DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 210 CE 080 666

AUTHOR	Relave, Nanette
TITLE	Collaboration between the Welfare and Workforce Development Systems.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Information Network, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, NY.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.; Woods Fund of Chicago, IL.; McKnight Foundation, Minneapolis, MN.; Administration for Children and Families (DHHS), Washington, DC.; Department of Labor, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2000-02-00
NOTE	14p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.welfareinfo.org/workforcecollab.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses (070)
JOURNAL CIT	Issue Notes; v4 n2 Feb 2000
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Agency Cooperation; Basic Skills; Cooperative Planning; Coordination; *Delivery Systems; Employment Qualifications; Federal Legislation; Guidelines; Job Skills; Job Training; *Labor Force Development; *Partnerships in Education; *Public Agencies; Public Policy; Services; Social Science Research; Social Support Groups; Systems Approach; World Wide Web
IDENTIFIERS	*Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; *Welfare Reform; Welfare to Work Programs; Workforce Investment Act 1998

ABSTRACT

This document examines selected issues related to collaboration between the welfare and work force development systems under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, Welfare-to-Work grant program, and Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA). The document begins with a brief overview of how recent policy developments have created new opportunities for state and local agencies to revisit how they administer and deliver employment-related and support services for TANF recipients. Section 2 discusses the following policy and program issues: (1) ways federal legislation have affected collaboration between the welfare and work force systems; (2) ways available funds can be used to provide coordinated or integrated services; (3) ways collaboration can benefit welfare and work force development agencies and clients; (4) challenges facing welfare and work force development agencies attempting to collaborate; and (5) factors and activities facilitating collaboration between welfare and work force development agencies. Section 3 reviews the findings of research on interagency collaboration under the TANF program, Welfare-to-Work grant program, and WIA. Section 4 profiles innovative models for integrating and coordinating welfare and work force development systems in four states and two counties. The bibliography lists 9 resource contacts and 13 publications. (MN)

Collaboration Between the Welfare and Workforce Development Systems

Welfare Information Network

Issue Notes

Volume 4, no. 2 February 2000

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK **Issue Notes**

Vol. 4, No. 2 February 2000

COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE WELFARE AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS

by Nanette Relave

The history of collaboration between the welfare and workforce development systems is varied and complex. Workforce agencies provided, to varying degrees, employment-related services to welfare recipients under the Work Incentive program (WIN) and, subsequently, under the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training program (JOBS). However, the core functions of the welfare and workforce development systems under WIN and JOBS were seen as distinct. Each system had sufficient resources to build its own service delivery system and administrative bureaucracy with different funding streams, legislative requirements, and performance expectations. With the advent of welfare reform, the core functions of the two systems have become less distinct. Both systems view their client pools as prospective and current workers and both are mandated to help individuals enter the workforce. The new reform environment, along with their historical interaction, shapes the current context for collaboration between the welfare and workforce development systems.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant program. TANF gives states significant flexibility to design services for low-income families but places new emphasis on moving welfare recipients into the workforce. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 authorized the Welfare-to-Work (WtW) grant program to fund employment-related services for hard-to-serve welfare clients. The Welfare-to-Work Amendments of 1999 will give grantees greater flexibility in serving this population. Although WtW is administered through the workforce system, implementing this program requires coordination between welfare and workforce agencies. The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA), which will be implemented in all states by July 2000, aims to create a more coordinated and responsive workforce development system through the one-stop service center approach. WIA also emphasizes workforce attachment. Under all of these reform efforts, welfare and workforce systems are focusing on work and serving low-income families, hard-to-serve clients, and employers.

Recent policy developments create new opportunities for state and local agencies to revisit how they administer and deliver employment-related and support services for welfare clients. With the greater flexibility, many agencies are developing new ways to coordinate or integrate services and systems. Collaboration between welfare and workforce development systems is an evolving process as reforms unfold and agencies respond to changing dynamics.

This *Issue Note* presents some of the issues related to collaboration between welfare and workforce systems under TANF, WtW, and WIA for state and local agencies interested in collaboration. It also profiles state and local collaboration initiatives. For further information, see the WIN *Issue Note* "Interagency Collaboration and Welfare Reform," at <http://www.welfareinfo.org/crosscuttingTara.htm>.

The Welfare Information Network -- Barry Van Lare, Executive Director
A Special Activity of the Finance Project
Tel: 202-628-5790 -- Website: www.welfareinfo.org -- Email Address: welfinfo@welfareinfo.org

Policy and Program Issues

How does federal welfare reform, welfare-to-work, and workforce development legislation affect collaboration between the welfare and workforce systems? New opportunities and incentives for collaboration have emerged following legislative reforms of the welfare and workforce development systems. Welfare reform is leading to a new focus on the cross-cutting needs of low-income families, and this provides additional impetus for collaboration. Federal welfare reform and workforce development legislation allows states and localities to integrate or coordinate the administration and/or delivery of welfare and workforce services to low-income clients, but it does not require interagency collaboration. The Workforce Investment Act requires several programs to be partners in the one-stop delivery system; TANF is a suggested partner. However, states can require that TANF be a one-stop partner under WIA.

Federal legislation gives states and localities significant flexibility in shaping welfare and workforce systems, and, consequently, there is considerable variation in how welfare and workforce agencies are working together. Some states have integrated all or part of their TANF and workforce development programs at the state level. Other states maintain separate welfare and workforce structures but use cooperative agreements or contracts to coordinate the delivery of services to TANF clients. There is further variation at the local level regarding the nuts and bolts of service coordination, such as information sharing, staff responsibilities, subcontracting, and client flow. Interagency linkages are not mandated at the federal level, so there is the potential for duplication of effort in providing employment and training services to TANF recipients.

The Workforce Investment Act aims to create a more coordinated service delivery system. Certain provisions of the legislation can facilitate collaboration between the welfare and workforce systems. Under WIA, states are authorized to develop unified plans that can include TANF and WtW programs. Although federal statutory requirements for individual programs must be met, unified planning can provide a state-level framework to address program coordination issues. Unified planning can mandate or encourage TANF participation in the workforce development system. WIA also grants states the authority to waive certain statutory and regulatory requirements of the legislation through workforce flexibility plans. This waiver authority could enable states to address certain obstacles to coordinating or integrating services.

The Welfare-to-Work grant program, though administered through the workforce development system, requires that welfare and workforce agencies work together to plan and implement welfare-to-work activities. This joint involvement in WtW can encourage further collaboration between welfare and workforce agencies as agency staff build relationships, learn about each other's policies and programs, and serve the same clients. In addition, the Welfare-to-Work program has prompted workforce agencies and welfare-to-work providers to address the needs of hard-to-serve welfare clients. Workforce agencies depend on welfare agencies to screen clients for WtW program eligibility. Recent amendments to the program that loosen eligibility requirements should make it easier for welfare and workforce agencies to work together to serve clients facing multiple barriers to employment.

How can available funds be used to provide coordinated or integrated services? Available data suggest that the TANF block grant is the principal source of funding for employment and training services to welfare clients, though these services are often delivered through the workforce development system. A February 1999 report from the U.S. General Accounting Office, *Welfare Reform: States' Experiences in Providing Employment Assistance to TANF Clients,* found that this funding pattern results from the fact that TANF funds are plentiful and flexible, while workforce development funds are limited and must serve a broader population.

Workforce agencies receive TANF and state maintenance-of-effort (MOE) funds to serve eligible families primarily through contracts or state appropriations. These funds must be used in accordance with the rules of the TANF program. States have much more flexibility under TANF than under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program to fund services for low-income families, but fiscal policy rules—statutory requirements, restrictions, and cost principles—must still be taken into account. States can use TANF and MOE funds for a wide variety of employment and training activities, support services, and benefits that promote job retention and advancement to meet the purposes of TANF. State agencies are encouraged to develop collaborative relationships to address the needs of low-income families. They can use TANF funds to supplement or enhance services available through other programs, integrate program services, and fill in gaps in the service delivery system. However, agencies need to keep in mind the restrictions on the use of TANF and MOE funds and the program's reporting requirements. For more information on using TANF and MOE funds, see *Helping Families Achieve Self-Sufficiency: A Guide on Funding Services for Children and Families through the TANF Program* by the Office of Family Assistance at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/funds2.htm>. WtW grants can also be used to fund employment-related services to hard-to-serve clients.

Developing integrated funding mechanisms to directly support integrated services is more difficult than contracting for such services. Different eligibility, reporting, and accounting requirements under TANF, WtW, and WIA can hinder efforts to use funds in an integrated manner. State and local agencies can take some steps to address these obstacles and, as they collaborate further, there will be more examples of how to use funds to support integrated services. Agencies can develop a single budget for like programs and services to enable a comprehensive approach to employment and family self-sufficiency. For example, for FY 2001, Ohio will have a single budget for its new Department of Job and Family Services. Cost allocation planning is an important process that agencies can use to better integrate funds. For example, Utah has a unique cost allocation planning methodology. (For more information, see the section titled *Innovative Practices*). Agencies can also work on developing common reporting measures (La Prad and Sand, 1999). Another approach that could facilitate the integrated use of funds is to loosen restrictions at the federal level that prevent blended funding (Martinson, 1999).

How can collaboration benefit welfare and workforce development agencies and clients?
Collaboration can benefit agencies and clients in numerous ways, so long as agencies continue to work toward achieving desired outcomes rather than viewing collaboration as the end result. Given the potential for duplication of effort in providing employment and training services to TANF clients, collaboration can improve program efficiency by enabling agencies to use resources more effectively (Martinson, 1999).

Collaboration can help welfare and workforce agencies achieve improved employment and job retention outcomes for their low-income clients. By working together, these agencies can plan and deliver comprehensive employment and support services to low-income clients and coordinate complementary activities. The one-stop center model mandated in the Workforce Investment Act creates opportunities for collocating staff and programs, which can facilitate comprehensive service delivery. Through collaboration, staff can enjoy greater access to each other's areas of expertise in workforce development and family support services as well as realize opportunities for cross-agency training (Kogan et al., 1997). Collaboration can also enable welfare and workforce agencies to more efficiently address the needs of employers for qualified workers. Employers find the duplication of job development efforts frustrating, so an interagency approach could generate better working relationships with employers.

Collaboration can open up a broader range of services to low-income clients. TANF clients' access to the workforce development system's education and training services could lead to career advancement opportunities. TANF clients may also benefit from receiving employment and training services alongside other job seekers, rather than receiving such services solely in a welfare-centered environment. Conversely, certain workforce development clients may benefit from greater access to the support services available through human service agencies.

What types of challenges do welfare and workforce development agencies face in collaborating? Although collaboration can bring shared benefits to agencies, the process is often challenging. Developing working relationships across organizational lines takes time. In some areas, welfare and workforce agencies have a history of working together, but in other areas, these agencies have operated separately. Moreover, implementing recent legislative changes is complicated and may leave little time to work on collaboration.

Although recent reforms of the welfare and workforce systems have more closely aligned the goals of these systems, significant differences remain in their organizational and operating environments. These differences pose challenges to collaboration. For example, welfare and workforce systems share a focus on labor force attachment, but the work-first orientation of welfare reform varies from the skill-development orientation of the workforce development system. Differences in goals, service priorities, regulatory environments, accountability standards, and performance measurements are other challenges to collaboration that agencies need to address. The level of collaboration desired will determine the degree to which these challenges are addressed. Even when these collaboration issues can be addressed, the mechanics of administering separate funding streams under TANF, Welfare-to-Work, and WIA also pose a significant challenge to coordinating or consolidating services.

Additional bureaucratic barriers to collaboration stem from differing organizational cultures and concerns about agency autonomy. Issues related to agency roles and responsibilities, staffing, job security, information sharing and confidentiality, and credit for shared accomplishments need to be worked through (Kogan et al., 1997).

Welfare and workforce development agencies both serve welfare-to-work clients, but establishing cross-agency priorities for serving welfare clients may be difficult. Balancing the needs of hard-to-serve welfare clients with the needs of other populations to be served under WIA may be a challenge for workforce development agencies. Hard-to-serve clients may place more demands on the workforce system for training and other services.

What factors and activities can facilitate collaboration between welfare and workforce devel-

opment agencies? National, state, and local agencies can undertake efforts to facilitate collaborative activities. Having a history of collaboration is helpful, but new incentives to collaborate under welfare and workforce development reform may lead agencies to initiate joint undertakings. The Welfare-to-Work grant program has played, and continues to play, a role in fostering interagency collaboration in the planning and delivery of welfare-to-work activities.

Political leadership is an important element in fostering collaboration, and it can help agencies overcome obstacles to working together. The WIA-mandated state and local workforce investment boards can provide leadership in developing a comprehensive and coordinated strategic vision for the workforce development system (La Prad and Sand, 1999). Collaboration must also occur at the local level. Federal and state agencies can set an example for those efforts by launching collaborative initiatives at the national, regional, and state levels and developing or strengthening coordinating committees. Federal and state agencies can also provide technical assistance and guidance on resolving problems to facilitate collaboration (Martinson, 1999). Agencies may find that making key people responsible for leading collaborative initiatives or designating liaisons between welfare and workforce agencies will promote collaboration.

Whether integrating systems or coordinating services, joint planning and goal-setting lay the groundwork for collaboration. Agencies can create a win-win situation by identifying mutually beneficial goals. Agencies can also work together to address programmatic obstacles to collaboration, including developing common reporting and performance measures and strengthening accountability and performance outcomes for welfare-to-work activities (La Prad and Sand, 1999). Using management information systems that are compatible or integrated is increasingly an option as software companies respond to the need for integrated systems stemming from the implementation of the one-stop delivery model. For example, Utah's Workforce System (UWORKS) is an integrated case management system. For more information, visit <http://www.dws.state.ut.us/PI/UWORKS/UWORKS.htm>. At the service delivery level, a focus on providing comprehensive, client-centered services can help agencies move beyond turf protection issues.

Agency staff play a key role in the collaboration process. Although management must send a clear message on the value of collaboration, effective collaboration cannot simply be mandated. Effective collaboration stems from fostering good working relationships among agency staff at all levels. Opportunities for cross-agency training that enable staff to learn about other programs' goals, policies, and operations can help overcome bureaucratic obstacles to collaboration.

Best practices in interagency collaboration can provide models to assist agencies interested in collaboration. Welfare and workforce development agencies should be encouraged to document and evaluate collaborative efforts to identify effective strategies. Federal and state agencies can help document and communicate effective strategies and the benefits of collaboration (Martinson, 1999). The "Welfare and Workforce Development Partnerships" web site funded by the U.S. Department of Labor includes profiles of local partnerships. Visit the site at <http://wtw.doleta.gov/wwpartnerships/>.

Research

Research examining interagency collaboration under TANF, Welfare-to-Work, and the Workforce

Investment Act is emerging as reforms unfold. To review the interaction between welfare and workforce agencies under welfare reform and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), see *The Structural Link between JTPA and State Welfare Reform Programs in 1997* from the Urban Institute (Nightingale et al., 1997). For an overview of service coordination and integration, see *Literature Review on Service Coordination and Integration in the Welfare and Workforce Development Systems* from the Urban Institute (Martinson, 1999). Martinson finds that much of the prior research on the coordination of workforce development and welfare programs offers only limited evidence of successful, sustained efforts, at least at the state level. However, the author suggests that the current environment may foster higher levels of service coordination as the welfare and workforce systems share more common goals and share new mandates to help hard-to-serve welfare recipients move into the workforce.

A recent report from the Corporation for a Skilled Workforce, *Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems in the Midwest: Analysis of Implementation,* examines the relationship between these systems and explores the impact of Welfare-to-Work and Workforce Investment Act legislation on the collaboration of welfare and workforce systems (La Prad and Sand, 1999). According to La Prad and Sand, separate funding streams are keeping state welfare and workforce development systems apart despite legislative mechanisms to encourage collaboration. Moreover, welfare and workforce systems continue to operate separately despite the convergence of goals. Not all states and localities are addressing collaboration, and improved collaboration tends to stem from efforts undertaken at the local level. The authors stress the need for further research to identify effective collaboration strategies and document the benefits of collaboration.

Evaluations of the Welfare-to-Work grant program suggest that it has helped improve coordination between the welfare and workforce development systems. Although interagency planning and coordination are difficult, WtW is raising awareness of related policies and programs and encouraging increased communication. At the state level, committees or workgroups are being formed to address planning issues. At the local level, partnerships are being formed to coordinate welfare-to-work activities provided by workforce agencies with human services provided by other agencies. In some areas, interagency coordination around welfare-to-work activities has been substantial. Refer to the U.S. General Accounting Office's *Welfare Reform: Status of Awards and Selected States' Use of Welfare-to-Work Grants* and the Urban Institute's *The Status of the Welfare-to-Work (WtW) Grants Program After One Year* (Nightingale et al., 1999).

Innovative Practices

Welfare reform and the Workforce Investment Act afford states and localities considerable flexibility in determining how welfare and workforce agencies will work together to serve low-income families. The following profiles illustrate some of the models for integration and coordination at the state level and highlight some of the mechanisms for collaboration at the local level.

In **Utah** the entire TANF program, called the Family Employment Program, has been integrated into the Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS). DWS was created through legislation in 1996 and became operational in 1997. The department was created to consolidate all job placement, job training, and welfare services into an integrated service delivery system to simplify programs, operate more efficiently, improve services, and provide a vehicle for welfare reform. Agencies and programs brought into DWS included the Office of Family Support, which ran the Food Stamp program, Medicaid, child care programs, and other programs; the Department of Employment Security; the Office of Child Care; the Office of Job Training; and the Turning Point Program, which served displaced homemakers. In 1997 the Utah legislature passed Family Employment Program legislation that moved authority for the Family Employment Program (FEP) from the Department of Human Services to the Department of Workforce Services. Utah, an early implementation state under WIA, has been actively creating a comprehensive one-stop system. One-stops are called employment centers (ECs) and are the point of service delivery for programs administered through DWS. At ECs, customers can access employment and training services as well as support services such as child care, food stamps, and financial assistance. One-stop employees, called employment counselors, have a range of skills and operate as part of multifunctional teams. Challenges to creating this integrated service delivery system have included differing organizational cultures and the varying skill sets of employees. Careful planning of the physical and social architecture of the employment centers has been an important part of developing an integrated environment.

DWS receives federal and state funding, including federal TANF funds and, through state appropriation, MOE funds. Several years ago, a consultant developed a unique methodology to support cost allocation planning. This methodology, a random-moment time sampling system, works like polling. Rather than each employee keeping time sheets, random sampling is used to gauge staff activities for purposes of cost allocation. With federal partners on board—the U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and Office of Management and Budget—this system was implemented two years ago and continues to be fine-tuned. DWS also is developing UWORKS, a case management database system that supports DWS' integrated service environment and meets the reporting requirements of the different funding streams. For more information, visit <http://www.dws.state.ut.us/> or contact Sarah Brenna, policy analyst, Office of the Executive Director, Utah Department of Workforce Services, at 801/526-9205.

In **Texas** the TANF employment and training program, called Choices, is administered by the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), while TANF cash benefits continue to be administered by the Texas Department of Human Services (TDHS). State legislation enacted in 1996 consolidated all workforce programs at the state level into a new agency, the Texas Workforce Commission, which also included the old Texas Employment Agency (TEC). The Workforce Development Division within TWC administers the following programs: Workforce Investment Act, TANF/Choices, Welfare-to-Work, the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program, and Child Care. Many of the personnel in TDHS who administered the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program, child care programs, and the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program were transferred to TWC. The Texas Department of Commerce administered the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), and this program also was merged into TWC. The Department of Human Services continues to determine TANF eligibility and administer cash benefits, food stamps, and Medicaid. TANF funds are received from the Department of Human Services, and then TWC allocates funds to local workforce development boards (LWDBs) for employment, training, and support services for Choices recipients.

Texas is an early implementation state under the Workforce Investment Act. The state has 28 LWDBs and a one-stop delivery system for providing workforce services. TANF clients participating in the Choices program generally receive employment services through the one-stop system. The consolidation of workforce programs in Texas has brought benefits in terms of delivering services more effectively; addressing client needs, particularly for postemployment services under a work-first philosophy; developing a broader awareness and understanding of programs among staff; overcoming turf issues; and recognizing local needs better. However, distinct funding streams and program participation rates remain as challenges to the full integration of services. TWC is developing The Workforce Information System of Texas (TWIST), a statewide automated system for gathering and reporting data, to further improve program integration and data gathering and promote interagency cooperation. TWC is collaborating with other agencies, such as the Department of Transportation, Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, and Office of the Attorney General, to serve Choices and WtW clients. Interagency collaboration is approached as an ongoing process and is supported by state and local leaders through legislation and program guidelines. For more information, visit the TWC web site at <http://www.twc.state.tx.us/> or contact John Hicks, program specialist, TANF Choices and Welfare-to-Work, Texas Workforce Commission, at 512/463-5388.

In **Ohio** reforms of the welfare and workforce development systems have created the impetus for making structural changes at the state level. The Ohio Department of Human Services (DHS) and the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (BES) will be merged into a new Department of Job and Family Services effective July 1, 2000. This merger will coincide with the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act in Ohio. In FY 2001, the executive budget will contain a single budget for the new agency. The merger stems from the need for greater coordination, integration, and efficiency in administering and delivering employment and family services to low-income clients. The merger is expected to provide benefits to the state and to customers, including improved efficiencies; greater system coherence, coordination, and accountability; and increased access to services. It also aims to eliminate duplication of effort at the state level while allowing for local flexibility in program design. Leadership by the governor has been a significant force behind the merger, but the participation of multiple stakeholders will also be critical for an effective transition. A guidance team composed of employers, local elected officials, representatives of employees and unions, legislators, local partners, and advocacy groups was established. In addition, action teams representing state and local BES and DHS employees, employers, unions, and other relevant agencies were formed to make recommendations to the cabinet leadership team.

Counties administer the TANF program in Ohio, so the effect of this state-level merger at the local level is likely to be varied. The state workforce investment board has decided to include TANF as a required partner under WIA. State leadership is encouraging local areas to improve integration, and a financial incentive system promotes collaboration. To gauge local integration and governance issues, several local pilot projects will be started to help evaluate the potential for integration at the local level. For more information, see <http://www.state.oh.us/ODJFS/> or contact John Allen, deputy director, Office of Communications, Ohio Department of Human Services, at 614/466-6650.

New Hampshire uses an interagency team approach to administer and deliver employment support services under the New Hampshire Employment Program (NHEP), which is the state's TANF program for families headed by able-bodied adults. NHEP is a collaboration between the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, New Hampshire Employment Security, and the Southern

New Hampshire Services Community Action Program, NHEP's link to community action programs across the state. Interagency teams operate at the front line as well as at the supervisory and oversight levels to provide seamless services to NHEP clients. TANF eligibility determination occurs at DHHS district offices, and clients are referred to NHEP local interagency teams for employment-related services. These teams are located at employment security offices that are now being converted to one-stop centers under WIA. NHEP clients receive employment services alongside other job seekers, though staff at the one-stop centers must continue to address privacy and client confidentiality issues. Local team members are cross-trained to enable them to provide clients with comprehensive employment-related services. The collaborative approach and resource sharing have led to smaller caseloads, a benefit for staff and clients. This interagency collaboration also has improved coordination under the Welfare-to-Work grant program, because the community action program directly delivers WtW services. At the supervisory level, an interagency statewide profile team provides guidance and technical assistance to the local teams, monitors program implementation and consistency, and reports to the oversight team. The oversight team, which consists of senior managers from the three NHEP agencies, provides general coordination and policy guidance and addresses obstacles to collaboration. Interagency collaboration at multiple levels, coupled with a history of working together, has facilitated the transition to NHEP. For more information, contact Mary Anne Broshek, oversight team member, New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, at 603/271-4442.

In **Monterey County**, California, the Department of Social Services, Office for Employment Training, and Employment Development Department, which includes the Employment Service, along with other community agencies and stakeholders, collaborated to plan and develop the Salinas One-Stop Career Center. Cross-agency partnerships were formed as part of an effort to provide improved and better-coordinated customer-oriented services. The Salinas One-Stop Career Center, a built-to-suit facility that opened in November 1998, was developed with one-stop competitive grants, and it will be the county's primary one-stop center under the Workforce Investment Act. All TANF employment and training staff, as well as a small TANF benefits staff, are collocated at the center. The lead agencies and community partners undertook an intensive effort of joint planning and collaboration to establish the one-stop center. A One-Stop Planning Task Force developed the plan for one-stop implementation and laid the groundwork for the transition. Using a professional facilitator was a critical part of planning and designing the one-stop center. Creating a one-stop career center system is an ongoing process. Seven partnership action teams, composed of staff members from the three core partner agencies, work on operational issues, such as technology, marketing, and safety, and foster a one-stop mentality among the partner agencies. Other committees address oversight, financial, and policy issues. Next steps include cross-training staff, hiring a job developer for the center, creating a shared case management system, and developing satellite offices. For more information, visit <http://www.onestopmonterey.org/> or contact Sandra Weaver, program manager for CalWORKS Employment Services, at 831/755-4457.

In **Hennepin County**, Minnesota, and the city of **Minneapolis**, a city-county partnership involving welfare and workforce development agencies administers employment and training services to Minnesota Family Investment Program (TANF) clients. A joint powers agreement describes the roles and responsibilities of the different agencies. The Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) implementation team oversees employment services operations. In Hennepin County, employment services are delivered to MFIP clients through a decentralized, neighborhood-based service delivery system. Community-based organizations as well as one-stop centers play a key role in providing employment-related services to clients. County and city workforce development staff evaluate employment service provider vendors and make recommendations on contract renewal. Hennepin County has collocated economic assistance and child care workers at several employment service provider sites and has initiated an effort to assign assistance workers, child care workers, and employment service provider counselors to geographic teams. For more information, visit <http://www.co.hennepin.mn.us/opd/Reports/categories.htm> and scroll down to "Welfare Reform" or contact Susan Sarhan, welfare reform coordinator for Hennepin County, at 612/348-2055.

For More Information...

RESOURCE CONTACTS

Center for Law and Social Policy, contact Steve Savner, 202/328-5140, <http://www.clasp.org/>.

Corporation for a Skilled Workforce, contact Sharon Sand or Jeannine La Prad, 734/971-6060.

National Association of Workforce Boards, contact Sally Reis, 202/289-2987, <http://www.nawb.org/>.

National Governors' Association, contact Evelyn Ganzglass, 202/624-5394, <http://www.nga.org/INDEX.HTM>.

Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, contact Thomas Gais, director of the Federalism Research Group, 518/443-5238, <http://www.rockinst.org/>.

Social Policy Research Associates, contact Debbie Kogan or Vinz Koller, 510/763-1499.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance, contact Robert Shelbourne, supervisor, Program Development Branch, 202/401-5150; or Mack Storrs, director, Division of Self-Sufficiency, 202/401-9289, <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/>.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Welfare-to-Work, contact Gretchen Sullivan, 202/219-0024, <http://wtw.doleta.gov/default.htm>. Visit <http://usworkforce.org/> for information on the Workforce Investment Act.

U.S. General Accounting Office, contact Cynthia Fagnoni, director of education, workforce, and income security issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division, 202/512-7215.

PUBLICATIONS

Grossenbach, Fred, and Jay Hein. *A Partnership for Full Employment*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Welfare Policy Center of the Hudson Institute, 1999. Available at <http://www.welfarereformer.org/articles/pfe.html>.

Kogan, Deborah, Kristin Wolff, Hugh Davies, Carole McCarthy, and Cheryl Martin. *Framework for Collaboration: Partnering to Improve Welfare-to-Work Outcomes.* Social Policy Research Associates and Technical Assistance and Training Corporation, October 1997. Available at <http://wtw.doleta.gov/wwpartnerships/WW%20Partnership/framework.pdf>.

La Prad, Jeannine, and Sharon Sand. *Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems in the Midwest: Analysis of Implementation.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Corporation for a Skilled Workforce, December 1999.

Martinson, Karin. *Literature Review on Service Coordination and Integration in the Welfare and Workforce Development Systems.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, January 1999. Available at <http://www.urban.org/welfare/lit_review.html>.

National Governors' Association. *The Welfare-Workforce Connection: Opportunities for Interagency Collaboration.* Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, February 1997. Available at <http://www.nga.org/Welfare/WelfareDocs/WelfareWorkforceConnection.htm>.

Nightingale, Demetra, John Trutko, and Burt S. Barnow. *The Status of the Welfare-to-Work (WtW) Grants Program After One Year.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, September 1999. Available at <http://www.urban.org/welfare/wtw_labor.html>.

Nightingale, Demetra, Russell Jones, Carolyn O'Brien, and Kathleen Brennan. *The Structural Link between JTPA and State Welfare Reform Programs in 1997.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, December 1997. Available at <http://www.icesa.org/national/docs/dsnight2.htm>.

Savner, Steve. *Key Implementation Decisions Affecting Low-Income Adults under the Workforce Investment Act.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy, August 1999. Available at <http://www.clasp.org/pubs/jobseducation/kellwia2.htm>.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance. *Helping Families Achieve Self-Sufficiency: A Guide on Funding Services for Children and Families through the TANF Program.* Washington, D.C., April 1999. Available at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/funds2.htm>.

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Welfare-to-Work and Technical Assistance and Training Corporation. "Recruitment through Interagency Collaboration." *Ideas that Work*, Issue 3 (November 1998). Available at <http://wtw.doleta.gov/ideasthatwork/Issue3.htm>.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Welfare Reform: States' Experiences in Providing Employment Assistance to TANF Clients.* Report to Congressional Requesters, GAO/HEHS-99-22. Washington, D.C., February 1999. Available at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces160.shtml>.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Welfare Reform: States' Implementation and Effects on the Workforce Development System.* Testimony, GAO/T-HEHS-99-190. Washington, D.C., September 9, 1999. Available at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces160.shtml>.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Welfare Reform: Status of Awards and Selected States' Use of Welfare-to-Work Grants*. Report to Congressional Requesters, GAO/HEHS-99-40. Washington, D.C., February 1999. Available at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces160.shtml>.

The Welfare Information Network is supported by grants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Woods Fund of Chicago, the McKnight Foundation, the Administration for Children and Families in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Labor.

"THE NEW FACES OF WELFARE REFORM: ENGAGING HARD-TO-SERVE FAMILIES"

VIDEO SATELLITE CONFERENCE
MARCH 29, 2000 - 12:30 PM - 3:00 PM CENTRAL STANDARD TIME

For information contact: Tom Corbett, Institute for Research on Poverty 608/262-6358 or corbett@ssc.wisc.edu or see http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/events.htm

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK
1000 Vermont Ave., NW - Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005