degree, works part-time as a janitor, and suffers from manic depression. Carol and her husband have four children. She cannot support her family on a minimum wage job without public assistance. Although Carol did work for four months in a flood relief agency, during which time she was able to leave welfare, her job has ended, and she now needs to reapply for AFDC. She wrote to President Clinton, saying, "I want to work, I need a job and I want to be able to take care of my children, without public assistance."

Laura Holdren
7125 W. Porpoise Dr.
Homosassa, FL 34446
Msg: 904/621-3233
Msg: 904/628-3764

Laura represents the mother on welfare who has tried working instead of welfare and has had to return to welfare because she could not make ends meet.

Laura is a 22-year old single mother of one child, eight months old. Laura was raised on welfare and is now supporting her child on AFDC. Laura entered the JTPA program and got a good job with a construction company. However, as soon as she started work, her benefits were cut. She had to pay \$200 a month for child care three days a week. The other two days, she brought her child to work with her. Laura could not afford her expenses, especially child care, and had to quit her job in order to stay with her baby. She now owes \$800 in back rent for her apartment which costs \$250 a month. She only receives \$241 in cash benefits. She is facing eviction, and the waiting list for HUD housing in her area is several months long. Laura does not receive any child support from the father of her daughter, who lives in Virginia.

Welfare Simplification/Service Delivery

Carol Judy
PO Box 86
Clearfield, TN 37715
615/784-6832

Carol is an excellent representative of the problems with rural service delivery under the JOBS program.

Carol is a 44 year old mother of two grown children, ages 22 and 18. Carol is divorced and lives in the very rural mountain town of Clearfield, TN. Carol is now off AFDC but had been on and off for 15 years. She first started on welfare in 1970 after she separated from her husband. She was pregnant and had to quit work. After her child was born, she worked on and off in temporary jobs. For a short time, she was reunited with her husband, but neither of them could find work. They ended up back on AFDC, and they eventually split again. Once alone, Carol alternately worked and depended on an AFDC check. In the early 1980s, Carol became involved as a volunteer with the Woodland Community Land Trust in her town, where she still works.

Living on a mountain, Carol has always had problems with transportation and with access to JOBS programs. She has not always had a car; when she did not she would have to walk or catch rides down the mountain. JOBS has not had very much to offer Carol. When introduced to the program, Carol was given the choice of only two tracks to follow: nurses' aid courses or secretarial courses. Carol was not interested in either of these areas and also knew that few, if any, job opportunities existed in her area in these fields. Carol would have had to travel approximately twenty-five miles each way into the town of LaFollette to attend these classes which were only held at night, when her children were at home.

Teresa Grandberry
PO Box 135
Stanton, TN 38069
901/548-6828

Teresa also represents the problem with rural service delivery and the inaccessibility of both training programs and employment opportunities in rural areas.

Teresa is a 37-year old mother of two children, ages 21 and 11. She is on AFDC and has been since she was 16 years old and had her first son. She has never been married. She had dropped out of high school to care for her child. At 17, she was accepted into a federally funded program in Texas that would pay for her transportation to Texas and her books and expenses while she attended a GED program. She got her GED through this program while her son stayed with her mother. After moving back to Tennessee, she had difficulty finding a job. In 1979, she heard of a plastic factory forty miles from her home that was hiring. She worked at this factory until 1982 when the plant moved out of state. While she was

working at the factory, she was completely off AFDC. However, she has not worked at all since then and has been completely dependent on AFDC. In 1982, when she lost her job, she also had her second son.

Teresa has not been able to find a job at all. Although what little her caseworker has told her about the JOBS program interests her, Teresa has not been able to participate because she has absolutely no transportation. She lives in a relatively rural area without public transportation. The nearest town to her is twenty miles away.

Child Care

Emily Monge
310/782-2728

Emily's story illustrates how the lack of child care can keep even someone who is motivated to work or go to school dependent on AFDC.

Emily is a 25-year old mother of two sons age 6 and 3. She has been on AFDC since June of 1991 and started in California's GAIN program in August 1993. She has held several jobs since high school, mostly retail positions and restaurant work, and currently works part-time in a flower shop as a florist's assistant. She has never been married and receives only random child support payments which go to the state.

Emily is from California but moved to Georgia with the father of her two children several years ago. In April 1991, when things were not going well between herself and the father, she moved back to California. She lived with her grandmother, but had no child care. In June of 1991 she went on AFDC and was not working because she could not afford the child care. In August 1991, she got an apartment in the Harbor Hill Housing Project. Living in the project only lowered her self-esteem more than even going on AFDC had done, and Emily decided she needed to do something with her life.

Emily enrolled in school at Harbor College in the fall of 91. She started working at the flower shop to pay for her child care. All of this time, she was on AFDC and was interested in GAIN but had been told that they were not taking volunteers. In April 93, she finally moved out of the housing project into a rented home, but because of the rent increase, she could no longer afford child care, and had to drop out of school in April.

Finally in August 93, she was accepted into GAIN and went through Job Club. At Job Club the workers told Emily she could go back to school through GAIN and receive child care, as long as she worked 15 hours a week. However, because of administrative errors, her approval was delayed. She missed the registration deadline at Harbor College and now has to wait until next semester to start back.

Sherri Smith
310/831-8435 (leave a message with Jamie Court from Harbor Interfaith Shelter)

Sherri also represents the mother who wants to be trained for a job and to work but who cannot afford the child care that would give her the opportunity to move off of welfare.

Sherri is a 24-year old mother of three children ages 2,3 and 4. She is on AFDC now and has been since February 1993, but is not, despite her efforts, in the California GAIN program. She cannot participate in GAIN because her daughter is not yet three years old and her county is not taking volunteers who do not have their own child care provider.

Sherri worked in manager positions after she graduated from high school. She has managed two restaurants and one portrait studio. After husband left home in September 1992, Sherri continued to work and support her children. However, in January 93 her store closed, and she was laid off. She lived off of her savings until late January when she was evicted from her home. She lived with friends and then at Harbor Interfaith Shelter until April. She had gone on AFDC in February and applied for the GAIN program at that time. The state would not admit her because her daughter does not turn three until May of 94. Until then, they told her that she could go to school but would have to find her own child care which Sherri cannot afford. Without this child care, Sherri cannot afford to work either.

When her daughter does turn three, Sherri's not even sure that she will be able to participate because her daughter needs special medical care, and Sherri doesn't know if GAIN will provide the special care. Sherri is very motivated to start school, and thinks GAIN could be a good program, but is frustrated with this question of her daughter having to be a certain age to get the child care she needs.

Transitional Support

Janet Price
269 College Drive
Edison, NJ 08817
908/248-9325

Janet, a potentially long-term welfare recipient, illustrates how a quality transitional support program can make bold changes in the lives of even the most at-risk welfare recipients.

Janet is a 30-year old mother of three sons, ages 8, 8 and 4. She had been receiving AFDC for approximately one and a half years but has been free of public aid, except for food stamps and medicaid, since February 1993.

Janet, a recovering addict, entered a rehabilitation program four years ago, after separating from her husband. Her aunt took custody of her three sons while Janet fought to stay off of drugs. Upon completing the rehab program, Janet regained custody of her sons and moved in and out of different temporary housing situations. She was receiving partial AFDC and working in waitressing jobs.

Janet heard about Amandla Crossing, a transitional housing program in New Jersey where mothers on AFDC can stay in an apartment with their children for one year while they work toward self-sufficiency. In order to be referred by welfare to Amandla, Janet had to quit her work and be receiving full AFDC benefits. Wanting a new and nice place to live where she could become used to being independent, Janet did so.

Janet stayed at Amandla for a little over one year, with an extension, and enrolled in college while she was there. She stayed on AFDC and received child care through the New Jersey REACH program. Janet left Amandla in October 1992 and has lived in the same apartment since. She attends school, alternately full and part-time, at Middlesex Community College where she is working toward her Associates Degree in Accounting. She also works full and part-time, alternately. Janet receives regular child support from her husband, is free from AFDC, receiving only food stamps and medicaid, and expects to graduate within one to two years.

Evelyn Parish
1531 Endicott Drive
San Jose, CA 95122
work: 415/988-6245
home: 408/272-3381

Evelyn's story illustrates the fact that even the most unskilled and emotionally distraught welfare recipients can be reached by a mandatory training program and can change their lives as a result.

Evelyn is a 45-year old mother of three children, ages 23, 11 and 8. Evelyn was a long-term welfare recipient who, with the help of the GAIN program, has regained her independence. Evelyn dropped out of high school at age 17 and worked as a garment packer. She had no marketable job skills. She married an abusive husband, had a child, left her husband, and filed for unemployment compensation. When her unemployment ran out, Evelyn began receiving AFDC. She worked on and off in unskilled labor positions and stayed off AFDC until 1980 when she had a second daughter and returned to the welfare system. At this point, Evelyn was drinking heavily and had neither motivation nor job skills. She had a third child in 1985.

In 1989, Evelyn was told she had to participate in the California GAIN program. Despite a bad attitude at first, Evelyn enrolled in GAIN and began basic skills and job training. She earned her GED and went through vocational training where she learned computer and typing skills. She received three awards from the GAIN program and now works full-time for Santa Clara GAIN as a clerk-typist.

Kathy Price
Freeport, IL
815/233-2505

Kathy's story shows how working poor parents who have difficulty maintaining self-sufficiency can be helped by a supplemental education or training program.

Kathy, a 33-year old mother of two children, spent over eight years on AFDC. Her husband left her and the children eleven years ago and has never been contacted. At that time, Kathy, who had been working full-time, started on AFDC despite continuing to work full-time. She could not make ends meet and needed additional assistance. When her employer shut down in late 1987, Kathy decided to start school full-time which she did in the spring of 1988. By December 1991, Kathy had earned an associates degree. During these three years, she was completely dependent upon AFDC.

Kathy considers her lack of education as the primary reason for her dependence. She made three times less salary than a coworker in a similar position because the coworker had the college degree that Kathy lacked. Additionally, she emphasizes child care expenses and the lack of insurance as major obstacles. At one point, when Kathy had no insurance coverage, one of her children was injured, needed surgery, and Kathy had to pay for the treatment herself. Kathy has never received any child support from her ex-husband.

The Employment Development Program at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Services Center in Freeport trained Kathy for a job and helped to find her an interview while she was still finishing school. During her last semester, Kathy divided her time between school and her on-the-job training arranged through the King Center. Kathy began her current full-time permanent position as a programmer analyst in December 1991 and has been free of public assistance since then.

Margaret Gray
25013 Whitman - 35 South
Hayward, CA 94544
work: 510/865-2099

Margaret's experience illustrates how a successful training program can work to move welfare recipients quickly into the work force.

Margaret is a 33-year old mother of one son, age 3. She has been divorced since 1989 and had been receiving AFDC for three years, until September 1993. She is an example of a successful California GAIN participant.

Margaret was seven months pregnant with her son when her drug-addicted husband left her. She was accepted onto AFDC, and her son was born. Margaret volunteered for the GAIN program in Alameda County, CA. Through GAIN, she entered the Hayward Adult School while GAIN paid for her child care and transportation costs. She stayed in GAIN for two years. While in school, she interviewed for jobs and volunteered in a law office. The lawyer for whom she volunteered hired her part-time, and she recently became full-time. Margaret is now independent of AFDC and has her own apartment.

Private Sector Job Development/Economic Development

Tinley Kent
Box 182
Albion, CA 95410
707/937-1733

Tinley's experience highlights the potential value in microenterprise and asset based development programs for creative and motivated welfare recipients.

Tinley is a 46 year old mother of two children, ages 21 and 12. After separating from her husband six years ago, Tinley worked part-time jobs and received AFDC to support herself and her daughter. At the time, Tinley had no marketable job skills. Eventually, she entered a Regional Occupations Program where she mastered the art of ceramics and sold pieces on her own. She shared a studio for a short time, but could not keep up with the payments. Needing a loan, she turned to The West Company in Ukiah, CA, and she joined their microenterprise program. After a twelve-week course in business skills and orientation, Tinley was given a \$2500 loan to set up ceramics equipment in her home. She has since been selling her work, making money, and has been classified as self-employed by the welfare agency. She is almost ready to be independent of AFDC completely. Tinley currently has one piece of work in the Ukiah Museum and is planning her first solo showing for May, 1994.

Beatrice Lynn Hardy
c/o Chicago Area Project
312/434-4613

Both Lynn's and JoAnn's stories illustrate how a microenterprise program can work to move a welfare recipient toward economic self-sufficiency.

Lynn is a 31-year old widow and mother of three children. She began on AFDC when she moved with her husband to Chicago; he eventually began working, and they went off welfare. However, she left her husband five years ago and because she was not receiving child support, went back on welfare for three years. While on AFDC, Lynn was not receiving enough money to support herself and her children and had to work at the same time. Lynn also had problems with child care and transportation that kept her dependent on welfare.

Eventually, Lynn became involved with the Women's Self-Employment Project (WSEP) in Chicago to which she was referred by an art teacher who saw potential in Lynn's work. She was on AFDC when she joined WSEP's Buddy System program. Here she worked with four other women in similar situations who also wanted to start a business. This "ladies success circle" provides WSEP with collateral for their loans through peer pressure rather than through financial means. Lynn used her first \$1500 loan to begin a graphic arts business, Lynn's Designs. After 18 months, she had expanded her enterprise from business cards and signs to Afro-centric posters and calendars, t-shirts and murals. Her second loan for \$3500

bought more supplies, and Lynn's business continues today. She is now supporting herself and her children without public aid.

JoAnn Kyle
Chicago, IL
312/643-8467

JoAnn, a 28-year old single mother of three children, grew up on welfare in her mother's home. JoAnn graduated high school but during her first year in college, she had a child and went back to the welfare system. JoAnn has never received child support from the father of her children in seven years. JoAnn has held two different jobs in these seven years, but had to quit both of them because the day she was hired, her public aid was cut. Although her mother provided JoAnn's children with child care, she could not afford self-sufficiency when her job did not pay enough for her to support her family.

Two years ago, JoAnn got involved with the Women's Self-Employment Project, and it has helped to change her life. JoAnn had been a street peddler when she heard about the program that could lend her money and offer her support in her business initiative. The program allows her to hold onto her AFDC benefits for two years while she is self-employed. These assets have made it possible for JoAnn to start her own home-cleaning business called Kyle's Cleaners. She works out of her home, her business is successful, and she expects to be free of public aid within a year.

5

Contents

The following fact sheets, which can be distributed publicly, are included in this section:

1. AFDC
2. AFDC-UP
3. EITC
4. Child Support Enforcement
5. Child Care Programs
6. Welfare Reform Demonstrations
7. JOBS

Fact Sheet

Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) provides financial assistance to needy families with dependent children. Federal and state governments share in its cost. The federal government provides broad guidelines and program requirements. Responsibility for program formulation, benefit determinations, and administration lies with the states. Eligibility for benefits varies by state and is based on the state's standard of need as well as the income and resources available to the recipient.

Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible for AFDC, a family must have a dependent child who is:

- Under age 18 (A state may elect to extend the age limit to include 18-year-olds who are expected to complete secondary school or the equivalent level of vocational or technical training before turning 19.);
- Deprived of parental support or care because of a parent's death, continued absence, incapacity, or the unemployment of the principal family earner in a two-parent family under the AFDC-Unemployed Parent (UP) program;
- Living in the home of a parent or other specified, close relative;
- A resident of the state; and
- A U.S. citizen or an alien permanently and lawfully residing in the U.S.

Along with the dependent child, an application for AFDC includes any eligible natural or adoptive parent and any eligible blood-related or adoptive sibling with whom the child is living.

Income and Financial Need Considerations

Each state sets its own need standard for determining eligibility. The term "need standard" refers to what a state determines that a particular size family needs to live. A state takes into consideration the needs as well as the income and resources of all individuals in the assistance unit. The state "disregards" some family income, thus permitting it to be retained along with AFDC payments.



Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ April 1993

The determination of income eligibility is a two-step process. First, the gross income of the assistance unit, after applicable disregards, cannot exceed 185 percent of the state-determined need standard. The disregards include the first \$50 per month of child support received by the family and optional earned income disregards for certain students.

Second, the family income is compared to the state's need standard. In addition to the disregards described above for the 185 percent test, the state must disregard the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the following amounts of earned income:

- \$90 per month for work expenses for individuals employed full- or part-time;
- For an individual who received AFDC in at least one of the prior four months:
 - a) all of the monthly earned income of a child who is a full-time student or who is a part-time student and not employed full-time;
 - b) \$30 and one-third of such person's remaining income for the first four consecutive months, and \$30 for each of the eight subsequent months;
- For full-time workers -- actual expenses for dependent care up to \$175 per month for each dependent child who is at least age two or each incapacitated adult, and up to \$200 per month for each dependent child who is under age two. (For part-time workers, a lesser amount may be applicable at state option.)

Resource Limitations

The federal statute sets a maximum limit of \$1,000 in resources per assistance unit. Resources include such things as stocks, bonds, and real property. The family's place of residence, burial plots, and funeral agreements valued up to \$1,500 are excluded from this resource limit as is that amount of equity in an automobile. The state may set lower dollar amounts for total resources, funeral agreements, and the automobile, and may also exclude from consideration household necessities.

Benefit Calculations

Each state establishes its own payment standard to determine the assistance unit's benefit amount. The payment standard may be lower than the need standard and is generally the amount which the state actually pays to a family for assistance. The state determines the benefit amount by considering the countable income of all persons included in the assistance unit and applying it against the state's payment standard. Income disregarded in determining eligibility is also disregarded in calculating benefits.

Work Program Requirements

The Family Support Act of 1988 established a Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program and revamped the requirements for state-operated welfare-to-work programs. All states have JOBS programs in place. The program provides training, work experience, and education opportunities for AFDC recipients. Unless otherwise exempt, AFDC recipients are required to participate in JOBS as a condition of eligibility. The goal of JOBS is to promote self-sufficiency.

Program Operation

All 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam participate in the AFDC program. American Samoa is authorized under the Family Support Act of 1988 to operate an AFDC program. States must submit plans and plan amendments to the Department of Health and Human Services for approval.

Federal Financial Participation

The federal government reimburses the states for operating an AFDC program with matching funds. Federal financial participation is provided to the states at different rates for various activities. Administrative and training costs are matched at a 50 percent rate; optional fraud control activities at 75 percent; and statewide automated information systems at 90 percent. AFDC benefit payment costs are matched under a formula which takes into account a state's per capita income relative to national per capita income. The federal matching rate for AFDC benefits may range from 50 percent for states with the highest per capita income to 83 percent for the state with the lowest per capita income.

Caseload and Expenditures – Fiscal Year 1992

AFDC Caseload

Average No. of Monthly Families _____	4,768,495
Average No. of Monthly Recipients _____	13,625,342

Benefit Expenditures

Total _____	\$21.9 billion
Average Monthly Benefits (per Family) _____	\$383.45
Average Monthly Benefits (per Recipient) _____	\$134.20

AFDC Unemployed Parent Program

The Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Unemployed Parent (AFDC-UP) program provides assistance to families in which a child is deprived because one of the parents in the household is unemployed. Under the provisions of the Family Support Act of 1988, the program is mandatory in all states.

The Family Support Act of 1988 allows certain states to limit the period of assistance. However, these states must provide eligible families with AFDC-UP benefits for at least six months a year. AFDC-UP covers families in which both parents are living in the household and the principal earner, whether the father or the mother, is unemployed.

Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible for AFDC-UP, a family must meet all of the regular eligibility requirements for AFDC. A family must have a dependent child who is:

- under age 18;
- living in the home of both parents;
- a resident of the state; and
- a U.S. citizen or alien permanently and lawfully residing in the U.S.

In addition, eligibility is based on the unemployment of the parent who is the principal earner. The principal earner is whichever parent earned the greater amount of income in the 24-month period immediately preceding application for aid.

Before a family can receive aid, the principal earner must have been unemployed for at least 30 days. As defined in regulation, a person who works less than 100 hours a month is considered to be unemployed.

The principal earner must demonstrate a recent attachment to the labor force by having (a) six or more quarters of work in any 13-calendar-quarter period ending within one year prior to application for aid, or (b) received (or qualified for) unemployment compensation within one year prior to application for aid.

A principal earner may establish quarters of work in the following ways:

- Receive \$50.00 or more of earned income in a calendar quarter;
- Qualify for a quarter of coverage under the Social Security program; or
- Participate in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program.

At the option of the state, a principal earner may establish up to four of the six required quarters of work in the following ways:



- Attend an elementary school, a secondary school, or a vocational or technical training course full-time that is designed to prepare the individual for gainful employment; or
- Participate in an education or training program established under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

If qualified, the principal earner must apply for and accept unemployment compensation.

Work Requirements

In any month, including the 30-day period prior to receipt of aid, the principal earner cannot refuse, without good cause, a bona fide offer of employment.

If the principal earner is exempt from participating in work or training activities because of living too far away from the JOBS program location, that individual must register with a public employment office in the state.

At least one parent in a family must participate for at least 16 hours a week in a work supplementation program, a community or other work experience program, on-the-job training, or a state-designed work program.

If a parent is under age 25 and has not completed high school, the state may require the parent to participate in educational activities directed at attaining a high school diploma (or equivalent), or in another basic education program.

If the principal earner fails to meet the work and training requirements, and the second parent is not participating in JOBS, the needs of the principal earner and of the other parent will not be taken into account in determining the family's need for assistance and the amount of its assistance payment.

Caseload and Expenditures -- Fiscal Year 1992

AFDC-UP Caseload

Average Monthly Families	321,771
Average Monthly Recipients	1,347,755

AFDC-UP Benefit Expenditures

(Federal and State)	\$2.1 billion
---------------------	---------------

AFDC-UP Average Monthly Benefits

Per Family	\$550.46
Per Recipient	\$131.42

Fact Sheet

Earned Income Tax Credit

Contrary to popular understanding, work is not a guarantee to escaping poverty. In 1991, 9.2 million workers were poor, 2.1 million of whom worked full-time, year-round. Fully 5.5 million people lived in poor families with children which contained one full-time, year-round worker.

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a refundable tax credit designed to help the working poor. The credit offsets the tax liability of low-income heads of household and is paid as a percentage of earnings to a certain maximum.

The recently-passed reconciliation bill includes a major expansion of the EITC which would achieve President Clinton's goal of enabling families of four with a full-time worker to reach the poverty line. The five-year cost of this expansion is \$20.8 billion, with \$7.0 billion spent in fiscal year 1998.

Eligibility Requirements

Under the provision, working poor families with two or more children would receive a \$4 wage supplement through the EITC for every \$10 of the first \$8,425 they earn. A family of four with full-time, full-year minimum wage earnings would receive the maximum credit of \$3,370.

For families with two or more children, the credit phases out at a rate of 21 cents for each dollar earned above \$11,000. Eligible tax filers making up to \$27,000 in earnings will still receive a credit.

For the first time, a credit will also be available for low-income workers without children. A childless worker would receive a maximum credit of \$306 based on earnings between \$4,000 and \$5,000. Nearly five million workers without children who have very low incomes (less than \$9,000) and are between the ages of 25 and 64 would also benefit.

Impact

Compared to the situation with no EITC at all, the enacted legislation would amount to a 40 percent higher return from working for low-income families with children. Compared to current law, a two-parent family with two children and one wage-earner working full-time at minimum wage would get \$1,375 more per year. In effect, this raises the pay for such a person by 16 percent over the situation under prior law.

Department of Health and Human Services
Office of Public Affairs
200 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20201
Phone: (202) 690-6853 \ August 1993

The expansion will substantially increase the anti-poverty effectiveness of government tax and welfare policy. In 1994, when the enacted legislation is fully implemented, approximately 1.5 million people will be removed from poverty, even if no more people go to work.

Enactment of the expanded EITC is an important first step in the welfare reform effort. One of the major principles in reforming welfare is to "make work pay." The expansion of the EITC significantly increases the return from work and increases the incentive to begin work. It lays a solid foundation for the Administration's welfare reform plan -- anticipated later this year -- to make work a more viable option than welfare.

Fact Sheet

Child Support Enforcement Program

The goal of the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) Program, which was established in 1975 under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, is to ensure that children are financially supported by both their parents. Recent laws, including the Family Support Act of 1988, provide for strong child support enforcement measures to assure that parental responsibility is met.

The CSE program is usually run by state and local human services departments, often with the help of prosecuting attorneys, other law enforcement agencies, and officials of family or domestic relations courts.

Child Support Enforcement services are available automatically for families receiving assistance under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) programs. A family receives up to the first \$50 of any current child support each month without a decrease in the AFDC payment. Any remainder reimburses the state and federal governments for AFDC payments made to the family. AFDC recipients must assign to the state any rights to support that they or eligible children may have.

Child support services are also available to families not receiving AFDC who apply for such services. Child support payments that are collected on behalf of non-AFDC families are sent to the family. For these families, states must charge an application fee of up to \$25, but may pay such fee from state funds. Some states may also charge for the cost of services rendered.

The most recent census data show that in 1989 approximately 10 million women were raising a total of 16 million children under age 21 whose fathers were not living in the household. Of these women, only 58 percent, or 5.7 million women had been awarded child support. Among the women due child support payments in 1989, half received the full amount due, a quarter received partial payment, and a quarter received nothing. Of the total \$16.3 billion owed for child support in 1989, \$5.1 billion was not paid.

During FY 1992, almost \$8 billion in child support payments was collected under this program. Paternity was established for more than 515,000 children that year, clearing the way for the establishment of child support orders and other vital links between the children and their non-custodial parents.

There are four major services provided by the Child Support Enforcement Program:

1. Locating Absent Parents
2. Establishing Paternity
3. Establishing Child Support Obligations
4. Enforcing Child Support Orders

1. **Locating Absent Parents** - Child support enforcement officials use local information and resources of State and Federal Parent Locator services to locate parents for child support enforcement, or to find a parent in parental kidnapping/custody disputes.



Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ April 1993

These resources include:

State:	Federal:
Motor Vehicles/Drivers Licenses	Internal Revenue Service
Employment/Unemployment Records	Department of Defense
State Income Tax	Social Security Administration
Public Assistance Records	Veterans Administration
	Selective Service System
	Federal civilian personnel records

About four million cases are processed annually by the Federal Parent Locator Service. The FPLS provides an address in approximately 80 percent of the cases submitted.

2. Establishing Paternity - Establishing paternity (legally identifying a child's father) is a necessary first step for obtaining an order for child support when children are born out of wedlock. Establishing paternity also provides access to:

- Social security, pension and retirement benefits;
- Health insurance and information; and
- Interaction with members of both parents' families

Many fathers voluntarily acknowledge paternity. Otherwise, father, mother, and child can be required to submit to genetic tests. The results are highly accurate. States must have procedures which allow paternity to be established at least up to the child's eighteenth birthday.

3. Establishing Support Obligations - States must have guidelines to establish how much a parent should pay for child support. Support agency staff can take child support cases to court, or to an administrative hearing process to establish the order. Health insurance coverage can also be ordered.

4. Enforcing Child Support Orders - A parent can be required to pay child support by income withholding — money held out of the paycheck by the employer and sent to the child support office or court. Overdue child support can be collected from federal and state income tax refunds. Liens can be put on property, and the property itself may even be sold with the proceeds used to pay child support arrearages. Unpaid child support can be reported to credit bureaus so that a parent who owes child support may have trouble making purchases on credit.

Child Care Programs

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) administers a variety of programs to help low-income families obtain child care services. ACF child care services focus on assisting individuals in low-income families who are employed, or are in training for employment, and who need child care to achieve or sustain self-sufficiency. Child care assistance is available through the states in the following four programs: the Child Care and Development Block Grant; At-Risk Child Care; Child Care for AFDC Recipients; and Transitional Child Care.

Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)

The Child Care and Development Block Grant provides low-income families with the financial resources to find and afford quality child care for their children. In addition, CCDBG increases the availability of early childhood development and before- and after-school care services. Funds are available to states, Indian Tribes, and territories to provide grants, contracts, and certificates for child care services for low-income families. To be eligible, a family must need child care either because a parent is working, attending a training or educational program, or because the family receives or needs to receive protective services.

This program emphasizes the role of parents in choosing the care that best meets their family's child care needs. Parents may choose from a variety of child care providers, including center-based, family child care and in-home care, care provided by relatives, and sectarian child care providers.

Grantees must ensure that child care providers meet minimum health and safety requirements and set procedures. In addition, during normal hours of operation, parents must have unlimited access to their children and the providers.

FY 1992 funds were awarded to 261 grantees, including 52 states, 4 territories, and 205 Indian Tribes.

Since September 1991, ACF has provided states with more than \$1.5 billion in CCDBG funds. For FY 1993, almost \$893 million is available. No state matching funds are required.

At-Risk Child Care

The At-Risk Child Care program gives states the option of providing child care to low-income working families who are not receiving AFDC, who need child care in order to work, and who would be at risk of becoming dependent on AFDC if they did not receive child care assistance. Families must contribute to the cost of care according to their ability to pay.

The central point of program planning, design, and administration with the state welfare



agency. In this way, state agencies, which also have the responsibility for providing welfare, employment, and related services under the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program, can coordinate child care with these services.

States may provide child care in the following ways:

- Directly;
- By arranging care through providers by use of purchase of service contracts or vouchers;
- By providing cash or vouchers in advance to the family;
- By reimbursing the family;
- By adopting such other arrangements as the state agency deems appropriate.

All child care providers must meet applicable state and local standards and allow for parental access.

Congress appropriated \$300 million for this program for FY 1993. State matching funds are required.

Title IV-A Child Care

Title IV-A Child Care provides funds for AFDC applicants and recipients through the AFDC and JOBS programs. This financial support allows them to pursue employment or work training and approved education which will help them to become economically self-sufficient.

Congress appropriated \$371 million for FY 1993. State matching funds are required. In FY 1991, 154,720 families, including those receiving transitional child care, were served.

Transitional Child Care

Transitional child care continues child care assistance for up to 12 months after a recipient leaves AFDC as a result of increased work hours, higher wages, or the loss of earned income disregards. Congress appropriated \$75 million in federal funds for FY 1993. State matching funds are required. For FY 1992, a monthly average of over 60,000 children were served.

Other ACF Child Care Activities

Several other ACF activities play a vital role in the delivery of child care services:

- AFDC Child Care Disregards support AFDC recipients' efforts to work by providing offsets against income from work for a portion of recipients' child care costs.
- The Head Start program, while not specifically targeted to provide child care, offers comprehensive services to enhance the development of low-income pre-school children. Head Start and the CCDBG can develop mutually beneficial arrangements

to provide extended day child care for Head Start children who need it due to their parents' work or training schedules, or to provide CC&DBG recipients with a Head Start experience.

- Dependent Care Planning and Development Grants are made to states to pay 75 percent of the planning and development costs for establishing information and referral systems and school-age child care.

- The Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) enabled states to provide social services which are best suited to the needs of its residents. Services can include child care.
- Child Welfare Services are available to states to provide child care and to help child care centers meet licensing requirements. In addition, as a complement to the state grant program, the Temporary Child Care/Crisis Nurseries program awards grants to public and non-profit agencies for research, demonstration, and training.

Fact Sheet

State Welfare Demonstrations - 1993

Under section 1115 of the Social Security Act, HHS is authorized to grant states waivers of current laws governing the AFDC and Medicaid programs. This authority is intended to give states the flexibility to demonstrate alternatives that better match their residents' needs.

HHS is committed to fulfilling President Clinton's mandate to make the waiver process more efficient. This should give states more flexibility in their management of joint federal-state programs while maintaining quality services for HHS beneficiaries.

Since January 20, HHS has approved welfare demonstration projects in Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Requests are pending from 15 other states.

GEORGIA

Georgia is initiating the "Personal Accountability and Responsibility Project" (PAR) which strengthens federal work requirements that must be met in order to receive cash benefits. Georgia's welfare agency will now be able to exclude from an AFDC grant any able-bodied recipient between the age of 18 to 60 who has no children under the age of 14 and who willfully refuses to work or who leaves employment without good cause. The rest of the family will continue to be eligible for AFDC benefits.

The plan will also allow the state to deny additional cash benefits for additional children born after a family has been on welfare for at least two years if the child was conceived while the family was on welfare. However, PAR would allow recipients to "earn back" the denied benefits through the receipt of either child support payments or earnings.

Medicaid and Food Stamps eligibility will continue for all family members. In addition, Georgia will offer family planning services and instruction in parental skills to AFDC recipients.

Georgia's waiver request was received on May 18, 1993 and granted on Nov. 1, 1993.

ILLINOIS

The Work Pays component, added to the previously approved Project Fresh Start, encourages employment and thereby self-sufficiency by enabling recipients to keep more of their earnings than is



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ December 1993

normally allowed. The State will disregard two of each three dollars earned for as long as they continue working.

Illinois' waiver request was received August 2, 1993 and granted on November 23, 1993.

IOWA

Iowa is implementing a reform plan that will encourage AFDC and Food Stamp recipients to take jobs and accumulate assets through a program of "Individual Development Accounts." Funds deposited in an account can only be withdrawn to pay for education, training, home ownership, business start-up or family emergencies. The current law which limits each family's assets to \$1,000 will be changed to allow each applicant to have up to \$2,000 in assets and each AFDC family to possess up to \$5,000 in assets. Additionally, the vehicle asset ceiling will rise from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

Recipients will also be encouraged to work under a new formula which disregards 50 percent of their earnings in the calculation of benefits. For recipients lacking in significant work histories, all income will be disregarded during the first four months on AFDC. A Family Investment Program will be created for most AFDC parents, requiring them to participate in training and support services as a condition of AFDC receipt. Only parents with a child under 6 months old at home, those working at least 30 hours per week, and the disabled are exempt. Individuals who choose not to participate in the Family Investment Agreement will have their AFDC benefits phased out over six months and will not be able to reapply for another six months.

Iowa's waiver request was received on April 29, 1993 and granted on Aug. 13, 1993.

VERMONT

Vermont's "Family Independence Project" (FIP) promotes work by enabling AFDC recipients to retain more income and accumulate more assets than is normally allowed. FIP also requires AFDC recipients to participate in community or public service jobs after they have received AFDC for 30 months for most AFDC families, 15 months for families participating in the unemployed parent component of AFDC. Current child support payments will now go directly to families entitled to them.

Vermont's waiver request was received on April 29, 1993 and granted on Aug. 13, 1993.

VIRGINIA

Virginia's "Welfare Reform Project" will encourage employment by identifying employers who commit to hire AFDC recipients for jobs that pay between \$15,000 and \$18,000 a year and by providing additional months of transitional child care and health care benefits. A second statewide project will: enable AFDC families to save for education or home purchases by allowing the

accumulation of up to \$5,000 for such purposes; encourage family formation by changing the way a stepparent's income is counted; and allow full-time high school students to continue to receive AFDC benefits until age 21. Further, in up to four counties, AFDC recipients who successfully leave welfare for work may be eligible to receive transitional benefits for child and health care for an additional 24 months, for a total of 36 months. In one location, Virginia will offer a guaranteed child support "insurance" payment to AFDC families who leave welfare because of employment to assist the family in maintaining economic self-sufficiency.

WISCONSIN

Wisconsin's reform plan, "Work Not Welfare," will require that most AFDC recipients either work or look for jobs. The plan provides case management, employment activities and work experience to facilitate employment. Receipt of AFDC benefits will be limited to 24 months in a four-year period, except under certain conditions, such as an inability to find employment in the local area due to a lack of appropriate jobs. Upon exhaustion of benefits, recipients become ineligible for 36 months.

With exceptions, children born while a mother receives AFDC will not be counted in determining a family's AFDC grant. In addition, child support will now be paid directly to the AFDC custodial parent in cases where the funds are collected by the state.

Wisconsin's waiver request was received on July 14, 1993 and granted on Nov. 1, 1993.

WYOMING

Wyoming's reform plan will encourage AFDC recipients to enroll in school, undertake a training program, or enter the workforce. Wyoming's plan will allow AFDC families with an employed parent to accumulate \$2,500 in assets, rather than the current ceiling of \$1000.

Wyoming will promote compliance with work and school requirements with tough penalties: AFDC minor children who refuse to stay in school or accept suitable employment could have their monthly benefit reduced by \$40; and adult AFDC recipients who are required to work or perform community service, but refuse to do so, face a \$100 cut in their monthly benefit. Also, Wyoming will severely restrict eligibility for adults who have completed a post-secondary educational program while on welfare, and will deny payment to recipients who have confessed to or been convicted of program fraud until full restitution is made to the State. Unemployed, non-custodial parents of AFDC children who are not paying child support can now be ordered, by the courts, into Wyoming's JOBS program.

Wyoming's waiver request was received on May 20, 1993 and granted on Sept. 7, 1993.

Fact Sheet

Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program

The Family Support Act of 1988 created JOBS, a comprehensive welfare-to-work program. JOBS provides recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with the opportunity to take part in job training, work, and education-related activities that lead to economic self-sufficiency. JOBS also provides welfare recipients with necessary support services, such as transportation and child care. JOBS is generally the responsibility of the state welfare agency. However, in some areas, JOBS is under the administration of an Indian and Native Alaskan Tribe or Organization.

The Primary Goal of JOBS – Self-Sufficiency

The ultimate purpose of JOBS is to improve a family's ability to become and remain self-sufficient. It targets resources to those AFDC recipients most at risk for long-term welfare dependency, especially young, never-married mothers and teenaged parents who did not complete high school. It also focuses on AFDC recipients who have been on welfare a long time and who are difficult to employ.

Fundamental Shift in Welfare Policy

Passage of the Family Support Act and the establishment of JOBS reflect a basic rethinking of the welfare system. It no longer merely provides cash assistance to meet the basic needs, but now encourages economically disadvantaged individuals and families to gain skills that allow them to move permanently into the economic mainstream, while cash assistance is considered temporary.

The new system places primary responsibility for JOBS implementation and accountability with the state welfare agency. Welfare agencies have the authority to provide job training, employment, and education-related services as well as cash assistance. These agencies have considerable flexibility to design JOBS programs. New relationships among welfare agencies and other state and local agencies, community-based organizations, educational institutions, and public interest groups demonstrate this shift in welfare policy.

Program Flexibility

States and local agencies understand what their AFDC recipients need in order to find and keep jobs in their own communities. They have significant flexibility to tailor and implement JOBS programs to meet these special needs. While the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) sets program goals and provides enhanced funding, states determine the appropriate types of services to offer to help their welfare clients overcome employment obstacles.



Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ April 1993

Making it Easier for Families to Participate in JOBS

JOBS helps AFDC recipients have access to vital supportive services, such as transportation and child care which make it easier to take part in JOBS. By funding these services, the Family Support Act provides states with a powerful tool to help welfare recipients achieve economic independence.

States may fund child care through vouchers, direct payments, or other types of financing. It may be provided by relatives, neighbors, family day care providers, independent contractors, or day care centers.

Generally, AFDC recipients who have found employment and no longer need cash assistance are eligible to receive up to one year of transitional child care and medical assistance.

The Link Between JOBS and Child Support

The Family Support Act emphasizes the link between earned income among AFDC recipients and effective child support enforcement. In fact, it requires that state welfare agencies furnish JOBS, AFDC, and child support benefits in an integrated way. An underlying theme of this legislation is that both parents, whether or not they are living together, must be involved in financially supporting their children. Child support payments ensure that custodial parents who are participating in JOBS receive the financial assistance they need from an absent parent for their children's well-being and family's economic stability.

Encouraging Extensive Coordination and Partnerships

The Administration for Children and Families has a strong leadership role in developing linkages among programs and throughout all levels of government. ACF promotes integration among the AFDC, JOBS, and Child Support Enforcement programs. ACF encourages active dialogue among organizations such as employment, job training, education, child support enforcement, child care, and community action agencies. It also supports collaboration with the business community to increase job training and work opportunities for JOBS participants.



Contents

- I. List of priority states for outreach efforts
- II. Model State Profiles:
 - Illinois
 - New Jersey

State profiles are being completed for each of the priority states. These profiles will also include state political information.

Priority States for WRWG Outreach Effort

STATE	KEY LEGISLATORS and STATE OFFICIALS	KEY MEDIA OUTLETS
Oklahoma	Sen. Boren, Finance Committee	Oklahoma City <u>Daily Oklahoman</u> Tulsa <u>World</u>
Michigan	Sen. Riegler, Finance Committee Rep. Levin, W&MSHR Rep. Camp, W&MSHR State and Local Task Force on WR: Gov. Engler Kay Beard, Wayne Co. Comm. Gerald Miller, Dir. DSS	Detroit <u>Free Press</u> Detroit <u>News</u> Grand Rapids <u>Press</u>
Louisiana	Sen. Breaux, Finance Committee	New Orleans <u>Times-Picayune</u>
Oregon	Sen. Packwood, Finance Committee Rep. Kopetski, W&MSHR Kevin Concannon, Dir. Dept Hum Resources, on State and Local Task Force on WR	Portland <u>Oregonian</u>
Kansas	Sen. Dole, Finance Committee Sen. Kassebaum, Labor & Hum Res.	Wichita <u>Eagle</u>
Missouri	Sen. Danforth, Finance Committee	Kansas City <u>Star</u> St. Louis <u>Post-Dispatch</u>
Rhode Island	Sen. Chafee, Finance Committee Sen. Pell, Labor & Hum Res.	Providence <u>Journal</u>
Minnesota	Sen. Durenberger, Finance Committee and Labor and Hum Res Sen. Wellstone, Labor & Hum Res Mayor Fraser, Minneapolis, State and Local Task Force on WR	Minneapolis <u>Star Tribune</u> St. Paul <u>Pioneer Press</u>

Iowa	Sen. Grassley, Finance Committee Sen. Harkin, Labor & Hum Res. Rep. Grandy, W&MSHR	Des Moines <u>Register</u>
Texas		Houston <u>Chronicle</u> Dallas <u>Morning News</u> Houston <u>Post</u> Forth Worth <u>Star-Telegram</u> San Antonio <u>Express-News</u> Austin <u>American-Statesman</u> San Antonio <u>Light</u>
Washington	Rep. McDermott, W&MSHR	Seattle <u>Times</u> Seattle <u>Post-Intelligencer</u> Tacoma <u>Morning News Tribune</u>
Pennsylvania	Sen. Wofford, Labor & Hum Res. Rep. Santorum, W&MSHR	Philadelphia <u>Inquirer</u> Pittsburgh <u>Press</u> Philadelphia <u>Daily News</u> Pittsburgh <u>Post-Gazette</u> Allentown <u>Morning Call</u>
New York	Sen. Moynihan, Chairman, Finance Committee St. Sen. James Lack, State and Local Task Force on WR	NY <u>Wall Street Journal</u> NY <u>Times</u> Long Island <u>Newsday</u> NY <u>Daily News</u> NY <u>Post</u> Buffalo <u>News</u> Rochester <u>Democrat & Chronicle</u>
Tennessee -- hearing state	Rep. Ford, Chairman, W&MSHR	Memphis <u>Commercial Appeal</u> Nashville <u>Tennessean</u>
New Jersey -- hearing state	Sen. Bradley, Finance Comm. State and Local Task Force on WR: Gov. Florio, Chairman Brenda Bacon, Office of Gov. Michael Pappas, Freeholder, Somerset County	Newark <u>Star-Ledger</u> Asbury Park <u>Press</u> Hackensack <u>Record</u>

<p>California -- hearing state</p>	<p>Rep. Matsui, W&MSHR Russell Gould, Sec. Health and Welfare Agency, on State and Local Task Force on WR</p>	<p>LA <u>Times</u> San Francisco <u>Chronicle</u> Orange County <u>Register</u> San Diego <u>Union-Tribune</u> San Jose <u>Mercury News</u> Sacramento <u>Bee</u> LA <u>Daily News</u> Riverside <u>Press-Enterprise</u> Fresno <u>Bee</u> San Francisco <u>Examiner</u> Long Beach <u>Press-Telegram</u></p>
<p>Illinois -- Hearing State</p>	<p>Rep. Rostenkowski, Chairman, Ways and Means Committee Rep. Reynolds, W&MSHR Sen. Paul Simon, Labor & Hum Res Rep. Bobby Rush</p>	<p>Chicago <u>Tribune</u> Chicago <u>Sun-Times</u></p>

ILLINOIS

<u>DEMOGRAPHICS</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Population (7/1/92)	11,631,000	255.1m (T)	6
Child Population (4/1/90)	2,961,000	63.9m (T)	4
Percent of Population that are children (7/1/92)	25.9%	25.7% (A)	29
Per Capita Personal Income-FY 89	18,858	17,567 (A)	11
Poverty Rate			
1991	13.5%	13.7% (A)	27
1989	8.8%	12.7% (A)	21
1983	7.7%	15.4% (A)	32
1979	11.0%	12.4% (A)	28
Change in Rate (1979-1991)	+2.5%	+1.3% (A)	

Aid to Families with Dependent Children

<u>AFDC -- Benefits</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total assistance payments-FY 92	882.6m	22,223.5m (T)
AFDC Grant-Jan 93 (Mother-two children-0 income)	367	367 (M)
Food Stamp benefit-Jan 93	285	285 (M)
Combined benefits-Jan 93	652	652 (M)
Percent of poverty threshold-Jan 93	70%	70% (M)
Percent change in AFDC benefit levels since 1980	-25.3%	-22.4% (A)

<u>AFDC -- Caseloads</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Average Monthly AFDC Caseload (people)-FY 92	228,600	4,768,600 (T)
AFDC Reciprocity Rate-FY 92	5.9%	5.3% (A)
Change in AFDC Reciprocity-FY 88-92	+2%	+20% (A)
Average Payment per Family-FY 92	322	388 (A)
Average Number in AFDC Unit (10/90-9/91)	3.1	2.9 (A)
Food Stamp Reciprocity FY 92	9.94%	9.95% (A)

<u>AFDC -- Income Data</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Percent of Families with Unemployed Parent-9/92	4.8%	5.7% (A)
Percent with Earned Income-10/90-9/91	5.7%	7.9% (A)
Percent Receiving Public Housing/ HUD Rent Subsidy-10/90-9/91	19.3%	21.0% (A)
Number of JOBS Participants on AFDC-FY 91	12,578	460,914 (T)

Child Support Enforcement

<u>Collections and Expenditures</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total Collections-FY 92	183.3m	7,951.1m (T)
AFDC Collections-FY 92	58.8m	2,252.6m (T)
Child Support Collections per \$ of Total Admin. Expend.-FY 92	2.90	3.99 (A)
Average Number AFDC Cases in which a Collection was Made-FY 92	23,639	830,713 (T)
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1983	+472%	+293% (T)
Total Number of Paternities Established-FY 92	18,900	515,393 (T)
Number of out-of-wedlock births-1990	62,148	1,165,384 (T)

*Type: A=average, M=median, T=total

Source: 1993 Green Book

STATE WELFARE POLICY

As part of a recent wave of individual state welfare reform efforts, the State of Illinois has introduced a number of programs that place more personal responsibility on the recipient for him or herself and for his or her family. The State has also supported demonstrations in improving the efficiency of service delivery and providing support services to those recipients who are trying to work. Measures include:

I. Legislation:

***One Step at a Time** targets AFDC mothers living in public housing who have limited education, no employment history, children age one or older, and have been on public aid for two years or longer. The program requires participants to enroll in a series of "steps toward employment."

***Relocation to Illinois** implements recently enacted State legislation which limits, for families who move to Illinois, for a 12 month period, AFDC payment levels to that of their former state of residence.

***A Chance for Self-Sufficiency** tests a transitional education and training program for recipients who have earned their way off of welfare, but require more training to ensure long-term self-sufficiency and job mobility. It also tests the efficiency of allowing a community-based organization (Bethel-New Life in Chicago) to provide orientation, employment training, education, job placement and job counseling, and housing subsidy instead of the State itself.

***Multi-Pronged Welfare Reform Demonstration** includes five distinguishable components, each of which is designed to contribute to eventual self-sufficiency by either augmenting service delivery, enhancing family stability or promoting fiscal responsibility. The program include: 1) Youth Employment and Training Initiative; 2) Homeless Families Support Program; 3) Family Responsibility; 4) Paternal Involvement Project; and 5) Income Budgeting Project.

II. Waivers

*One approved this year for the Youth Employment and Training Initiative allows the State to use federal JOBS matching funds to provide services to inner-city AFDC you whose participation in specified programs would count toward required State JOBS levels.

*AFDC waivers were granted in May 1989 for the Chance for Self-Sufficiency program to: 1) mandate that families with children under age 6 participate in the project; 2) allow Bethel-New Life to exempt resources in excess of \$1000 for self-employed applicants; 3) to allow supplementation for housing.

*An AFDC waiver was granted

III. Other motions include: 1) the Learnfare bill, designed to encourage teenage welfare mothers to stay in school; and 2) a bill to cut additional benefits to welfare mothers having more than one child (this bill passed in the State Senate earlier this year but failed in the House).

MODEL PROGRAMS

Project Match: A Long-Term Welfare-to-Work Program

CONTACT: Toby Harr
312-266-6464

LOCATION: 1276 N. Clybourn
Chicago, IL 60610

MISSION: 1) to provide long-term assistance to welfare dependent families as they move through multiple career stages toward economic self-sufficiency; and 2) to document and disseminate lessons learned about the process of leaving welfare.

SUMMARY: Project Match uniquely understands the difficulty involved in leaving welfare and persistent poverty and recognizes that it involves false starts, setbacks and incremental gains. The program, therefore, makes a commitment of long-term support (3-5 years) to its participants. Its service goals include helping participants enroll in and complete training and education programs, obtain and keep jobs, advance to better jobs, and become quickly reemployed when they lose their jobs.

Participants may move through Project Match in a variety of ways. After receiving an initial assessment, a participant is placed in one or more of a range of activities, including education, training, employment, and community volunteer work. The combination and sequence of activities vary for each participant as does the length of time in the program. Key services include job development (i.e., help to find a job), job and school retention support (e.g., help to keep a job or stay in school), and recognition for attainment of incremental milestones (e.g., working for two months, regularly attending GED classes).

SCOPE: Project Match has worked with more than 740 residents of the Cabrini-Green community in Chicago. Service sites include the Winfield/Moody Health Center, the program's primary service site, and a second site funded by the Department of Health and Human Services at a Head Start in Cabrini Green. Northwestern University's Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research and the Erikson Institute of Chicago serve as research sites.

EVALUATION: A study of participants suggests the relative success of the Project Match approach. The average number of months worked among participants increased by about one month in each of the three years studied, and hourly wages increased by 23% between year one and year three.

FUNDING: Sources include mostly State funds (e.g. Illinois Department of Public Aid and the Illinois State Board of Education) but also a federal grant from the Department of Health and Human Services through their Office of Community Services's Demonstration Partnership Program. The Primary funders of the Project's policy research work include The Joyce Foundation and Woods Charitable Funds. The Project receives other local foundation support and private donations.

Women's Self-Employment Project

LOCATION: 166 W. Washington Street Suite 730
Chicago, IL 60602
Connie Evans, Executive Director 312-606-8255

MISSION: 1) to raise the income and degree of economic self-sufficiency of low- and moderate-income women through a strategy of self-employment; and 2) to serve as a catalyst for developing viable options for alleviating poverty.

SUMMARY: WSEP is the only non-profit, city-wide financial services/entrepreneurial training program targeting poor women in Chicago. Since 1986, WSEP has successfully supported the efforts of low-income women to increase family economic self-sufficiency, leave welfare, create new options for their children, achieve empowerment, demonstrate credit-worthiness, and launch their own micro businesses. WSEP has distributed over \$500,000 in small, short-term loans and has provided business tools and information to nearly 3000 women.

WBI: The Women's Business Initiative, a WSEP program, offers 150 Chicago women receiving AFDC a chance to get self-employment training and begin their own small businesses, without losing their AFDC benefits. WBI provides business training sessions twice a week for twelve weeks in which participants: 1) complete a comprehensive business plan; 2) develop their products and services; 3) network with and provide peer support to their colleagues; 4) practice business skills, including marketing and presentation.

Participants receive public aid in the form of subsidized child care, continued eligibility for AFDC cash assistance and Medicaid, and eligibility for child care and Medicaid for up to one year after leaving AFDC cash assistance. Finally, women who participate:

- 1) Must be committed to opening and operating a business;
- 2) Will complete a comprehensive business plan;
- 3) Must arrange to attend classes regularly and on time;
- 4) Can apply to WSEP's Revolving Loan Fund for a micro business loan.

FUNDING: WSEP is the only agency in Illinois to receive a Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals (JOLI) grant from the U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services (\$500,000 for three years). WSEP also receives private foundation money.

LEGISLATION: Rep. Barbara Flynn Currie introduced HB707 (Illinois Self-Employment Training Legislation), co-sponsored by Sen. Alice Palmer, and signed into law by Gov. Edgar in July 1992. This law permits AFDC clients to accumulate up to \$5000 worth of assets used for self-employment ventures without losing their AFDC eligibility for two years and requires the Illinois Department of Public Aid to include self-employment in the Illinois JOBS plan.

CONTACTED BY: Helene Grady, 202-401-4886

The Albany Park Community Center

LOCATION: 3403 West Lawrence Avenue #300
Chicago, IL 60625

CONTACT: Frank Albanese, Executive Director
312-583-5111

MISSION: to increase the stability of families and to aid the healthy development of children. The programs are designed to strengthen families and to protect children, while assisting with their development. Their primary objectives are to promote a suitable environment in which to raise children, a stable neighborhood, the steady employment of adults – especially heads of households – and a healthy living environment for individuals and families.

SUMMARY: While providing a wide range of services to its local community, The Albany Park Community Center, Inc. tackles specifically the problem of child care and early child education for welfare families. The Center is a not-for-profit, community-based organization located in the multi-ethnic, working poor neighborhood of Albany Park, but it operates at eight locations in and around the Albany Park community. Since 1975, the Center has provided programs in areas such as: early childhood education and day care, family programs, programs for school-age children, literacy and adult education, and community service.

One objective of the child education and day care programs is to assist parents who meet income and program guidelines in maintaining economic self-sufficiency. The Pre-School Day Care serves 40 children from 3 to 5 years old. The Center is open from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm and provides the service primarily for working-poor parents who meet income and program guidelines. The School-Age Day Care program meets these same needs for families with children aged 5 to 13 who need provision after-school and on holidays and vacations. The Center additionally promotes self-sufficiency through its Adult Literacy Tutoring Program, its Adult Basic Education classes for adults 16 years or older not enrolled in high school, its GED preparation classes, its Adult Education Information and Referral program, and its Life Skills/Lifelong Learning program.

FUNDING: The Center is a United Way agency. It also receives State money and private donations from foundations and individuals.

REFERRED BY: John Bouman
Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago
312-341-1070

CONTACTED BY: Helene Grady, 202-401-4886

**The Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Services, Inc.
Single Parent Employment Development Program**

CONTACT: Kara Fiane
815-233-9915
LOCATION: 511 S. Liberty Ave.
P.O. Box 663
Freeport, Illinois 61032

***Freeport is a town of approximately 26,500 residents; it is in the northwest corner of Illinois, about 30 miles west of Rockford, 20 miles south of Wisconsin, and 60 miles from the Iowa border.

MISSION: to provide single parents in the Freeport area assistance in finding jobs and gaining self-sufficiency.

SUMMARY: The Single Parent Employment Development Program targets welfare clients' difficulty in obtaining jobs because of inaccessibility to interviews and openings as well as a lack of basic skills training. The program was created to assist clients in accessing employment with long-term career potential that could lead to self-sufficiency. The SPED program, therefore, includes a ten-hour per week on-the-job training for those clients who are eligible. The main component of SPED, the Single Parent Initiative Resource and Linkage Program (SPIRAL), connects single parents with transportation, child care and other resources essential to their attaining and maintaining employment. An Advisory Committee consisting of Human Resource professionals that represent various area businesses meets quarterly to discuss practical ways to assist the women.

Any single parent in Stephenson County who is 16 years of age or older is eligible for these services which also reach out to parents in Joe Davies and Ogle Counties. Support is provided through groups, workshops, and/or individual contacts. Some of the targeted areas for support groups include:

- *family issues
- *parenting concerns
- *alcohol and substance abuse prevention
- *parent-child interaction
- *self-esteem
- *healthy living
- *preparing for college
- *career decisions
- *home management skills

In the Career Matched Mentoring Program the SPIRAL Advisory Committee members are matched with clients interested in their field of work. The mentor has monthly contact with the participant by phone, home visits, and worksite visits. Participants receive assistance in setting career goals and guidance with regard to the steps they need to take to reach those goals. In a similar program, the Mom-to-Mom Mentoring, "mentor mothers" are paired according to common interests with single parents to whom they provide education, friendship and support. All of these mentor relationships are supervised by directors at the Center.

FUNDING: The Single Parent Employment Development Program has been funded in part by the "Community Partnership Fund," a 1990 grant developed by the Illinois Department of Public Aid. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center is also a United Way Member Agency.

REFERRED BY: Susan Eby, Illinois Dept. of Public Aid, 217-782-1210
CONTACTED BY: Helene Grady, 202-401-4886

Tri-County Urban League, Inc.
Employment Program

LOCATION: 317 MacArthur Highway
Peoria, IL 61605

***Peoria is a city of 113,504 residents situated in central Illinois,
approximately 150 miles from both Chicago and St. Louis.

CONTACT: Annie Gordon, Associate Director
672-4362

MISSION: to serve the community with several programs designed to ease the employment training and retention process for low-income adults in the Peoria area. Its education, training, support and personal fulfillment programs target young adults, displaced homemakers, teenagers and entire family units.

SUMMARY: Focusing on helping welfare recipients back to work, the Employment component of the Tri-County Urban League consists of several programs to assist participants in career guidance and placement. Its programs include:

*Job Placement and Referrals: designed to assist individuals in obtaining gainful employment to match their skills, talents and capabilities.

*Pre and Post Job Guidance: helps those minority participants who need to learn the basic skills for obtaining employment and keeping a job. This program includes follow-up counseling for any problems that interfere with participants' job retention.

*Vocational Guidance: includes sessions on career exploration, educational opportunities, and job training, as well as support groups on specific issues. This component focuses on helping displaced homemakers with skills development.

The League's New Horizons Center also offers programs to promote family stabilization and education. Its components include: a Parent-Child Education Center, an Effective Black Parenting Class, Teens Organized for Pride and Success, and Man to Man, a series of workshops specifically designed for males ages 13-19. A speaker meets weekly to discuss subjects related to sexuality, parenting, family, careers, cultural awareness, etc.

FUNDING: The program is funded basically through United Way funds, but also through State money and a federal grant from the Department of Health and Human Services to provide programs for Afro-American males.

REFERRED BY: Arlene Happach,
Children's Home Association, Peoria
309-685-1047

CONTACTED BY: Helene Grady, 202-401-4886

INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCES

Mary Hartsfield

c/o Women for Economic Security
312-663-3574

Mary, a single mother of three children, had been on AFDC for sixteen years but has now broken free of the welfare cycle. At sixteen years old, Mary had a baby and started on AFDC under her mother's benefits; at 18 she was independently on AFDC. She dropped out of high school and had tried GED classes and Job Searches, but neither of these worked out for her. Mary had had three or four low-paying jobs and had been evicted several times (the last time was about one year ago) from her residences.

Mary identifies several obstacles in her long road off of welfare. Primarily, even though she had had a few jobs, Mary quickly realized that it did not pay for her to work. She had had little work experience and little education; therefore, when she found a job, it was always for very low pay. She could not afford child care for her three children and had no insurance with these jobs. Additionally, Mary cites transportation, both to find a job and to afford to get to work everyday, as one of the biggest obstacles to her self-sufficiency. Another major problem that Mary discusses is the difficulty that she had raising her children in a welfare home. She had to send one of her sons to Iowa to live with relatives in order to save him from the gang pressure that especially afflicts welfare children because the gangs offer them the money that their parents cannot.

Two programs in particular played instrumental roles in Mary's road to self-sufficiency: the Legal Assistance Foundation and Women for Economic Security. The Legal Assistance Foundation took Mary's landlord to court for illegal eviction a year ago and won Mary's case. This win has helped to keep her head above ground for awhile. The second group, Women for Economic Security, has given Mary the self-confidence as well as the basic skills and information that she needed to attain her GED and to motivate her to continue her schooling. Mary has worked as a volunteer for WES for 3 years now, is off welfare thanks to her court settlement, and serves on the Social Services Advisory Council Board for the State of Illinois. Additionally, Mary has testified before the regional field hearing of the House Ways and Means Committee in Chicago and has appeared in several media articles and pieces.

From my conversation, I feel that Mary is a very enthusiastic and involved resource on the grass-roots level who could present herself and her experiences very well to the press, to members of the Working Group, and anyone else who might be interested in her experiences and opinions.

Referred by: Jackie Lynn

Women for Economic Security
200 S. Michigan Avenue
Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60604
312-663-3574

Interviewed by: Helene Grady

401-4886

María Joan
708-980-4171
DuPage County, IL

María is a 38 year-old single mother of four boys ages 19, 15, 14, and 6. In 1981, María was laid off from her \$11.75 an hour factory job when the plant closed and moved to Mexico. While on unemployment compensation, her husband broke into her home with a gun and stole everything she owned. She slept in a car for 8 months while her children were being cared for by DCFS. In order to get her children back, she went on AFDC; she acquired housing with the help of a section 8 voucher. She receives only public child support; one father of her children owes them more than \$59,000 in child support payments but has not been found.

In describing the problems within the welfare system that hold women such as herself back, María emphasizes child support enforcement, child care, transportation, and education. María still receives AFDC benefits because she has realized that for her work does not pay. She cannot afford child care for her youngest son who will start school this year. She could work only part time after he is in school. In order to have better schools for her children, María moved to the suburbs of Chicago, but she cannot afford the transportation costs of getting into the City for work. María has also had problems keeping her sons away from the gangs that feed on the boys' economic disadvantages. One of her sons is currently in juvenile hall in Harrisburg, IL for gang-related crimes.

María has become very active in fighting for rights for the economically disadvantaged. She works as a volunteer for Women for Economic Security and works with advocacy groups. She has had much exposure to the press; she has written an article entitled "My Life" and has been interviewed by the Chicago Tribune. She testified at the Energy Assistance hearings in Illinois, has been interviewed by Channel 2 local news in a piece entitled "The Hidden Poverty in DuPage County," and has appeared in a videotape produced by "Voices for Illinois Children." Among other topics, María advocates strongly for increased funding of Head Start (three of her four children finished a Head Start program), abortion rights, mandatory AIDS testing for teenagers, and restoration of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

From my conversation with her, I consider María a very informed and articulate welfare recipient who can express her experiences well and who would be more than willing to talk with anyone about those experiences and about her opinions/ suggestions.

Referred by: Jackie Lynn
Women for Economic Security, 312-663-3574
Interviewed by: Helene Grady, 401-4886

**Mary Gonzalez
312-476-3927**

"Back of the Yards," Chicago

Mary, a 48 year-old wife and mother of two children (a 13 year-old daughter and a 17-year old son), grew up on welfare and is now fighting to stay off of welfare. She lost her job two years ago after 25 years with the same meat-packing house which closed down her department. She receives severance pay and holds flea markets weekly in order to survive without public aid. Although she is not currently on welfare, Mary has been involved with Women for Economic Security where she interacts largely with welfare recipients dealing with problems similar to hers.

In describing her experiences with the welfare system, Mary has emphasized several points for discussion, including child care and the poverty level. Child care, Mary believes, is the biggest thing holding women back from self-sufficiency. Mary also points to the low poverty level; many families such as hers are above the poverty level but, with no insurance and few benefits, still need public aid to stay on track.

Mary's experience with Women for Economic Security has been very positive. She explains that their life skills class (a 9 week course in basic skills and self-esteem) for AFDC women pulled her out of a deep depression that hit when she lost her job. Currently, Mary works out of her own home, starting a program called "Mary's Kids" for children ages 6-15 with which she tries to create a family atmosphere for these children from primarily broken-down homes. Her group, consisting of children from her immediate neighborhood, has started a garden for the 4-H club, goes on outings, etc.

Although she is not currently on welfare, I think that Mary could be a good example of the many borderline families struggling to stay off public aid. She hates the system and knows why she hates it. Mary has some exposure to the press, having been interviewed by cable television and having spoken at the People's Inaugural, a program for the homeless in Chicago in January. Mary seems very open about her story and willing to talk to the public.

Referred by: Jackie Lynn
Women for Economic Security
312-663-3574

Interviewed by: Helene Grady, 401-4886

Beatrice Lynn Hardy
312-434-4613

Beatrice Lynn is a 31-year old widow and mother of three children. She began on AFDC when she moved with her husband to Chicago; he eventually began working, and they went off welfare. However, she left her husband five years ago and because she was not receiving child support from her husband, went back on welfare for three years. At the time, she had one child in school full-time, one part-time and one at home.

Lynn describes several obstacles that she encountered while on welfare that made it difficult for her to get off AFDC. The thing that she hated the most about the system was the way that it forced her to live a lie for three years. While on AFDC, Lynn was not receiving enough money to survive with her children. Therefore, she had to work on the side in order to make the extra money she needed, but she could not tell the government that she was earning money. She feels that she had no choice but to work "off the books." Other problems that Lynn encountered include: lack of child care, inability to afford transportation, and child support enforcement. Lynn explains that even when the government was collecting the child support, she never saw the money because they simply used it against her benefits.

Eventually Lynn became involved with the Women's Self- Employment Project to which she was referred by an art teacher who saw some potential in her work. She was on AFDC at the time she joined WSEP's Buddy System program. Here she worked with four other women in similar situations who also wanted to start a business. This "ladies success circle" provides WSEP with collateral for their loans through peer pressure rather than financial means. Lynn used her first \$1500 loan to begin a graphic arts business, Lynn's Designs. After 18 months, she had expanded her business from business cards and signs to Afro-centric posters and calendars, t-shirts and murals. Her second loan, for \$3500, bought more supplies, and Lynn's business continues today. She is now supporting herself and her children without public aid.

Although Lynn does not have any prior experience with the press or with public hearings, I would not hesitate to contact her about a visit or an interview at any time. She cares very much about the system and about welfare recipients and would be willing to expose her story for the sake of education.

Referred by: **Connie Evans, Executive Director, WSEP**
312-606-8255
Interviewed by: **Helene Grady 401-4886**

JoAnn Kyle
312-643-8467
Chicago, IL

JoAnn, a 28-year old single mother of three children, grew up on welfare in her mother's home. JoAnn graduated high school but during her first year in college, she had a child and went back to the welfare system. JoAnn was not receiving child support and never has received support from the father in seven years.

During these seven years as a welfare mother, JoAnn has encountered several obstacles that have made it difficult for her to work her way off of welfare. Her primary problem has been the fact that welfare inhibits mothers from working even when they try to work. JoAnn had held two jobs but quit both of them because the day she was hired, her public aid was cut. She could not afford self-sufficiency with a job without her benefits also. JoAnn was lucky with child care in that her mother took care of her children for her.

Two years ago, JoAnn got involved with the Women's Self-Employment Project, and it has helped to change her life. JoAnn had been a street peddler when she heard about the program that could lend her money and offer her support in her business initiative. The most valuable aspects of the program for JoAnn have been the sisterly support of people in similar positions and the ability it offers for her to hold onto her AFDC benefits for two years while she is self-employed. These assets have made it possible for JoAnn to start her own home-cleaning business called Kyle's Cleaners. She works out of her own home, her business is successful, and she expects to be free from public aid within a year.

JoAnn has never testified at a hearing and does not have any press exposure. She has been very open about her story, however, and although she might not be as politically motivated as some of the other women I interviewed, her story is an interesting and exemplary one. She is willing to speak with anyone else who might be interested.

Referred by: Connie Evans, Women's Self-Employment Project
312-606-8255

Interviewed by: Helene Grady, 401-4886, 8/93

Kathy Price
815-233-2505
Freeport, IL

Kathy, a 33 year old mother of two children, spent over eight years on AFDC. Her husband left her and the children eleven years ago and has never been contacted. At that time, Kathy, who had been working full-time, started on AFDC despite continuing to work full-time. She could not make ends meet and needed additional assistance. When her employer shut down, in late 1987, Kathy decided to start school full-time which she did in the spring of 1988. By December 1991, Kathy had earned an associates degree. During these three years, she was completely dependent upon AFDC.

Kathy clearly identifies specific obstacles within the welfare system that had made it difficult for her to gain self-sufficiency despite her working full-time. Primarily, Kathy cites education as a reason for her dependence. She made three times less salary than a coworker in a similar position because the coworker had the college degree that Kathy lacked. Additionally, she emphasizes child care expenses and the lack of insurance as major obstacles. At one point when Kathy had no insurance coverage, one of her children was injured, needed surgery, and Kathy had to pay for the treatment herself. Finally, Kathy has never received any child support from her ex-husband.

Some of her success today, Kathy attributes to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Services Center whose Employment Development Program trained her for a job and helped to find her an interview while she was still finishing school. During her last semester, Kathy divided her time between school and her on-the-job training arranged through the King Center. The training experience led to a permanent position as a programmer analyst, a position that Kathy still holds today. Since she began work full-time, in December of 1991, Kathy has been completely free of public assistance.

Kathy has not had much press exposure, being covered only once by local media when she spoke at a luncheon for the King Center. However, Kathy clearly can explain the difficulties she faced as a working AFDC mother, and her story is very inspirational and optimistic.

Referred by: Kara Fiene,
Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Services, Inc.
Single Parent Employment Development Program
815-233-9915

Interviewed by: Helene Grady, 202-401-4886

PRESS REPORT

Chicago Tribune

Welfare reform has been a very prominent part of the *Tribune's* editorial and news coverage over the past year. The paper, though officially politically "independent," seems to take a liberal stance on the issue. Generally, its editorials and commentaries have recognized the need for broad reform of the welfare system, the inadequacy of the 1988 Family Support Act because of states' inability to meet matching requirements, and some disadvantages of many of the programs that make up the recent wave of state reforms such as those demonstrations in NJ, WI, and Illinois. The writers seem to see access to child care, education, and training as essential to any type of self-sufficiency program. In general, while usually defending welfare mothers and children, the paper tends to support Clinton's vision for welfare reform but also wants to see concrete actions implementing his ideals.

Most of the coverage of the issue has been through editorials, but some commentaries and news stories have also appeared. Key reporters seem to be Carol Jouzaitis who writes news stories on the issue of reform and on Clinton's administration as well as Hugh Dellios who also covers the issue as a news topic. Various columnists have contributed their opinions to the paper and several non-designated editorials have appeared over the last year and a half.

The coverage has repeatedly included the expert opinion of Doug Dobmeyer from the Illinois Public Welfare Coalition (312-829-5568). Highlighted programs include: 1) Illinois' Project Chance, a job training and literacy program whose funding has been cut this year; 2) Illinois' Earnfare; 3) the Day Care Action Council of Illinois (Shelley Peck, 312-561-7900); 4) Options for People, a successful non-profit community welfare-to-work program (312-921-3000); 5) Suburban Job Link (John Plunkett 312-522-8700); and 6) Chicago Commons West Humboldt ETC (Jody Raphael 312-772-0900).

The specific articles include:

Feb. 9, 1992: Commentary; Clarence Page; "The Flip Side of Welfare 'Reform':"

Page highlights NJ's child benefits reform proposal as an example of a recent wave of behaviour-modification approaches to reform. Wary of workfare and other state proposals that only "impose new hardships instead of removing old

ones," he implies that a stronger national stand for "genuine reform" needs to be adopted. Finally, Page describes President Bush's campaign tactics as merely renaming the provisions of the 88 FSA as his own ideas.

Feb. 11, 1992: Editorial; "Reform Welfare, but Cautiously":

This piece comments on Bush's support of the new wave of state welfare reforms that demand something from recipients in return for public aid and on Bush's vow to make waivers easier to obtain. It defends the notion of welfare, saying that most recipients are not dependent from generation to generation. It implies, however, that reform is needed; but cautions strongly against federal waivers being automatic (cites the New Jersey waiver as an example of the danger of the lack of federal control).

April 20, 1992: Editorial; "Welfare reform, Wisconsin-style":

This piece discusses the political pressure surrounding welfare reform which makes "the line between genuine reform and opportunistic bashing a thin one." It considers the Wisconsin initiative for reductions in benefits to teens having babies an "unhealthy mixture of both" of these circumstances which "panders to middle-class resentments." The points of the piece include: 1) reform is needed but should not result in a cutback in aid for children 2) a defense of AFDC families; they do not generally have more children for the additional benefit.

April 29, 1992: News; "Welfare reform revisited in tightfisted legislature" by Hugh Dellios:

Dellios outlines pending action in Springfield to reform welfare by: 1) freezing benefit levels for people moving into Illinois and 2) stopping additional payments per child to AFDC mothers who have more than one child. The article presents both sides but emphasizes the opposition's argument which says that these reforms are based on misperceptions about the quality of life on AFDC. The opposition also points out that the recession has left people bitter and in favor of cuts in public aid. Dellios quotes Doug Dobmeyer from the Illinois Public Welfare Coalition as an expert opinion for the opposition.

May 1, 1992: News; "Lawmakers look to trim welfare list" by Hugh Dellios and Robert Vitale:

The authors review pending Illinois legislation, particularly the "Learnfare" pilot program that would force teenage welfare mothers to go to school. The article cites Lynda Wright, a former recipient and worker for the Illinois Public Welfare Coalition (is no longer with the Coalition), and Joseph Antolin, Deputy Director for the IL Dept. of Public Aid.

July 19, 1992: "Voice of the People" Column; "How to make the welfare system work" by Sandra O'Donnell:

O'Donnell advocates for more federal funding of the '88 Family Support Act with lower state matching requirements. She also stresses the principle of making work pay, recognizing the need to include child care and health care in a self-sufficiency program for working parents.

September 10, 1992: News; "Clinton tells his welfare reform plan" by Mitchell Locin:

Locin covers the campaign rhetoric on welfare reform: Clinton v. Bush. He emphasizes Clinton's trying "to piece together a winning coalition by performing a juggling act between loyal constituencies and disaffected Democrats." Locin infers that Clinton is trying to sell his welfare reform plan in a way that appeals to all of his interests.

February 2, 1993: Editorial; "Earnfare earns its keep":

The author supports Illinois' Earnfare program which "places former transitional assistance recipients into part-time jobs with Illinois employers. The State pays the minimum wage for a 62-hour-a-month job, plus \$111 a month in food stamps and some commuting costs." Employers get free labor for six months and the opportunity can lead to a permanent job for the client.

February 3, 1993: News; "Clinton focuses on jobs, welfare" by Carol Jouzaitis and Michael Arndt:

The report reviews basic points of Clinton's reform vision and its relation to the Stimulus plan.

February 4, 1993: Editorial; "Welfare as we'd like to know it":

This column comments on Clinton's plan to "end welfare as we know it." It points out that the '88 Act never got off the ground because the recession kept the states from meeting their matching requirements. It supports reform but adds that Clinton's bold proposals are not yet supported with concrete action; it leaves the burden of welfare reform on Clinton. (see attached copy).

February 11, 1993: News; "State plans to launch 5 welfare programs" by Rob Karwath:

Karwath outlines five Illinois demonstration proposals approved by HHS. He highlights Illinois' Project Chance, a program that will be set up to target non-

custodial fathers, and he quotes Doug Dobmeyer as an expert opinion.

March 3, 1993: "Voice of People" column; "Closing off promise of Project Chance" by Shelley Peck (Day Care Action Council 312-561-7900):

Peck discusses the need for child care for AFDC mothers in getting off welfare; cites Project Chance as a successful model that is being cut by the Illinois government.

March 9, 1993: News; "Poor need more time, study says" by Nancy Lawson:

Lawson reports that recipients need more than two years to get off welfare. Advocates hope Clinton's limit will be flexible. Key source for the article is: Jody Raphael from Chicago Commons West Humboldt ETC.

March 30, 1993: News; "A welfare option that works" by Julie Poppen:

Poppen highlights small non-profits whose welfare-to-work efforts have been successful. Two programs are highlighted: Options for People (312-921-3000) and Suburban Job Link (John Plunkett, head, 312-522-8700).

April 15, 1993: News/Commentary; "Cap on welfare still a family matter" by Sharman Stein:

Stein discusses the question of whether AFDC mothers would continue to have children if the additional benefit was revoked; generally defends the mothers but presents both sides of the issue.

April 26, 1993: Commentary; "Poor suffer as states jump on the welfare 'reform' bandwagon" by Michael Gauf:

This piece comments again on the wave of state "punitive" reforms, saying that reform should not mean simply budget-cutting. Rather, states need to concentrate on self-sufficiency programs that might cost money.

Chicago Sun-Times

Welfare reform has not been as prominent an issue in the *Sun-Times* as it has been in the *Tribune*. This paper, generally considered politically conservative, has presented a series of editorials on welfare reform that fashion a moderate stand on the issue. Overall, the editorial board tends to support more federal involvement, decreasing state responsibility, as well as overall reform of the system. No model programs or key contacts are highlighted in the editorial coverage.

***Because the Library of Congress has no access to an index for the *Sun-Times* after the early 1980s and because the paper itself could only release to the public the listings of editorials, only these editorials were used in compiling this report.

The specific editorials include:

December 11, 1992: "Clinton can't ignore inner city problems":

This piece criticizes Clinton's lack of direct focus on inner city problems since his campaign. It supports welfare reform as is discussed in *Mandate for Change*.

February 8, 1993: "Edgar should lead a review of DCFS":

The author sees Clinton's opening of the debate on welfare reform as an opportunity for Illinois to evaluate its own programs. It offers one State program by which relatives are paid money to take in children from their extended family as an alternative to foster care as an example of things that need to be reevaluated.

February 9, 1993: "Send the IRS after deadbeats":

Here, the paper advocates a stronger message on child support enforcement: "Paying child support is as important as paying taxes." It suggests that because state agencies do not have the capabilities for such an enormous task, that collection be turned over to the IRS.

February 16, 1993: "Put unspent U.S. cash to work":

This piece proposes that Congress eliminate state matching requirements for JOBS programs. Because of the recession, states cannot afford to pay their share and lose their federal dollars, money which then lies unspent.

April 22, 1993: "Setting welfare cap is worthy proposal":

This commentary supports the Illinois proposal to cap payments to mothers who have additional children while on welfare. It considers current incentives "backward." Further, it does not see children as the potential victims of such reform because the families would still receive food stamp benefits, child care or health care.

June 8, 1993: "Rosty plan means JOBS funds":

Again, this piece asks that state matching requirements be revoked. It supports Rep. Rostenkowski's proposal that would reduce matching requirements and make other changes in the JOBS program.

Peoria *Journal Star*

The *Journal Star's* (circulation: 85,024) coverage of Illinois welfare reform has been fairly complete, even though it rarely discusses a national welfare reform plan. The paper presents a relatively moderate stance on the issue, usually discussing both sides, with the exception of one key reporter named Toby Eckert who presents a liberal opinion. Issues such as Illinois' welfare reform proposals including Learnfare, a cap on additional benefits per child, a requirement for able-bodied recipients to work, and a program to force teenage welfare mothers to go to school are discussed widely. Key expert opinions include Doug Dobmeyer from the Illinois Public Welfare Coalition and Joseph Antolin from the Illinois Department of Public Aid. Other than State proposals, the paper does not highlight specific model community programs.

The specific articles include:

February 17, 1992: News; "Welfare reform bills stress stick" by Toby Eckert:

Eckert reviews the pending legislation in Illinois sponsored by Sen. Frank Watson (R-Greenville). He highlights two bills in particular: 1) a cap on additional benefits to mothers with more than one child; and 2) a requirement for able-bodied recipients to go to work. Eckert presents both sides of the debate: Watson defends his bills and Doug Dobmeyer (IL Public Welfare Coalition) represents the opposition.

March 29, 1992: Commentary; "Edgar hints at some form of welfare reform" by Toby Eckert:

Eckert criticizes the reform bills pending in Springfield as unreasonable alternatives. He defends welfare families and emphasizes the need for job training and education components in any reform bill, as he states: "Simplistic slash-and-burn approaches will do little to further genuine reform. Unless lawmakers are willing to make the investments needed to truly improve the lot of the needy, we're stuck."

May 1, 1992: News; "Tie vote stalls welfare reform" by Toby Eckert:

Eckert reports on the stalling of the bill to cap welfare benefits for mothers due to a 7-7 tie in a Senate committee. He discusses Learnfare a bill which passed through the committee that would require teenage welfare recipients and their children to attend school. He presents both sides as Joseph Antolin speaks for the State and Lynda Wright

(Public Welfare Coalition) defends welfare families.

January 27, 1993: News; "Bills offer incentives to leave welfare track" by Toby Eckert:

Here Eckert reviews legislation introduced by House Republicans which would add a \$50 increase in benefits to encourage teen parents on welfare to stay in school. The bills would also impose copayments on Medicaid recipients and require child immunizations before AFDC families would receive benefits. Eckert reviews the support for the bill and also presents the opposition, represented by Doug Dobmeyer (Public Welfare Coalition) who is quoted saying, "The bills were manufactured somewhere on Pluto and have no basis in reality."

February 4, 1993: News; "Welfare plan might work in 'ideal world'" by Pam Louwagie:

Louwagie writes in response to Clinton's speech to the NGA in which he emphasized three ideas for welfare reform: work, an expanded EITC, and a national database for tracking "deadbeat dads." The article surveys local responses to his ideas. It talks to Brent Hursey-McLaughlin, assistant to the director at Peoria's South Side Mission, who is apprehensive about the reality of reform; Amy Owens and Arleatha Foster, residents of the New Promise Shelter, who discuss the need to make work pay; and Dean Schott, from the Illinois Department of Public Aid, who verifies Illinois' increase in welfare recipients in recent years.

April 25, 1993: Commentary; "Better off on welfare" by Shari Mannery:

Mannery presents Cynthia Davis, a high school grad and single mother living in public housing and on AFDC, as a case study example of how it does not pay for welfare mothers to go to work.

May 5, 1993: News; "Vote targeting mothers on welfare delayed in House" by Bill O'Connell:

O'Connell presents an update on this bill as it reaches the House. William Oppen from the Illinois Dept. of Public Aid, supported by Gov. Edgar, the Illinois Catholic Conference and Voices for Children, speaks against the bill.

June 23, 1993: News; "Child-support deadbeats pay up or paint" (AP) by Jennifer Dixon:

The paper prints Dixon's article which discusses a Wisconsin law to force deadbeats into community service if they do not pay their obligations. It

recognizes the necessity of better child-support enforcement.

July 12, 1993: News; "Welfare compromise created budget deal" by Toby Eckert:

Eckert reports on the role of a welfare compromise in helping the two parties to agree on a budget. The Republicans allowed an increase in AFDC benefits while Democrats agreed to fund certain welfare reform initiatives.

Springfield State Journal-Register: Capitol City Newspaper

Although welfare reform has been a prominent issue in Illinois and its legislature, it has not been covered extensively in the *State Journal-Register*. The editorials that the paper has printed seem to take a conservative stand, supporting tough, "punitive" reforms like some of those that have been introduced within the State. The paper additionally seems to have put the pressure on President Clinton to live up to his promise to "end welfare as we know it." Where it supports this ideal, it does not necessarily feel confident that the present Administration can handle this responsibility. No key news reporters seem to concentrate on welfare issues, and the paper has not highlighted any specific programs or individuals involved in welfare reform.

***Because of an inability to attain copies of the paper from March 1993 to the present, articles from the April 19, May 4, May 5, May 12, June 2, and June 4 issues have not been included in this report.

The specific articles include:

July 22, 1992: Editorial; "Welfare Reform has to include 3 key elements":

This piece calls for strong reform in order to target "the real drain on the welfare system...the long-term recipient, like the teenage mother." It proposes a program of "education + marriage + work." Finally, the author praises state "punitive" reforms such as the ones in Wisconsin and California.

February 3, 1993: News; "\$31 billion Clinton plan for economy" provided by the New York Times News Service:

The article reviews the President's speech to the NGA, emphasizing his ideas for welfare reform.

February 8, 1993: Editorial; "Clinton must take lead in reforming the welfare system":

This editorial questions Clinton's leadership in welfare reform; it says that he has called for the reform, but asks why he has been stalling on making a move. It emphasizes that he could not be stalling because of a lack of Republican support on the Hill for welfare reform because most Republicans support reform measures. Finally, it makes two suggestions for reform: that the proposal sticks to the two-year limit and that states be granted more freedom through waivers.

NEW JERSEY

<u>DEMOGRAPHICS</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Population (7/1/92)	7,789,000	255.1m (T)	9
Child Population (4/1/90)	1,811,000	63.9m (T)	9
Percent of Population that are children (7/1/92)	23.4%	25.7% (A)	46
Per Capita Personal Income-FY 89	23,764	17,567 (A)	2
Poverty Rate			
1991	9.7%	13.7% (A)	43
1989	8.2%	12.7% (A)	46
1983	10.9%	15.4% (A)	43
1979	9.5%	12.4% (A)	45
Change in Rate (1979-1991)	+ .2%	+1.3% (A)	

Aid to Families with Dependent Children

<u>AFDC -- Benefits</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total assistance payments-FY 92	515.7m	22,223.5m (T)
AFDC Grant-Jan 93 (Mother-two children-0 income)	424	367 (M)
Food Stamp benefit-Jan 93	270	285 (M)
Combined benefits-Jan 93	694	652 (M)
Percent of poverty threshold-Jan 93	74%	70% (M)
Percent change since 1980	-30.9%	-22.4% (A)

<u>AFDC -- Caseloads</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Average Monthly AFDC Caseload (people)-FY 92	125,800	4,768,600 (T)
AFDC Reciprocity Rate-FY 92	4.7%	5.3% (A)
Change in AFDC Reciprocity-FY 88-92	+15%	+20% (A)
Average Payment per Family-FY 92	342	388 (A)
Average Number in AFDC Unit (10/90-9/91)	2.9	2.9 (A)
Food Stamp Reciprocity FY 92	6.36%	9.95% (A)

<u>AFDC -- Income Data</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Percent of Families with Unemployed Parent-9/92	3.0%	5.7% (A)
Percent with Earned Income-10/90-9/91	2.4%	7.9% (A)
Percent Receiving Public Housing/ HUD Rent Subsidy-10/90-9/91	12.8%	21.0% (A)
Number of Persons JOBS Money Obligated-FY 91	27,426	460,914 (T)

Child Support Enforcement

<u>Collections and Expenditures</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total Collections-FY 92	372.5m	7,951.1m (T)
AFDC Collections-FY 92	83.5m	2,252.6m (T)
Child Support Collections per \$ of Total Admin. Expend. -FY 92	4.02	3.99 (A)
Average Number AFDC Cases in which a Collection was Made-FY 92	24,376	830,713 (T)
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1983	+160%	+293% (T)
Total Number of Paternities Established-FY 92	10,314	515,393 (T)
Number of out-of-wedlock births-1990	29,756	1,165,384 (T)

*Type: A=average, M=median, T=total

Source: 1993 Green Book

STATE WELFARE POLICY

New Jersey's welfare reform activity pre-dates the 1988 Family Support Act. Beginning under Governor Kean's administration, the State has passed two major pieces of welfare reform legislation. The most recent program, Governor Florio's 1992 Family Development Program is a controversial state model for welfare reform that includes several bold components.

I. Legislation:

Governor Florio's 1992 Family Development Program has been very controversial nationally because it is the first state plan to impose a "family cap" on AFDC benefits; it ends the practice of increasing benefits for families who conceive a child while receiving AFDC payments. It also requires parents with children over 2 years old to participate in educational or employment-related activities and those with children under 2 years old to participate in mandatory counseling and vocational assessment activities. However, the plan includes several other "non-punitive" provisions that serve to increase supports for these same families. The FDP allows the earned income disregard to increase for families falling under the family cap. Furthermore, it allows families to retain more of their earnings from work and increases the period of transitional Medicaid benefits for those leaving AFDC due to employment from 12 to 24 months. Other supportive services include transportation and a one-year child care extension once a parent becomes ineligible for AFDC. This program mandates participation for all welfare recipients, not just those receiving federal AFDC benefits. These additional groups include AFDC families that do not meet the federal definition of unemployed and General Assistance recipients who receive assistance at the municipal level. Waivers required for the provisions of the program include:

- *The family cap provision requires a waiver of Federal guidelines that provide additional AFDC benefits for a child born while the family is on assistance. Children not provided cash assistance will be eligible for Medicaid and increased food stamp benefits.

- *A waiver was required to permit participation by parents in the mandatory counseling and vocational assessment activities if the youngest child is under two years of age.

- *A waiver was required to continue the REACH/JOBS waiver allowing the State to require participation in educational and employment and training activities of a parent or caretaker relative who is employed 30 or more hours per week. This waiver permits the State to evaluate a family's circumstances and to offer those activities which may help to make the family more self-sufficient in the future.

- *The FDP's specific sanctions for non-compliance require a waiver of Federal sanctioning criteria. New Jersey has two alternate sanctions: either a 20% reduction in family benefits for at least 30 days or an individual penalty for at least 90 days.

- *A waiver was required to exclude the natural parent and his or her spouse from the filing unit provisions. If the parent of an AFDC family marries someone not receiving AFDC benefits, that parent will no longer be eligible for the benefits, only the dependant children will remain eligible. The stepparent is seen as being responsible for himself, any of his or her natural children, and for the new spouse.

- *A waiver was necessary to permit the application of the State disregard to earned income of employed family members when a newborn child is born to an assistance family and no benefit increment is received for the newborn. The family is entitled to a higher earned income disregard to compensate for the lack of additional benefits for the newborn child.

*The State required a waiver to allow participants of higher education activities to be considered as JOBS participants. This waiver allows the State to enroll more welfare recipients in college without jeopardizing the enhanced JOBS funding.

*Two initiatives continued from the REACH/JOBS waiver provide for additional disregards of income. The first of these initiatives permits 600 AFDC parents to serve as family day care providers for other AFDC recipient children. The second waiver expands the six-month disregard of earnings received by a dependent child from a JTPA training program to other non-JTPA training programs and expands the disregard to young parents under age 25 who are permitted to participate in the program. This second request corrects inequalities wherein one recipient participates in a JTPA training program and receives a financial advantage through disregarded earnings, but another recipient in a non-JTPA type activity like the State Job Corps is penalized.

*The gradual phase-in schedule of the FDP enhancements of the REACH/JOBS program required a waiver of the federal requirements of comparability of treatment. In the first year, the program has been made available to the three counties (Camden, Essex and Hudson) with the largest number of AFDC recipients. The remaining 18 counties will be added to the FDP in a selected sequence which will be completed as of July, 1994.

Waivers were granted in July 1992; the program began in October 1992 and will run for five years.

The predecessor to the Family Development Program, the REACH program (Realizing Economic Achievement) began in 1987 as a mandatory work and education program for mothers with children age two or older. The program provided Medicaid transitional benefits, immediate wage withholding and updating of past child support orders. It also included an initiative to encourage AFDC recipients to provide day care for other AFDC recipients' children by disregarding 50% of their earnings. Much of this program was encompassed by the JOBS program under the 1988 Family Support Act. Medicaid, AFDC and Child Support waivers were granted in 1987; the demonstration ended in December 1989 with implementation of the federal JOBS program. The waivers that had been granted for REACH include:

*AFDC: increased earning disregards for those working while receiving AFDC; increased income limits for eligibility for family day care providers; job search requirement extended to last more than eight weeks.

*Medicaid: allowing those leaving welfare to keep their Medicaid benefits for a transition period even if they lose AFDC eligibility.

*Child Support: allowed the State not to notify AFDC recipients of child support collections.

II. Demonstration Programs

Two demonstration programs funded by the Department of Health and Human Services and private foundations are currently being implemented in New Jersey.

*Parents' Fair Share is a research and demonstration project for AFDC families. It involves a test

of employment and training services, peer support, enhanced child support enforcement and mediation services for unemployed noncustodial parents of AFDC children. A pilot program began in April 1992 and will run through December 1993. An evaluation is scheduled to begin in 1994. Refer to section 4 of the Briefing Book for further information.

*Teen Parent Demonstration is another demonstration program whose major features include: intensive case management, use of sanctions, and early involvement of teen parents of a single child in the education and job training programs. This program is jointly funded by ACF and ASPE.

MODEL PROGRAMS

The Work Group

CONTACT: Deborah Reese,
President/CEO
609/486-7390

LOCATION: 3720 Marlon Pike
Pennsauken, NJ 08105
(Camden County)

GOAL: to move people, particularly those lacking the most basic educational skills, off of public assistance and into the workplace or into advanced training and education through an intensive program of basic education, career decision making, job readiness preparation and case management services.

SUMMARY: The Work Group is a private, not-for-profit education and training corporation that has offered literacy and employment services to adults and youth throughout southern New Jersey since 1983. The Work Group provides culturally-sensitive counseling and case management services, along with individualized education, work experience and job readiness training. The Work Group pays particular attention to the emotional, cultural, and cognitive aspects of self-esteem building and implements daily activities to promote it.

The Work Group's adult basic education programs are designed for people who lack the most basic educational skills. Instruction is provided in a supportive environment in reading and math, problem-solving, civic responsibilities, and life-coping skills. Three hundred welfare recipients receive services annually. Additionally, in 1989, the Work Group was the only community based organization selected by the NJ Department of Education to work with unions and businesses in South Jersey to teach literacy skills to employees at the workplace.

The Work Group also operates the New Jersey Youth Corps of Camden County, the largest corps program in the state. Designed for unemployed high school dropouts between the ages of 16 and 25, this program offers basic skills and work-related education and training in conjunction with meaningful work experiences. Since its founding in 1985, the Youth Corps has served over one thousand of the most at-risk youth in Camden County. In 1990, the New Jersey Youth Corps program received national recognition (U.S. Department of Education National Diffusion Network Award) as a model program meriting nationwide replication.

FUNDING: The Work Group currently receives support from the New Jersey Department of Education, the New Jersey Department of Labor, the Camden County Freeholders, the Camden County Private Industry Council, and local private foundations.

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. in its 1990 study of the implementation of New Jersey's welfare program, highlighted The Work Group's program as a potential model for programs successfully educating the most at-risk welfare clients.

Amandla Crossing

CONTACT: Janet Jones, Director
908/549-5559

LOCATION: 100 Mitch Snyder Drive
Edison, NJ 08837-3653

GOAL: 1) to help residents achieve the maximum level of self-sufficiency possible for their families within a one-year period; 2) to help the residents pursue resolution of their dysfunctional issues as much as possible within one year; and 3) to help each family find and keep permanent housing.

Amandla Crossing has successfully helped homeless families on AFDC by providing complete transitional support, including housing and child care, for one year, so that the parents can complete the job training and education programs necessary to solve their homelessness problem for the long term.

SUMMARY: In 1988 Middlesex Interfaith Partners with the Homeless became the first organization in the country to obtain federal surplus property to meet the needs of the homeless under Title V of the federal Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. In July 1991, MIPH raised \$1.7 million and constructed Amandla Crossing, a 30-unit apartment complex complete with a child care center, offices, classroom space, recreation space, and laundry facilities.

Amandla Crossing provides housing and supportive services to 27 families in a supervised facility, through a 12-month program where residents have the opportunity to recover from the trauma of homelessness while working to build their skills for a better life once they find permanent housing. Each family has a private apartment, fully furnished and equipped with kitchen and bath, providing them with privacy and space in which to learn to make a stable home.

Amandla Crossing serves some of the most at-risk welfare recipients. Most of the women participating in Amandla Crossing started having children at a very young age, usually ranging from 13 to 16. They tended to drop out of school once their children were born, some as early as the 7th grade. Many of the women suffered years of physical and sexual abuse as children themselves, and many grew up in homes where one or both parents had serious alcohol or drug problems. Several of the women themselves suffered serious addiction problems for many years.

Immediately upon entering Amandla Crossing, parents begin an intensive three-month in-house Self and Family Development phase which includes a program of classes, taught by Amandla Crossing staff as well as outside professionals, in such areas as parenting, nutrition, self-esteem building, substance abuse recovery, domestic violence workshops, budgeting, and creative expression. At the end of this phase, parents begin job training programs or they enroll in the county college. Then, depending on individual circumstances and growth, parents have generally been "graduated" after 10-12 months. At this time the Housing Relocation Coordinator begins to help them find suitable permanent housing, with the help of various subsidies when they are available and necessary.

RESULTS: Of the 83 mothers who have entered Amandla Crossing, 38 have graduated, 9 dropped out, 14 were terminated for noncompliance, and 22 are current participants. All of the graduates have relocated to permanent housing, without a recurrence of homelessness. About 34 percent have left the welfare rolls through employment, and another 32 percent are still enrolled in college or job training. Of the graduates who came into the program admitting to a substance abuse problem, 67 percent have continued with their recovery.

December 16, 1993

F.O.C.U.S. Newark, Inc.

CONTACT: Nitza Molina,
Acting Director
201/624-2528

LOCATION: 443 Broad Street
Newark, NJ 07102

MISSION: to empower those Hispanics with limited language, occupational, and educational skills, thus improving the quality of their lives and that of the community at large.

SUMMARY: F.O.C.U.S., which stands for Field Orientation Center for the Underprivileged Spanish-speaking, is a non-profit, community-based, multi-service agency which has worked to meet the needs of the Hispanic poor of Newark since 1967. Specific service areas include:

- **Community Development and Support Unit:** The center provides emergency services, in addition to general information and referral services.
- **Educational Services Unit:** Essex County Community College has a Bilingual Education Extension Center at the Agency, serving nearly 100 students. The Center provides college and remedial courses as well as English as a Second Language instruction.
- **Bilingual Family Institute Unit:** Families are assisted with crisis intervention. Social workers and parent aides provide escort and interpretation services, parenting skills, advocacy, home visits and referrals to other agencies.
- **Youth Services Unit:** Adolescents are assisted with tutoring, counseling services, cultural, educational enrichment and recreational trips.
- **Employment Services Unit:** The mission of the F.O.C.U.S. Employment Service is to meet the needs of industry by providing qualified candidates for employment. Simultaneously, the program seeks to assist urban residents to enter the workforce and become productive members of society. The Service provides interviews, job counseling, and workshops to applicants seeking employment. The job development component has been instrumental in securing work orders from thousands of employers in manufacturing, clerical and the service industries. To date the Employment Service Unit has placed over 18,000 candidates in jobs since 1968.
- **Bilingual Office Skills Training:** This sixteen week program is designed to enhance participants' English language dominance, technical skills and knowledge necessary to secure and retain employment. During the first twelve weeks of training, participants receive instruction in a broad range of job skills including computer applications, general office procedures, business mathematics and English, effective communication, and typing. From week nine through twelve, participants receive extensive training in employability skills such as interview styles, resume development, and career development. The final four weeks of job search activities provides participants with job leads but also trains them in researching and following-up on leads using their own initiative.

FUNDING: F.O.C.U.S. was started with a \$30,000 grant from former President Johnson's "War on Poverty" campaign. Other contributors include the Victoria Foundation, the Florence and John Schumann Foundation, and the United Way of Essex and West Hudson.

December 16, 1993

F.O.C.U.S., a community institution, has been instrumental in helping at-risk Hispanic and Latino families in Newark become self-sufficient. The program helps to ease the transition for these families by eliminating the language and cultural barriers to the business, political and social environment in the United States.

The Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Operation Fatherhood

LOCATION: Union Industrial Home for
Children
864 Bellevue Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08618

CONTACT: Barbara Kelley-Sease, Executive
Director, Union Industrial Home
609/695-1492

GOALS: 1) to reduce poverty among children receiving public assistance by encouraging and requiring their noncustodial parents to establish paternity and pay child support; 2) to increase the employment and earnings of noncustodial parents who are unemployed and unable to adequately support their children; and 3) to assist these parents in providing other forms of support to their children when appropriate.

SUMMARY: The nine Parents' Fair Share Demonstration programs use a variety of approaches, built around four core services: employment and training, peer support and instruction in parenting skills, mediation, and enhanced child support enforcement. Fathers generally enter the program because they need a job, and they want to become more actively involved with their children. However, they themselves have a wide range of problems, including substance abuse and legal problems over child support arrears. The Operation Fatherhood program addresses these problems in several ways. First, they offer the men job skills sessions and help with the job search. Second, informal group sessions teach the participants more about their role as a single parent. These sessions are mandatory for program participants. Topics for the sessions include:

*Personal Development sessions cover issues involving fatherhood, manhood, values, communication, decision-making and self-esteem.

*Fatherhood sessions cover childhood growth and development, behavior and parenting skills.

*Relationships sessions cover the qualities and types of relationships in general, dealing with anger, and establishing goals to improve relationships.

*Health and Sexuality sessions cover sexual behavior, family planning and birth control.

SCOPE: Operation Fatherhood works with noncustodial fathers age 16-35 living in Mercer County who are unemployed or underemployed. The program has met its required enrollment level of 300 for the pilot phase which lasts from April 1992 - December 1993. 33 men have been placed into on-the-job training slots and 39 entered unsubsidized employment. To date, child support garnishments were entered for 25 of the participants and collections initiated for 18.

FUNDING: Operation Fatherhood is an initiative of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, and a consortium of foundation partners, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, AT&T and the Ford Foundation. The funding includes \$750,000 of federal money, \$325,00 in State money and \$200,000 in private funds.

December 13, 1993

Parents' Fair Share is the nation's first federally funded program to provide services and support to noncustodial parents. This interesting nine state demonstration, created by the Family Support Act, is a model for service strategies likely to be encouraged in welfare reform.

CLIENT PROFILES

Janet Price
269 College Drive
Edison, NJ 08817
908/248-9325

Janet is a 30-year old mother of three sons, ages 8, 8 and 4. She had been receiving AFDC for approximately one and a half years but has been free of public aid, except for food stamps and medicaid, since February 1993.

Janet, a recovering addict, entered a rehabilitation program four years ago, after separating from her husband. Her aunt took custody of her three sons while Janet fought to stay off of drugs. Upon completing the rehab program, Janet regained custody of her sons and moved in and out of different temporary housing situations. She was receiving partial AFDC and working in waitressing jobs.

Janet heard about Amandla Crossing, a transitional housing program in New Jersey where mothers on AFDC can stay in an apartment with their children for one year while they work toward self-sufficiency. In order to be referred by welfare to Amandla, Janet had to quit her work and be receiving full AFDC benefits. Wanting a new and nice place to live where she could become used to being independent, Janet did so.

Janet stayed at Amandla for a little over one year, with an extension, and enrolled in college while she was there. She stayed on AFDC and received child care through the New Jersey REACH program. Janet left Amandla in October 1992 and has lived in the same apartment since. She attends school, alternately full and part-time, at Middlesex Community College where she is working toward her Associates Degree in Accounting. She also works full and part-time, alternately. Janet receives regular child support from her husband, is free from AFDC, receiving only food stamps and medicaid, and expects to graduate within one to two years.

Referred by: Janet Jones, Amandla Crossing
Interviewed by: Helene Grady, WRWG staff

December 16, 1993

Erin Hunter
1812 Mildred Avenue
Linden, NJ 07036
Work: 908/241-7005
Home: 908/486-3326

Erin is a 40-year old mother of two children, ages 13 and 10. She has never been on AFDC because she does not qualify, but because of a lack of child support, Erin has struggled to maintain her self-sufficiency. She has her high school degree and one year of college and currently works full-time as a medical assistant at the Urological Group of Union County. She has been divorced since 1985.

At the time of her divorce, in May 1985, Erin's ex-husband was ordered to pay \$60 per week in child support for his two children. However, in November of that year, the father left New Jersey and moved to Florida. Erin managed to track him down through the mail system, with no help from the probation office. Erin received a court order through Florida for only \$10 per week per child. This order was never reevaluated until later in 1986 when it was increased to \$12.50 per week. Now New Jersey says that the father owes over \$40,000 in arrears, but Florida states a much smaller sum.

Erin does not qualify for public aid because her salary is too high. However, her mortgage payments take over half of her annual income, and she is constantly behind in her utility bills. Erin is very frustrated with the child support enforcement system and fears losing her security and independence.

Referred by: Geri Jensen, ACES
Interviewed by: Helene Grady, WRWG staff

December 16, 1993

PRESS REPORT

September, 1993

Newark Star-Ledger

Welfare reform has been a very prominent issue for the Star-Ledger over the past year and a half. This is an independent newspaper with the 15th largest circulation in the country. The paper seems to present the issue objectively through news reports on both State and federal innovations. Several editorials and commentaries have been printed, however, that express concern over Clinton's vision for reform and over the general political approach to reform. Key reporters on the issue seem to include Donna Leusner, Maryann Spoto and J. Scott-Orr (from the Washington Bureau) with news stories, as well as Ben Wattenberg with commentaries. The one major expert on the issue locally to whom the reporters seem to turn for comment is De Miller from Legal Services of New Jersey, an organization that represents the rights of the poor.

Specific articles include:

February 3, 1992: News: J. Scott Orr, "Florino lists welfare reforms":

Orr reviews Florino's announcement a day earlier of the details of his welfare reform plan to the NGA. Both Bryant and Florino anticipate support from the White House and Congress for their Family Development Program.

September 19, 1992: News: Angela Stewart, "Welfare reform law hotly debated at state gathering of black leaders":

Stewart reviews the discussion of the Family Development Program that had occurred at the NJ Black Issues Convention (BIC). The NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund has challenged the family cap provision in court. BIC opposes the state measure, as a representative says, "25,000 'young, black female' welfare recipients in Essex County now have criminal records because they have been charged with welfare fraud for working on the side in an effort to pay their rent and meet other obligations." Rev. Charles Rawlings, executive director of the NJ Council of Churches, called the law an example of the "deep moral sickness" of the whole society.

September 30, 1992: News: Donna Leusner, "Program stresses self-sufficiency":

This article, written the day before the Family Development Program would take effect, reviews the provisions of the reform

program and the planned improved service delivery through the use of Family Resource Centers.

October 26, 1992: Commentary: Lawrence Hall, "Politicians blame the poor":

Hall criticizes politicians on the state and federal level for using welfare reform as a political tool to "pit racial and economic groups against one another." He believes their proposals are a "knee-jerk form of workfare which...translates into slavefare." If they really wanted to help welfare recipients and to save money, Hall says that politicians should trim the welfare bureaucracy.

November 25, 1992: News: Gabriel Gluck and Gail Ferguson Jones, "Activists rally against proposed cuts in welfare":

The authors review protests held in New Brunswick and Elizabeth over a \$10 million cut from the municipal welfare program by the Republican controlled legislature in June of 1992. The article cites several key opposition players, including: De Miller of Legal Services of NJ; Elliot Katz from Middlesex Interfaith Partners with the Homeless; Janice King, chair of the Coalition Against the G/A Cuts; and Abdul Muhammad from Standing Up for Justice in Elizabeth.

February 22, 1993: Editorial: "Making welfare work":

The column sees Clinton's vision for reform as being along the lines of workfare, but it states that reform is urgently needed. The author says that welfare will always be needed but recognizes the need also to provide incentives for employable recipients who would otherwise remain on welfare.

April 5, 1993: News: Alan Ota, "Administration quietly moving on a major overhaul of welfare":

Ota reports on Clinton's plan to set up a welfare reform task force and discusses Shalala's role in social reform.

May 26, 1993: News: Mary Jo Patterson, "Deadbeat dads fear 'Wanted' list":

Patterson reviews Florio's plan to distribute posters of the "10 Most Wanted" parents with sizable arrears in child support.

June 2, 1993: News: Maryann Spoto, "Reform-minded Dixie senator looks at model Jersey welfare reform program":

Sen. Breaux visited classes for ESL, GED preparation and job skills training at Union County College as an attempt to view the State's welfare reform efforts. He seemed especially interested in the extended medicaid plan for recipients leaving AFDC due to work.

June 28, 1993: Commentary: Ben Wattenberg, "Clinton plan would perpetuate welfare mess":

Wattenberg expresses his concern over the lack of toughness in the Clinton reform plan. He is afraid it will not provide incentives for work -- even with a 2 year limit -- because the limit will only be applied to a mother's AFDC grant, not to her children's share, to Medicaid, to food stamps, or to housing grants. He thinks that reform will be a disaster unless the plan is extremely bold and tough.

July 2, 1993: News: Stacy China, "Essex organizations honored for literacy efforts":

Literacy programs honored include: La Casa de Don Pedro in Newark, the Leaguers Inc's Head Start Program, the First Occupational Center of New Jersey, the Center for Academic Skills at Essex County College, and Public Service Electric and Gas Co.

July 12, 1993: News: Donna Leusner, "Ambitious overhaul of welfare starts slowly in urban counties":

Leusner reports on the slow start of the Family Development Program in the three pilot counties. She reports that one year after the reform had become law, the participation rate in the three counties of Camden, Essex and Hudson is only 10.2 percent. She cites spending limits, start-up problems, and the difficulties of training staff as explanations for the slow start. However, she focuses more closely on the fact that many of the welfare mothers living in these counties have very low literacy levels, and, as she says, "the social service system is busy doing what the education system failed to do." Assemblyman Wayne Bryant, however, realizes that it will take more than one year to revamp the system the way the legislation intends it to be done.

July 13, 1993: News: J. Scott Orr, "Welfare reform blueprint: National panel headed by Florio stresses self-sufficiency":

This article reports on a meeting of the State and Local Task Force on Welfare Reform chaired by Gov. Florio whose proposal incorporates many of the reforms that have taken place in New Jersey under the Family Development Program. Despite its slow start in the State, the Governor defended his program as a national model for reform.

July 14, 1993: News: Joseph D. McCaffrey, "State honors ex-welfare recipients":

McCaffrey reports on a ceremony in Camden marking the one year anniversary of Florio's Family Development Program. It recognized eight welfare recipients who have been working toward a career with the help of the Family Development Program. One recipient highlighted in the article is Lue Hamilton, a 29-year

old mother from Newark, who entered the program in March 1993. Hamilton received basic skills training and then the department provided child care while she attended school. She should have received her certificate as a nursing assistant in August of this year.

July 19, 1993: Commentary: Ben Wattenberg, "A non-marital birth of a dilemma for Dems":

Wattenberg discusses the relationship between the rise in out-of-wedlock births and a growing dependence on welfare. He believes that these births are the root of our social problems. The question he asks, however, is why Clinton's new task force on welfare reform has not publicly addressed the issue of out-of-wedlock births. He suggests that this has not been mentioned publicly as a root cause of poverty in this country because of the political uproar it would cause with liberal Democrats who would claim that it is "blaming the victim." Wattenberg asks, "Can a Democratic president really say that voluntary change in reproductive behavior is the principal agent driving welfare and most of our other social problems and that it could be reduced by a threat to end benefits?" Wattenberg urges that the Administration send the message that they will stop subsidizing "voluntary illegitimacy."

July 22, 1993: News: J. Scott Orr, "Florio discusses welfare reform, governor race with Clinton, aides":

Orr reports on a meeting among Gov. Florio, the President, and White House officials during which they discussed the national welfare reform plan as well as the Governor's reelection campaign. Florio urged the Administration to model their plan on New Jersey's reforms, paying especial attention to child support enforcement on a federal level.

July 29, 1993: News: Maryann Spoto, "New welfare reform effort under way in Union":

Spoto reports on the implementation of the Family Development Program in Union County which has been added to the original three participating counties of Hudson, Essex, and Camden. The article stresses the education component of the program which will be run out of Union County College.

July 31, 1993: News: Donna Leusner, "Challenge developing to welfare baby law":

This piece anticipates the legal battle that will ensue once women begin to be affected by the family cap provision of the Family Development Program. Legal Services of New Jersey, among other groups, intends to file suit challenging the law. De Miller from Legal Services warns, "It's very likely there will be litigation within the next two months." He explains further that, "Our basic premise in the litigation is that government

does not have--constitutionally or statutorily--an appropriate role in trying to control the family choices of human beings." The article also cites Martha Davis, a NOW Legal Defense Fund staff attorney whose book on welfare rights will be published in October.

September 2, 1993: News: Donna Leusner, "State aiding Essex in welfare program":

Here, Leusner reports on State intervention in the implementation of the Family Development Program in Essex County, the largest New Jersey county with regard to welfare caseloads. The State has taken control of all new contracts for client services. The State will contract with private, non-profit groups to expand enrollment by 3300 clients in the next year. Essex will continue managing the contracts for the 2000 mothers currently enrolled, plus another 1800 they expect to enroll on their own in the next 10 months. Essex gets about \$4.9 million in contracts for job training, child care, education and other services for clients, and the State will add \$3.9 million in services.

The Record, Hackensack NJ

The Record from Hackensack in Bergen County is the 69th largest newspaper in the country with 161,797 readers. It is an independent newspaper that has had fairly objective coverage of welfare reform. Most of its news coverage seems to stem from Associated Press articles on the national and state reform efforts. One key reporter for this issue is Thomas Moran who has written news articles featuring case studies of working poor individuals as well as the EITC debate and other issues affecting the working poor.

Specific articles include:

October 28, 1992: News: Thomas Moran, "Stuck on the dole: her steady job record bars access to training":

Moran presents the case of a mother who had worked consistently in low-paying jobs until having a baby and because of her experience cannot qualify for most job training programs. The Family Support Act had required states to spend at least 55% of their training and education funds on a target group of unskilled recipients. New Jersey, however, had been spending 69% of its money on this group. Moran presents a case for the working poor mothers who cannot get help from the State because of this standard.

March 2, 1992: Editorial: "Quayle to New York: Get off the dole":

This editorial is based on a campaign speech by Vice President Quayle in New York City during which he apparently attempted to blame recession on welfare. The editorial responds to this approach by saying that obviously the welfare system is in dire need of reform, but welfare is not the sole cause of the recession. The author considers this tactic a political ploy on the part of the Republican ticket to attract angry voters.

March 22, 1992: News: Thomas Moran, "Locked out of the American dream: life on the border of welfare and work":

Here, Moran presents another testament to the plight of the working poor, paying particular attention to the minimum wage. New Jersey had been scheduled for an 80 cent increase to \$5.05 per hour, but the new Republican-dominated Assembly voted to cut that increase to 40 cents. Moran uses case studies to illustrate the difficulty for the working poor living on minimum wage.

July 23, 1992: Editorial: "A muddled attempt at welfare reform":

This editorial looks at the mixed signals that welfare mothers have been receiving both from the State and from the federal government. New Jersey has passed legislation that includes a family cap provision supposed to push welfare mothers to work. But at the same time, the State has cut the appropriations for the job training component from \$10 million to \$2.5 million. Similarly, the federal government under the Bush administration has granted approval for the New Jersey program despite its staunch right-to-life advocacy that is against Medicaid funding for abortions.

January 17, 1993: News: Thomas Moran, "For working poor, dignity vs. survival":

Moran again describes the plight of the working poor, interviewing two working mothers in New Jersey who do not qualify for AFDC but who also cannot support their families on their incomes alone. He discusses Clinton's plan to help the working poor as well as those on welfare, and cites David Ellwood and Bruce Reed on the President's vision for reform.

January 17, 1993: News: Thomas Moran, "Critic says poor don't want to work":

Here, Moran presents the opinion of Lawrence Mead, a conservative expert on poverty and a professor at New York University. Mead says that "The dependent do not lack opportunity...They do not seize opportunity that lies before them. Boosting the rewards of work, as the president-elect proposes, will not move them." He believes that the government must be stern and require virtually all welfare recipients to work or train. Moran, however, balances this opinion with that of David Ellwood who defends the Clinton plan.

July 13, 1993: News: AP, "White House may follow NJ on welfare reform":

This article discusses, on the first anniversary of New Jersey's reform plan, the White House's focus on New Jersey as a model for national reform.

July 14, 1993: News: Eugene Kelly, "Campaign-style fanfare for NJ welfare reform":

Kelly reports on an anniversary celebration held on the first anniversary of the State's Family Development Program. He describes the provisions of the program and its political implications for Governor Florio who has received national attention for the plan and who has been appointed chair of the National Governor's Association's State and Local Task Force on Welfare Reform. Kelly also presents some opposition to the program, citing Myra Terry, president of the NJ chapter of NOW, who criticizes Florio for using welfare as a tool to get himself reelected.

July 22, 1993: News: AP, "Florino visits Clinton's chief of staff":

This article reviews Florino's recent visit to the White House to discuss both welfare reform and his reelection campaign.

July 31, 1993: News: AP, "NOW to sue NJ over welfare cut for new mothers":

This reviews the suit to be filed by NOW against the State's family cap provision.

August 1, 1993: News: Thomas Moran, "Both parties think kindly of Earned Income Tax Credit":

Moran discusses the earned income tax credit in light of the House's vote to expand the program. Moran makes a case for the effectiveness of the credit for working poor families.

Asbury Park Press

The Press is the 66th largest newspaper in the country, with a circulation of 166,305 readers. Its coverage of welfare reform has been minimal, including mostly news coverage through associated press articles. The articles tend to focus on the legal battles over New Jersey's reform, battles primarily between minority rights groups such as NOW and the NAACP and the State, as well as the national focus on New Jersey's plan as a model for the federal reform proposal. The coverage does not extend to editorials or commentaries expressing opinions on the issue. There do not seem to be any key reporters on the issue, as the paper prints mostly AP articles.