

**Welfare Reform  
State Profiles**

**for the**

**Working Session on Welfare Reform  
January 28, 1995**

# CONTENTS

**California** 1  
**Delaware**

---

**Florida** 2  
**Georgia**

---

**Louisiana** 3  
**Kansas**

---

**Maryland** 4  
**Massachusetts**

---

**Michigan** 5  
**Minnesota**

---

**Missouri** 6  
**New Jersey**

---

**New York** 7  
**Ohio**

---

**Oregon** 8  
**Pennsylvania**

---

**Texas** 9  
**Vermont**

---

**Wisconsin** 10

---



**CALIFORNIA**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.
Population (1993)	31,211,000	257,908,000
Child Population (1990)	7,810,000	63,924,000
Percent of Population that are Children (<18)	26.3%	25.7%
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$21,278	\$19,841
Poverty Rate		
1993	15.8%	14.5%
1990	13.9%	13.5%
1983	14.9%	15.2%
1979	11.4%	11.7%
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	4.4%	2.8%
Unemployment Rate (1992)	9.1%	7.4%
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	25.7%	20.8%
FMAP	50%	55%

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>		
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$6,393,441,000	\$25,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$5,897,367,000	\$22,533,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 496,074,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$607	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	63%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit—Jan. 1994	\$214	\$295
Combined Benefits—Jan. 1994	\$821	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	86%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	-5.9	-1.3%
QC Error Rate (1991)	3.49	4.96

January 24, 1995

CALIFORNIA (continued)

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)

	FY 1993	
<u>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	859,000	4,981,301
Basic	718,000	4,622,000
UP	142,000	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	16.5%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	2.9	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	50.3%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1992	37.8%	27.2%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	8.1%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1992	34.2%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	8.29%	9.95%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	8.0%	21.3%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	7.5%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	56,653	541,995
Participation Rate	9.9%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$156,787,273	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$ 96,809,104	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	61.7%	74.6%

**CALIFORNIA**  
**CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT**

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$736.9	\$8,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$335.3	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$401.6	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$2.54	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	12.7%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	1,833,853	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	12.5%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	43.9%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$3,223	\$2,855
Total Number of Paternities Established	77,321	554,204
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Sources: NCHS)	204,229	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	38%	46%

**CALIFORNIA**  
**FOSTER CARE**

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	48,526	52,646	232,668
Total Foster Care Children	90,311	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (b)	478.1 (in millions)	552.3 (in millions)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		6.9 (in millions)	\$60 (millions)

(a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.

(b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

January 24, 1995

CALIFORNIA

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993 STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	39,889*	735,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$90,062	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

CALIFORNIA

HEAD START

	FY 1994 STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$371,133	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	70,295	740,463
% ELIGIBLE	33	38
# GRANTEES	56	1,405

January 24, 1995

**CALIFORNIA**  
**NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM**

FY 1994			
STATE		U.S.	
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
28	2,587,869	259	34,997,413

**CALIFORNIA**  
**REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM**

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a/)	OBLIGATIONS (b/) \$	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c/)
31,355	55,903,960	5,532

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## STATE WELFARE POLICY

### I. GAIN

California's GAIN program, in place since 1986, was a model for the federal JOBS program and still serves as California's JOBS program. The program, administered by all of California's 58 counties, requires most single parents on welfare with no children under the age of three, as well as heads of two-parent households on welfare, to participate. Recipients who have a high school diploma and pass a basic reading and math test start with activities that help them look for jobs. Those who do not have a high school diploma, do not pass the test, or are not proficient in English are considered, according to GAIN's criteria, to need further education. They can choose to look for work first, but they must attend adult education classes if they do not find a job within a few weeks. Each county has considerable flexibility in shaping its own version of GAIN. As MDRC reports, some counties focus more heavily on education as a route to better jobs, while others stress efforts to find a job quickly.

### II. LEGISLATIVE REFORMS/WAIVER ACTIVITY

California has had much legislative activity regarding welfare reform, as Governor Wilson has tried repeatedly to pass his reform measures. In 1992, Governor Wilson proposed his reform legislation that sought to implement the following changes in the AFDC program:

- Reduce the monthly AFDC assistance payment by 10 percent to all families.
- Limit AFDC benefits for 12 months to new families to the level of the former State of residence or the current California level, whichever is lower.
- Cap benefit levels to exclude children conceived while their mother or father was receiving aid.
- Reduce the monthly AFDC assistance payment by 15 percent for families headed by non-disabled adults after an initial 6-month transitional period.
- Apply the \$30 plus one-third earned income disregard indefinitely.
- Extend AFDC-UP eligibility to two-parent families when the principal earner works 100 hours or more per month.
- Provide a \$50 per month incentive payment or \$50 per month grant reduction based on school attendance of pregnant or parenting teens on AFDC.
- Exercise the federal option to require minor parents to live with their parents (with some exceptions).

The Governor had attempted to move this program through the State legislature in April 1992 and failed. Wilson did, however, get enough votes to put the package on the ballot for a referendum vote set for November 1992. In the meantime, on July 14, 1992 HHS approved the AFDC waivers for these measures for a demonstration period. Also prior to November, the residency requirement, the "work incentive" provisions and a smaller AFDC grant cuts of 5.8 percent had passed the legislature as part of the State budget resolution. The referendum in November did not pass; therefore the measures that were not included in the 92 budget provisions were not enacted.

In summary, the measures that were implemented by December 1, 1992 were provisions to:

- Reduce AFDC payments by 5.8 (4.5 percent had been effective October 1, 1992 and an additional 1.3 percent was effective December 1) to all households; and
- Extend AFDC eligibility to two-parent families when the principal wage earner works 100 hours or more per month.

By September, 1993, the State had implemented measures to:

- Apply the \$30-plus-one-third earned income disregard indefinitely; and
- Reduce AFDC payments by an additional 2.7 percent (this measure had passed during the State's 1993-94 budget legislation).

Other measures passed during the 1993-94 budget legislation include:

- **Cal Learn:** Teen-age AFDC parents who maintain at least a "C" grade point average or ultimately graduate from high school will be eligible to receive cash bonuses of \$100 and \$500, respectively. Conversely, parents who fail to maintain a "D" grade point average could have their monthly AFDC payment reduced by up to \$50 for each of two months.
- **California Alternative Assistance Program:** AFDC applicants and recipients who have earned income could volunteer to decline a cash grant and still be eligible to receive child care assistance and Medi-Cal benefits. Continued receipt of CAAP would be contingent upon continuing AFDC eligibility.
- **Savings Allowances:** The resource limit for AFDC recipients would be raised to \$2,000 and the vehicle equity value limit would be raised to \$4,500. Recipients would be allowed to retain savings of up to \$5,000 in a restricted account. Money in that account can be spent only on a child's post-secondary education or training, the down payment on a home, or starting up a business.
- **GAIN expansion and reform:** The budget included measures to limit the exemption for participants who have a child under 3 years of age; to restrict access to additional program services for participants who have completed post-assessment education or training services and have failed to obtain employment until all other program eligible persons are being served; to allow AFDC-UP parents' job search and employment to count towards JOBS participation; and to remove the prohibition on using established unfilled positions for work experience placements.

As of March 1, 1994, all of these measures have been included under two different HHS-approved demonstration programs, the California Assistance Payments Demonstration Project and the California Work Pays Demonstration.

### **Governor Wilson's budget proposal for FY 1995:**

The 1994-95 Governor's budget builds on the reforms initiated during the 1992-93 and 1993-94 budgets, and reflects his continuing priority of modifying expenditures in the AFDC program to further promote personal responsibility, make work pay and control unaffordable program growth. His proposal, which was submitted to HHS for waiver approval on March 14, 1994, includes the following measures to:

- Reduce current AFDC grants by 10 percent, effective July 1, 1994.
- Implement a "transition grant" for a maximum of six months, at the grant level described above, available to families requiring immediate support. Effective January 1, 1995, those families with an able-bodied adult continuing on aid beyond six months would shift to a "basic grant." The Basic Payment Level is 15 percent less than the Transitional Payment Level.
- Implement a family cap on AFDC benefits.
- Mandate that teen parents live with their parent, unless good cause is established.
- Establish a two-year time limit on the receipt of aid by able-bodied adults.
- Postpone AFDC payments to pregnant women without other children until their third trimester (consistent with federal law) and eliminate the special needs allowance that is currently granted during the third trimester.
- Allow \$50 child support disregard even when the support payment goes directly to the client.
- Restrict homeless assistance to once-in-a-lifetime.
- Require children, ages 16 to 18, to attend school.
- Eliminate the 10-day advance notice requirement to reduce grants.
- Eliminate, for some clients, the requirements for redeterminations and submitting monthly report forms.

State Assemblymen Bates and Vasconcellos wrote HHS to oppose these waivers because they were previously rejected by the Legislature and voters. Children Now also opposes these measures because they punish children without helping families find work, ignore the will of state voters, and because cuts in baseline benefits would restrict resources available to enact the President's welfare reform initiative.

### **Governor Wilson's budget proposal for FY 1996:**

Under Gov. Pete Wilson's welfare proposals unveiled as part of his \$ 56.3 billion budget, welfare recipients would experience a 10 percent reduction in their benefits by September and another 15 percent reduction by March 1996. After two years, if the adult recipient is able-bodied but not working, the grant would be provided only for the children. The premise behind the proposed cuts — which would come on top of grant reductions totaling 13 percent during the past four years — is that welfare recipients need some stern prodding to get into the work force.

## **Study of California's Welfare Reform Initiatives**

California is currently conducting a major statewide study that is exploring the impact of the welfare changes enacted by Wilson during his first term. The five-year study is required as part of a federal waiver that allowed California to reduce Aid to Families with Dependent Children grants.

The study exempted 5,000 welfare recipients from grant reductions and other work incentives. Researchers at the University of California, Berkeley, then compared those clients' behavior to 10,000 other recipients who experienced such changes. Preliminary data suggest that grant reductions and other work incentives are not having the intended effect. In Los Angeles County, a greater percentage of single parents who were exempted from the reductions were working than were single parents who experienced grant cuts and other work incentives.

## **III. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS**

### **California Assistance Payments Demonstration Project**

This project, approved by HHS on October 29, 1992, implements the Wilson provisions passed in the 1992-93 budget resolution bill. This program approved the State's measures for reducing benefits, imposing a residency requirement, applying the earned income disregard indefinitely, and extending AFDC eligibility rules for two parent families. Implementation of the state residency provision has been delayed resulting from a lawsuit (*Green v. Anderson*) which challenges the constitutionality of the provision (see below).

### **California Work Pays Demonstration**

As an amendment to the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project, the Work Pays Demonstration encourages young AFDC recipients to stay in school or work. All four of the major elements of the 1993-94 State budget legislation were approved as part of this demonstration program. These include: the Cal Learn program, the California Alternative Assistance Program, increased savings allowances, and GAIN expansion and reform.

The Work Pays Demonstration was approved by HHS on March 1, 1994 and is scheduled to operate for five years.

### **California Automated Fingerprint Image Reporting and Match System (AFIRM)**

This demonstration application requested Federal approval and funding to expand the existing LA County General Relief "Automated Fingerprint Image Reporting and Match" project to include the county's AFDC population. Under the demonstration, compliance with fingerprinting is an eligibility condition for AFDC. The HHS approval letter states that "failure to cooperate with fingerprint requirements by an aided adult or an aided minor parent will result in ineligibility for that individual," and that a nonaided payee's failure to cooperate may result in an investigation of fraud. Mandatory fingerprint participants are all aided adults, including minor parents, and nonaided payees. The program was approved by HHS January 8, 1993, and will last 3 years.

**Riverside Grant:** In January, 1994, Secretary Shalala announced a \$2.8 million federal grant awarded to four states implementing programs designed to provide the support services needed for an aid recipient to make the successful transition from welfare to work. Illinois, California, Texas and Oregon will use the money to decide what kind of support services are needed to keep a former recipient from returning to welfare. California will implement its program in Riverside County. The program is scheduled to run through July 1996.

#### Pending Waivers

On March 11, 1994, California submitted a new amendment to the WPDP that includes the following:

**Two-Year Time-limited AFDC** for all able-bodied adults. However, the State will continue Medicaid and Food Stamps eligibility for these non-aided members of the assistance unit (AU).

**Maximum Family Grant** will not increase for any child conceived while either parent is on AFDC.

**Two-Tiered Payments Levels** in which AFDC grants for all AUs would be reduced by ten percent. After 6 months of AFDC, all AUs containing an able-bodied adult would be reduced by an additional 15 percent.

However, these provisions were never approved by the State legislature. The State has asked us to hold this waiver request.

On May 23, 1994 California submitted another waiver application to the federal government, including provisions for:

- Making AFDC and Food Stamp policy more compatible by making AFDC households categorically eligible for Food Stamps;
- Allowing recipients to deduct 40 percent of self-employment income in reporting monthly income;
- Disregarding \$100 per quarter in non-recurring gifts and irregular/infrequent income;
- Disregarding undergraduate student assistance and work study income if payments are based on need;
- Reinstating Food Stamp benefits discontinued for failure to file a monthly report when good cause is found for the failure; and
- Simplifying vehicle valuation methodology.

**Work Pays Demonstration Program (WPDP):** In November of 1994, California submitted a waiver application to amend some of the provisions of the Work Pays program, by adding the following provisions: with limited exceptions, not increase AFDC benefits to families for additional children conceived while receiving AFDC; and allow the child support received for any such child(ren) to be paid directly to the assistance unit and not be counted as income. The waiver is still pending. A large number of organization have written in opposition of this provision.

California also has submitted three separate waiver requests not connected to WPDP.

**AFDC/Food Stamp Compatibility Demonstration Project:** The first, received in May and still pending, would, statewide, make AFDC and Food Stamp policy more compatible by making AFDC households categorically eligible for Food Stamps; allowing recipients to deduct 40 percent of self-employment income in reporting monthly income; disregarding \$100 per quarter in non-recurring gifts and irregular/infrequent income; disregarding undergraduate student assistance and work study income if payments are based on need; reinstating food stamp benefits discontinued for failure to file a monthly report when good cause is found for the failure; and simplifying vehicle valuation methodology. Draft terms and conditions should be submitted to the State soon.

**San Diego County:** This request, which was received in December, 1994, would require AFDC recipients ages 16-18 to attend school or participate in JOBS.

The other waiver application was submitted on December 28, 1995. It would require 100 hours CWEP participation per month for JOBS mandatory individuals who have received AFDC for 22 of the last 24 months and are working fewer than 15 hours per week after two years from JOBS assessment and; have failed to comply with JOBS without good cause, have completed CWEP or are in CWEP less than 100 hours per month, or have completed post-assessment education and training. The program would also provide Transitional Child Care and Transitional Medicaid to families who become ineligible for AFDC due to increased assets or income resulting from marriage.

#### IV. RELATED LITIGATION:

**Green v. Anderson:** This class action challenges the provision that limits the benefits for new residents of the State. Plaintiffs claim the policy violates the Equal Protection and the Privileges and Immunities clauses of the US Constitution, and the constitutionally guaranteed right to travel. A preliminary injunction was granted on January 28, 1993. In granting this first injunction, the Court found that the policy penalizes new residents and that there is a clear line of Supreme Court cases barring such disparate treatment unless a compelling State interest is shown. No compelling State interest was found here: the express desire to deter migration is a constitutionally impermissible purpose, and the desire to save State funds does not justify this particular classification. The Court noted that the payment of benefits at the level that would have been provided in the previous State did not reflect higher housing costs in California. Plaintiffs include persons who were victims of abuse and who were returning to or joining family members. In May 1994, the U.S. Court of Appeals in San Francisco upheld the District Court's ruling, and said that the law violates the constitutional rights to equal protection and travel. On January 17, 1995, the Supreme Court heard the state's appeal of the case.

**Beno v. Shalala:** In another case involving challenges to APDP, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, in its decision in Beno v. Shalala, remanded the waiver approval to the Department of Health and Human Services for reconsideration. As a result of this decision, the State resubmitted an amended request for waivers for APDP, exempting certain categories of AFDC families; paying the exempt cases based on grant levels in effect in California on November 1, 1992 and renewing a waiver of the Medicaid maintenance of effort provision at section 1902(C)(1) of the Social Security Act, which facilitates the State's reducing AFDC benefits below their May 1988 grant levels. The decision regarding reinstating the waivers is still pending. A large number of groups have written opposing the waivers. At the same time a number of governors and members of the State's congressional delegation have favored approval of the waivers.

**Anderson v. Edwards:** Under California's regulations all children receiving welfare benefits in a household are defined as "one assistance unit" even if some of the siblings are not siblings. In other states a niece, nephew, or unrelated child added to the household by a parent or grandparent is defined as a "second assistance unit", which results in a higher total benefit. The U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals struck down the California regulation as violating federal welfare regulations. In November, 1994, Clinton Administration lawyers filed a friend-of-the-court brief arguing that California regulations comply with federal law and should be upheld. On Wednesday, January 18, 1995, the U.S. Supreme Court heard the states appeal of the case.

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *Teenage Pregnancy and Parenting Project (TAPP)*

**CONTACT:** Charlene Clemens, M.P.A.  
Project Director  
415/695-8300

**LOCATION:** 2730 Bryant Street, 2nd Fl  
San Francisco, CA 94110

**MISSION:** to assure that pregnant and parenting teens have access to all health, education and social services to which they are eligible regardless of their school status.

TAPP's comprehensive case management network is a model for both the culture change that needs to occur under welfare reform and for focusing on preventing welfare dependency among young parents.

**SUMMARY:** TAPP is an interagency city-wide comprehensive continuous case management service network coordinated by the Family Service Agency of San Francisco (FSA/SF), in conjunction with San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), which began in 1981. TAPP designed, developed and implemented (beginning in March 1988) a local demonstration program, the TAPP GAIN TEEN program. By providing comprehensive case management for teen parents ages 16-19 with children under age three, this program was the first of its kind in California. In July 1990, the local DSS took the case management in-house. Currently, TAPP coordinates closely with the DSS as a source of referral for its ongoing Adolescent Family Life Program (AFLP) participants who are eligible/mandated to be in the GAIN/Teen program. Most recently, as San Francisco's AFLP, TAPP is in the planning stages for, once again, providing their model of *comprehensive* case management services, by contract with DSS, under California's new Cal Learn program, targeted to serve teen parents under age 19.

The underlying foundation of TAPP is the case management system which coordinates the provision of services to pregnant and parenting teens throughout their adolescence. Case managers serve as primary contacts in order to personalize the relationship between client and service network, facilitate service delivery, and conduct follow up to ensure that services are received. The case manager maintains a relationship with the client for up to three years. Case manager responsibilities include: providing information and referrals for clients who are not eligible for the TAPP program; counseling the client's extended family; facilitating support groups of peer teen parents; and providing comprehensive services to the teen fathers as requested and/or needed.

On-site services at TAPP include:

- **Education - Hilltop Special Services Center/Pregnant Minor Program (PMP):** San Francisco Unified School District's PMP provides all necessary courses for high school graduation; TAPP directly provides other critically important ancillary courses which include vocational, nutrition and child development education as well as support groups. A drop-in center, funded through SFUSD, staffed by TAPP, provides infant day care for twelve infants. TAPP has had expectant fathers and teen fathers enrolled in the PMP.
- **Public Health Nurses:** These Department of Public Health nurses work collaboratively with TAPP to provide specialized home visits/health assessment and education as well as health education classes for the PMP.

TAPP recently implemented the Young Teen Parent Consortium Project to provide specialized child development and parenting education services to pregnant and parenting teens ages 15 and under. TAPP works in conjunction with the Children's Council of San Francisco and the San Francisco Unified School District to implement this program.

## **The West Company**

**CONTACT:** Sheilah Rogers,  
Executive Director  
707/468-3553

**LOCATION:** 367 N. State Street, Suite 206  
Ukiah, CA 95482

**MISSION:** to stimulate the growth of economic opportunity in Northern California, with a particular emphasis on small businesses, economic options for low-income people and employment in the community.

**SUMMARY:** The West Company, established in 1988, is a private non-profit economic development corporation specializing in microenterprise development. With two offices in Ukiah and Fort Bragg, the West Company has assumed a leadership role in the effort to stimulate the development of new and innovative economic opportunities for low-income individuals.

The West Company's comprehensive program is aimed at addressing a range of barriers to successful entrepreneurship, including a lack of business development and management skills, a lack of support in organizing one's personal life to accommodate business ownership, and a lack of access to credit. The West Company collaborates with several organizations and agencies, including Advancement Enterprises, Mendocino Community College, College of the Redwoods, the City of Ukiah Redevelopment Agency, the Small Business Development Center, the local Chambers of Commerce, the University of California Extension Service, and local banks to deliver services.

Program components include:

- Self Employment Training course: assists people in developing their business idea and the skills necessary for self-employment.
- Technical Assistance: provides technical assistance through low-cost seminars and one-to-one consulting on a sliding scale basis to all business people in the county.
- Latino Component: expands services to target the Latino community. A bilingual Business Consultant works with Latino customers and the self-employment training course is modified to be culturally relevant.
- Marketing Lab: provides advanced marketing training for customers and assistance in stabilizing and/or expanding their businesses, and eventually will provide income to The West Company.
- Loan Fund: makes small loans to people enrolled in the program through both individual and peer lending models.

**RESULTS:** The West Company has worked with more than 480 customers, including 200 in the start-up stage, more than 100 stabilizations and several expansions. These businesses have included professional services, small manufacturers, fine arts and crafts producers, and mail order companies. In the past two years, The West Company has more than twenty microloans through its peer and individual loan programs.

**FUNDING:** The West Company was originally established by a four-year grant from the James Irvine Foundations. It is supported by the Small Business Administration, the Office of Community Services, the City of Ukiah and private and corporate foundations.

The West Company provides business training, technical assistance and microenterprise loans to help low-income individuals achieve self-sufficiency by becoming self-employed. This microenterprise model is an innovative form of economic development that will most likely be encouraged in welfare reform.

# Center for Employment Training

**CONTACT:** Russell Tershy  
Executive Director  
408/287-7924  
701 Vine Street  
San Jose, CA 95110

**MISSION:** to increase the wages of hard-to-serve low-income individuals through an integrated model of employment training.

**SUMMARY:** Since 1967, the Center for Employment Training (CET) has trained and placed more than 55,000 "hard-to-serve" low-income persons. CET is the largest nonprofit, vocational classroom trainer of low-income people in the country. By the end of this year, CET-model training centers will be operating in forty cities across the nation including the center in San Jose.

CET offers a unique program that emphasizes *concurrent basic skills instruction integrated with and taught in the context of vocational skills training*. Since 1967, CET has trained and placed more than 55,000 high-risk/low-income persons. CET is now the largest nonprofit, vocational classroom trainer of low-income people in the country.

The central element of CET's training design is concurrent basic skills instruction integrated with and taught in the context of vocational skills training. Other program aspects include: 1) open entry/open exit self-paced training (In the same course, some students may take nine months, others six and less for some); 2) assessment used only for instruction planning and competency validation, not for screening out needy participants; and 3) one stop services including:

- assessment and vocational counseling
- hands-on vocational skill training
- basic skills instruction
- English as a Second Language
- individual and family counseling
- social service referral and advocacy
- work behavior modification
- thinking and problem solving skills development
- job development
- follow-up services.

The average training time at CET is approximately seven months during which time students develop all of the skills needed to function in their chosen occupations. CET trains only in-demand occupations with career ladders, starting and stopping training courses based on consultation with industry and an ongoing assessment of placement rates and entry level wages. Currently, CET offers approximately thirty skill programs from computer operation to medical skills. As much as two-thirds of participants' time is spent working hands-on with equipment similar to that which they will find on the job.

Throughout its history, CET has focused its services on the very poor. Approximately one-third of CET's students have been farmworkers, one-third welfare recipients, and one-third youth. Over half were limited English speaking and more than seventy percent were school dropouts with at least half of these having less than eight years of formal education. Nevertheless, CET has placed well over seventy percent of those who entered the program in jobs (this is seventy percent of all who enter the program, not just those who complete). Students remain in training until placed. At CET, graduation is getting a job, and one's diploma is his or her first paycheck.

**FUNDING:** The San Jose center is funded through JTPA money allocated through the local PIC; a federal contract with the Department of Labor to serve 18 counties in CA; State Employment Training Panel funds; and some private contributions.

## **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

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.

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

**SUMMARY/RESULTS:** The GAIN program is administered by each of the 58 counties in California. However, current GAIN statute and regulation provide significant flexibility to each county. Riverside County has used this flexibility in an interesting way to create a program with very high participation and employment results.

As MDRC reports in its April, 1994 review of GAIN, Riverside had the most impressive results for single parents. Over a three-year period, Riverside increased the experimental group's earnings by an average of \$3,113, a 49% gain over the control group average. It reduced welfare payments by \$1,983, a 15% reduction compared to the control group. These impacts were the largest in any of the six counties and are greater than those found in previous large-scale experimental studies of state welfare-to-work programs. Riverside also set a new standard of cost-effectiveness, returning taxpayers \$2.84 for each net \$1 invested. Riverside also produced large earnings gains and welfare savings for single parents with children under the age of 6 and AFDC recipients on welfare for more than two years.

For AFDC-UP, while the earnings impact continued to decline in the third year, the overall third-year earnings impact was comparatively large and was statistically significant (15% over controls). Riverside's welfare payments for UP were reduced (although declining in the third year) over the third year period by 14% compared to the control group which is statistically significant and larger than in the other counties.

What most distinguished Riverside from the other counties, according to MDRC, and therefore, what might have contributed to Riverside's more favorable results, was its particular combination of practices and conditions. Its pervasive employment message and job development efforts; its more equal use of job search and education and training activities; its strong commitment to securing the participation of all mandatory registrants; and its greater reliance on GAIN's formal enforcement mechanisms to reinforce the participation obligation made up a collection of practices not found in any of the other five counties.

**DESCRIPTION:** 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.

# Mar Vista Family Center

**CONTACTS:** Betty Factor, Executive Director  
310/390-9607  
5070 Slauson Avenue  
Culver City, CA 90230

**GOAL:** to use parent participation child care as a means for addressing the problems of violence, unemployment and welfare dependency, school underachievement and hopelessness.

**SUMMARY:** The Mar Vista Family Center, founded in 1977 by Executive Director Betty Factor, uses a simple and effective approach to helping families achieve self-sufficiency and family stability. The Center uses child care with mandatory parent participation as the spring board for intensive training of families in parenting skills, nonviolent conflict resolution, and personal growth.

In the early 1980s, the area where the Center is located had one of the highest murder rates on the west side of Los Angeles. The Center is located near the Mar Vista Gardens, a federal housing development in the Culver City section of West Los Angeles. 60 percent of the neighborhood's youth under the age of 18 live in poverty today. Over 90 percent of the mothers who attend the center's programs have never graduated from high school. 50 percent of them receive AFDC and 65 percent are single mothers. 15 percent of the parents in the program have gang affiliations.

Mar Vista believes that responsibility for change comes within the members of the community, with the whole family involved in the process. The basic premise of the program is that we can learn to live responsibly at a family level. Families are trained using the Center's unique Shared Responsibility Model, which focuses on setting goals, communicating effectively, and making decisions. The staff demands that parents arrive for work at the Center one day a week by 8:55am, or arrange for a replacement. They must agree to attend a parent meeting at least once a month, and to call when their children are absent. Betty Factor, the Executive Director and founder, explains "these are very small agreements, but when parents are able to keep these promises at school, the rest of their lives start to come together -- because then they see how to make commitments to the priorities in their lives."

Parents are provided economic and educational opportunity through UCLA Extension courses in Early Childhood Education conducted at the Center. These courses issue certification in preschool teaching upon the completion of 21 units. Parents attend courses on a scholarship basis. The UCLA program was started in 1984. Since then, 45 parents have become accredited, employed preschool teachers.

At regular rap sessions, parents learn techniques for communicating more effectively with their children. Parents and children are asked to request what they want, to tell the truth about what they are doing to get it, to do what is necessary to get the job done, and to listen to others. Parents and children are encouraged to focus on the following questions in order to assist in problem solving: What is the problem? What do you want? What are you doing? Is it working? and What else could you do that might work?

When the center was founded in 1977 it met with initial resistance from local gangs, who burned down the first center building. However, since that time, the center has been extremely successful in outreach efforts to the local community.

**RESULTS:** Since 1977, the Mar Vista Family Center has involved more than 1,000 families in its activities. The Center has not formally tracked participants, but is beginning to do so. Early results show that 85 percent of the preschool students are achievers in elementary school. 35 percent of the mothers once on welfare now have permanent employment. 20 percent of the parents attend UCLA Extension courses at the Center. 14 Los Angeles Unified elementary schools in South Central Los Angeles are utilizing the Center's model to create parent involvement programs.

**FUNDING:** The Center is currently financed by a combination of funding by the Los Angeles Community Development Department and private funding. It operates on an annual budget of \$208,350.

The Mar Vista Family Center's program strongly reflects welfare reform's emphasis on people taking responsibility for their own lives. This program has developed a method by which even the most hard to reach welfare recipients, those with little work experience, language barriers, drug problems and living in the worst crime areas of the country, can be encouraged to truly change their lives, nurture their families and become self-sufficient. The Center is a model for the type of culture change that needs to occur within communities under welfare reform.

## **San Diego Community College Vocational Adult Basic Education (VABE) Lab**

**CONTACT:** Bill Grimes, Assoc. Dean, Mid-City Continuing Education Center  
619/265-3455

**LOCATION:** 5350 University Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92105

**MISSION:** to connect the educational component of the GAIN program and its participants to the job market and to employers who would be the source of hiring program participants.

**SUMMARY:** The VABE lab was designed out of a realization on the part of program providers in San Diego that the educational component within the GAIN model was imbedded deep within the system of GAIN services. The education programs received referrals from DSS and referred clients back to DSS but had no connection to the job market nor any ability to follow through and follow up with participants. GAIN components are compartmentalized so that both education providers and participants are separate from the direct job preparation and job placement role to which the overall GAIN program is committed. As a consequence, students may receive educational experiences that are disjointed from the needed experiences of their future work setting.

The VABE lab expands on the GAIN model by providing *concurrent* basic education and vocational skills training. On a small scale, the program has begun to change the culture of the JOBS program in a way that stresses the urgency of employment as a first priority for participants and service providers.

The VABE design was intended to collapse the GAIN model of sequential component services into more of an overall focus on job preparation and employment. Adult Basic Education is integrated closely with the VABE's office skills program. The program offers a very active guest speaker system with many presenters from private industry and others who successfully completed the VABE program. Speakers discuss interview skills, describe different fields and industries, review the application process and conduct practice interviews.

The curriculum of the lab involves an integration of basic skills and vocational skills (through the accompanying office skills program) specific to preparing an individual for employment. VABE students are pulled out during the day to gain competencies in word processing, spreadsheet, medical terminology or other skills that complement their employability. The lab uses a network of IBM computers to deliver computer assisted instruction. VABE offers certificates in WASATCH basic word processing, filing/records management, typing, electronic calculator, medical terminology, medical insurance, Lotus 1-2-3, Wordperfect 5.1, and DOS.

**JOB DEVELOPMENT:** The program's job developer has a presence in the classroom and with the graduates which helps to reinforce the sense of urgency and the connection to the ultimate goal of GAIN - employment. The Job Developer works with the community in finding volunteer work for job preparation, forging business partnerships and alerting temporary services as to the VABE program. Within VABE, the developer arranges for outside speakers, job leads and job fairs, conducts individual conferences, follows up with graduates and works closely with the instructors.

**SCOPE/RESULTS:** The office skills program component has enrolled just over 100 students since it began in March 1991. The students consist of women, age 19 to 52 years old, one-third of whom have previous work experience. According to VABE's year-end report for FY93, the program served 82 students, 43 of whom completed the program during that year. Of those who completed, 16 students are employed with an average starting salary of \$5.46/hour.

## Press Report

***The Los Angeles Times*** 213/237-5000

Circulation: 1,146,631 as of 1994

National Rank: 3rd out of 100

Key reporters:

National reform: Elizabeth Shogren  
Ron Brownstein  
James Risen  
State reform: Virginia Ellis

Key editorial writer: There is no particular editorial writer at this time who is concentrating on welfare reform, as editorial staff is currently undergoing changes. Thomas Plate, the Editorial Page Editor, would be our best contact.

Coverage: The *LA Times* has covered welfare reform, both on a state and a national level, very thoroughly. Its coverage has included editorials in support of the Riverside model of a welfare-to-work program. Although the paper has not supported the family cap proposal, it has supported Governor Wilson's cuts in cash benefits and increasing GAIN funding. National news staff have had extensive reports on particular points of the Work and Responsibility Act, including financing, the work component, prevention measures, and state flexibility. Elizabeth Shogren has been reporting extensively on the Personal Responsibility Act and the Congressional hearings.

***San Francisco Chronicle*** 415/777-1111

Circulation: 556,715 as of 1994

National Rank: 10th out of 100

Key reporters: Jonathan Marshall  
Dan Levy  
Vlae Kershner (Sacramento Bureau)  
Greg Lucas (Sacramento Bureau)

Key editorial writer: Michael Harris

Coverage: The *Chronicle* has had significant coverage of welfare reform. Its coverage consists mainly of news reports on reform proposals by Governor Wilson and individual counties. Although recognizing the need for support services for welfare recipients who work, the paper generally seems to support tougher measures that provide work incentives.

**Sacramento Bee 916/321-1000**

Circulation: 276,031 as of 1994

Key reporters: Nancy Weaver  
Dan Bernstein, Capitol bureau

Key editorial writer: Mark Paul

Coverage: Welfare reform has been a very prominent issue in the *Bee's* coverage. The paper has taken a somewhat liberal position on the issue. It covers closely Governor Wilson's reform proposals and has generally not supported his approach to welfare cuts. Its coverage focuses mainly on the State reform proposals and the debate locally over an approach to welfare reform. Some articles do, however, expand the discussion to the national level with Clinton's vision for reform and general trends across the country. The articles seem to support Clinton's reform efforts but are wary of Governor Wilson's plans.

**San Diego Union-Tribune 619/299-3131**

Circulation: 373,453 as of 1994

Key reporter: Susan Duerksen

Key editorial writer: Joseph Perkins, 619/299-1511

Coverage: The *Union-Tribune* has had significant coverage of welfare reform. The paper has definitely taken a somewhat progressive stand on the issue. It supports the general principles for reform and is optimistic that it can be done. The paper generally supports Gov. Wilson's reform measures.

**San Jose Mercury News 408/920-5000**

Circulation: 270,174 as of 1994

Key reporter: none in particular

Key editorial writer: Joe Rodriguez

Coverage: The *Mercury News* has taken a relatively liberal stance on welfare reform. The paper has highlighted some good programs and generally has presented the viewpoint of the advocate for the poor.

***Orange County Register* 714/835-1234**

**Circulation: 332,164 as of 1994**

**Key reporter: Mark Lifschier, from the Sacramento Bureau  
No particular reporter for national reform -- use mainly wire stories**

**Key editorial  
writer: Alan Bock**

**Coverage: The *Register* has taken a rather conservative viewpoint regarding welfare reform. The writers basically do not feel confident that welfare will ever really be reformed.**

## PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS

### CONGRESS:

Representative Herger (R), Ways and Means Committee  
Representative Thomas (R), Ways and Means Committee  
Representative Stark (D), Subcommittee on Human Resources, Ways and Means Committee  
Representative Matsui (D), Ways and Means Committee  
Representative Cunningham (R), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee  
Representative McKeon (R), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee  
Representative Riggs (R), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee  
Representative Becerra (D), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee  
Representative Miller (D), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee  
Representative Martinez (D), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee  
Representative Woolsey (D), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee

### STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT:

Governor Wilson, 916/445-2841  
Mike Genest, state deputy director of social services for welfare programs  
Bruce Wagstaff, Office of the Governor  
Maria Hernandez, GAIN Policy, 916/654-1450  
Joe Cerna, Mayor, Sacramento  
Richard Riordan, Mayor, Los Angeles  
Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Chair, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
State Senator Mike Thompson, (D-St. Helena), sponsored the welfare reform measures that passed as part of the 1993-94 budget legislation  
State Senator Tim Leslie, (R-Carnelian Bay), sponsored Wilson's welfare reform measures that would have cut benefits by almost 20 percent; this bill lost to Thompson's bill  
State Senator Teresa Hughes, in 1993 sponsored SB407 to coordinate the state child support enforcement system; her efforts were highlighted in a *Sacramento Bee* editorial.

### ADVOCACY COMMUNITY:

Casey McKeever, Western Center on Law and Poverty  
Jamie Court, Harbor Interfaith Shelter, 310/831-8435  
Sarah Kurtz, Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, filed suit against the State for its AFDC residency requirement law  
Kathleen O'Brien, Child Care Law Center, 415/495-5498  
Kevin Aslanian, Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations

**PRESS:** Reporters on national reform efforts:

Elizabeth Shogren, LA Times, 213/237-5000  
Ron Brownstein, LA Times, 213/237-5000  
James Risen, LA Times, 213/237-5000  
Jonathan Marshall, San Francisco Chronicle, 415/777-1111  
Dan Levy, San Francisco Chronicle, 415/777-1111  
Nancy Weaver, Sacramento Bee, 916/321-1000  
Susan Duerksen, San Diego Union Tribune, 619/299-3131

Reporters on state reforms:

Virginia Ellis, LA Times, 213/237-5000  
Vlae Kershner, San Francisco Chronicle, 415/777-1111  
Greg Lucas, San Francisco Chronicle, 415/777-1111

Editorial writers on welfare reform:

Thomas Plate, LA Times, 213/237-5000  
Michael Harris, San Francisco Chronicle, 415/777-1111  
Mark Paul, Sacramento Bee, 916/321-1000  
Joseph Perkins, San Diego Union Tribune, 619/299-1511  
Joe Rodriguez, San Jose Mercury News, 408/920-5000  
Alan Bock, Orange County Register, 714/835-1234

**OTHER:**

James Ricchio, MDRC  
John Wallace, MDRC  
Larry Townsend, Riverside GAIN, 909/358-3005

January 24, 1995

**DELAWARE**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.	Rank
Population (1993)	700,000	257,908,000	46
Child Population (1990)	164,000	63,924,000	
Percent of Population that are Children (<18)	24.6	25.7%	
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$21,451	\$19,841	
Poverty Rate			
1992	7.6%	14.5%	
1990	6.9%	13.5%	
1983	8.5%	15.2%	
1979	11.8%	11.7%	
% Point Change in Rate (1992-1979)	-4.2%	2.8%	
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	13.7%		
Unemployment Rate (1992)	5.3%	7.4%	
FMAP	50%	55%	

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<u>FINANCIAL DATA</u>	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$46,045,000	\$25,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$39,730,000	\$22,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 6,315,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$338-	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	35.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefits—Jan. 1994	\$295	\$295
Combined Benefits— Jan. 1994	\$633	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	66%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	0	-1.6%
QC Error Rate (1991)	6.68%	4.96%

January 24, 1995

DELAWARE (continued)

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
<b>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</b>		
Average Monthly Caseload	11,397	4,981,301
Basic	11,176	4,622,000
UP	121	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	1.1%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	2.8	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	27.5%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1992-1988	41.1%	27.2%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	3.9%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1992-1988	34.7%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	87.5%	87.3%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	33.3%	23.0%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	10.3%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	1,102	541,995
Participation Rate	15.2%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$2,121,490	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$1,053,861	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	96.9%	74.6%

DELAWARE

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<u>Collections and Expenditures</u>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$26.7	\$8,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$7.8	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$18.9	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Adm'n. Expend.	\$2.39	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	2.8%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	46,845	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	27.7%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	66.4%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$2,058	\$2,855
Total Number of Paternities Established	1,395	554,205
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source:NCHS)	3,559	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	39.2%	45.7%

DELAWARE

FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	183	221	232,668
Total Foster Care Children	716	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (b)	1.34 (in millions)	2.3 (in millions)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		105.5 (in thou)	\$60 (million)

- (a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.
- (b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

DELAWARE

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	1,905*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$1,547	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

DELAWARE

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$5,813	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	1,455	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	45	38
# GRANTEES	5	1,405

## DELAWARE

## NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

FY 1994			
STATE	U.S.		
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
0	0	259	34,997,412

## DELAWARE

## REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a/)	OBLIGATIONS (b/)	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c/)
30	94,447	188

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## STATE WELFARE POLICY

As the Chairman of the National Governor's Association Task Force on Welfare Reform, Governor Carper has made welfare reform a priority in Delaware and around the country. In his State of the State address on January 19, 1995, Governor Carper described the five key principles of his new welfare reform plan, called A Better Chance:

1. **Work should pay more than welfare.** A Better Chance will allow welfare parents who take an entry-level job to keep part of their benefits. It encourages full use of the federal earned income tax credit and addresses the two most critical barriers to private-sector employment for poor families -- access to child care and health care.

A Better Chance will help welfare recipient find jobs. The Department of Labor and Economic Development and the new Delaware Workforce Development Council will work closely with the private sector to remove the training, transportation, and child care barriers that often impede the employment of welfare recipients.

2. **Welfare recipients must act responsibly in exchange for benefits.** The Governor stated he will require welfare recipients to enter into a contract of mutual responsibility with the state. This includes paternity establishment, parenting classes, and the expectation that welfare recipients take a job that is offered, even if it's minimum wage job.
3. **Welfare should be a temporary measure to get a family back on their feet - with real time limits.** By 1997, there will be a two-year time limit for every welfare recipient age 19 or older. If the recipient has not secured private-sector employment by the end of that time limit, the state will enable that person to take a workfare job and earn their welfare check for a maximum of two more years.

By 1999, the welfare system will be totally overhauled. New welfare applicants who can't find jobs will be permitted to work in workfare jobs for a maximum of two years, to earn their welfare check. No able-bodied person in Delaware will receive a welfare check if he or she refuses to work."

4. **Both parents must be responsible for raising and supporting their children.** Mothers must cooperate with paternity establishment as a condition of eligibility. Young fathers will be required to participate in job training, job search and parenting programs, and child support orders against them will be strengthened.

5. **The establishment and maintenance of two-parent families must be encouraged — and teenage pregnancy strongly discouraged.** A Better Chance provides incentives for people to get married, pool their incomes, and share child-rearing responsibilities. Delaware's welfare plan will end welfare payments to teen mothers. In 1999, Delaware will continue to provide the child care, health care, and other services to keep teen mothers in school and finish their education. But cash benefits will end.

Further, Governor Carper proposed a family cap that will deny increased cash benefits to families that have additional children within ten months after they begin receiving welfare.

Governor Carper's welfare reform plan builds on Delaware's Division of Social Services Blueprint for Change, a multi-year plan for Delaware's Welfare Reform, published in 1987. The major goals of that plan were to:

- o Develop an employment and training program to target needs of hard to employ, long term welfare clients.
- o Develop a case management approach to service delivery that focuses on individual and family strengths.
- o Raise the cash assistance standard of need to bring benefits in line with neighboring states and national averages.
- o Develop indigent medical care programs for needy families and individuals, not eligible for cash assistance, especially to reduce infant mortality, and to provide a bridge from welfare to work.

In January 1994, Delaware's Welfare Reform Task Force's report A Better Chance — Welfare Reform in Delaware: Empowering The Family Into The Year 2000, reviews what has been accomplished since 1987. The most significant accomplishments include:

- A. Delaware created and implemented a successful employment/training JOBS program, called First Step. Annually, about 800 AFDC clients, primarily single mothers are enrolled, or about 8% of AFDC families. Since 1986, over 5,600 clients have benefitted
- B. Delaware's Division of Child Support Enforcement was established on July 1, 1985. Since establishment, Delaware has been on the forefront of child support automation, enforcement and collections. Collections for State Fiscal Year 1993 totaled \$33.3 million, with over \$25 million distributed directly to custodial parents and the remainder collected on behalf of clients receiving AFDC. Revenue and cost savings to the State of Delaware from child support collections on behalf of AFDC clients totalled \$6.2 million in FY 1993.

Delaware's welfare policy emphasizes the mutual obligations of families and government to work toward maximum economic independence. Families have the responsibility to support and care for their children and work to improve their emotional and financial independence. Delaware's Welfare Reform Task Force states that it is the government's responsibility to provide programs and services which encourage and support the families' efforts to achieve independence.

Delaware's Welfare Reform Task Force organized their strategies around three themes:

- o **Reward Work & Encourage Child Support** -- Provide incentives for families with incomes below the poverty level to keep more earnings from work and child .
- o **Family Responsibility** -- Require parents to support and care for their children, and obtain the education and experience necessary for financial independence. A two year time limit will be imposed for those enrolled in First Step employment and training, with an expectation that the end result will be: a job; community service (if a job is not available); or reduced benefits for failure to cooperate.
- o **Family Supports** -- Provide services that encourage, support and assist families to stay together, to meet their responsibilities, and maintain their independence.

#### Federal Demonstration Program:

Delaware was selected as the lead state in a 2-year child support order modification demonstration project. As a result, over 11,000 child support orders have been reviewed since 1990, with 29% modified. The average modification resulted in an 82% increase in the order amount. The project also successfully and substantially raised the rate at which medical support was acquired.

#### Waivers Pending:

It is anticipated that Delaware will request a waiver which would impose two year limit on JOBS participants with expectation of employment. It will establish a social contract outlining parental responsibility, phase out JOBS services for teen and non-custodial parents; allow families to keep more earnings and child support; and support two-parent families who marry and stay together.

The Draft proposal is being prepared by the Delaware Welfare Reform Task Force.

Application expected: January 1995

## **FIRST STEP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM**

**CONTACT:** Elaine Archangelo, Director of Social Services  
302/577-4400

Becky Varella, Chief Administrator of First Step  
302/577-4451

**PURPOSE:** A comprehensive program of basic life skills, academic, and employment training.

**SUMMARY:** The Delaware Division of Social Services implemented its First Step Employment and Training Program on April 1, 1986. This Employment and Training initiative used state Work Incentive Demonstration (WIN Demo) funding to operate. The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS), under the Family Support Act, replaced WIN Demo.

Participants - AFDC or Food Stamp recipients who are federally mandated. Individuals not required to participate can volunteer.

### Key Program Features:

- o Assessment and goal setting as an ongoing process to determine career plan. Uses KEVAS (Key Educational Vocational Assessment System) self administered, computerized system to measure vocational interests, math and language skills, social competency etc. Case manager and participant jointly develop Employability Plan which outlines short term, long term and employment goals, as well as what is needed to achieve them.
- o Basic Academic and Life Skills Development
- o Career Counseling and Self-Directed Job Search Training
- o Community Work Experience (CWEP)
- o Further education and vocational training referrals and follow-up
- o Teen Family Literacy Pilot Program, which targets out-of-school AFDC mandated teen parents ages 16-21
- o Supportive Services: child care, transportation, Remedial medical (eye exam, glasses, physical exams & dental) work and/or training related equipment and supplies, CWEP incidental expenses
- o Work Transition: Child Care, Medicaid

### Unique Features:

- o Strong emphasis on supporting and building positive self concept
- o Holistic approach to building family strengths and economic self-sufficiency
- o Assessment of drug and alcohol dependency
- o Small group settings, non-traditional environments, experiential learning
- o Incremental, Developmental approach (reward participants for each success as they progress toward self-sufficiency.
- o Individualized instruction (personalized achievement tool for every basic skills participant)

- o Life Skills training aimed at building a participant's capacity to overcome daily challenges.
- o Public Recognition of participant's achievement
- o Employment and Training Automated System - automated referrals to First Step Case Managers from Financial Eligibility staff & on-line communication to AFDC/Food Stamp eligibility and First Step contractor staff

Seven (7) statewide community based agencies operating in 16 locations provide Basic Academic, Life Skills Development and Self-Directed Job Search Training. First Step Employment and Training Provides in New Castle County: CITE, Delaware Elwyn Institute, Delaware Technical & Community College, Goldey Beacom College, Ministry of Caring and West End Neighborhood House (Consortium of 8 agencies). First Step case managers make referrals to JTPA, Community College, or other higher education or training programs.

**SCOPE AND EVALUATION:** Governor Carper's in A Better Chance, reports that annually, about 800 AFDC clients, primarily single mothers are enrolled, or about 8% of AFDC families. Since 1986, over 5,600 clients have benefitted:

- o 2,779 are working full time
- o 2,075 have left welfare altogether
- o Resulting welfare cost savings (AFDC, Food Stamps, and Medicaid) - estimated \$10.8 million.

Funding to First Step contractors is contingent upon satisfactory performance measure. Employment retention up to one year is included as a performance measure. First step uses flexibility in measuring performance targets in order to provide a fair measure with which to compare contractors and allows for individual contractor program emphasis on further training or higher education to maximize participant earning potential with the focus on earning a "living wage."

Delaware has recently let a contract with ABT Associates to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of First Step.

**FUNDING:** The First Step program is funded by both Federal and State Food Stamps and AFDC(JOBS) monies.

**FY 1993 First Step Budget Summary:**

<b>Food Stamps:</b>	<b>State</b>	\$371,235
	<b>Federal</b>	\$469,774 -
	<b>Total</b>	\$841,009
<b>AFDC (JOBS):</b>	<b>State</b>	\$978,558
	<b>Federal</b>	\$1,765,115
	<b>Total</b>	\$2,743,673

## **DELAWARE DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT**

**CONTACT:** Barbara Paulin  
Delaware Child Support Enforcement Program  
302/577-4807

**PURPOSE:** To ensure child support enforcement and collections.

**SUMMARY:** Delaware's Division of Child Support Enforcement was established on July 1, 1985.

### Automation

In 1986, Delaware developed and in 1987 implemented the Delaware Automated Child Support Enforcement System (DACSES). It was the first system in the county to be implemented statewide under enhanced funding and the second to be certified as meeting comprehensive Federal requirements. DACSES increased child support enforcement productivity by 25% to 30% and helped the division increase collections and manage a growing caseload with minimal additional staff.

In 1991, the American Public Welfare Association, Information Management Section, honored Delaware's Division of Child Support Enforcement with its award for innovative technology for the automation of Delaware's Melson Formula, considered to be a model for determining child support obligations

### Collections

Delaware's child support collections have increased rapidly, at a rate of about 13% each year. Collections for State Fiscal Year 1993 totaled \$33.3 million, with over \$25 million distributed directly to custodial parents and the remainder collected on behalf of clients receiving AFDC. Revenue and cost savings to the State of Delaware from child support collections on behalf of AFDC clients totalled \$6.2 million in FY 1993.

### Wage With-holding

In 1990, legislation was passed mandating immediate wage withholding in all cases coming through the Division of Child Support Enforcement. The amount of child support received via wage withholding has increased from \$0.1 million in FY 85 to over \$15 million in FY 93, accounting for close to 50% of collections.

### Tax Intercepts

The Federal and State tax refund interception programs, whereby an absent parent's income tax refund can be intercepted in order to collect back child support, continued to experience expanded participation by clients not receiving AFDC benefits. Previously, these clients had to apply for the tax refund intercept program. Beginning in Fiscal Year 1991, cases meeting the criteria were submitted automatically unless the client requested that the case not be submitted. In 1993, over \$2.2 million was collected from the interception of 1992 tax refunds.

### Federal Demonstration Program

Delaware was selected as the lead state in a 2-year child support order modification demonstration project. As a result, over 11,000 child support orders have been reviewed since 1990, with 29% modified. The average modification resulted in an 82% increase in the order amount. The project also successfully and substantially raised the rate at which medical support was acquired.

### Medical Support

Delaware's Division of Child Support Enforcement and Social Services have worked together in recent years to lower dependency on Medicaid through court ordered medical insurance. The child support division requests medical support in each petition for support it files with the Family Court. When medical insurance is court ordered for AFDC families, the DSS medicaid staff contact the provider to verify coverage. The modification demonstration project has proved particularly effective in reducing dependency on medicaid having obtained court orders for medical insurance which have reduced annual Medicaid costs by an estimated \$131,372.

### Electronic Funds Transfer

Delaware's Division of Child Support Enforcement is currently partnering with Scott Paper Company, the State Treasurer's Office, and the Bank of Delaware on a pilot project to test the feasibility of electronic funds transfer (AFT). EFT permits electronic acceptance of payments from obligors and disbursement of monies to obligee. The first payments appeared in DCSE's account in November, 1993.

## **PRESS REPORT**

*Delaware State News: 302/674-3600*

Circulation: 31,927 as of 9/91

*Wilmington Sunday News Journal: 302/324-2500*

Circulation: 140,563 as of 9/91

### Key reporters:

Tom Curley, reporter, 302/324-2500

Sara Ellen Amster, reporter on welfare issues, 302/324-2898

### Key editorial writer:

### Coverage:

The *Wilmington News Journal* has had some coverage of welfare reform over the past year. Its reports tend to be supportive of Governor Carper and welfare reform.

### Specific recent articles include:

**January 20, 1995:** news, Tom Curley, "Carper hits a high note - State speech plays well in legislator": "If Carper broke new ground, it was in setting a timetable to overhaul the state's welfare system. He will seek permission from the state and federal government to replace welfare with a "workfare" program."

**January 20, 1995:** news, Tom Curley, "Carper pushes for 'a better chance' - Outlines welfare plan that includes working for benefits": "If singer James Brown's shriek 'I feel good' sums up Gov. Carper's mood; then perhaps a song from REM best describes the governor's welfare reform package, 'It's the end-of the world as we know it.'"

## **PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS**

### **Congress**

Senator William V. Roth, (R), Finance Committee

Representative Michael Castle (R). Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee

### **State Government**

Governor Thomas R. Carper, Chair of the National Governors' Association Task Force on Welfare Reform

Carmen R. Nazario, Secretary, Health and Social Services

Elaine Archangelo, Director of Social Services, 302/577-4400

Becky Varella, Chief Administrator of First Step, 302/577-4451

Ann Farley, Director of the Division of State Service Centers,  
302/577-4965

Barbara Paulin, Delaware Child Support Enforcement Program, 302/577-4807

### **Press**

Joyce Mullins, Delaware State News, 302/674-3600, ext. 212

Tom Curley, Wilmington News Journal, 302/324-2500

Sara Ellen Amster, reporter, Wilmington Sunday News Journal,  
302/324-2898

### **Advocacy Community**

David Hill, Sussex County Community Action Agency, 302/856-7761

Olga Ramirez, Co-chair, Delaware Public Assistance Task Force,  
302/575-0660

Al Schneider, chair, Delaware Action for Families, 302/658-5177



January 24, 1995

**FLORIDA**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.
Population (1993)	13,679,000	257,908,000
Child Population (1990)	2,884,000	63,924,000
Percent of Population that are Children (<18)	22.3%	25.7%
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$19,397	\$19,841
Poverty Rate		
1992	15.3%	14.5%
1990	14.4%	13.5%
1983	14.8%	15.2%
1979	13.4%	11.7%
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	1.9%	2.8%
Unemployment Rate (1992)	8.2%	7.4%
Child Poverty Rate (1993) - 5 to 17 years old	26.9%	20.8%
FMAP	55.03%	55%

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$948,520,000	\$25,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$830,374,000	\$22,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$118,146,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$303	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	32.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit--Jan. 1994	\$295	\$295
Combined Benefits--Jan. 1994	\$598	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	62%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	0	-1.3%
QC Error Rate (1991)	9.66	4.96

January 24, 1995

FLORIDA (continued)

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)

	FY 1993	
<u>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	254,000	4,581,301
Basic	248,000	4,621,000
UP	6,000	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	2.4%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	1.8	1.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	34.3%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1993	100.0%	37.2%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	5.0%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1993	95.8%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	10.41%	9.95%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	16.3%	21.3%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	4.9%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	19,909	541,995
Participation Rate	17.9%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$38,500,355	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$15,862,079	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	41.2%	74.6%

## FLORIDA

## CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$290.0	\$2,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$ 78.1	\$3,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$211.9	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$3.78	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1991	14.9%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	280,938	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	15.3%	18.3%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	NA	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$3,154	\$3,855
Total Number of Paternities Established	10,879	554,304
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source: NCHS)	64,101	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	17%	46%

## FLORIDA

## FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	4,191	4,070	233,668
Total Foster Care Children	9,212	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (in millions) (b)	45.9	62.4 (Estimated)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		2.6 (in millions)	\$60 (millions)

- (a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.
- (b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

January 24, 1995

FLORIDA

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	47,752*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$38,408	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

FLORIDA

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$118,940	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	27,461	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	33	38
# GRANTEES	40	1,405

January 24, 1995

FLORIDA

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

STATE	FY 1994		U.S.
	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	
I	63,000	259	34,997,412

FLORIDA

REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a)	OBLIGATIONS (b) \$	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c)
4,558	15,333,431	8,508

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

# STATE WELFARE POLICY

Florida has participated in the federal JOBS program through its Project Independence program since October 1989. As of fiscal year 1993, Project Independence had a participation rate of 17.9 percent.

Governor Chiles' Administration has been fairly active in the recent flood of state welfare reform initiatives. Florida received waiver approval on January 27, 1994, for its Family Transition Program, one of the broadest current state demonstrations. The program was implemented in two counties in February 1994. The program is expected to last eight years and reach approximately 5,000 welfare clients in Alachua and Escambia counties (Note: participation is mandatory in Escambia but optional in Alachua). On January 10, 1995, Florida's Secretary of Health and Rehabilitative Services said that Governor Chiles wants to expand the mandatory version of the Family Transition Program to another five counties.

## Waivers Approved

### **Family Transition Program**

The Family Transition Program includes provisions to:

- Increase the earnings disregard formula by replacing the current \$90 and \$30 and one-third disregards, in determining the amount of AFDC benefits, with a single, non-time-limited disregard of \$200 plus one-half the remainder.
- Eliminate the 30-day unemployment requirement, the 100-hour rule, the required quarters of work, and (on a case-by-case basis) the 6-month time limit requirements in the AFDC-UP program
- Limit eligibility for AFDC benefits for applicants and current recipients, with some exceptions, to 24 months in any 60-month period. A family whose AFDC time limit expires will be offered transitional employment in a private or public-sector job.
- Increase transitional child care benefits and remove the periodic income reporting requirement for transitional Medicaid.
- Disregard for 6 months the income of a stepparent whose needs are not included in the AFDC assistance unit.
- Raise the AFDC resource limit to \$5,000 and the vehicle equity limit to \$8,150.
- Exclude interest income of AFDC recipients in determining AFDC and Food Stamp benefits.
- Require school conferences, regular school attendance, and immunizations.
- Modify the JOBS program by lowering the age of child for JOBS exemption to 6 months, allowing non-custodial parents' participation in employment and training activities, allowing incentive payments to employers, and establishing

a bootstrap training program to continue the provision of education and training services to those who lose AFDC benefits.

- Disregard certain income of teenagers in determining AFDC and Food Stamp benefits.
- Establish a program to continue JOBS training and education services for those who lose AFDC benefits due to earnings.
- Allow unemployed or underemployed noncustodial parents of AFDC children to participate up to 40 hours per week in JOBS training, work experience, or education activities, if they are under court order to do so.

### Demonstration Programs

#### **Parents' Fair Share**

The Florida Parents' Fair Share program provides a broad range of services to non-custodial parents to enable them to find employment and pay child support on a regular basis. 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. MDRC is conducting an impact evaluation to be completed in 1996.

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *Family Transition Program*

**CONTACTS:** Shirley Jacques  
Escambia County Family  
Transition program  
904/444-5764

**MISSION:** To help get women off of welfare by providing the necessary support services that will allow them to find employment within a two to three time limit.

**SUMMARY:** Florida received waiver approval on January 27, 1994, for its Family Transition Program, one of the broadest current state demonstrations. The program was implemented in two counties, Escambia and Alachua, in February 1994. Participation in the program is mandatory in Escambia but optional in Alachua county.

Under the Family Transition Program women have two to three years to find work and get off of the dole. The state is willing to go to extraordinary lengths to help the recipients meet this deadline. They will fix their cars, type their resumes, get them housing and furniture, send them to school, and take care of the children while the mothers learn a new trade. The Family Transition program tests each participant and provides career counseling in order to help each participant select a goal, and one that is in reach. When additional education and training is needed, the state will help get the client funding. After a participant gets a job, the state will continue to assist her for another two years, providing extended Medicaid benefits and child care.

**SCOPE:** The program is expected to last eight years and reach approximately 5,000 welfare clients in Alachua and Escambia counties. The program, now only a few months old, has not been evaluated at this time.

**FUNDING:** The Family Transition Program is funded by both the federal and state governments.

*The Family Transition Program is similar to the provisions included in the President's Work and Responsibility Act of 1994. It is an example of time limited system which also provides education, training, and support services to move welfare recipients from dependence to independence.*

## *The Nontraditional Careers Program*

**CONTACT:** Delaine Priest  
(407) 628-3511

**LOCATION:** 1010 N. Orlando Ave.  
Winter Park, FL 32789

**OBJECTIVES:** To encourage women to enter high-wage, nontraditional vocational training in order to become economically self-sufficient.

**SCOPE/RESULTS:** Currently there are 192 students enrolled in the Nontraditional Careers Program. Last year 18 people completed their education and received their Associate of Science degree in nontraditional fields. About 80 percent have been placed in jobs.

**SUMMARY:** The Nontraditional Careers Program is administered by the Women's Center at Valencia Community College. The program provides individual career counseling, academic advising and interaction with positive role models from nontraditional jobs. It actively recruits women for high-wage, vocational training in nontraditional fields. Participants must attend a three day career exploration course that assesses the participant's values, interests and goals. The course assists in exploring and developing a career plan for women preparing to enroll in vocational training programs.

The program also provides academic counseling, assistance with registration and funding for tuition, books, transportation and/or childcare. The program conducts seminars to increase retention and recruitment of nontraditional students. It offers workshops that focus on students' success in employment placement and includes topics such as interviewing skills and job hunting techniques.

**PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT:** The program has an advisory committee comprised of individuals representing business and industry and education, students in targeted programs, and people working in nontraditional occupations. The main functions of the advisory committee are to support program marketing efforts and role model development. The committee as well as major employers in the area participate in many of the seminars and workshops. The committee plays an important role by keeping the curriculum current and relaying the skills that employers look for in trainees from each field.

**FUNDING:** The Nontraditional Careers Program is funded by the Carl Perkins Act and administered by the state of Florida Sex Equity Vocational Education Office.

The Nontraditional Careers Program is committed to moving welfare recipients, particularly women, into nontraditional jobs. It is a model program for coordination with the local business community, and the recruitment and support for women entering nontraditional, high-paying jobs.

## ***Housing Renovation Partnership (HRP)***

**CONTACTS:** William Snipes,  
Program Manager  
Homebuilders' Institute  
Washington, DC  
800/959-0052

Richard Ernst  
Project Independence  
1605 SW 107th Avenue  
Suite 202B  
Miami, FL  
305/227-5076

The Housing Renovation Partnership in Dade County is an example of a successful working relationship between HUD and the JOBS program that combines academic and vocational training, housing and employment.

**MISSION:** To provide participants with job skills in construction trades that will enable them to obtain high-wage employment.

**SUMMARY:** The program began as a partnership between Dade County Public Schools' (Miami Skill Center), Dade County Department of Housing and Urban Development, State of Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, and the National Association of Home Builders Institute in July of 1990. The program is designed to provide JOBS participants with vocational training in Building Maintenance, GED preparation, and Job Readiness Skills training which will increase their level of employability. While gaining hands-on experience, these JOBS participants contribute to the renovation and rehabilitation of vacant, distressed HUD properties within Dade County. Consequently, as the housing units are rehabilitated, the trainees are able to attain construction skills and at the same time increase their employment potential in non-traditional fields for women.

One day per week is devoted to academic training in math and literacy, much of which is job related. The remaining four days are devoted to vocational skill training restoring deteriorated and boarded up public housing units and foreclosed single family homes. Community and educational facilities are used as classrooms. Public housing units are renovated and restored to meet the critical needs of families on waiting lists. In addition, participants restore housing for the homeless and improve and make repairs to various educational and recreational facilities. Teachers and instructors, certified by the public school system, provide overall supervision and develop participants' skills while doing real work in carpentry, plumbing, electricity, painting, landscaping, etc.

Materials are provided from Dade County HUD; properties from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; facilities and academic teachers from Dade County Public Schools; support services for health, child care and counseling from Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services; vocational training and management from the Home Builders Institute.

**RESULTS:** Many of the trainees have attained their GED and 82 percent of those completing the program have found employment in various fields.

## **PRESS REPORT**

***Miami Herald:*** 305-350-2111

Circulation: 388,914 as of 1994

Key editorial writers: Tony Proscio: 305-376-3505  
Wingate Payne: 305-527-8439

Key reporter: Peggy Rodgers: 305-376-3455

### Coverage:

Supports welfare reform proposals that encourage employment and job placement. In favor of providing supportive services such as child care and Medicaid. Skeptical about high costs and the effectiveness of some of the restrictions such as time limits. Support strengthening child support enforcement measures, but is uncertain about the effectiveness of current proposals in this area. The paper has not endorsed any specific proposals.

***St. Petersburg Times:*** 813-893-8111

Circulation: 62,266 as of 1994

Key editorial writer: Sharon Bond: 813-893-8328

Key reporter: Marlene Sokol: 813-226-3407  
David Dahl, Washington Bureau: 202-393-4553

### Coverage:

Supports welfare reform. Believes that the President's plan is a good start and strongly supports its emphasis on work and reaching the next generation. Not supportive of the family cap state option. The paper has questioned the funding of welfare reform and whether there are enough good jobs.

***Tampa Tribune:*** 813-272-7711

Circulation: 315,227 as of 1994

Key editorial writer: Morris Kennedy: 813-259-7620

Key reporter: Craig Palosky: 813-259-7633

Coverage:

Generally in favor of welfare reform and making the system more sensible. Supports Florida's demonstration projects and has encouraged the state to apply the lessons learned from these projects statewide. Vigorously in favor of more aggressively collecting child support payments. Against the idea of child support assurance. Generally in favor of time limits, but would like to see how it works in the real world.

***Orlando Sentinel:*** 407-420-5000

Circulation: 271,384 as of 1994

Key editorial writers: Myriam Marquez, civil rights, minority affairs and children's issues: 407-420-5399  
John Bersia, federal government politics: 407-420-5517

Key reporter: Sandra Mathers: 407-420-5507

Coverage:

Supportive of welfare reform, particularly the concentration on teenage mothers. Would like to see it move more quickly through the legislative process.

***Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel:*** 305-356-4000

Circulation: 295,231 as of 1994

Key editorial writer: Kingsley Guy: 305-356-4616

Key reporter: Rick Robb: 305-356-4681  
Jack Brennan: 305-356-4512

Coverage:

Tends to support self-sufficiency efforts including job training and job placement. Has questioned the effectiveness of time limits. The paper has not taken a stand on any of the current national welfare reform proposals.

***Jacksonville Florida Times-Union:*** 904-359-4111

Circulation: 178,582 as of 1994

Key editorial reporter: Lloyd Brown 904-359-4307

Key reporter: John Burt 904-359-4379

Coverage:

Although the paper has not had a lot of welfare reform coverage to date, it tends to take a more conservative view. A recent editorial suggested that Secretary Shalala's 12/29/94 press conference demonstrated that the "left wing of the Democratic party still exists". The paper supports the provisions of the PRA. Tends to highlight problems with the current system and the need for change. Supports strengthening of child support enforcement. Earlier, the paper stressed the importance of including arguments such as Charles Murray's in the welfare reform debate.

***West Palm Beach Post:*** 407-820-4100

Circulation: 183,812 as of 1994

Key editorial reporter: Fran Hathaway 407-820-4460

Key reporter: Bill Cooper 407-820-4413

Coverage:

Long time supporter of welfare reform, particularly supportive of the need to target young girls and teenage pregnancy. The paper has not taken any stand on Clinton's proposal or other bills in Congress.

***Sarasota Herald Tribune:*** 813-953-7755

Circulation: 104, 546 as of 1994

Key editorial reporter: Tom Tryon, Editorial Page Editor, 813-957-5225

Key reporter: Eddie Robinette 813-957-5189

Coverage:

Generally supportive of time limits and education and training pilot projects currently in place in Florida.

## PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS

### Congress

Sen. Graham (D), Finance Committee

Rep. Shaw (R), Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Ways and Means Committee

Rep. Gibbons (D), Ranking Minority, Ways and Means Committee

Rep. Weldon (R), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee

### State Government

Governor Chiles, 904/488-4441

Jim Towey, Secretary of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 904/488-1234

Dan Goss, Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services, Employment and Training, 904/922-9622

Jay Trautman, Elantra County Family Transition program, 904/955-5479

Shirley Jacques, Escambia County Family Transition program, 904/444-5764

### Press

Tony Prascio, editorial writer, Miami Herald, 305/376-3505

Wingate Payne, editorial writer, Miami Herald, 305/527-8439

Peggy Rodgers, reporter, Miami Herald, 305/376-3455

Sharon Bond, editorial writer, St. Petersburg Times, 813/893-8328

Marlene Sokol, reporter, St. Petersburg Times, 813/226-3407

David Dahl, reporter, DC Bureau St. Petersburg Times, 202/393-4553

Morris Kennedy, editorial writer, Tampa Tribune, 813/259-7620

Craig Palosky, reporter, Tampa Tribune, 813/259-7633

Myriam Marquez, editorial writer, Orlando Sentinel, 407/420-5399

John Bersia, editorial writer, Orlando Sentinel, 407/420-5517

Sandra Mathers, reporter, Orlando Sentinel, 407/420-5507

Kingsley Guy, editorial writer, Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel, 305/356-4616

Rick Robb, reporter, Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel, 305/356-4681

Jack Brennan, reporter, Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel, 305/356-4512

Lloyd Brown, editorial writer, Jacksonville Times-Union, 904/359-4307

John Burr, reporter, Jacksonville Times-Union, 904/359-4379

Fran Hathaway, editorial writer, West Palm Beach Post, 407/820-4460

Bill Cooper, reporter, West Palm Beach Post, 407/820-4413

Tom Tryon, editorial page editor, Sarasota Herald Tribune, 813/957-5225

Eddie Robinette, reporter, Sarasota Herald Tribune, 813/957-5189

### Advocacy Community

Jack Levine, Executive Director, Florida Center for Children and Youth

Cheryl Parker Rose, Florida Legal Services, Inc.

Chuck Daly, Florida State University researcher

Cindy Huddleston, Florida Legal Services, 904/385-7900

Deborah Sims, SMILE, 407/889-2946

Karen Woodall, 904/222-7607

Elaine Roberts, Florida Impact, 904/222-3470

January 24, 1995

**GEORGIA**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.	RANK
Population (1993)	6,917,000	257,908,000	11
Child Population (1990)	1,737,000	63,924,000	
Percent of Population that are Children (<18)	24.8	25.7%	
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$18,130	\$16,053	
Poverty Rate			
1992	17.8	14.5%	
1990	15.8	13.5%	
1983	18.8	15.3%	
1979	16.6	11.7%	
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	1.2	2.8%	
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	17.5%	20.8%	
Unemployment Rate (1993)	5.8%	6.8%	
FMAP	62.08%	55%	

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<u>FINANCIAL DATA</u>	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$489,177,000	\$25,371,893,000
Benefit Payments	\$413,919,000	\$22,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 55,248,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$280	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	29.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit—Jan. 1994	\$295	\$395
Combined Benefits—Jan. 1994	\$575	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	60%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	0	-1.6%
QC Error Rate (1991)	3.37%	4.96%

January 24, 1995

GEORGIA (continued)

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)

	FY 1993	
<u>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	141,279	4,981,301
Basic	140,260	4,622,000
UP	1,019	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	0.7%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	2.8	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	44.3%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1992	54.8%	27.2%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	5.0%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1992	54.5%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	85.9%	9.95%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	29.4%	23.0%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	7.6%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	12,454	541,995
Participation Rate	18.2%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$25,862,150	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$14,788,997	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	61.6%	74.6%

## GEORGIA

## CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$205.6	\$2,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$84.6	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$120.9	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$4.47	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	17.8%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	478,116	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	16.9%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	49.7%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$2,540	\$2,835
Total Number of Paternities Established	29,329	554,205
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source: NCHS)	38,116	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	77.0%	45.7%

## GEORGIA

## FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	3,254	3,426	133,668
Total Foster Care Children	16,654	Not Available	444,900
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (b)	24.5 (in millions)	21.4 (in millions)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FF/FS Services in \$		1.6 (in millions)	\$60 (millions)

(a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.

(b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

GEORGIA

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	10,881*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$25,037	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

GEORGIA

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$81,948	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	19,445	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	36	38
# GRANTEES	28	1,405

January 24, 1995

GEORGIA

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

FY 1994			
STATE	U.S.		
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
1	65,000	259	34,997,412

GEORGIA

REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a/)	OBLIGATIONS (b/)	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c/)
3,128	\$ 3,196,350	4,267

a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.

b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration. (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance(RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.

c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## **STATE POLICY**

The state's job training and education program geared to preparing people on welfare for work is called PEACH. The program began in 14 Georgia counties in 1986 and it is now available in each of the state's counties.

In addition, Georgia is one of thirteen states participating in the **Comprehensive Services Delivery for JOBS Teen Parents** demonstration program. Through this program, the local JOBS program establishes linkages with appropriate services providers and enrolls non-exempt teen parents in the JOBS program and provides comprehensive services to the teens and to their children.

### Waivers Approved - Personal Accountability and Responsibility (PAR) Project

#### **Description**

- o Eliminate the incremental increase in AFDC benefits resulting from the birth of an additional child to a family that received AFDC benefits for at least 24 months after December 31, 1993, and was on welfare in the month in which the child was conceived. The restriction on the welfare amount will not apply to births resulting from rape or incest, or births to minors on AFDC who become first-time minor parents. The additional child will be included in the family's need standard and will be an AFDC recipient.
- o Offer instruction in family planning and parenting skills to all AFDC applicants and recipients.
- o Exclude from the AFDC grant any able-bodied recipient who is not caring for a child under age 14 and who has refused an offer of full-time employment paying at least the Federal minimum wage or who terminates such employment without good cause. Current sanction policy would be modified so that the sanction would last a maximum of 3 months for the first violation and 6 months for each subsequent violation.

#### **Status**

Application submitted May 18, 1993.

Approved November 2, 1993.

Proposed implementation date: January 1, 1994.

**Project Fulton (NOT A WELFARE REFORM PROJECT)**

**Description**

- o The demonstration will serve the residents of 500 housing units in south Fulton County in the Tri-Cities Cluster, one of the clusters constituting the operational areas of the Atlanta Project, for two years. The demonstration will operate in cooperation with the Atlanta Project, which will provide staff and resources.
- o Residents in 500 housing units will be briefed on, and invited to participate in, Project Fulton. Participation is voluntary and participants may leave Project Fulton at any time.
- o Participants receive extensive case management and supportive services, counseling, education and training, and they are referred to job openings in unsubsidized employment.
- o The demonstration provides economic incentives, including: the substitution of earned income for cash benefits and Food Stamps; a second year of transitional child care; disregard of income earned by participants for 12 months; and, disregard of resources for the first 18 months of employment of participant.

**Status**

Application resubmitted March 15, 1994

Application approved October 2, 1994

Proposed implementation date January 1, 1995.

### Waivers Pending - Work for Welfare (WFW) Project

The state submitted a waiver application on July 6, 1994. It is currently pending HHS approval. The specific provisions included in the request are:

In 10 volunteer pilot counties, would implement the WFW Project which would:

- o require every non-exempt recipient and non-supporting parent to work up to 20 hours per month in a state, local government, federal agency or nonprofit organizations. If work placements of 20 hours per month are not available, recipients would be required to participate in job search activities for such portion of the 20 hours per month for which placements are not fully available.
- o change JOBS non-compliance sanction against the participant to one month for the first violation, three months for the second violation and 24 months for the third violation;

On a Statewide basis, would:

- o exempt the equity value of one automobile if the fair market value does not exceed \$4,500, adjusted annually based on the new car component of the Consumer Price Index;
- o disregard the earned income of children who are full-time students when determining 185 percent of the need standard to include children up to age 19 when that provision is implemented (scheduled for July 1, 1996).

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *Pathways by Marriot, Inc.*

**CONTACT:** Debra Willburn  
Marriot Marquis Hotel  
Atlanta, GA  
404/521-0000

**The Pathways by Marriot Program is a model of a large corporation getting involved at the community level; to help train and hire welfare recipients and low-income individuals.**

**PURPOSE:** To train welfare recipients and other low-income people so that they are employable (by Marriot, Inc.) and can become economically self-sufficient.

**SUMMARY:** Pathways, established 3 years ago, is a six week training program, administered by Marriot, Inc. and conducted at the actual site of the Marriot Marquis Hotel. The six week period is divided between classroom training and occupational skills training. For the first four weeks of their training, participants spend 3 hours in the morning, Monday through Friday, in a classroom, where they focus on life skills training, stress management, developing interviewing techniques, self-esteem building, hospitality, and general information about the Marriot corporation. The remaining three hours a day is spent in occupational skills training, during which each participant learns a specific job in the hotel. In the last two weeks of the program, the participants spend the entire day working in those positions. Hotel managers become familiar with the participants and the program administrators make sure that there is a good match between potential employee, supervisor and actual position. Every person who completes the training program is guaranteed placement in a job in the hotel, which also includes health benefits.

Participants enrolled in the program receive one meal a day from the hotel. Their transportation and child care needs are also met through the program's partnership with the Private Industry Council (PIC) and the Georgia Department of Human Resources, Division of Family and Children Services. Pathways recruits participants 2-4 weeks before every training cycle through various methods including the PIC, JTPA, and by word of mouth. Candidates must be at sixth grade reading and math levels to participate, but most screening of clients is done by the PIC. Marriot also runs a in-house center that helps people attain a GED or additional education and training.

**SCOPE/EVALUATION:** On average, there are between 3 and 8 people participating in each training session. There are 11 students in enrolled in the current session, so the program seems to be expanding. In the past 3 years, through 5 training cycles, roughly twenty-five people have finished the program and are currently working at Marriot. Since the inception of the Pathways, only six people have not completed the program successfully. The program has been so successful that Marriot plans to replicate it throughout the Washington, D.C. area.

**FUNDING:** The program is funded by Marriot, Inc. and by the local Private Industry Council.

## ***Postponing Sexual Involvement Awareness Program***

**CONTACT:** Marian Howard  
Emory University/Grady  
Hospital  
Atlanta, GA  
404/616-4307

**The Postponing Sexual Involvement Awareness Program is a model of a community-based, successful teen pregnancy prevention initiative, in which schools and local businesses and organizations have come together to effect long-term changes in attitudes and behavior.**

**PURPOSE:** To encourage teenagers to postpone pregnancy and sexual activity by teaching them about family planning and human sexuality.

**SUMMARY:** Emory University and Grady Hospital in Atlanta began a pregnancy prevention education and case management program in Atlanta in 1985. The program involves several components, including a human sexuality program in the Atlanta public schools. Through this program, counselors in the schools present 8th graders with 5 sessions on human sexuality information and family planning and 5 sessions on peer pressure and postponing sexual activity. The program chooses teen leaders (juniors and seniors in high school) to present these last 5 sessions to the 8th graders.

Along with the informational sessions, the program provides contraceptive services on a case management basis. Each school has a counselor who works with students interested in participating in this component. The students enter into a valuable relationship with a case manager who meets with them every three months and contraceptive services are made available to them through the medical clinic at Grady Hospital. The program provides all types of contraceptive services, including Norplant.

**SCOPE/EVALUATION:** The program has produced promising results. 8th graders from low-income families who have not participated in the program have been 3 to 4 times more likely to become sexually involved. These positive results extend through 12th grade.

**FUNDING:** The program is funded by Emory University, Grady Hospital, with the help of some private organizations and the Atlanta Board of Education.

## ***Georgia Preschool Immunization Project***

**CONTACT:** Winnie Clark  
Employment Services Unit  
Division of Family and  
Children Services  
Atlanta, GA  
(404) 657-3727

**The Georgia Preschool Immunization Project is a model of a statewide program that links cash assistance with parental responsibility and children's health care, by imposing sanctions if preschool aged children do not receive immunizations.**

**PURPOSE:** To ensure that preschool aged child to receive the necessary immunizations.

**SUMMARY:** In November, 1992, Georgia received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to operate the immunization project. The state also adopted similar legislation.

This project requires preschool aged children to receive immunizations appropriate for their age in order for their needs to be included in the family's AFDC grant. Failure to obtain required immunizations or to provide sufficient proof of immunization will result in the child's needs being removed from the AFDC grant until the child has been immunized. Medicaid eligibility is not included. The HHS waiver also requires that the state policy include an appropriate period of time for compliance.

A good cause exception to the immunization requirement exists where a child has a physical disability which makes vaccination undesirable; the parent or guardian opposes immunization on religious grounds; or the child cannot be immunized within the normal time period for verifying immunization because of scheduling problems with the health care provider. The state also requires that the child be current in the immunization series at each eligibility review and that the recipient's statement that the series is continuing be accepted unless questionable.

**SCOPE/EVALUATION:** This is a statewide project, except for a randomly chosen control group of at least 1000 cases from Muscogee county. The project will run for five years. It has not been evaluated at this time.

**FUNDING:** The program is funded with federal and state money.

## ***PRESS REPORT***

***Atlanta Journal/Constitution*** 404/526-5151

**Circulation:** 302,515 as of 1994

**Key reporters:** Frances Swartzkopff  
Mark Sherman  
Jeanne Cummings  
Bob Dart (Washington Bureau)

**Key editorial writer:** Dick Williams

**Coverage:** The Atlanta Journal/Constitution has had extensive coverage of the national welfare debate. In general, the paper seems to support state flexibility. It does not support simply ending welfare, but rather suggests comprehensive reforms, including child care and child support enforcement.

## **Primary State Contacts**

### **Congress**

**Rep. Newt Gingrich (R), Speaker of the House**

**Rep. Mac Collins (R), Subcommittee on Human Resources, Ways and Means Committee**

**Rep. John Lewis (D), Ways and Means Committee**

**Rep. Charlie Norwood (R), Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee**

### **State**

**Governor Miller**

**Michael Thurmond, Director of Family and Children Services**

**Nell Gamble, Georgia Department of Human Resources, Division of Family and Children Services**

### **Programs**

**Marian Howard, Postponing Sexual Involvement Program, (404) 616-4307**

**Carol Matthews, Dir. of Human Resources, Marriot Marquis Hotel, (404) 521-0000**

**Marian English, Grady Teen Services, (404) 616-3515**

### **Press**

**Atlanta Constitution, (404) 526-5151**



January 24, 1995

**KANSAS**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.	Rank
Population (1993)	2,531,000	257,908,000	
Child Population (1990)	663,000	63,924,000	
Percent of Population that are Children (<18)	26.3%	25.7%	
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$19,376	\$19,841	
Poverty Rate			
1993	11.0%	14.5%	
1990	10.3%	13.5%	
1983	13.5%	15.2%	
1979	10.1%	11.7%	
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	0.9%	2.8%	
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	16.0%		
Unemployment Rate (1992)	4.2%	7.4%	
FMAP	58.18%	55%	

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<u>FINANCIAL DATA</u>	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$147,531,000	\$15,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$125,876,000	\$12,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$21,655,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$429	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	45.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit--Jan. 1994	\$284	\$295
Combined Benefits--Jan. 1994	\$713	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	74.0%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	1.7%	-1.6%
QC Error Rate (1991)	4.36%	4.9%

January 24, 1995

KANSAS (continued)

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<b><u>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u></b>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	30,179	4,981,301
Basic	27,729	4,622,000
UP	2,450	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	8.1%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	3.0	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	41.0%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1992	19.8%	27.2%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	3.5%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1992	20.1%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	88.9%	87.3%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	22.2%	23.0%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	11.5%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	5,695	541,995
Participation Rate	48.5%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$8,407,262	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$5,859,440	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	69.7%	74.6%

## KANSAS

## CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$ 73.6	\$8,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$ 22.4	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$ 51.2	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$ 3.18	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	11.4%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	119,485	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	27.9%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	52.6%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$2,207	\$2,855
Total Number of Paternities Established Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source: NCHS)	4,445 8,746	554,205 1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	50.8%	46%

## KANSAS

## FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	1,371	1,326	232,668
Total Foster Care Children	4,593	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (b)	19.37 (in millions)	21.3 (in millions)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		372.1 (in thousands)	\$ 60 (millions)

- (a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.
- (b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

KANSAS

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	2,415*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$ 7,369	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

KANSAS

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$22,087	\$3,325,724
ENROLLMENT	5,793	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	36	38
# GRANTEES	22	1,405

January 24, 1995

KANSAS

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

FY 1994			
STATE		U.S.	
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
0	0	259	34,997,412

KANSAS

REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a)	OBLIGATIONS (b) \$	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c)
694	937,485	1,082

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## **STATE WELFARE POLICY**

Kansas' JOBS program, KanWork, is operated as outlined in the 1988 Family Support Act. Kansas also operates a successful CWEP program: many people who start CWEP jobs are later hired into permanent positions at the same job sites.

In 1991 an interagency working group on welfare reform was formed in Kansas. The group came up with a program to promote work, maximize child support collections, decrease teen pregnancy and provide more incentives to work with an enhanced transitional assistance program. In 1993, the program passed in the House and Senate. The provisions of the program include: elimination of the 100 hours rule; raised earning disregard limit, extended medical benefits for people leaving the system, creation of pregnancy prevention programs; and two provisions added in the Senate are penalizing AFDC parents who drop out of school and imposing a family cap. Kansas is now waiting for the federal approval of their waiver application in order to implement this program.

### Waivers Pending:

#### **Actively Creating Tomorrow for Families Demonstration**

Kansas submitted a waiver application on July 26, 1994. The Kansas state legislature passed a bill that would implement these welfare reform measures in last year's session

#### **Description**

On a Statewide basis (except where specified):

- o replace the time-limited \$30 and 1/3 earned income disregard with a non-time-limited 40% disregard.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, exempt from consideration as income and resources, earnings of children in school and earnings of an 18 year old that is expected to graduate from High School before reaching the age of 19.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, exclude the value of one vehicle from the resource requirements, and exclude other vehicles if used to produce income, used as the household's home, or specially equipped for use by a handicapped person.
- o increase transitional Medicaid from 12 to 24 months with a 25% co-pay for the second 12 months. Other Medicaid changes would also be made that would remove the requirement that a child remain in the home, and eliminate reporting and continuous employment requirements.

**o Under JOBS:**

- target those judged to be able to obtain employment after 30 months of JOBS services
- eliminate target group JOBS requirements
- After 30 months of receiving JOBS services, the individual would be eliminated from the budget group for 3 years. In these cases, the individual may receive up to 6 months of support services after the 30-month period.
- in three counties, in conjunction with KanLearn (see below), require all pregnant and parenting teens, regardless of their employability, to participate in JOBS education components if they do not have a high school diploma or GED.
- expand the CWEP program to include alternative work experience placements with private sector employees, invest in public/private cooperative efforts to create customized on-the-job training programs, and eliminate the requirement that jobs in a work supplementation program come from newly created positions.

**o eliminate the AFDC-UP work and earnings requirements.**

**o expand eligibility for AFDC benefits to include pregnant women with no other children in their first and second trimester.**

**o for AFDC and Food Stamps, require a minor unmarried parent to live in his/her home with a parent or guardian, or in a supervised living arrangement.**

**o for AFDC and Food Stamps, standardize employment requirements and penalties. Recipients would be required (unless there is good cause) to attend a job interview if referred, accept suitable employment if offered, and not quit a job or be terminated due to misconduct. The penalty for non-compliance for an applicant or recipient will be ineligibility for the individual until they comply or for 3 months.**

**o for AFDC and Food Stamps, standardize work-program requirements. Non-exempt parents or spouses that do not meet work requirements are removed from the budget group for three months or until compliance, whichever comes first. During this time the individual would not be categorically eligible for Medicaid. If the individual has not cooperated within three months the case will be closed. For non-exempt persons that are not a parent or spouse, only the individual is removed from the budget group. The individual may be reinstated in the budget group if he/she becomes exempt**

from work requirements, leaves the household, accepts employment with weekly earnings at least equal to the federal minimum wage multiplied by 30 hours, or participates in a employment and training component.

- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, eliminate parents not cooperating with child support enforcement from the budget group and discontinue child care assistance for up to 3 months. The individual will not be considered categorically eligible for Medicaid during this period of ineligibility. If, after three months, non-cooperation continues, the case will be closed.
- o for families with at least two children at the time of application for AFDC that conceive an additional child while receiving assistance, limit the increase in AFDC benefits to 1/2 the normal increase and not increase the benefits at all for subsequent children. For families with one child at the time of application for AFDC, allow the full increase in benefits for the next child conceived while receiving assistance, and limit the increase for the next child conceived to 1/2 the usual increase, with no further increases for children conceived subsequently. These limitations do not apply if at least one parent is working. Further, in two parent families, there will be an additional earned income disregard equal to the increased benefits the family would have otherwise received for parenting the additional children.
- o implement the KanLearn program in three counties of the State. Under this program, teens attending school in good standing will receive an incentive payment. If the teens do not, the payment to the case will be reduced by 10 percent of the need standard, unless the parent is cooperating with a plan to bring the teenager into compliance. Incentive payments will not count as income for food stamp purposes.
- o adopt Food Stamp rules with regard to redetermination and notice of redetermination periods for AFDC and Medicaid.
- o adopt Food Stamp rules with regard to the effective date of changes in household composition for AFDC. In particular, this would mean that the changes would be effective the month following the month verification is received.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, change work-related exemptions and good cause criteria so as to make the programs more similar. In addition to changing several Food Stamp work-related policies so as to conform to AFDC policies, this would include changing AFDC to eliminate the work exemption for students over 18 that can reasonably be expected to complete school before turning 19. For AFDC, good cause would be expanded to include work offered at a site subject to a lock-out (with some exceptions) and work which interferes with a person's religious observances or beliefs.

- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, limit the burial exemption, to one burial plot per family member and to \$8,000 per burial fund and/or contract.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, penalize households that do submit monthly reports in a timely manner at a rate of 10 percent of the need standard for AFDC and 10 percent of the Food Stamp maximum benefit for Food Stamps. This penalty would apply whether or not the household had earnings. The requirement to report changes within 10 days will be eliminated.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, exempt up to \$50 in interest income per month.
- o exempt, from AFDC income, lump sum payments. Such payments would be considered as a resource in the month after receipt.
- o adopt AFDC policy in the Food Stamp program with respect to grants, scholarships or loans for educational purposes. The effect of this would be that such funds would not be counted as income or resources in the Food Stamp program.
- o adopt Food Stamp policy with respect to declaration of citizen status. The effect of this would be that one member of the household could declare the status of all other members.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, delay the requirement to apply for and provide verification of a Social Security number for a newborn child until the time of the next eligibility review.
- o eliminate the requirement to make protective payments except when money mismanagement is documented.
- o in the Food Stamp program, reflect changes in shelter expenses prospectively rather in the month in which the change occurred.
- o for the Food Stamp program, change the definition of homelessness to remove the possibility that someone in a temporary residence where the stay is intended to be for more than 3 months would be declared homeless.
- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, eliminate the one month grace period for submitting monthly reports for persons living on an Indian Reservation.
- o for the Food Stamp program, allow for the collection of overpayments caused by administrative error to be accomplished by a benefit reduction of up to the greater of \$10 or 10 percent of the allotment amount if the recipient does not make payments as agreed.
- o for the AFDC and Food Stamps, deny assistance to fugitive felons.

- o for AFDC and Food Stamps, standardize the treatment of sponsor's income and resources in determining a sponsored alien's eligibility. The treatment of such income would include a provision to make individuals whose sponsor is a public or private agency ineligible for assistance for 3 years after entry into the United States. Also, 20 percent of the sponsor's total gross income will be disregarded and the sponsor's income will count in full.**
- o for AFDC and Medicaid, SSI income would no longer be disregarded in determination of eligibility.**
- o for AFDC and Medicaid, owning a home in another state without making a bona fide effort to sell the property will result in not being eligible to receive services.**
- o expand the Federal Tax Refund Offset Program to recover AFDC and CSE overpayments.**

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *Wichita/Sedgwick County 911 Emergency Dispatch*

**CONTACT:** Becky Stewart  
(316) 383-7078

**LOCATION:** 535 North Main Street  
Wichita, KS 67203

**MISSION:** To provide skilled emergency dispatchers who serve over a half-million citizens, to provide a means toward self-sufficiency for welfare recipients, to aid governmental bodies involved in furthering their Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action objectives

The Wichita 911 program trains welfare recipients to be 911 emergency dispatchers and hires those who successfully complete the program at high wages with benefits. Being a 911 dispatcher requires a high level of training as well as a tremendous willingness to work extremely hard in high stress conditions. Although very small-scale, the program is unique because it gives people valuable training and well-paying work, and helps to break the stereotype that welfare recipients are lazy and do not contribute to society.

**SUMMARY:** The KanWork 911 program enables welfare recipients to compete for jobs for which they might not otherwise be considered. SRS clients go through extensive testing of eye-hand-foot coordination, reasoning, vocabulary, spelling and deductive reasoning. Then oral interviews are used to select candidates to be placed in an extensive in-depth, eleven week training course to become a 911 emergency dispatcher.

The individuals who qualify for 911 training must be literate and be able to type at least 35 words a minute, in addition to passing the other skills and reasoning tests. Most of the 911 dispatchers referred by KanWork have had some previous work experience.

Individuals employed by 911 are paid \$8.53 an hour plus life and medical insurance.

**SCOPE:** The program began in June of 1992 and in its first year and-a-half, 10 welfare recipients have been trained and hired as emergency medical dispatchers

**EVALUATION:** In its first year the program graduated eight new dispatchers.

**FUNDING:** All monies are from public sources including JTPA, JOBS, state child care programs and city/county departmental budgets which are responsible for operating the 911 service.

## ***Southeast Kansas Area Vocational/Technical School***

**CONTACT:** Melvin Briley  
(316) 429-3863

**LOCATION:** 501 West Elm  
PO Box 267  
Columbus, Kansas 66725

This school provides basic skills and vocational training to over 100 welfare recipients each year and gives the tools they need to find employment and become self sufficient.

**MISSION:** To provide people with vocational training and to help build their confidence so that they can be successful in the workplace

**SUMMARY:** Working with SRS, southeast Kansas vocational school provides vocational education to nearly 130 post-secondary students each year, half of whom are welfare recipients. Each student takes an interest survey and receives career counseling to try and ensure that students are involved in the fields for which they are best suited and in which they have the greatest chance of success. SRS trains people on welfare in basic life skills before they enter Southeast Kansas Area Vocational/Technical School, but at Southeast, all students are mainstreamed. The school provides training in business and computers, low level nursing skills, graphic arts and printing, construction trades, machinists and auto mechanics.

The school arranges temporary job placements for its students so that they can receive valuable on-the-job training. Often these temporary placements turn into permanent jobs. The school also teaches its students how to write resumes and conducts practice job interviews.

The school provides GED classes for its students who are not enrolled in, or who have not completed, high school.

**SCOPE:** Approximately 100 adults attend the school on a full-time basis, which is six hours per day, one-hundred eighty days a year, for two years. Approximately 70 high school age students attend the vocational school on a half-time basis during their junior and senior years. Some finish their vocational training during that time, but many return for one more full year of vocational training after high school and then receive certification in their trade.

**EVALUATION:** The state requires that a minimum of 80% of the graduates find employment upon graduation. 90% of Southeast Kansas Vocational School graduates are able to obtain employment.

**FUNDING:** Southeast Kansas Area Vocational/Technical School is a State sponsored institution. For welfare recipients, funds to cover tuition are covered by a variety of sources including Pell Grants, student loans and JTPA funds.

***Diversified Educational, Training and Manufacturing Company, Inc. (DETAMC)***

**CONTACT:** George Johnson  
(316) 263-6720

**LOCATION:** 1330 E. 1st St., Suite 121  
Wichita, KS 67214

**MISSION:** To train the chronically unemployed through academic courses and on the job training; to place trained persons in entry level positions with local industry or retain them as DETAMC employees; and to establish a productive, minority owned, community oriented business.

DETAMC is a skills training and employment program. Unlike other job training programs which just train workers and try to help them find employment, DETAMC only trains as many people as it knows it can find employment for.

**SUMMARY:** Trainees are provided to DETAMC through KanWork, which continues to provide the trainees with support during their academic and training phase. DETAMC has secured contracts with Beech, Boeing, and J.I. Case in Wichita to repair electric and pneumatic portable tools, sharpen drill bits, and repair heat guns. The companies also assist in training, cost and quality control.

DETAMC has also developed a housing rehabilitation program to improve housing in low and moderate income areas. Contracts have been secured with the City of Wichita and Bank IV for this project.

**SCOPE:** 55 participants have been through the DETAMC course.

**EVALUATION:** Due to business downsizing it is not possible to place all trainees with the companies where they train. However, 21 are employed at DETAMC, 8 are employed elsewhere, 7 have completed GED testing, 4 are attending VoTech School, 7 are pregnant or exempt for other medical problems, 3 are in CWEP and two have moved out of the State.

**FUNDING:** KanWork, JTPA (JTPA pays 50% of the trainee salaries during six months of OJT.)

## **Cessna 21st Street Training Program**

**CONTACT:** Johnnie Cartledge  
(316) 265-8818

**LOCATION:** 2101 E. 21st St.  
Wichita, KS 67214

**MISSION:** To provide skilled employees for Cessna Aviation and to help bring economic recovery to a disadvantaged area of Wichita.

**SUMMARY:** There are four phases to the training program: 1) a literacy program which teaches basic academic skills or upgrades those skills; 2) vocational training consisting of training in sheetmetal assembly and blueprint reading; 3) the performance of light sub-assembly work; and 4) personal counseling. Individuals may enter the program in either the vocational training or the literacy program. When individuals enter vocational training, they are paid and covered by a Cessna benefits package. A trainee's compensation is increased when he or she progresses to perform sub-assembly work at the 21st Street Facility.

The participants must meet delivery, productivity, and quality goals which are exactly the same as the ones required at Cessna's two other Wichita facilities. Expectations of performance increase each month and trainees are given a raise each month they successfully meet expectations. Throughout the program participants progress at their own rate.

Personal counseling is an integral part of the training program. A full-time counselor assists the participants in areas such as attendance, work-place ethics, hygiene, child care, budgeting and long range financial planning.

After successfully performing sub-assembly work at the 21st Street Facility, the trainees are guaranteed employment at one of Cessna's two manufacturing facilities in Wichita.

**SCOPE:** The number of participants in the training program each quarter is dependent on the needs of Cessna. On average, the program trains 40 people a year. Participants are referred to the training program by SRS after they have taken CASAS and other tests. There are three potential trainees for each available position. Cessna then interviews the applicants and chooses the most motivated individuals.

**EVALUATION:** 115 welfare recipients have completed the training program. 55 are now employed at the main Cessna plants, 8 are at the 21st Street location and 11 have been placed at other aircraft industry companies. All of these jobs provide health benefits and pay an average of \$10 an hour. 21 people have been terminated during their training phase at the 21st Street facility and 20 people who have completed the training have been terminated while employed at the Cessna plants.

In addition to moving people from welfare to work, the program has given rise to a number of other programs focused upon at-risk children in the 21st area including a Cub Scout Pack, Summer Recreational Program and scholarship assistance program which offers financial assistance to high school students who achieve mutually agreed upon GPA's.

**FUNDING:** The program is a partnership with City, County, and State governments, organized labor, the Wichita school district and several other corporations. The city and county allocated funds for the renovation of an old grocery store which houses the 21st Street facility. Cessna has leased the facility. KanWork reimburses Cessna for \$150,000 a year and other costs are assumed by Cessna.

Cessna, a successful aviation company created a training program in Wichita's most economically disadvantaged area. The program hires and trains individuals that had been deemed unemployable and places them in skilled, high wage jobs which allow them to become self-sufficient.

## **PRESS REPORT**

**WICHITA EAGLE**  
**(316) 268-6000**

Circulation: 118,295 as of 1994

The Wichita Eagle, the largest paper in Kansas, has not written extensively about welfare reform on the national or state level. As of the spring of 1994, the editorial board has begun to discuss welfare reform on the state level. There is not a designated staff person at the paper who covers welfare reform issues.

### **TOPEKA CAPITAL-JOURNAL**

Circulation: 65,912 as of 1994

On April 5, 1994, the paper printed an editorial strongly supporting the welfare reform measure passed by the Kansas House and Senate. The paper believes that the plan fosters responsibility, but in an intelligent and enlightened way. The program penalizes AFDC recipients who drop out of school, eliminates the 100 hour rule, extends transitional medical benefits, and creates teen pregnancy prevention programs. It also imposes a family cap, which the paper believes is a punitive way of trying to encourage responsible parenthood. They think the Kansas welfare reform plan is good for both recipients and tax payers.

## **PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS**

### Congress

Senator Dole (R), Majority Leader, Finance Committee  
Senator Kassebaum (R), Chairperson, Labor and Human Resources

### State and Local Government

Governor Graves (R)

Phyllis Lewin, Director, Employment Preparation Services, 913\296-3742

Linda Sorrell, Director, KanWork of Wichita 316\651-5416. The Wichita KanWork program has been very effective in creating partnerships with the City and with private businesses in order to create jobs for welfare recipients

### Press

Wichita Eagle, Dave Rancy, (316) 268-6000

January 24, 1995

**LOUISIANA**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.	RANK
Population (1993)	4,395,000	257,908,000	21
Child Population (1990)	1,233,000	63,924,000	
Percent of Population that are Children (< 18)	29.2%	25.7%	
Per Capita Personal Income (1993)	\$15,713	\$19,841	
Poverty Rate			
1992	24.2%	14.5%	
1990	23.6%	13.5%	
1983	21.6%	15.3%	
1979	18.6%	11.7%	
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	5.6%	2.8%	
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	39.4%	20.8%	
Unemployment Rate (1993)	7.4%	6.8%	
FMAP	73.71%	55%	

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
FINANCIAL DATA	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$197,689,000	\$25,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$177,466,000	\$22,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 20,223,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$190	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	20.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit--Jan. 1994	\$295	\$295
Combined Benefits--Jan. 1994	\$495	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	51.0%	69.0
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	0	-1.3%
QC Error Rate (1991)	7.14%	4.96

January 24, 1995

LOUISIANA (continued)

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)

	FY 1993	
<u>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	90,019	4,981,301
Basic	88,928	4,622,000
UP	1,091	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	1.2%	7.2
Average Number in AFDC Unit	3.0	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	52.2%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1992	1.5%	27.2
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	6.0%	5.4
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1992	0.5%	34.8
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	18.17%	9.9%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	28.4%	21.3
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	3.5%	7.4
Number of JOBS Participants	7,349	341,995
Participation Rate	14.6%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$16,465,914	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$16,465,914	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	100.0%	74.6%

## LOUISIANA

## CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$103.1	\$8,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$26.8	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$76.2	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$3.19	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	22.1%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	288,552	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	14.0%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	38.5%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$2,544	\$2,855
Total Number of Paternities Established	13,272	554,205
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source:NCES)	27,694	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	47.9%	45.7%

## LOUISIANA

## FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	2,784	2,792	232,668
Total Foster Care Children	5,633	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$	28.56 (in millions)	29.6	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		1.9 (in millions)	\$60 (millions)

- a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.
- (b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

LOUISIANA

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	22,956*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$23,624	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

LOUISIANA

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$75,850	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	19,344	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	34%	38
# GRANTEES	43	1,405

January 24, 1995

LOUISIANA

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

FY 1994			
STATE		U.S.	
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
3	260,000	259	34,997,412

LOUISIANA

REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a)	OBLIGATIONS (b) \$	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c)
683	1,274,942	1,153

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993.  
CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## **STATE WELFARE POLICY**

Louisiana is not currently involved in any specific state welfare reform efforts. The state has been primarily concerned with expanding the state JOBS program, Project Independence, so as to be implemented in all 64 parishes (counties). A great deal of emphasis has been placed on linking the Department of Social Services with community-based resources, in an effort to better serve Project Independence participants. Collaborative efforts between Project Independence and community-based organizations have produced several education, training, job readiness, and child care facilities around the state.

Project Independence exceeded the federal participation rate standard, achieving a participation rate of 14.64%. Also in 1993, the percentage program expenditures on those participants defined to be potentially long-term welfare recipients has exceeded the 55% federal requirement and is as of September 30, 1993, 75%.

In the 1993 legislative session only one bill pertaining to welfare policy was signed into law, but several reform ideas, currently implemented by other states, were introduced and debated.

### **I. Legislation:**

**Parental Training for Teens:** In the 1993 session of the legislature a bill was passed requiring the state to offer parental training to first time teen parents. The training program is on a volunteer basis.

#### **Legislative Initiatives:**

**Immunization:** The Health and Welfare Committee approved a House bill which would penalize - at \$25 a welfare check for each child not vaccinated by age 6 - families that receive AFDC. It was cleared by a Senate panel. However, the legislation was not passed.

**Keeping Children in School:** A bill that could cut off welfare benefits to families that do not keep their children in school was killed in the Senate Health and Welfare Committee.

**Welfare Credit Card:** The Louisiana House passed a bill which would establish a pilot welfare credit card system by mid-1994 in which welfare recipients would use magnetic cards to redeem food stamps and AFDC benefits. The program intended to reduce fraud and errors while cutting issuance costs. It will move to the Senate in the next legislative session.

### **II. Waivers:**

Louisiana has not applied for any waivers

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *Training, Inc.*

**CONTACT:** Scott W. Howard  
Director  
504-529-2245

**LOCATION:** 333 St. Charles Avenue  
Suite 700  
New Orleans, LA 70130

Using a combination of JTPA, JOBS and private funds, Training, Inc. places equal emphasis on basic and technical skills and life management training which enable participants to move from unemployment and public assistance into the work place.

**MISSION:** To provide low-income, unemployed and underemployed people with the skills and assistance they need to find employment and gain self sufficiency. The primary objective of Training, Inc. is to help welfare recipients (many of whom come from three generations of welfare recipients) overcome their negative self-images and foster a sense of independence through constant positive reinforcement.

**SUMMARY:** Training, Inc. was started in 1975 as a project of the Institute of Cultural Affairs. There are currently seven Training, Inc.'s. around the country (Chicago, Indianapolis, Boston, Newark, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C.). Focusing on helping welfare recipients enter or return to the workplace, Training, Inc. offers a 22 week class for welfare recipients who test at a minimum of a sixth grade level of reading and math and have an interest in possessing office skills. The class focuses on developing life management skills, the ability to conduct a job search, and an understanding of corporate culture. The program teaches a combination of office skills with the interpersonal and personal subjects. Training, Inc. works closely with the business community who conducts practice job interviews and also hires many of the program's graduates. Training, Inc. does not guarantee it's clients employment, but the expectation is that each client will be job ready by the end of the five month session. All necessary services such as child care and transportation are offered through the JOBS program, Project Independence.

**SCOPE:** Training, Inc. trains 130 clients a year. It has an operating staff of seven people. Roughly 70% of the Training's clients have volunteered to be in the JOBS program.

**EVALUATION:** In six training cycles, Training, Inc. has enrolled 261 trainees, with 88% graduating, 67% of the graduates have been placed in unsubsidized permanent or long-term temporary jobs. Over 84% are still employed one year later, with 92% receiving raises and 24% receiving promotions.

**FUNDING:** Training, Inc. is a program of the YMCA of Greater New Orleans, a United Way Agency. In 1992 the program was granted additional funding from the Orleans Private Industry Council. It also receives state JOBS funds.

## *Rafael Perales and Company Microenterprise Program*

**CONTACT:** Rafael Perales  
(504) 822-0074

**LOCATION:** 2609 Canal Street  
New Orleans, LA 70119

The Perales Company operates the only microenterprise program in Louisiana. The program is committed to providing the education and training needed to assist welfare recipients to become self-sufficient through self-employment.

**MISSION:** The program was designed to serve JOBS participants who want to own their own business. Mr. Perales saw a need to move people away from dead-end jobs and give them the ability to operate their own, more profitable business.

**SUMMARY:** The program offers a 12 week business training course, a 1-2 week business internship, and a 6 month follow-up. The program provides financial counseling and technical assistance to participants. The course addresses every aspect of what is needed to start a business, such as: cost, real estate, marketing, and networking. Special efforts are made to work with various lending institutions and state agencies to gain funding and support for the microenterprises. Various professionals working in business, insurance, public relations, and law serve as the instructors. Participants are identified by Project Independence - - those who express interest in owning their own business and already have attained basic skills.

**SCOPE:** The program has the capacity to serve up to 30 participants on an annual basis. It has been in operation since September, 1993. Thus far, the program has served 15 participants.

**EVALUATION:** Of the initial 15, 4 participants have opened their own businesses; 4 participants have obtained employment, and 1 participant is seeking additional education. Examples of the enterprises that have been established are a family day care center, a beauty salon, and a catering operation.

**FUNDING:** The program is funded by Project Independence

## **PRESS REPORT**

***New Orleans Times Picayune***  
**(504) 826-3300**

**Circulation: 269,839 as of 1994**

**Key Reporter: Bruce Alpert, (504) 383-7861**

**Key Editorial Writer: Malcolm Forsythe**

**Coverage: The Picayune has not had extensive coverage on either state or national welfare reform efforts. In 1994, the Picayune did pick up a few national wire stories on welfare reform. In general, the Picayune's opinion is that reforming the welfare system is extremely complicated - caseloads are growing and recipients stay on the rolls for a long time. The paper suggests that the cost of educating and training these recipients would be enormous, but the status quo is more costly.**

**Specific recent coverage:**

**November 20, 1994, Bruce Alpert, "Welfare Reform Path May Turn to Rough Road"**

The article reports that although welfare reform is a top priority among liberals and conservatives in Congress, there is little agreement on how to fix the system. It briefly compares and contrasts the Personal Responsibility Act and the Clinton plan. Sens. Johnston and Breaux (both D-LA) were quoted in the article.

## **PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS**

### **Congress**

**Senator Breaux (D), Finance Committee**  
**Representative McCrery (R), Subcommittee on Human Resources, Ways and Means Committee**

### **Press**

**Reporter: Bruce Alpert, New Orleans Times Picayune, 504/383-7861**

**Editorial Writer: Malcolm Forsythe, New Orleans Times Picayune, 504/826-3300**

### **State Government**

**Governor Edwards, 504/342-7015**

**Carolyn Hitt, Director of Project Independence, Louisiana Department of Social Services, Office of Family Support, 504/342-2511**

### **Advocacy Community**

**Scott Howard, Director of Training, Inc., 504/529-2245**  
Training, Inc. is a model program that moves people from welfare to work

**Alma Young, Ph.D., Chairperson of Agenda for Children, College of Urban and Public Affairs, University of New Orleans, 504/586-8509**  
She recently completed a study entitled, "Poor Women, Work, Child Care: The Case of Project Independence in Louisiana"

**David Williams, New Orleans Legal Assistance, 504/529-1000**  
David was the CLASP contact in Louisiana (was not extremely helpful)

**Viola Francois Washington, 504/529-1113**  
Viola is the head of Louisiana's Welfare Rights Union



January 24, 1995

**MARYLAND**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.	Rank
Population (1993)	4,965,000	257,908,000	19
Child Population (1990)	1,168,000	63,934,000	
Percent of Population that are Children (< 18)	24.4	25.7%	
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$22,974	\$19,841	
Poverty Rate			
1992	11.6%	14.5%	
1990	9.9%	13.5%	
1983	8.6%	15.3%	
1979	9.8%	11.7%	
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	1.8%	2.8%	
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	13.4%	20.8%	
Unemployment Rate (1993)	6.2%	6.8%	
FMAP	50.0%	55%	

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

FY 1993		
<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>		
	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$380,346,000	\$25,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$316,544,000	\$22,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 63,802,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$366	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	38.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit-Jan. 1994	\$395	\$395
Combined Benefits-Jan. 1994	\$661	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	69.0%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	-2.9%	-1.3%
QC Error Rate (1991)	6.88%	4.9%

January 24, 1995

MARYLAND (continued)

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<b>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</b>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	80,199	4,981,301
Basic	79,232	4,622,000
UP	967	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	1.2%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	2.7	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	46.0%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1992	26.0%	27.1%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	4.4%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1992	25.9%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate (all persons)-FY 1992	6.99%	9.95%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	24.6%	21.3%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	4.0%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	7,457	541,995
Participation Rate	15.2%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$16,682,490	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$14,069,669	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	84.3%	74.6%

## MARYLAND

## CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$219.1	\$8,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$51.3	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$167.8	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$4.56	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	12.9%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	313,088	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	24.4%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	77.0%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$2,863	\$2,855
Total Number of Paternities Established	9,993	554,205
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source:NCHS)	24,292	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	41.1%	45.7%

## MARYLAND

## FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	3,073	3,553	232,668
Total Foster Care Children	6,446	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (b)	44.60 (in millions)	57.4 (in millions)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		760.9 (in thou)	\$60 (millions)

- (a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.
- (b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

MARYLAND

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	STATE	U.S.
Enrollment	2,507*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$10,339	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

MARYLAND

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	STATE	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$33,798	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	8,509	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	40%	38
# GRANTEES	15	1,405

MARYLAND

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

FY 1994			
STATE	U.S.		
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
1	65,000	259	34,997,412

MARYLAND

REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a)	OBLIGATIONS (b) \$	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c)
2,365	2,511,478	1,603

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## STATE WELFARE POLICY

Maryland's JOBS program is called Project Independence and is administered statewide by the individual counties.

Governor Glendenning was inaugurated on January 17, 1995. At the time of this report it is unclear what changes to the state's welfare system he may propose. Former Governor Schaefer had a Commission on Welfare Policy that released an initial report in October 1993 outlining a proposed Family Investment System. The Commission's final report was issued in June 1994. The Commission proposed that the Family Investment System should:

- Eliminate unconditional income maintenance;
- Build a transitional service system, emphasizing work, with cash incentives for education and job training;
- Make education, skills training or entry level employment a condition of continued eligibility;
- Solicit private sector participation in providing jobs;
- Emphasize the responsibility shared by both parents for their children;
- Require DHR staff to stress jobs and family self-sufficiency;
- Underscore protection of affected children during the reform process and;
- Build interagency cooperation

### Waivers pending

Governor Glendenning has not formally withdrawn the state's pending waiver application yet, however it has been reported that he does that plan to pursue this request.

The Welfare Reform Project, as it was first submitted on March 1, 1994, includes the following provisions:

o The following provisions would be implemented statewide:

- Minor custodial teen parents will be required to live with a parent, legal guardian, custodian or other caretaker relative who will be the protective payee, or in an adult supervised group living arrangement. Exceptions will be made where a social worker determines that such a living arrangement is not in the best interests of the minor parent.
- For applicants, additional cash benefits will not be made available for children born more than 10 months after the date of initial application for AFDC.<sup>1</sup> Exceptions will be made in the case of rape, incest or medically verified contraceptive failure. For recipients, this provision will become effective on the date of first redetermination after implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Maryland General Assembly did not approve elimination of increased AFDC benefits for additional children conceived while receiving AFDC. The Governor is seeking Federal approval by May 26th (the date he would have to veto legislation passed by the General Assembly), despite the legislative vote.

o The following provisions would be implemented in pilot counties:

- All able-bodied applicants will be required to participate in job search as a condition of eligibility as will able-bodied recipients at the time of redetermination. Recipients will be required to participate in job search and other appropriate education or training activities.
- Non-exempt custodial parents will be required to participate in JOBS or face sanctions. The initial sanction will be to remove the individual from the budget group for 6 months. If there is still no compliance the case is suspended for three months and if there is still no compliance the case is closed. These sanctions end immediately if the parent complies with requirements. Once a case is closed, the sanctioned parent must comply with JOBS requirements for 30 days before becoming eligible for benefits. During the 9 month sanctioning period food stamp benefits would remain constant.
- After 18 months of AFDC receipt, all able-bodied recipients not employed at least 30 hours must work in a community service job.
- Applicants judged to need only short term assistance may be offered a single payment of up to three months of benefits to meet immediate needs instead of the usual AFDC grant. Such cases will be eligible for food stamps and Medicaid for a three month period.
- The 100-hour rule, work history and 30 day unemployment requirements for AFDC-UP applicants and recipients will not be applied.
- The equity value for an automobile will be raised to \$5,000 for AFDC and Food Stamps applicants and recipients. The resource limit will be raised to \$5,000 for AFDC and Food Stamps recipients.
- Earned income of dependant children will be disregarded for purposes of the grant calculation and the 185% gross income test, unless the child is sanctioned.
- Custodial teen parents will be required to attend a family health and parenting class and continuing education as a condition of ongoing eligibility.
- Non-custodial parents who are unable to pay child support may be provided JOBS services.

**Full Employment Program:** Maryland had earlier been considering a program to move large numbers of participants into entry level, training-oriented jobs, and then into regular jobs with career potential. The program would include employer subsidies, Food Stamp cash-out, providing employment and training to non-custodial parents, and extension of some services to individuals at-risk of becoming AFDC recipients. After submitting its recent waiver application, however, it is unclear if the State still plans to develop the Full Employment Program proposal.

## Demonstration Programs

**Primary Prevention Initiative (PPI):** PPI applies fiscal sanctions to AFDC cases which do not comply with specific requirements related to preventive health care and education:

- preschool-age children must receive scheduled EPSDT services;
- school-age children and adults must receive annual preventive health check-ups;
- school-age children must attend school regularly; and
- pregnant women must receive regular prenatal visits.

Waivers for the statewide demonstration were approved on June 30, 1992 for a five-year period beginning July 1, 1992 and ending June 30, 1997.

**Self-Employment Initiative Demonstration:** Maryland, along with four other states, is currently implementing a federal Self-Employment Initiative Demonstration to test the entrepreneurship concept for AFDC recipients. The voluntary program offers small business loans to start micro-businesses and business skills training in finance, marketing, and management. Participants receive technical consultation and evaluations from an economic development service provider while completing a 27-month program. The first three months involve preparation of a detailed business plan, marketing survey, and cash flow projections for the businesses; and training in accounting and money management skills. Actual business operation comprises the remaining 24 months. The demonstrations are four-year programs with waivers for statewideness and income and resources. The program began in Maryland in October 1990.

**Comprehensive Services Delivery for JOBS Teen Parents:** Maryland is one of thirteen states participating in this demonstration program. Through this program, the local JOBS program establishes linkages with appropriate services providers and enrolls non-exempt teen parents in the JOBS program and provides comprehensive services to the teens and to their children. The demonstration began in September 1992 and is scheduled to continue through September 1994.

**Maryland's Family Planning Medicaid Demonstration:** In the near future, the Department plans to announce approval of Maryland's "Demonstration Project for Family Planning and Preventive Reproductive Services." This project will extend Medicaid eligibility for family planning and preventive reproductive services to women who are on Medicaid solely due to their pregnancy and would otherwise lose their eligibility. The estimated 11,500 participating women will receive these services for a 5-year period. Maryland expects to generate Medicaid savings by reducing the number of unintended births and improving the health status of the participants.

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *Family Partnership of Frederick County*

**CONTACT:** Margaret Nusbaum Radtke,  
Director  
301/846-2206

**LOCATION:** 7630-B Hayward Road  
Frederick, MD 21702

**MISSION:** to coordinate services in a way that guides entire families to becoming stable, functioning and self-sufficient by emphasizing the families' strengths.

The Family Partnership program is very unique in its strong community partnerships that have helped it to provide a range of child care, education, case management, and employability services to clients in one location. It is a model for reinventing government assistance and changing the culture of welfare offices.

**SUMMARY:** The Family Partnership was formed in 1991 by partnerships with several local agencies and private organizations (Job Training Agency, Adult Education Department, HeadStart, Department of Social Services, Health Department, the IBM Corporation and the Community Foundation of Frederick County). The Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development, Department of Human Resources and the Office for Children, Youth and Families have been active players in the funding and program direction of the Center. The Family Partnership through these partnerships has "fit the system to the families."

At the Family Partnership's Resource Center, early childhood development, family literacy, and employability services are integrated and managed at one location to provide comprehensive accelerated opportunities for families. All programs build on existing strengths within each family.

The Center serves families regardless of where they live. On average, over 75 adults and children frequent the Center on a daily basis. Seventeen three and four year olds are enrolled in a year-round Extended HeadStart Classroom/Wrap Around Child Care for five days per week while their parents are engaged in some type of employability or literacy activities. Adults at the Center enroll to gain marketable job-related skills and educational skills.

The Center's strong community partnerships have really helped its development. For instance, the County government and Board of Education has provided the free facility space, as well as in-kind maintenance, custodial and budget/accounting services. Local groups such as the Private Industry Council, Economic and Community Development Commission, Department of Social Services Board, the Transportation Council and the Chamber of Commerce collectively approached the City and County governments requesting an extension of a City bus route to serve the Center. Both governments agreed to fund the expansion. Through an IBM Corporation and the Community Foundation loan agreement, a thirty station computer-lab was provided to the Center. IBM maintains the equipment and assists with ongoing supplies needs.

**RESULTS:** Since the Center opened its doors in 1991, over 300 families have been served. Over 100 have actively brought their children to the Center for the family-directed services. Over 150 adults have found employment and 30 adults have obtained their GEDs.

**FUNDING:** The Center is funded through a variety of sources, including JTPA, Project Independence, County funds, Child Care Development Block Grants, and others.

## ***Project Success***

**CONTACT:** Ana Palmer, Exec. Asst. to the Director  
Mayor's Office of Employment Development  
410/396-1910

**LOCATION:** 100 West 23rd Street  
Baltimore, MD

**MISSION:** to serve AFDC clients through a "one-stop shopping" approach by which they receive social services in the same location as employment training services; to facilitate a more organized and easier method of moving AFDC recipients into the workforce and toward self-sufficiency.

Baltimore's Project Success is an interesting model for changing the culture of the welfare system. Although it does not have any evaluation results yet, it is a creative approach to providing both social services and employment and training under one roof and with one case manager.

**SUMMARY:** Project Success is a Baltimore initiative that conducts all aspects of Maryland's Project Independence, including recruitment, registration, assessment, barrier removal, case management and referrals to training. A unique feature of the program is that the case managers assume both the responsibilities of the Department of Social Services Intensive Case Manager and the Office of Employment Development Case Manager. The client, therefore, has the opportunity to have more of his or her services met by one person and under one roof.

On-site services include:

- a 120 slot work experience component
- an adult literacy program
- a client resource lab
- client follow-up
- conciliation/sanctioning
- referrals to job placement opportunities

The Employability/Skills Development component of Project Success prepares clients to take advantage of either training work experience or direct job placement opportunities. This segment is comprised of two tracks: Workshop Delivery (Employability) and Adult Literacy/Resource Laboratory (Skills Development). The Resource Lab provides skills brush-ups, an automated library of local resources, and activities for clients awaiting enrollment into training or employment. Clients may use the Lab to enhance basic skills, develop resumes, conduct independent job search and prepare for enrollment into a more structured activity.

**SCOPE/RESULTS:** Project Success feeds from four different area agencies. It receives approximately 120 participants per month. The program began in January 1993. An inside evaluation is being conducted to be completed sometime in the next several months.

## ***Teen Parent Demonstration Project***

**CONTACT:** Ana Palmer, Executive Assistant to the Director  
Mayor's Office of Employment Development  
410/396-1910

**LOCATION:** Sandtown Community Center  
1114 N. Mount Street  
Baltimore, MD

**GOALS:** 1) to assist teen parents receiving AFDC to develop their skills so that they can become both successful parents and providers; and 2) to place the teen parents in an unsubsidized job which results in a partial or total elimination of the cash welfare payment.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Employment Development and the Family Investment Center operate a Teen Parent Demonstration Project with a forty-five slot allocation. The project is overseen by the Governor's Work Force Investment Board in consultation with the Department of Human Resources. The program began in November 1993 and is scheduled to run for 15 months.

The project's objective is to provide -- at a single facility -- a casemanaged and intensive service system that includes support, child care, education, training and parent/child developmental services to teen parents who are receiving AFDC. The services that are provided include:

- Intake and assessment
- Family services coordination/brokering
- Mandatory access to preventive and therapeutic health services and substance abuse services
- Educational services
- Intake and enrollment for all employability development services
- Child development/parenting services
- Housing counseling
- Case management
- Support groups among families enrolled
- Parent/child activities that improve interaction and understanding
- Social and recreational activities that build community and family strength
- Follow-up; weekly contact with the teen and quarterly home visits

**RESULTS:** An evaluation will be conducted by the State of Maryland. Currently approximately 28 teens are enrolled in the program. Preliminary results are not yet available.

Baltimore's Teen Parent Demonstration Project is a creative program aimed at serving teen parents receiving AFDC through a one-stop shopping approach operating on a community level. Although the program is relatively new and has started with a small number of participants, it could prove to be an effective approach to reaching at-risk teen parents.

# ***The Step-Up Apprenticeship Program***

**CONTACT:** Dr. Samuel B. Little, Director  
410/396-1229

**LOCATION:** Housing Authority of Baltimore  
City  
410 E. Lexington Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Step-Up is a national initiative that works creatively with unions to train public housing residents for manual labor jobs working on the public housing sites. It is a model program for coordination of services and agencies and for employment training and placement.

**MISSION:** to assist residents of public housing developments in becoming employable and self-sufficient by providing meaningful job training in construction trades, combined with attractive wages, educational resources and support services.

**SUMMARY:** The Step-Up Program of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (HABC) is a national initiative created by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as a component of the National Apprenticeship and Training Standards, sponsored by the National Association of Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO), and approved by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. The national program began in Chicago and started in Baltimore in January 1994.

Step-Up is a creative program that trains residents to become union apprentices and offers them jobs with high wages working to redevelop the public housing community. During a year-long intensive training cycle, participants receive a minimum of 144 hours of classroom instruction taught by union craftsmen in eleven trades. The trades include carpentry, electricity, bricklaying, painting, hazardous waste removal, cement masonry, roofing, sheet metal work, sprinkler fitting, steamfitting and plumbing. Additionally, the Baltimore City Community College conducts courses in remedial education ranging from pre-GED classes in reading, writing and math to job skills enhancement workshops, as well as seminars on employee self-esteem and understanding cultural differences.

Public housing developments or low-income housing projects undergoing comprehensive modernization or new construction serve as work sites. Other work sites may include federally-assisted public or private construction projects in the metropolitan area.

**GUARANTEED JOBS:** Participants who successfully complete the requirements of the Step-Up program are guaranteed employment and entry into a traditional union sponsored apprenticeship program provided that they possess a GED or high school diploma and remain drug free.

**DECENT WAGES:** During the Pre-Employment Orientation and Pre-Construction Training phases of the program, participants receive a weekly stipend of \$50.00 paid by the Office of Employment Development. However, a progressive wage scale is offered during the Pre-Apprenticeship Training phase starting with \$6.75 hourly and increasing to \$11.75 by the ninth month provided that satisfactory performance is maintained. For participants who receive AFDC, their AFDC cash grant is diverted for nine months to the HABC in order to help pay for training costs. Participants, however, do receive an hourly wage and continue to receive medical and child care assistance.

Upon completing all training requirements, participants will be employed by HABC full-time to complete emergency repairs and to perform other construction-related jobs at developments undergoing comprehensive modernization.

**SCOPE:** The Baltimore Step-Up program began in January 1994 and currently has 72 residents training as apprentices. Approximately 75 percent of these trainees are welfare recipients.

## **PRESS REPORT**

***Baltimore Sun:*** 410/332-6000

Circulation: 347,008 as of 1994

Key reporters:

Local stories:                      Laura Lippman

No one in particular is covering welfare reform on a national level; our contact would be Fred Monyak, the Assignment Editor at the Washington Office, 202/452-8250

Key editorial writer:              Sara Engram

Coverage:    The paper's coverage has been fairly liberal and seems to favor giving recipients incentives rather than punitive measures. Recently the Sun has been profiling people who are on the welfare system. The paper supported the state General Assembly's welfare reform bill that was passed in May, 1994 and at the time, urged Governor Schaefer to sign it. The Sun has been critical of the family cap provision.

## **PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS**

### Congress

**Senator Barbara Mikulski (D), Labor and Human Resources**  
**Rep. Benjamin Cardin (D), Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources**

### State/Local Government

**Governor Glendenning, 410/974-3901**  
**Charlene Gallion, Director, Office of Project Independence Management, 410/333-0837**  
**Carolyn Colvin, Human Resources Secretary, 410/333-0017**  
**Katherine Cook, Director, Office of Policy Administration,**  
**Primary Prevention Initiative, 410/333-0700**  
**Delegate Richard Rynd (D-Baltimore Co.), introduced a family cap bill in Feb. 1993.**  
**House Speaker R. Clayton Mitchell, endorsed the family cap bill.**  
**Benjamin Civiletti, Chairman, Maryland Welfare Committee (Governor's task force)**  
**Mayor Schmoke, Baltimore, Linda Harris is a contact in his Office of Employment Development,**  
**410/396-1910**

Note: As of this report, we are not aware of the staff changes that newly inaugurated Governor Glendenning may impose.

### Advocacy Community

**Linda Eisenberg, Executive Director, Maryland Food Committee, 410/366-3963**  
**Michael Conte, Economist, University of Baltimore**  
**Lynda Meade, Welfare Advocates, 410/547-5538**

### Press

**Sara Engram, editorial writer, Baltimore Sun, 410/332-6000**  
**Fred Monyak, assignment editor, Washington office, Baltimore Sun, 202/452-8250**

January 24, 1995

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

	STATE	U.S.	RANK
Population (1993)	6,012,000	257,908,000	13
Child Population (1990)	1,361,000	63,924,000	
Percent of Population that are Children (<18)	22.6%	25.7%	
Per Capita Personal Income (1992)	\$24,059	\$19,841	
Poverty Rate			
1992	10.0%	14.5%	
1990	10.7%	13.5%	
1983	7.7%	15.2%	
1979	9.6%	11.7%	
% Point Change in Rate (1979-1992)	0.4%	2.8%	
Child Poverty Rate (1993) 5 to 17 years old	16.4%	20.8%	
Unemployment Rate (1993)	6.9%	6.8%	
FMAP	50.0%	55%	

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<u>FINANCIAL DATA</u>	STATE	U.S.
Total AFDC Expenditures	\$816,996,000	\$25,372,883,000
Benefit Payments	\$750,300,000	\$22,553,082,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$66,696,000	\$ 2,819,801,000
AFDC Grant (Mother-3 children-0 income)	\$579	\$365
AFDC Benefits as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	60.0%	38.0%
Food Stamp Benefit--Jan. 1994	\$223	\$295
Combined Benefits--Jan. 1994	\$801	\$661
Combined as % of 1993 Poverty Threshold	83.0%	69%
% Change in AFDC Benefits Since 1992	7.4%	-1.6%
QC Error Rate (1991)	3.99%	4.96%

January 24, 1995

MASSACHUSETTS (continued)

**AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)**

	FY 1993	
<u>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u>	STATE	U.S.
Average Monthly Caseload	114,441	4,981,301
Basic	107,916	4,622,000
UP	6,525	359,000
UP as % of Caseload	5.7%	7.2%
Average Number in AFDC Unit	2.8	2.9
% Caseload on More Than 2 Years	46.1%	46.5%
% Change in Caseload FY 1988-1992	28.5%	27.2%
AFDC Reciprocity Rate	5.3%	5.4%
% Change in AFDC Reciprocity FY 1988-1992	32.0%	24.8%
Food Stamp Reciprocity Rate-FY 1992	7.15%	9.95%
% AFDC Cases Receiving Housing Subsidies	41.5%	23.0%
% AFDC Cases With Earned Income	4.0%	7.4%
Number of JOBS Participants	18,011	541,995
Participation Rate	16.2%	17.0%
UP Participation Rate	N/A	N/A
JOBS Allocation	\$24,364,561	\$1,000,000,000
Grant Amount (Preliminary Data)	\$21,104,422	\$ 746,195,829
% of Allocation	86.6%	74.6%

MASSACHUSETTS

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

	STATE	U.S.
	FY 93	FY 93
<b>Collections and Expenditures</b>		
Total Collections (in millions)	\$195.4	\$8,907.3
AFDC/FC Collections (in millions)	\$77.3	\$2,416.3
NAFDC Collections (in millions)	\$118.1	\$6,491.1
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Total Admin. Expend.	\$4.30	\$3.97
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1992	5.6%	11.8%
Total IV-D Caseload	214,616	17,110,468
Percent of IV-D Cases with Collections	20.6%	18.2%
Percent of IV-D Cases with Orders	68.4%	55.4%
Average Collection from Cases with Collections	\$4,413	\$2,855
Total Number of Paternities Established	6,234	554,205
Out-of-Wedlock Births-1991 (Source:NCHS)	22,873	1,213,769
Percent of Paternities to Out-of-Wedlock Births	27.3%	45.7%

MASSACHUSETTS

FOSTER CARE

	FY 1993	FY 1994	U.S.
# Title IV-E Foster Care Children (a)	7,904	12,223	232,668
Total Foster Care Children	13,395	Not Available	444,000
Title IV-E Foster Care \$ (b) (in millions)	57.40	\$4.1 (in millions)	2.5 (billions)
Title IV-B FP/FS Services in \$		960.8 (in thousands)	\$ 60 (millions)

- (a) The number of children represents a simple average of four (4) quarters which the States submit with their claims for reimbursement.
- (b) The numbers (IV-E Foster Care \$) represent the raw (unadjusted) claims, submitted by the States, for reimbursement by the Federal government. These costs are a proportion of the amount which States pay out in order to support a child in foster care.

MASSACHUSETTS

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CCDBG)

	FY 1993	
	State	U.S.
Enrollment	2,117*	755,000*
\$ Grant (in thousands)	\$11,130	\$797,290

\* These data should be viewed in light of the fact that States have considerable latitude in spending their CCDBG funds (e.g., they may concentrate their funds on relatively fewer children and families, spread their funds to serve more children and families and/or blend Federal funding streams). Additionally, States have three years in which to expend their CCDBG funds.

MASSACHUSETTS

HEAD START

	FY 1994	
	State	U.S.
FUNDING (in thousands)	\$57,249	\$3,325,728
ENROLLMENT	10,794	740,465
% ELIGIBLE	36	38
# GRANTEES	31	1,405

January 24, 1995

MASSACHUSETTS

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM

FY 1994			
STATE	U.S.		
NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED	NO. OF GRANTS	\$ AWARDED
0	0	259	34,997,412

MASSACHUSETTS

REFUGEE AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

FY 1993		
ARRIVALS (a)	OBLIGATIONS (b) \$	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (c)
3,534	9,163,403	2,492

- a/ Includes refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants.
- b/ Includes (1) Social Services formula allocation, (2) Targeted Assistance formula allocation, and (3) Cash/Medical/Administration (CMA) funding for FY 1993. CMA includes Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses.
- c/ Includes all refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants enrolled in ORR-funded employment services in FY 1993.

## **STATE WELFARE POLICY**

Massachusetts' JOBS program is called MassJOBS and currently operates without any federal waivers. However, on March 22, 1994 Governor Weld applied for federal waivers for his welfare reform program.

The Governor's plan would include the following measures:

- End cash assistance to most AFDC families after 24 months on AFDC, requiring recipients who could not find jobs to do community service and job search to earn a "subsidy";
- Provide direct distribution of child support collections to, and cash-out Food Stamps for, those who obtain jobs;
- Require teen parents on AFDC to live with a guardian and attend school;
- Continue child care for working families as long as they are income-eligible (but require sliding scale co-payment); and
- Extend transitional Medicaid for a total of 24 months.

On March 21, 1994, however, State Senate Chair Therese Murray and State House Chair Paul Kollios wrote Secretary Shalala, telling her that the Massachusetts Legislature is making progress toward the passage of a comprehensive welfare reform bill that could pass this Spring. The legislators asked that the Secretary delay consideration of the Governor's waiver request until the bill is enacted.

On January 11, 1995, Governor Weld introduced a new welfare reform proposal that focuses on work and targets deadbeat fathers. The plan is similar to the one the State Legislature rejected last year. The specific provisions include:

- All able-bodied recipients of AFDC must go to work within 60 days in exchange for day care and health care benefits. Recipients who cannot find a private sector job would be required to do at least 25 hours of community service. There would be limited exemptions for recipients who are disabled or are caring for a disabled family member.
- Those able-bodied recipients who cannot find private sector jobs would be ineligible to receive welfare beyond two years unless the welfare commissioner grants an extension.
- Community service work would be mandated for absent parents who refuse to pay child support. Recipients must identify the fathers of their children before receiving benefits.
- There would be state funded child care for those who meet income guidelines.

- Recipients would not be paid extra benefits if they have additional children.
- Teenage mothers would be required to live at home or in a state-run group home in order to receive benefits.
- State subsidized health insurance would be provided to recipients for two years after they leave the welfare rolls.
- Anti-fraud measures would be implemented, including finger-printing new recipients.
- The rental portion of welfare payments would be sent directly to recipients' landlords.

Governor Weld last summer approved funding to cover the state's share of AFDC through February 28, in order to try to move the Legislature to pass his welfare reform package. The state's House Ways and Means Committee will most likely take up the Governor's new proposal early in February, as to meet this cut-off deadline. On January 11, the Massachusetts Welfare Department began sending out notices to the state's 104,000 recipients warning that "your first check in February will be the last check you will receive" unless legislation is enacted extending the benefits.

#### Other Waiver Applications

*Massachusetts Child Care Co-Payment Project:* would require MassJOBS participants to pay a co-payment for child care. The maximum contribution that an AFDC family with no other income would be required to make is \$2.00 per week. The application was submitted on January 14, 1993. The application was denied on September 15, 1994.

The State is also considering applying for waivers to implement the following proposals: eliminate face-to-face redetermination for least error-prone cases; not increase Food Stamp benefits for sanctioned AFDC recipients; and increase automobile asset limit.

## Demonstration Programs

***Parents' Fair Share:*** The Massachusetts Parents' Fair Share program provides a broad range of services to non-custodial parents to enable them to find employment and pay child support on a regular basis. 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. MDRC is conducting an impact evaluation to be completed in 1996.

***Comprehensive Services Delivery for JOBS Teen Parents:*** Massachusetts is one of thirteen states participating in this demonstration program. Through this program, the local JOBS program establishes linkages with appropriate services providers and enrolls non-exempt teen parents in the JOBS program and provides comprehensive services to the teens and to their children. The demonstration began in September 1992 and is scheduled to continue through September 1994.

## MODEL PROGRAMS

### *YMCA of Greater Boston's Training, Inc.*

**CONTACT:** Linda Swardlick Smith, Executive Director  
617/542-1800

**LOCATION:** 294 Washington Street  
Boston, MA 02108

**MISSION:** to help people from economically (and educationally) disadvantaged backgrounds obtain jobs and a better future for themselves and their families.

**SUMMARY:** The YMCA of Greater Boston's Training, Inc. program was established in 1984. It is one of seven Training, Inc. sites located in major cities across the U.S. The Boston program has been recognized for its success in placing participants in employment and for developing partnerships with the private sector.

The Boston Training, Inc. offers a Computerized Office Skills training program with an intensive Job Search component. The Computerized Office Skills program is taught hands-on, in a business setting, to provide as much "real" office experience during training as possible. Trainees are encouraged to learn at their own pace with the goal of skill proficiency sufficient to secure a full time job. While technical skills are stressed, communication skills, problem solving skills, conflict resolution, dependability and professional image also occupy a large part of the curriculum.

The program lasts approximately 18 weeks. This includes an unpaid internship which extends beyond the graduation date if needed, and each individual works closely with Training, Inc. until job placement.

Trainees spend the first 11 weeks learning or expanding basic office skills such as typing, receptionist skills, filing, bookkeeping, 10-key calculator, word processing, electronic spreadsheets, data entry, and business communication. Remedial reading, writing and math skills (varying with level of need) are part of the program for all trainees.

Weeks 12-18 are spent preparing for the job search and a skills concentration in one or two areas. Some trainees choose word processing, others bookkeeping, others customer service/data entry. During this period all trainees produce a resume and build their interviewing/job hunting skills. A formal graduation ceremony/business luncheon is held three times each year.

The final program period is spent in a part-time, unpaid internship and job seeking. Training, Inc. continues to provide additional internship placements, skills refinement and job search counseling until each participant is in a full time job. Full time job placement is the required outcome of each trainee's program.

**BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT:** One hundred volunteers from the business community, including graduates, are key participants in the success of the program. A Board of Advisors meets three times each year to plan and evaluate programming, fund raising and fiscal planning. Committees on Curriculum, Employer Relations, and Strategic Planning meet monthly to plan ways to keep Training, Inc. current with the work place, expand the employer network, and raise money to maintain and expand programs. Volunteers participate as weekly trainers, guest trainers, workshop leaders, "Career Day" and Job Fair participants, practice interviewers and tutors.

**RESULTS:** The YMCA of Greater Boston's Training, Inc. program has graduated over 1,500 individuals who have been placed in jobs with good wages, benefits and growth potential.

**FUNDING:** Training, Inc. is funded through a variety of both public and private sources.

The YMCA of Greater Boston runs one of seven nationwide Training, Inc. programs. The program is a model welfare to work training and placement program that works closely with the private sector to ensure that its participants will qualify for full time jobs.

## ***National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE) - New England***

**CONTACT:** Julie Silard, Director  
NFTE-New England  
617/731-4171  
Lou Sussan, Executive Director  
NFTE National  
212/233-1777

**LOCATION:** 50 Longwood Avenue  
Brookline, MA 02146

NFTE is an innovative program for teaching business skills to high school students. Because it teaches tools for self-sufficiency, it is one model for preventing welfare dependency among at-risk youth.

**MISSION:** to offer youngsters a different vision and a way to attain business goals, thereby providing a sound alternative to an actual or potential life of crime or welfare dependency.

**SUMMARY:** The National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship to Handicapped and Disadvantaged Youth, Inc. (NFTE) is a national New York-based nonprofit founded by Steve Mariotti in 1987 to teach at-risk (economically and physically challenged) youth (in grades 6-12 and up to 24 years old) entrepreneurial skills.

Since its founding in 1987, NFTE has taught nearly 5,000 youth the basics of entrepreneurship. Many of the participants have arrest records, are residents of halfway houses or come from high crime communities. Approximately 90 percent of NFTE's students lead lives of dependence. NFTE's program provides a productive alternative. NFTE's program builds a sense of identity, dignity, self-esteem and emotional and psychological well-being in each of its students by helping each youth build a sole proprietorship around an individual interest and comparative advantage.

NFTE trained community workers, business executive volunteers, MBA candidates, public, private and board of education teachers, as well as NFTE staff, teach 80-hour "simplified MBA" entrepreneurship courses in classrooms during and after school, in settlement houses and in local youth service agencies. These volunteers and staff teach basic educational skills including reading, writing, math and public speaking through entrepreneurship education. NFTE also provides opportunities for employment or self-employment through job readiness/entrepreneurship training and the provision of seed capital.

Massachusetts has NFTE program sites in New Bedford and Brockton and recently expanded into Boston with a site in Roxbury. About 250 Massachusetts youth have completed the NFTE program.

**RESULTS:** NFTE in Massachusetts conducted a survey last year of its 1992 participants. One year after completing the program, 32 percent of the clients were still running their own businesses; 95 percent were still in school; and 100 percent had plans to attend college. Andy Hahn from Brandeis' Heller School of Social Research is currently conducting an outside evaluation of the NFTE program.

**FUNDING:** NFTE is funded primarily through private sources (95 percent). Nationally, organizations such as Koch Industries and The Coleman Foundation have funded the program's expansion into different regions. The Massachusetts program is funded largely through grants from companies such as Inc. Magazine, Polaroid, The Island Foundation, GTE and Nynex. The Massachusetts program receives some government money for a summer jobs program, as well as some Brockton PIC and JTPA funds. It is looking for more funding sources.

## *Comprehensive School Age Parenting Program*

**CONTACT:** Bette Bohlke O'Gara  
Executive Director  
617/524-4951

**LOCATION:** The English High School  
144 McBride St.  
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

**MISSION:** to serve young women, young men and their families while giving daily encouragement and support for completion of school, the program's primary goal.

**CSAPP is an innovative and very successful program that works with pregnant and parenting teens in an effort to encourage high school graduation and self-sufficiency. CSAPP also works with younger school-aged children through its widespread and well-collaborated prevention campaign.**

**SUMMARY:** The Comprehensive School-Age Parenting Program, Inc. (CSAPP) in Boston, MA was founded as a collaborative effort to serve the needs of pregnant and parenting teens. Personnel from a local hospital, day care center, high school and counseling center provided services to lower the risks associated with teen pregnancy: low birth weight, prematurity, toxemia, school dropout, poor family relations and welfare dependency. When begun in 1978, CSAPP was a single site program which graduated 56 percent of its clientele. CSAPP is now located at six sites within the Boston Public School Department and graduates 90 percent of its clientele.

The high school sites provide counseling, information, referral, case management and outreach services to 200 pregnant and parenting teens each year. At the program's two middle school sites, over 400 youths participate in life skills seminars and long-term groups which facilitate young people's understanding of their bodies, peer group communications and exposure to life options. At Boston's only school for the deaf, CSAPP provides support services for pregnant and parenting teens and human growth and development education for middle school and high school students. CSAPP is committed to providing services, building a teen's self esteem and expanding a teen's sense of his or her capabilities, within the school setting and throughout the summer.

**COLLABORATIONS:** Specialized collaborations include a subcontract with Family Day Care, Inc. for provision of licensed family day care for infants, toddlers and preschoolers; summer employment programs with ABCD Summerworks (Boston's antipoverty agency) and the Private Industry Council; extensive collaboration with Boston's system of health centers and hospitals; joint programming with Boston's Children's Museum, Science Museum and Computer Museum; and production of a series of videotapes which address issues of prevention, a product of extensive collaboration with Cablevision. CSAPP also collaborates with a number of school based services including a day care center sponsored by the local YMCA.

**FUNDING:** Starting as a medical model based out of a local hospital and currently an educational model based in local schools, CSAPP's funding sources have changed as the program has evolved. Originally funded by the March of Dimes, Department of Public Health and local foundations, CSAPP now receives funding from fifteen different sources to support its budget of \$500,000. All space is provided by the Boston Public School Department. In addition to space, CSAPP receives \$100,000 - \$150,000 in in kind services annually. It is funded by the state, the city, private foundations, corporations and most recently has become part of Boston's Healthy Start Initiative with receipt of \$138,000 from the federal government for this fiscal year.

## **PRESS REPORT**

***The Boston Globe:*** 617/929-2000

Circulation: 508,867 as of 1994

National rank: 11th out of top 100

Key reporters: Jill Zuekeman from the Washington bureau, 202/857-5050  
Theresa Hanafin, City Editor, 617/929-2000  
Don Aucoin  
Scott Lehigh

Key editorial writer: Larry Harmon

Coverage: The Globe has had much coverage of welfare reform, especially of state measures including Governor Weld's reform proposals. The editorial board has come out against the Governor's proposal. The paper has also accused the Governor of taking a tough stand on welfare reform merely for political gain. Its position has been fairly liberal, although they have made an argument in favor of the family cap. They fear that jobs will not be available for recipients who are forced to work. The news coverage is usually very compassionate toward the recipients, and almost always includes recipients' personal stories.

***The Boston Herald:*** 617/426-3000

Circulation: 330,614

Key reporter: No one in particular; our news contact would be Dan Rosenfeld.

Key editorial writer: No one in particular; our contact would be Shelly Cohen, editorial page editor.

Coverage: The coverage has focused largely on state reform efforts and has been somewhat conservative. The editorial board has endorsed Gov. Weld's family cap proposal, and has challenged Speaker Flaherty's liberal views on welfare reform. Recent editorials have been in support of Governor Weld's 1995 welfare reform plan and advocated for a quick passage.

**Worcester Telegram & Gazette: 508/793-9100**

**Circulation: 115, 129**

**Key reporter: Brian McNiff**

**Key editorial writer: No one in particular; our contact would be Robert Nemeth, editorial page editor.**

**Coverage: The paper has had much coverage of state reform efforts. The editorial board has taken somewhat conservative stands on welfare reform. It clearly supports Governor Weld's welfare reform program, with time limits, work requirements, and measures requiring teen parents to live at home and attend school. The news coverage often includes interviews with clients who support the Governor's program.**

## **PRIMARY STATE CONTACTS**

### **Congress**

**Senator Kennedy (D), Ranking Minority, Labor and Human Resources Committee**  
**Representative Neal (D), Ways and Means Committee**

### **State and Local Government**

**Governor Weld, 617/727-3600**

**Joseph Gallant, Commissioner, MA Department of Public Welfare**

**John Buonomo, Director, MassJOBS program, 617/348-5930**

**Sen. Richard Tisei (R-Wakefield) and Rep. Kevin O'Sullivan (D-Worcester) filed an amendment for the Fresh Start work requirement program in 1993 - passed the House in May 1993.**

**St. Sen. Therese Murray (D-Plymouth) chairs a Senate Ways and Means Subcommittee that forwarded the Senate welfare reform bill that rivals Weld's proposal and the House democrats' proposal.**

**House Speaker Charles Flaherty: led a coalition of House democrats to draft a very liberal bill with the support of the Coalition of Basic Human Needs; the bill would extend transitional child care and Medicaid to three years.**

**Sen. John O'Brien (D-Andover): helped push the time-limit provision through the Senate.**

**Rep. Paul Kollios (D-Millburg): co-chair of the Joint Committee on Human Services that rejected the two-year time limit provision in the Senate bill.**

### **Advocacy Community**

**Dellamarie Morrison, welfare recipient and board president of the Coalition for Basic Human Needs, a welfare rights organization**

**Deborah Weinstein, executive director, Massachusetts Human Services Coalition, a powerful state lobbying group**

**Robert Coard, executive director, Action for Boston Community Development**

**Steve Savner, Massachusetts Law Reform Institute, in 1992 challenged the State in a suit claiming that the State had to provide money for child care for about 1,200 welfare recipients involved in the federal JOBS program who were on waiting lists for child care; the Governor had cut child care funding by 10 percent in his fiscal 1993 budget, 617/742-9250**

**Rev. Diane Kessler, executive director, Massachusetts Council of Churches**

**Joan Tighe, executive director, Alliance for Young Families, 617/482-9122**

### **Press**

**Larry Harmon, editorial writer, Boston Globe, 617/929-2000**

**Shelly Cohen, editorial page editor, Boston Herald, 617/426-3000**

**Robert Nemeth, editorial page editor, Worcester Telegram and Gazette, 508/793-9100**

**Jill Zuekeman, Washington bureau, Boston Globe, 202/857-5050**

**Theresa Hanafin, city editor, Boston Globe, 617/929-2000**

**Dan Rosenfeld, reporter, Boston Herald, 617/426-3000**

**Brian McNiff, reporter, Worcester Telegram and Gazette, 508/793-9100**