DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 829 CE 085 614

AUTHOR	Richer, Elise; Kubo, Hitomi; Frank, Abbey
TITLE	All in One Stop? The Accessibility of Work Support Programs at One-Stop Centers.
INSTITUTION	Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Moriah Fund, Washington, DC.; Public Welfare Foundation, Washington, DC.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, NY.; Open Society Inst., New York, NY.; Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Joyce Foundation, Chicago, IL.; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Palo Alto, CA.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2003-09-00
NOTE	47p.; Additional support from JP Morgan Chase Foundation and Nathan Cummings Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.clasp.org/DMS/Documents/1063733515.9/one-stop_rpt.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Adult Education; Agency Cooperation; *Career Centers; Career Counseling; Comparative Analysis; *Counseling Services; *Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Geographic Regions; Methods Research; *Program Content; Public Agencies; Research Methodology; Resource Allocation; Social Services; State Programs; Telephone Surveys; Trend Analysis; *Working Poor
IDENTIFIERS	*Access to Services; Barriers to Participation; Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

ABSTRACT

The accessibility of work support programs at one-stop centers was examined in a study during which 33 telephone directors or managers of one-stop centers in 22 states were interviewed by telephone. The interviews established the existence of extensive differences between one-stop centers from the standpoint of all aspects of their operation, including resources and program accessibility. Collocation or a close working relationship with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families agencies emerged as an important factor for accessibility, particularly for programs such as publicly funded health insurance, food stamps, and cash assistance. One-stop director's attitudes about the provision of work supports also affected programs' accessibility. Rural one-stops and those in smaller counties tended to have fewer staff and other resources and were often geographically isolated. The combination of these factors appeared to make it harder for rural areas to offer access to many work supports. Lack of resources, staff, facility space, child care, and transportation and attitude or turf issues were identified as significant barriers to service provision. Despite these barriers, many sites had created innovative approaches to providing a vast array of services to one-stop customers. (A description of the study methodology is appended along with tables detailing the number of one-stops in the sample by region and by county size. Twenty-eight endnotes are listed.) (MN)

All in One Stop?

The Accessibility of Work Support Programs at One-Stop Centers

September 2003

Elise Richer,
Hitomi Kubo,
and Abbey Frank

All in One Stop?

The Accessibility of Work Support Programs at One-Stop Centers

September 2003

Elise Richer,
Hitomi Kubo,
and Abbey Frank

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Support for the writing of this report was provided by the Nathan Cummings Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Joyce Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Open Society Institute, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Moriah Fund, the Public Welfare Foundation, and the JP Morgan Chase Foundation.

We are grateful for the time and thoughtfulness of the one-stop directors who agreed to be interviewed for this paper.

Liz Schott, Susan Golonka, and Josie Hathaway reviewed the paper and provided helpful comments. Nisha Patel and Mark Greenberg of CLASP also gave important feedback and review. The U.S. Conference of Mayors provided assistance in contacting some of the larger urban areas for participation in the survey. Gayle Bennett of CLASP provided feedback on earlier versions and edited the final version of the paper.

The authors are solely responsible for the paper's content.

Introduction

Under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, all local workforce areas in the U.S. (there are currently over 600) are required to develop a "one-stop" delivery system that makes an array of federally funded employment programs available at one location. The one-stop system is designed to make the workforce development system more user-friendly for both job seekers and employers, and, over time, to serve people looking for help finding an initial job, a better job, and/or accessing services to improve their skills. The system is also designed to serve employers seeking qualified workers or funding to train prospective or incumbent workers.

The purpose of this paper was to conduct an initial investigation into the role one-stop centers currently play in providing job seekers with access to public work support programs. Work support programs are designed to help workers find a job, accept a job, and/or keep a job, by helping families make ends meet when earnings are not, or will not, be enough.

To learn about the current state of access to work supports at one-stop centers nationwide, we surveyed 33 one-stop center directors from across the country. Although one-stop directors do not typically set workforce development policies in their regions (local Workforce Investment Boards [WIBs] are designed to do this instead), directors are responsible for implementing policies. Given their location "on the ground," they are also able to provide feedback to WIBs about policies that should be adopted or modified.

WIA created WIBs (which replaced Private Industry Councils), intending them to take on a broader role in creating a local workforce development system. WIA mandates that businesses, local education entities, labor organizations, community organizations, economic development agencies, one-stop partners, and other appropriate entities be represented on local WIBs.[1]

The One-Stop System

Under federal law, agencies are designated as "required partners" for one-stop systems. These partners include programs within WIA, Wagner-Peyser employment services, adult education and literacy, Welfare-to-Work, Older Americans Act, Perkins postsecondary vocational education, Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and NAFTA-TAA, Veterans Employ-

ment and Training, Community Service Block Grant employment and training, Housing and Urban Development employment and training, and Unemployment Compensation. Other federal, state, and local programs are designated "permissible" partners, and many one-stops do partner with other agencies, such as vocational rehabilitation agencies, community colleges, and Job Corps. Note that partners of any kind, whether required or simply permissible, do not have to be physically collocated with the one-stop center.

Although the list of mandated partners for one-stops is extensive, agencies that administer certain important work support programs are not included—including those that administer the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, food stamps, Medicaid, child care, and child support. States and local areas may ask these agencies to be partners if they wish, but many do not. Under WIA, one-stop centers are only required to provide "information" about supportive services. Nevertheless, as one-stops become increasingly important places for low-income job seekers to find employment services, the centers are well-situated to be useful linkage points for work support programs. Our survey sought to determine the extent to which one-stop centers are indeed becoming such a linkage point, and whether one-stop directors and staff find such a purpose within their mission and capacity.

As of 2001, according to a General Accounting Office (GAO) study, 28 states reported using "formal linkages, such as [memoranda of understanding] and state level formal agreements, between the agencies administering TANF and WIA."[2] GAO also found that 36 states used TANF funds to support their one-stop centers, while 39 had collocated at least some of their TANF work services with one-stops centers.[3] The study, however, says little about how accessible work supports are for job seekers who enter the one-stops. To learn more about this question, CLASP interviewed 33 randomly selected one-stop directors and managers in the winter of 2002-03 about the ways in which seven work supports are made available to one-stop customers.[4]

What Are Work Supports?

Federal and state "work supports" are programs designed to help working families make ends meet when earnings alone are not enough. Because these benefits help workers retain jobs, they also reduce turnover and reduce costs for businesses. As a result, work supports benefit *both* working families and employers. In this project, we focus on seven work supports: the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), subsidized child care, food stamps, publicly funded health insurance, cash assistance, child support, and transportation assistance. We focus on these specific work supports because they are the programs most closely linked to serving low-income families and to helping those families find work, keep their jobs, and maintain their families.

These programs have very different characteristics. Some are uniformly operated across all states; some have a basic federal blueprint with some state variation; some have extensive

state variation; some are mostly determined by states, but allow local variation; and so on. For those unfamiliar with these programs, we provide brief descriptions in the sidebars on pages 4-6.[5] Eligibility for most of the work supports depends on income, although in many cases, income eligibility levels are significantly higher than the federal poverty line (which was $15,260 for a family of three in 2003).

A key concern with work support programs is declining participation among eligible individuals and families. In fact, recent research indicates that an increasing number of eligible families are not taking advantage of public benefits, particularly food stamps, Medicaid, and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). One such study recommends strategies for increasing participation in work support programs, including increasing program awareness through locally based outreach activities and improving access through "outreach units"—that is, places working families may frequent for other purposes—that can offer assistance with applications and eligibility determination.[6]

Immigrant Eligibility for Work Supports

The welfare reform law of 1996, and immigration legislation passed that same year, restricted immigrants' eligibility for a number of work supports and other public benefits based on immigration status and date of entry into the U.S. These restrictions have subsequently been modified for some programs. Further complicating the matter is that states have some flexibility to serve (or not serve) immigrants specified as eligible under federal law. The work supports we focus on in this report all have some level of eligibility restriction based on immigration status, although legal immigrants with the right to work in the U.S. would typically be eligible for these services, depending on their date of entry. For more specific information about immigrant eligibility for a variety of programs, see the National Immigration Law Center's *Guide to Immigrant Eligibility for Federal Programs (4th Edition)*, published in June 2002.

Who Are One-Stop Customers?

Job seekers are perhaps the most obvious potential one-stop customers. WIA designates three categories of job seekers, each with separate funding streams: adults (individual job seekers age 19 and older, including TANF recipients and people with disabilities who are not dislocated workers), dislocated workers, and youth (age 14-21).[7]

WIA also established a tiered system of services that must be administered sequentially. Customers first receive core services (including initial assessments, job search assistance, information about access to supportive services, and employment counseling), then may be determined eligible for intensive services (including development of individual employment plans, short-term pre-vocational services, work experience activities, and case management for participants seeking training services), and finally may be determined eligible for training services (including occupational skills training, on-the-job training, skills upgrading and retraining, adult education and literacy activities, and customized training). Under federal

law, local areas are required to give priority for intensive and training services to low-income individuals and public assistance recipients when the local area's adult funding allocation is limited. However, local workforce areas have the flexibility to develop and implement systems for determining priority. For core services, there is no federal priority based on income.

Employers are also potential one-stop customers. Employers may use one-stops to recruit new employees, to access training and/or retraining for current employees, and to establish programs and services, such as on-the-job training programs or informational workshops. In addition, employers may look to one-stops to help their employees access work supports.

Program Descriptions

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a tax credit for working people who earn low or moderate incomes. The EITC is refundable, so in addition to reducing the tax burden on workers, it also supplements wages. Even workers whose earnings are too low to owe income tax (but who still pay payroll taxes for Social Security and Medicare purposes) can receive the EITC. The federal government funds and administers the EITC. Depending on family circumstances, workers with children may be eligible for the credit if they had family income of up to approximately $30,000 in 2002.[8] Seventeen states have also instituted EITCs based on the federal credit, 12 of which are refundable.[9]

Subsidized Child Care

Every state and some Native American tribes operate child care subsidy assistance programs for low-income families. Most often, funds are used to provide families with "vouchers" intended to cover all or part of the cost of care from private providers. For the most part, child care subsidies are funded through the federal Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and the TANF block grant. Because funding is limited, the availability of child care subsidies varies among states and communities.

States may design their child care subsidy programs and administer them, or they may give counties the authority to administer or contract the program out to a private entity. Federal law gives states the flexibility to set income guidelines for child care assistance, within certain limitations, and states may set priorities for assistance among income-eligible families. As of May 2002, the income eligibility level for a family of three ranged from $17,784 in Missouri to $47,592 in Connecticut, although not all families who meet eligibility levels are served.[10] (Note that these eligibility levels do not reflect subsequent retrenchment in services due to budget cuts during the past fiscal year and ongoing economic troubles in the states.) In 2000, 2.3 million children received child care subsidies—14 percent of the estimated 15.7 million who were eligible.[11]

Food Stamps

Food stamps provide assistance to low-income families so they can purchase food necessary to maintain a nutritionally adequate diet. The federal government pays all of the benefit costs for food stamps, but states administer the program and share in the administrative costs. The Food Stamp Program is governed by federal rules, with eligibility set at 130 percent of poverty. There is no time limit on food stamps for families with

Program Descriptions (continued)

children and for the elderly, but unemployed, able-bodied adults with no children are limited to three months of benefits within a 36-month period unless they are working 20 hours per week or participating in a qualifying job training program. The amount of food stamps a household receives depends primarily on household size, income, and housing costs. In fiscal year 2002, the average monthly benefit per household was $186.[12] Food stamps reach many low-income families in the U.S.: in February 2003, more than 20.7 million people participated. Nonetheless, advocates have estimated that as many as four out of 10 people who are eligible for food stamps do not participate in the program.[13]

Publicly Funded Health Insurance

Medicaid is the principal publicly funded health insurance program for low-income people. The federal government and state governments jointly fund Medicaid, with the federal government paying half or more of the costs. Eligible persons include three groups: parents (including pregnant women) and children, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities. States establish income and asset eligibility levels for these groups, within federal guidelines. Rules among states vary widely, but, at a minimum, states are required to provide coverage for children under age 6 in households up to 133 percent of poverty and children under age 19 in households up to 100 percent of poverty. Currently, states must also provide Medicaid to certain very low-income parents, with eligibility levels varying among the states. Eighteen states provide Medicaid benefits to parents with incomes above 100 percent of poverty.[14] States may also use Medicaid funds to pay premiums for employer-sponsored coverage, which can allow both parents and children to maintain private coverage. The average number of people enrolled in Medicaid each month in fiscal year 2002 was 34.3 million, including 6.4 million adults who were neither elderly nor disabled.[15]

The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), enacted in 1997, targets uninsured children under age 19 in families below 200 percent of poverty who are neither eligible for Medicaid nor covered by private insurance. SCHIP is a federal block grant program that requires a state match. As of January 2002, 40 states had expanded income eligibility for children in families with incomes up to 200 percent of the federal poverty level or higher (equal to $30,520 for a family of three in 2003).[16] In fiscal year 2002, 5.3 million children were enrolled in SCHIP.[17] In fiscal year 2001, there were an estimated 9.2 million children in the U.S. lacking health insurance, of whom three-quarters are estimated to be eligible for public health insurance but not receiving it.[18] As with child care subsidies, state fiscal crises in 2002 and 2003 are leading to cutbacks in SCHIP eligibility in some states.

Cash Assistance

Under the 1996 welfare reform law, every state and some Native American tribes receive an annual TANF "block grant"—a lump sum of federal funds that can be used to provide cash assistance and other supports for low-income families. In order to receive its federal allocation, a state must also spend a specified level of state dollars on low-income benefits and services. Each state or tribe uses its TANF funds to operate a program of cash assistance for families with children. States and tribes have very broad discretion in deciding which families are eligible and the level of assistance to be provided to eligible families, but families must include children and parents who are typically unemployed when they begin receiving assistance. In fiscal year 2001, 5.4 million people (on average) received TANF cash assistance each month, of whom 4.0 million were children. As of September 2002, the total number of recipients had declined to 4.9 million. In the first half of fiscal year 2002, families receiving TANF assistance received $412 per month, on average.[19]

continued...

Program Descriptions (continued)

A number of states have adopted "earnings disregards," which allow working families to receive cash assistance. Earnings disregards mean that a certain share of a TANF applicant's or recipient's earnings is not counted as income when calculating that family's eligibility for cash assistance. This means that working families may be eligible for cash assistance, and that families on cash assistance may be able to work and still receive cash benefits. In most states, the level of earnings which would permit a family to both work and receive cash benefits is quite low, although the variation is considerable.

General Relief (or General Assistance) programs provide cash or in-kind support to populations other than families with children. As of 1998, 35 states had such programs, although most targeted the unemployable, typically the elderly or the disabled. Only 13 states had General Relief programs for able-bodied adults without dependents, and many of these provide in-kind support as opposed to cash. These programs typically have extremely low financial eligibility thresholds and provide very low benefits. The number of people receiving General Relief varies widely from state to state, but is typically no more than 15 percent of the TANF caseload in the state.[20]

Child Support

Children are eligible for child support when they live apart from a parent because their parents are divorced, separated, or were never married. State courts or agencies, using state income-based guidelines, issue child support orders that set the obligation of non-custodial parents—usually fathers—to help support their children. Although rules vary across states, the amount of child support a family receives is primarily dependent upon the non-custodial parent's income and assets, the number of children, and the needs of the children. In FY 2002, the average yearly amount collected per case—for cases in which some support was paid—was $2,575. Half of the families participating in the program receive payments.[21] Because eligibility for the child support program is not based on financial need, child support services are available to both custodial and non-custodial parents, regardless of income. In fiscal year 2002, 17.9 million children were served in the child support program.[22]

Nearly two-thirds of all child support-eligible families participate in the child support program.[23] The remaining one-third of child support-eligible families often have their child support orders enforced through private attorneys and do not use the public program. Some families are required to participate in the child support program, including those receiving TANF assistance, Medicaid, federally funded foster care, and (at state option) food stamps. In FY 2002, 17 percent of program cases involved current TANF recipients and 46 percent involved families who had previously received TANF.[24] Program organization varies considerably from state to state, as child support services may be housed in the human services agency, the attorney general's office, or an independent agency.

Transportation Assistance

The federal government does not provide states with funds for transportation assistance in a single funding stream. Both TANF and WIA funds may be used to provide transportation assistance to workers and job seekers eligible for those programs. States may also use federally funded programs such as Welfare-to-Work, Access to Jobs, and Housing and Urban Development programs, such as HOPE VI and Empowerment Zone/ Enterprise Communities, to pay for transportation assistance. To qualify for assistance, workers need to meet the eligibility criteria for the funding stream in question. Transportation assistance can be used in a variety of ways: for example, to pay for bus passes and other forms of public transportation; to repair cars; or to establish van service in areas without public transit.

Accessibility of Seven Work Supports at One-Stop Centers

The primary focus of our interviews with one-stop directors was to examine the level of access to the seven work support programs of interest. Access to work support programs could be provided in a number of different ways—the provision of information about programs, referral to other agencies for assistance, and/or the acceptance of program applications on-site. The provision of information ranges from comprehensive hand-outs, which caseworkers then discuss with customers, to the posting of flyers or brochures in waiting areas or resource rooms to group orientations where programs are introduced and discussed. Similarly, referrals range from "active," wherein a one-stop staff member actually makes an appointment at the appropriate agency for the customer, to "passive," wherein the customer might be given an address and phone number or, perhaps, only the name of the agency, and would be expected to follow up on his or her own. On-site application allows customers to complete and submit an application for a given work support while at the one-stop, with the help of either a one-stop employee or a worker from the appropriate agency that handles the work support program. (The eligibility determination for the program may not always be done at the one-stop itself, but, as far as the customer is concerned, all the interaction for the work support application occurs at the one-stop center.)

We divided the 30 one-stops surveyed into three categories—high, medium, and low—which describe the level of access to work supports they offer.* We determined whether a given one-stop would be considered to provide high, medium, or low access based on the provision of information about work supports, the type of referral made, the availability of on-site application, and the inaccessibility of work supports. We judged a work support to be inaccessible via the one-stop when our interview indicated that, at best, only written information or a passive referral would be available to those customers who asked. At worst, a work support is inaccessible because nothing is done to facilitate a customer accessing the program.

The six one-stop centers that we categorize as providing a high level of access provide information on most of the work supports (usually six of the seven); provide on-site application

* Out of the 33 one-stop centers surveyed, three are located in Utah. Since all three one-stops in Utah provide a high level of access, we have focused this section on the remaining 30 one-stops, and have left the Utah sites out of this discussion. See the separate discussion of Utah on pages 12–13 for more information about levels of access there.

Table 1. Determination of Level of Access Among the 30 One-Stop Centers Surveyed

	Number of Work Supports (out of 7)		
Level of Access	Active Referrals or Information Is Available	On-Site Application Submission	Inaccessible
High	6-7	At least 4	At most 1
Medium	6-7	2-3	At least 1
Low	Varies	1-2	At least 3

or active referrals for at least four of the seven work supports, and more commonly for five or six; and have, at most, one work support that we judged to be inaccessible through the one-stop center (although several have no work supports considered inaccessible). The inaccessible work support (if there is one) in all of the centers providing a high level of access is either child support or the EITC. The EITC is somewhat different from other work supports in its application process, which may partially account for its tendency to be inaccessible. Child support is perhaps not typically considered a work support program, and thus may be left out of services provided at one-stop centers.

The 15 one-stops we judged as providing a medium level of access also have information about most of the work supports, but usually allow on-site application or provide an active referral for only two or three of the work supports. In addition, they typically have at least one completely inaccessible work support.

The nine one-stops we categorize as providing low access to work supports provide more varied levels of information. In some cases, they provide information for as few as three work support programs out of the seven. They allow on-site application or provide an active referral for only one or two of the work support programs (but typically only one). Most distinctively, however, is that at least three, and often more, of the seven work supports are inaccessible from these centers. (In one case we placed a one-stop center in the low category although only two work supports were inaccessible.)

Naturally, these categories are subjective, and our ability to assess the quality of the information provided or the referrals given was limited. Nonetheless, we believe that the one-stops we judged as providing the best access give information about and access to a wide variety of work supports for all customers. One-stops providing lower levels of access appear to assume what customers need based solely on which agency referred them or which life event brought them to the one-stop.

Our attempts to categorize one-stops as low, medium, and high access were somewhat complicated because a number of one-stop directors told us they target certain services toward certain populations. In some one-stops, for example, information about and access to subsidized child care is only provided for TANF recipients. In such cases, the one-stop staff may simply be assuming that only TANF recipients are in need of subsidized child care. Or it may be that staff feel funds are so limited, they cannot afford to advertise the program to all those who might be eligible. Or, the local WIB may have recommended that the one-stop director not use staff resources to assist non-TANF recipients with child care subsidies. (Although only one state currently restricts child care assistance to TANF recipients [a state not represented in our survey], GAO has found that low-income families not associated with the TANF system tend to have lower priority for assistance.[25]) For the most part, it was difficult for us to tell which situation best described a given one-stop. When categorizing one-stops, in most cases we considered providing information and application assistance for targeted groups the same as providing it to job seekers in general.

A final note is that, among the 33 one-stops surveyed, three are located in Utah. Utah presents a special case, as the state has fully integrated its TANF and workforce development services at the state level. For most of the following analysis, we do not include Utah because all three Utah sites provide high access to services in much the same manner. We do devote a separate text box to one-stops and accessibility in Utah (see pages 12–13).

Referrals

For many of the work supports in question, one-stop centers provide customers with referrals to outside agencies in order to access services. A referral can be as simple as giving a customer the name of an organization or as complex as calling a specific outside agency worker and setting up an appointment for the customer. We felt the amount of information given during the referral process was crucial to the outcome. That is, the more specific the information given, the more likely a customer will be able to follow through on the referral. Thus, we divided the referral category into active and passive.

What is an active referral?

An active referral occurs when a one-stop staff member provides the customer with detailed contact information or actually assists the customer in setting up an appointment at the referral site. For example, for a customer interested in finding out about child care options in his/her community, an active referral would involve the one-stop staff calling the outside agency and making an appointment for the customer or providing the customer with a written referral form to present to the outside agency. The most successful referrals are those in which follow-up occurs—the one-stop is notified that the customer sought assistance at the agency he/she was referred to.

What is a passive referral?

A passive referral occurs when a one-stop staff member provides basic information to a customer seeking specific assistance that is not available on-site. In the worst case, one-stop staff might simply provide the customer with the name of an agency (not an individual at the agency) that handles the work support program in question. Another example is to provide a customer with a generic brochure (for example, a brochure for publicly funded health insurance that includes a toll-free number one can call for more assistance).

Provision of Information Is Common, Except for Information About Child Support

Providing access to work support programs begins with providing information, since people cannot apply for programs if they do not know they exist. (The exception is when customers automatically apply for work supports, without having to ask on their own or explore their options. We found this exception only applied in a few sites, and then only to TANF clients, who automatically applied for a series of work supports during the completion of the TANF application.) In our surveys, we asked one-stop directors whether they provided information about the programs in certain formats. We were not able to determine how aggressively the information was offered, however, nor whether the formats used were appropriate for the customers in question, as we did not actually observe how the information was provided.

Thus, when a one-stop director told us she has flyers and/or brochures available about a given work support, we could not assess how prominently the material was displayed, how effectively it was written, how current it was, whether it was provided in multiple languages —all factors which would influence how well the written material serves the clientele. Although we noted when case managers discuss programs with customers, we were not able to assess if this happens universally or if they only discuss programs with some customers, if case managers speak of programs glowingly or discouragingly, or if case managers are up-to-date about program specifics.

Verbal and written methods of communication are equally common in the one-stops we surveyed, and many of the sites use more than one method, typically relying on a case manager to discuss the program with customers and perhaps also having printed material available. Providing information in more than one format—that is, in both written and verbal forms—would seem to be the best way to reach the most customers. Yet about one-quarter to one-third of the sites rely solely on printed material to provide information about various work supports, and a smaller number (typically four or five, depending on which work support) offer only verbal information. The number of sites providing information on programs during group workshops or orientations is small (three or four sites, depending on the work support). In a handful of cases, information about a given work support is only provided to a targeted part of the one-stop population, usually TANF recipients, or a subset of WIA clients. This is most common for information about the EITC.

Child Support Differs from Other Programs

Two-thirds of the one-stops we surveyed provide information for six or seven out of the seven work supports, and no site provides information for fewer than three of the work supports. Six of the work supports—the EITC, subsidized child care, transportation assistance, publicly funded health insurance, food stamps, and cash assistance—are equally likely to have information provided about them at a given one-stop. Child support is considerably less

likely and shows other patterns making it appear different from the other programs. In 14 sites, respondents indicated that no information about child support is available. This is much higher than any other work support (the closest is the EITC, for which six sites stated they provide no information). In addition, six sites indicated that caseworkers discuss child support with customers *only if the customer asks about it.* No other program elicited such a response.

Work Supports Affiliated with TANF Are Less Likely to Be Discussed

The only other discernible pattern pertaining to the provision of information is that sites are more likely to provide information in written form only (that is, through flyers and brochures, with no oral follow-up) for the three work supports most closely associated with TANF or least likely to be perceived as linked to employment: food stamps, publicly funded health insurance, and cash assistance. About one-third of all sites indicated that they provide only written information for these programs. These responses may indicate less of a commitment to linking non-TANF one-stop customers with certain types of work support programs.

Coordination at Many Levels Appears to Distinguish High-Access One-Stops

As noted earlier, we found that six of the 30 one-stops provide a high level of access to work supports, defined as allowing relatively easy access to four or more of the work supports; 15 provide a medium level of access, by allowing easy access to two or three of the work supports, while one program is typically inaccessible; and nine provide a low level of access, allowing easy access only to one or two programs, while several others are completely inaccessible. The one-stops with either high or low levels of access appear to share more characteristics than those in the middle.

One-Stops with High Access to Work Support Programs Tend to Have Close Relationships with TANF Agency Staff

The six high-access one-stops among our sample are evenly distributed across geographic locations (urban, suburban, and rural), although only one is located in a small county. (Three are in medium-sized counties, and two are in large counties.) Far more pertinent than geographical attributes is the close relationship all these one-stop centers have with their local TANF agency. Of the six high-access one-stops, one is fully collocated with the TANF agency, while three have TANF agency staff on-site several days each week. The other two are within close proximity of the TANF agency office (one is in the same building and the other is on the same block) and have a referral system in place. As we discuss later, these close relationships with the TANF agency do not *guarantee* that a one-stop center will provide easy access to numerous work supports, but without them, easy access appears unlikely.

Integrated Services at Utah One-Stops

In 1996, the Utah state legislature granted authority to state officials to consolidate five state agencies into one. The new Department of Workforce Services (DWS) was the product of merging the Office of Family Support, the Department of Employment Security, the Office of Job Training, the Office of Child Care, and the Turning Point program for displaced homemakers. In 1997, as a part of welfare reform, the Family Employment Program was relocated to DWS. The mission of DWS is "to provide quality, accessible, and comprehensive employment-related and supportive services responsive to the needs of employers, job seekers, and the community." Prior to the passage of WIA, the state consolidated 106 service locations into 54 Workforce Service Employment Centers (ECs), of which 37 are full-service one-stop centers.

As part of the integration process, all EC staff, now called employment counselors, were trained in the programs and services offered by each of the merged departments so they have a range of knowledge and skills to allow for seamless service delivery. Employment counselors are part of a team that includes eligibility specialists and information specialists. The employment counselors focus on job development, training and skills needs assessment, placement interviewing, working with customers with multiple barriers, employer needs, and some eligibility determination. They also function as case managers. Eligibility specialists determine eligibility for food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, and child care. Therefore, one-stop centers in Utah provide access to all programs that were formerly administered by the once separate agencies, which include all of the work supports discussed in this report, with the exception of the EITC and child support.

continued...

One-stops offering easy access to many work support programs also appear to benefit from having a TANF agency that actively communicates with one-stop staff.

One-Stop Centers Offering Medium Access to Work Support Programs Are Not Well-Linked with TANF Agencies

We classified 15 of the 30 one-stops as medium access. One notable shared characteristic of these sites is that none provides on-site application for either food stamps or Medicaid for the general public. (Two have on-site application for SCHIP available, while a third allows TANF recipients to apply for Medicaid on-site.) Although more than half of the medium-access sites have some kind of connection to the TANF agency—either they are collocated, are physically very close, or have TANF agency staff come on-site regularly—these sites do not provide access to programs the TANF agency typically administers (such as Medicaid and food stamps). When connections to the TANF agency exist in these sites, the centers fail to capitalize fully on their connection to the TANF agency workers. It is possible that at these centers the TANF agency workers assist only current TANF recipients rather than determine eligibility for all customers. These patterns show that mere proximity of the TANF agency is not enough to guarantee customers' easy access to many work supports.

Another indication of poor linkages with work supports is that most of these sites offer few, if any, active referrals for customers to go to a separate agency to apply for a given program. For example, at one

small, rural one-stop with a medium level of access, customers who inquire about food stamps would be referred to the TANF agency; however, no information or referral is provided for customers who inquire about cash assistance.

The medium-access one-stops typically allow for on-site application of transportation assistance (a work support that usually does not require extensive eligibility determination) in addition to one or two other work support programs. Three sites provide on-site access to the EITC, another work support that does not require working closely with the TANF agency. One of the medium-access sites is an official Volunteer Income Tax Assistance site, while the other two provide assistance to customers who want to apply for the EITC via the Internet.

One-Stops with Low Access to Work Supports Tend to Have Weak Connections with the TANF Agency

We classified nine of the 30 one-stops as low access because they provide customers with limited ability to access work supports. In three of these sites, customers cannot access any work supports on-site, and in four of them, the only accessible work support is transportation assistance. Although the low-access one-stops are distributed across the county sizes, only one is located in an urban area.

As with the high-access sites, collocation appears to play a role among the low-access sites as well. Only one of the low-access sites is collocated with the TANF agency, and only two others are near the

Utah (continued)

Utah is not the only state that has formally integrated TANF and workforce services, and it has been refining this process for over six years. One of the advantages of Utah's integration is statewide uniformity in the one-stop system, something uncommon in the majority of other states. This uniformity is a product of the agency integration, and perhaps more specifically, of the cross-trained staff, who are now knowledgeable about a range of support services and programs.

We interviewed three sites in Utah, all within different geographical areas. One was located in a major urban center, another in a mid-size county, and the third in a small, rural county. Despite different locations, each of the one-stops provided the same services. All three provided general information about the EITC, and employment counselors are able to assist with tax preparation for clients who seek further assistance. All other services can be applied for on-site, with the exception of child support. Although one-stop staff can assist a parent in obtaining information and applying for child support, the client will still need to go to the Office of Recovery Services.

Utah has spent six years refining its new system and has encountered problems along the way. One possible disadvantage of the current structure is that some customers may not be aware that public benefits are available at one-stops, since one-stops do not look like typical welfare offices. And early on in the integration process, advocates in Utah were concerned about the low level of food stamp participation among one-stop customers. Many customers were confused by the new system and were therefore not accessing services for which they were eligible. The state has made a concerted effort to not only increase access to food stamps in particular, but to educate people about all of the services available at the one-stop centers.

TANF agency office. All the rest have a more distant relationship with the TANF agency and its staff. Indeed, it appears from the interviews that coordination of services and referrals between these sites and the TANF agency is rather weak. The directors of seven of these sites expressed attitudes regarding the role of the one-stop and/or the best way to serve TANF clients that run counter to integration or coordination of services. In some instances, directors expressed a narrow conception of employment services, defining them as only those programs or supports that are directly related to finding employment, such as resume writing, interviewing, and possibly transportation assistance. In a few other instances, the directors felt that the one-stop is not the appropriate place to provide services to TANF recipients (or those who might be eligible for TANF), either because doing so might harm the image of the one-stop, or because the one-stop's staff is not viewed as qualified to do so. For example, at one medium-sized, suburban one-stop, the administrator explained that she saw no reason to integrate TANF services into the one-stop or to collocate because the one-stop "[is not] equipped to handle that...and [the TANF agency] does a good job at that." This attitude, while not hostile, runs counter to making TANF-related work supports accessible at the one-stop for all customers.

Access to Work Supports Varies Considerably by Program

Making work supports accessible through one-stops must go beyond merely supplying information about the programs to providing assistance with applying for the work supports. The highest level of access is on-site completion and submission of an application, done with staff assistance. Another form of access is the provision of an *active* referral—a referral for the customer to a specific agency that can help the customer apply for the work support in question, including specific instructions on applying, caseworker assistance in making the appointment, and/or caseworker follow-up subsequent to the application. Less vigorous methods of providing access include having an application physically available on-site, but requiring the customer to go elsewhere to apply, and providing a *passive* referral, where a customer is simply given information about which agency to go to in order to pursue an application. Work supports are considered inaccessible when none of these is available for the work support in question—no application, no assistance in completing the application, no referral—or when the passive referral is so passive it appears meaningless. (For example, several one-stops stated they assisted customers with the EITC by referring them "to the IRS.")

Eligible Customers Can Easily Access Transportation Assistance at One-Stops, When It Is Available

Transportation assistance is clearly different from the other work supports. Although it is a frequently provided work support, there is no large, dedicated funding stream one-stops use to pay for transportation services, unlike Medicaid funding, which pays for health insurance.

One-stops that want to provide transportation assistance do so by tapping into a variety of funding streams, including TANF and WIA funds, county or city funds, public transportation funds, and others. Given this wide variety of funding sources, it is not surprising that the one-stops we surveyed described a number of different types of transportation assistance available, including van pools with sliding scale fees, car repair assistance, bus tokens, and even the purchase of used cars.

Table 2. Number of One-Stop Centers in Sample Providing Access to Work Supports, by Type of Access and by Work Support

	Number Providing Access (out of 30 total)				
Work Support Program	Information Available	Passive Referral	Active Referral	Apply On-Site	Inaccessible
Transportation assistance	29	4	0	24	2
Cash assistance	27	14	3	8	6
Publicly funded health insurance	28	18	7	8	6
Food stamps	26	19	2	7	6
Child care	29	12	6	12	2
Child support	16	14	3	2	16
EITC	24	9	1	7	14

Note: Figures do not include the three Utah one-stops. Also, figures in the last four columns sometimes add up to more than 30 due to some sites providing different methods to different types of customers and to some sites' "passive referrals" being so passive as to make the program appear inaccessible.

Transportation assistance also differs from the other work supports in that it may only be available through the one-stop. Unlike programs such as food stamps and cash assistance, which have entire agencies or departments dedicated to their provision, transportation assistance for job seekers in a community (who are not TANF recipients) may very well *only* be accessible through the one-stop. In our interviews, it appeared that most of the time, if transportation assistance was available in the area, customers could apply for it on-site at the one-stop. Of the 30 one-stops, 24 allowed on-site application for transportation assistance—by far the highest number of one-stops allowing on-site application. No director indicated that staff give clients an active referral to another agency for transportation assistance, while four said they provide a passive referral.

An important caveat, however, is that in 10 of the 24 one-stops accepting on-site applications for transportation assistance, only a targeted population could apply. In this case, the targeting of the population should not be seen as limiting access, as it appears that only certain groups are even eligible for transportation assistance—typically TANF recipients, WIA dislocated workers, or WIA intensive services clients. In these instances, transportation assistance may be a benefit of program participation in one-stop activities rather than a work support for low-income working families in general.

TANF Agency Staff Usually Handle Cash Assistance, Health Insurance, and Food Stamp Applications

Cash assistance, health insurance, and food stamps are moderately accessible at one-stops. About one-quarter of the sites accept applications for the programs on-site, while two-thirds provide outside referrals, although most are passive. Even when applications are accepted on-site, however, it is usually other agency staff (such as TANF agency staff) who handle the application process with the customers. Thus, sites not closely connected to the TANF agency are unlikely to provide easy access to this service. In only two sites do one-stop staff handle cash assistance applications, and in only one site do they handle food stamp applications. For these two work supports, it is also unlikely that sites have applications available if they do not actually accept the applications on-site. In six of the 30 sites, these work supports appear to be inaccessible.

Publicly funded health insurance is slightly different, partly because of the division among sites offering access to SCHIP only and not Medicaid. In four sites, one-stop staff handle the application process, but, in two of those sites, they only assist with the application for SCHIP. Also, publicly funded health insurance is more targeted than some of the others. In the eight sites that accept an on-site application for Medicaid, three provide this service only for a targeted population, typically TANF recipients or WIA intensive service customers.

Outside Agency Staff Also Typically Handle Subsidized Child Care Applications

Sites are more likely to allow on-site application for subsidized child care, but less likely to provide outside referrals. About one-third of all the one-stops we interviewed allow on-site application, while six provide active referrals to an outside agency. Twelve sites provide a passive referral to an outside agency. (These outside agencies are usually the TANF agency, but sometimes are a specific child care agency or contractor.) Both applications and active referrals are often targeted to specific populations—TANF recipients, WIA intensive and training service customers, and so on—although we are not certain if this is because the program is limited to those populations, or because the one-stop staff assume only customers in those programs would need the service. In either case, most of the time (in eight sites) outside agency staff handle the applications for this support.

One-Stop Centers Rarely Handle Child Support Applications On-Site and Often Provide No Access Whatsoever

Child support stuck out as a work support with little connection to the one-stop centers we interviewed. Only two sites allow on-site application for child support, the lowest number of any of the work supports. In both cases, staff target the service to TANF recipients only. (Even in Utah, a state that has combined its public benefits and workforce development agencies, customers could not apply for child support on-site.) In only three of the one-stops, staff make active referrals to an outside agency to assist with child support applications. Thirteen sites make only a passive referral, often merely providing the contact information for the District Attorney's office. In 16 sites, child support appeared to be completely inaccessible. This was surprising, given the financial importance child support plays in single parents' lives.

Another note on child support is that only two one-stops indicated that they provide any special assistance or referrals to non-custodial parents who owe child support or are under child support payment orders. Although a number of the directors we spoke with acknowledged that this was an area they had planned to work on, most had no idea how to pursue assisting such parents. Other directors appeared never to have considered assisting this population.

The EITC Is Often Inaccessible

The EITC provides substantial amounts of cash to low-income working families each

Rural Themes

During our survey of one-stop centers, we made a concerted effort to include one-stops located in rural areas, believing that they face unique circumstances and could provide a particular perspective on the challenges of offering access to many services all in one location. As it turned out, nine of the 33 one-stops we surveyed are located in areas their directors defined as "rural." The populations of eight of the nine counties these one-stops are in were also what we considered "small" (i.e., population less than 250,000), with some being extremely small (two had populations less than 10,000). There was one exception, which was a rural one-stop located in a geographically large and highly populous county (over 1.1 million residents). One-stops in rural areas clearly face distinct challenges in trying to carry out their work. Of the nine counties in question, six had unemployment rates higher than 5 percent in January 2003, and five had poverty rates over 11 percent.

Many directors of rural one-stops noted that they are heavily dependent on a single industry, such as agriculture, or even a single employer, such as a call center. If the industry or major employer suffers a downturn, the one-stop is forced to deal simultaneously with an influx of newly unemployed customers and a dearth of placement options for them. At least three of the rural one-stops we spoke with had experienced this situation recently.

This situation leads to specific workforce development challenges for rural one-stops. Long-time employees of a given industry or firm may be difficult to place in a new job because they may have extensive work experience but relatively little formal education. Specialized white-collar workers can be hard to place because of the lack of diversity of the local economy. Transportation limitations brought on by geography can make it hard for

continued...

Rural Themes (continued)

customers to navigate a job search and to apply for services. Many rural one-stops also have greater difficulty disseminating information about program availability.

Within this context, the story of rural one-stops and their provision of access to work supports is mixed. Two of the rural one-stops (including one in Utah) we talked to provide high access to services. The remaining seven rural one-stops neither provide customers the ability to apply on-site for most work supports, nor make many active referrals to an agency in the area that can accept applications. In fact, three of the rural one-stops do not provide on-site application to a single work support. The work support most frequently available among the rural sites is transportation assistance, which is not surprising, given the problems with transportation in rural areas.

While rural one-stops do not generally shine in providing easy access to work supports, many are creative in trying to meet customers' other needs, even in an environment without the number of formal services available in a large urban area. We were surprised by how many of the rural one-stops offer English as a Second Language classes on-site, or referrals to classes nearby, and by how many have bilingual staff available to assist customers in need.

Rural one-stops also work creatively to provide transportation assistance to their customers. Transportation problems are perceived as the biggest difficulty for their clientele, as public transportation is not generally available, and distances between homes and jobs or services are often vast. Some one-stops run their own van service; others work with local government to provide vans that are low-cost or free to one-stop customers.

continued...

year—in 2001, 18.4 million families received over $30 billion through the program.[26] Despite its importance as an earnings supplement, the EITC frequently does not have much of a place in one-stop centers. Part of this is understandable, as applying for the EITC is done when filing one's tax return. Therefore, making the EITC accessible is not as simple as merely having an application available and having a staff person who can complete it with the customer. We consider it impressive that seven one-stops provide help with applications on-site, some going so far as to be certified as a Volunteer Income Tax Assistance site.

More surprising is that only one of the 30 sites is able to provide an active referral for customers to get assistance elsewhere with the EITC. Nine offer passive referrals, and nearly half do nothing to make the EITC accessible to their customers, even though many could presumably benefit, and some quite substantially, from the program. Additionally troubling is that during several interviews, it appeared that one-stop directors were not familiar with the EITC, and thus would hardly be in a good position to encourage staff to pursue it with customers.

Several Factors Appear to Influence the Accessibility of Work Supports at One-Stops

Although our sample of one-stop centers is relatively small, we were able to detect the presence of several factors that seemed to play a role in determining the accessibility of work supports at a given one-

stop. Some of these factors are less tangible (for example, the attitudes discussed in the next chapter), but others are more quantifiable. The more easily analyzed factors, discussed here, include the collocation of the TANF agency, or of TANF agency staff, with the one-stop center; strong support from the local Workforce Investment Board for providing these services; the type of environment in which the one-stop is located (rural, urban, or suburban); and the size of the county in which the one-stop is located. We turn to each of these factors below.

Rural Themes (continued)

Some rural one-stops have begun to use technology to help them make up for their lack of staff and close partners. One site we spoke with has developed a CD-ROM for customers, which includes information about all services available in the county. Another is exploring the use of the Internet to allow households geographically far from the one-stop to stay informed about job listings and available workshops.

Rural one-stops are also creative in how they involve their partners. A number work closely with local Native American tribes to provide services on reservations and to have organizations from the reservations come on-site to recruit participants. Rural one-stops partner with community colleges, when they are nearby, to provide access to education and training resources to customers. Harnessing this same creativity and cooperation, rural one-stops may be able to provide better access to work support programs in the future.

A Close Relationship with the TANF Agency Is an Important Factor in Providing a High Level of Access to Work Supports

One common factor among the one-stops with high access to work supports is collocation, staff-sharing, or close proximity to the TANF agency (or the equivalent TANF-administering agency). In Utah, as noted in the text box on pages 12–13, integration between the one-stop system and TANF allows for easy access to work supports traditionally considered the purview of the TANF agency (cash assistance, food stamps, child care, and publicly funded health insurance). Even without full integration, however, collocation offers the potential for easy access to work supports. Only five of the one-stops we spoke with are actually fully collocated with the TANF agency. But a larger number of sites (seven) have TANF agency staff present at the one-stop several days per week, to provide customers with access to programs administered through the TANF agency, and a comparable number (six sites) are within close physical proximity to the TANF agency. We have noted earlier that these factors appear to be related to providing a high level of access to work supports.

Collocation does not guarantee easy access to many work supports, however. Twelve of the one-stop centers have TANF agency staff on-site to accept applications for at least one program, but, as we noted, only six of the one-stops are high access. The reason is that some one-stops, despite having TANF agency staff physically present, only use them to handle applications for one or two programs. It is not clear why, given that TANF agency staff may typically determine eligibility and/or complete applications for several programs (for exam-

ple, both cash assistance and food stamps), some sites only use them for certain work supports. It may be that questions of staff attitudes and turf arise.

It is important to note that in some cases, physical collocation may not necessarily be the best way to ensure high access. At one high-access site, located in a major city, both the welfare system and the workforce system are large, and the one-stop director felt that combining the systems would burden caseworkers with paperwork without serving clients better. Given the small physical size of the one-stop center, the director felt that clients would gain little by having TANF agency workers squeeze into the site itself. In fact, that might necessitate the loss of space to carry out other essential services. Transportation is not typically a challenge in this urban environment, so customers can get to the TANF agency offices relatively easily. One-stop staff are aware that they may need to refer customers to the TANF agency to ensure customers receive needed work supports. From a director's perspective, then, the administrative and spatial costs of collocating may not be worth the benefits. Whether customers agree is another question, of course.

Top-Down Support for Seamless Provision of Services Makes Access to Work Supports More Likely

In addition to collocation with the TANF agency, another characteristic many of the high-access one-stops share is an active local board. Of the seven high-access one-stops, five told us that their local board is active, interested, and engaged in the activities of the one-stop. In some cases, the local board formally directs the activities and programs offered in the one-stop, while, in other instances, the board is simply supportive of the decisions of the one-stop. Only one of the high-access one-stops could not articulate the mission of the board and felt somewhat disconnected from the board's decision-making process.

Rural One-Stops and One-Stops in Small Counties May Encounter More Challenges in Providing Access to Work Supports

When interviewing the one-stop directors, we asked them to describe their surroundings so we could get a sense of whether the one-stop is located in a rural, suburban, or urban area. These classifications did not necessarily overlap with the divisions made based on the population of the county, although in most cases they did. Of the 30 one-stops we contacted, 14 are located in urban areas, eight are in suburban areas, and eight are in rural areas. (The three Utah one-stops are distributed equally—one is rural, one suburban, and one urban. They are not included in the following analysis.)

We also divided our sample into three size categories. The counties in the large category have populations over 1 million, medium counties have populations between 250,000 to 1 million, and small counties have populations less than 250,000. Of the 30 one-stops we interviewed, eight are in large counties, 11 are in medium counties, and 11 are in small

counties. (See Appendix C for more detailed information.) There is considerable overlap between size and urbanization, particularly for small counties, as the majority of the one-stops in small counties were also in rural areas. (Only one of the one-stops in a rural area was in a large county.)

Across the three size categories, the most striking pattern that emerged is that only one of the 11 small-county one-stops offers a high level of access to work support programs. Similarly, the one pattern that emerged with regard to urbanization is that rural one-stops are not generally high access, as only one of the eight rural one-stops is high access, while four are low access.

Of the eight rural sites, only one is fully collocated with the TANF agency, while four others lack evidence of any close relationship with the TANF agency at all. Although the sample is admittedly not very large, the consistency of answers is suggestive of a broader trend. Rural one-stops, and those in smaller counties, tend to have fewer staff and other resources and are often geographically isolated. These factors may make it harder for rural areas to offer access to many work supports. On pages 17–19, we discuss in greater detail some of the rural themes that arose during our interviews with these directors. As described in the Utah text box, however, the rural Utah one-stop is a high-access site, providing access to five work supports, the same as the suburban and urban Utah sites. Thus, there are clearly ways in which rural areas may compensate for geographic shortcomings.

Other Factors Affecting Work Support Accessibility

Several factors came up consistently during our interviews with the 33 one-stop directors, although we did not ask specific questions targeting them. These discussions provide important context for our examination of the levels of access provided to customers seeking work supports.

The Recession Has Affected One-Stops' Ability to Provide Access to Services

The U.S. economy fell into a recession in March 2001. Since that time, 2.7 million jobs have been lost,[27] and since November 2001, the unemployment rate has not fallen below 5.6 percent. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the counties in which our 33 one-stops are located had unemployment rates ranging from 2.9 percent to 17.4 percent in January 2003; more than half have unemployment rates over 5 percent. Of course, the official unemployment rate of the county only provides a general context for the environment in which the one-stops are operating. Most directors we spoke with indicated that they feel the effects of the recession quite strongly, and this complicates their work in general as well as their ability to provide access to work supports.

Perhaps most obviously, many operators have seen the number of clients served increase over the past 18 months. During the surveys, directors regularly referred to the increasing number of clients coming in, due to layoffs or to people's difficulty in finding employment on their own. Several of the rural sites referred to major employers in the area shutting down, causing a dramatic spike in the number of dislocated workers. Other sites specifically noted that the number of TANF recipients coming through their doors was rising.

The increase in the number of customers complicates the one-stop's service provision in several ways. In the less populous areas, if a major employer has closed, one-stop operators face a dual challenge of working with more customers while having fewer employment options for them. One-stops may also see a more diverse population coming in for services. The slowdown in the information technology sector, for example, gave several one-stops in our sample large numbers of customers with completely different needs than the long-term

Urban Themes

Just as we noticed certain themes, some of them surprising, in our interviews with rural one-stops, we noted some trends with urban one-stops. (We did not note any specific trends for the six suburban sites in our sample.) Fifteen of the one-stops in our sample are in urban areas. Among those 15 urban counties, seven had unemployment rates over 5 percent in December 2002, and eight had poverty rates over 11 percent.

We found, somewhat to our surprise, that collocation with the TANF agency is not common among the urban one-stops in our sample, as only three of the 15 sites are collocated with the TANF agency, and two others have the TANF agency staff on-site three days per week. These low numbers may be because space limitations can hamper collocation, as noted in the barriers section. Indeed, in one-stops located in three of the four largest counties (population over 2 million) space is a top issue for one-stop directors. As mentioned earlier, the director of one center in a large urban area told us she is afraid to advertise its services, despite knowing that outreach is needed to reach certain populations, because space at the center is so limited that caseworkers are sharing desk space.

In addition to space, other factors may affect the level of collocation in urban areas. First, urban areas tend to have more public transportation available, making traveling to multiple agencies to access services easier than in rural areas. Second, major urban centers tend to have a high concentration of welfare cases within the state.[28] Accurately or not, one-stop directors may feel that these customers already have adequate services available within the city to assist them in finding employment.

continued...

unemployed or poorly educated workers they had focused on previously. Another challenge created from layoffs is the poorly educated but highly skilled manufacturing workers, who have trouble appearing attractive to employers in a different industry.

In all these cases, surmounting the challenges these new customers pose requires significant resources. The one-stops in our sample are facing simultaneous demands to serve more people and to serve different kinds of customers who need appropriately tailored services. These tasks must be accomplished without an increase in staff, however, as the one-stops we talked to had not received more funding to hire additional staff to cope with the changed circumstances. Amidst these difficulties, it is clear that, in some places, providing access to work supports is not seen as a core activity of the one-stop and therefore is expendable during these times. Thus, even one-stop directors who might like to provide better access to work supports see themselves at the moment as far too strapped with "essential" duties to divert resources from job-seeking activities.

Attitudes Toward Providing Work Supports Vary

The one-stop directors we surveyed expressed a range of attitudes about providing access to the work supports we were investigating. Respondents ranged from believing that providing access and information about these programs was essential, to expressing that providing access was fine as long as it did not entail

extra work, to feeling that providing access was actually detrimental to the functions of the one-stop.

The question of attitude arises because it appears to be a strong factor in having work supports truly accessible, as opposed to simply available. Attitude toward work supports may be the difference between investing in staff training on how to enroll customers in a given program, versus having some flyers available and staff who may assume most job-seeking customers do not need any of the programs discussed.

Urban Themes (continued)

Another theme of urban one-stops is the diversity of the customer population. Urban areas tend to have a higher percentage of immigrants and refugees, as well as significant numbers of low-income individuals. Diverse populations present additional challenges to one-stops, as they may need to adjust programs and services to be suitable to these various populations. For example, a few one-stops have hired bilingual staff to address language barriers. In addition, knowledge of and access to ESL courses, training programs for limited English speakers, and possibly written materials in various languages may need to be available.

In our surveys, we came across one-stops that exemplified each extreme, as well as many one-stops that fell somewhere in the middle. The three sites in Utah provide the best example of one-stops that currently see provision of work supports as essential to their mission. This may be partly due to the state's integration of the workforce system with the TANF system. Nevertheless, it appeared from our interviews that one-stop directors in Utah embrace this integration, instead of fighting it. In the Utah facilities, customers are provided with detailed information and the ability to apply for at least five of the seven work supports we investigated. The underlying presumption seems to be that the one-stop is a proper place to apply for such programs and that the usefulness of such programs is not limited to any particular group of people. In one of the Utah sites, instructions on applying for food stamps are included on the center's answering machine in case a customer calls when the office is closed and cares to pursue application on his/her own. This effort reflects a belief that many customers might benefit from applying for food stamps and that the one-stop should provide the information and services to make application easy. Naturally, achieving this level of service integration in Utah did not simply occur overnight.

In our sample, a few one-stops outside of Utah displayed a similar attitude—that work supports are vital to the work of the one-stop and that all customers should have the opportunity to apply for whichever services are needed. Even among sites with a positive attitude toward providing access to work supports, very few provide on-site application for as many programs as the Utah sites.

Far more common was an attitude of mild indifference toward work support programs. The majority of the one-stop directors we spoke with believe that providing access to such servic-

es should not be a specific focus of their work. In a number of cases, the one-stop director was hesitant about whether a given work support was available at the site, often stating that a caseworker might discuss the program with a client "if appropriate" or "if asked." For example, one small urban area's one-stop responded that customers could "probably" apply on-site for cash assistance, and that, while customers could not apply on-site for publicly funded health insurance, they could use the one-stop's phones to call on their own. These types of answers indicate the common perception that while the one-stop might take simple, cost- and labor-free steps to help a client obtain a given work support, it was not the one-stop's job to ensure the client's access to these programs. Such one-stops are adhering to the letter of the law, since, as noted, WIA does not require one-stops to provide more than information about "supportive services."

Less common, but clearly present, were one-stops with hostile attitudes toward providing access to the work supports in question. There appear to be several reasons behind this negative attitude. One is a belief that one-stops are designed to focus on employment and not on social services. This reasoning is exemplified by the director of a large suburban one-stop who expressed the concern that making the one-stop too effective at providing work supports would dilute its mission to provide universal employment services. Other directors said that local TANF agency staff possess skills and training to assist customers in applying for the work supports in question, and it is therefore duplicative and less helpful for the client to have one-stop staff assist them. In these cases, one-stop directors typically provide referrals for clients to go to the TANF agency. Clearly some directors consider the work support programs described here as public benefits as opposed to work supports. When considering a model wherein a universal case manager determines eligibility for the programs discussed here, at least one director of a medium-sized urban one-stop felt it was a "terrible" idea, because one-stop staff would become ineffective if expected to work for many different programs.

A final note is that some small one-stops expressed the desire to help customers access work supports but felt that their current staff are unable to do so, either because of a lack of training or because of a lack of enough staff. In these cases, directors indicated that more resources allowing them to hire or train their staff would improve the level of access to services. For example, one small rural one-stop would like a staff member from the TANF agency to come on-site once a week to help improve access to services, but lacks a computer or even workspace for an additional staff member.

Attitudes Toward Serving TANF Recipients Vary, But Are Often Negative

Attitudes toward serving TANF recipients seem likely to influence the provision of work supports at the one-stop, if the work supports in question are seen as linked to TANF recipi-

ents. In a few places, TANF recipients are not viewed any differently than the rest of the job-seeking population. Once again, this is typified in the Utah sites, where clients seeking "intensive services" (i.e., TANF) are just one slice of the population served and where work supports, such as food stamps, are not perceived as being only for TANF recipients. In other places, however, TANF recipients are commonly viewed as being different from other customers. Sometimes this difference is not perceived as a barrier to receiving services at the one-stop, but merely something to acknowledge and take into account when planning services. In other cases, directors perceive TANF recipients as being difficult to serve at the one-stop, since they are hard to employ and at times display significant barriers to work, which one-stop directors do not always feel equipped to handle.

The thought that TANF clients are different from the rest of the job-seeking population has led a number of sites to offer certain work supports only to TANF recipients and not to other clients. Often TANF recipients go through a different intake process than other clients, and one-stop directors feel this is appropriate, given the different circumstances of the clients. During these intake processes, TANF recipients often hear about or are assisted in applying for work supports to which other customers have no ready access. For example, one small, rural one-stop provides information about six of the seven work supports. When pressed, however, it became clear that TANF recipients are the only clients who are told about five of the programs. Thus, only one of the work supports is accessible to non-TANF-receiving customers. It is not clear why a program such as SCHIP, for example, which is means-tested and should be available to all state residents who meet the income requirements, is only offered to TANF recipients at some one-stops.

The view of TANF recipients as being "different" sometimes shaded into a view that they were bad for the one-stop. The director of one large suburban one-stop stated that if the one-stop were serving welfare-to-work clients, it might be seen as less "professional" by both other customers and employers. While few other directors expressed an attitude this strong, a number of others did suggest that their tantamount concern is attracting employers to the one-stop. The implication is that the clients served should not distract from that mission or possibly tarnish the reputation of the one-stop. Some one-stop directors explicitly stated that the local TANF agency does a better job working with TANF clients, since staff there are trained to work with them and the one-stop could hardly improve on that. One-stop directors want both to maximize their own ability to serve clients who could truly benefit from their services and to avoid unnecessary duplication. A negative consequence of this attitude, unfortunately, is that TANF recipients may be required to seek job services from a system not interested in serving them.

Innovative Techniques for Providing Access to Work Supports

During the course of the interviews, one-stop directors not only told us *whether* they provide access to work supports, they also told us how they did so. Many of the sites we surveyed had at least one practice we considered innovative or uncommon, which provided greater access to a work support or to a particular population. We think it is important to highlight some of these practices. (Note that we did not specifically ask respondents to tell us their "best practices," so this list is unlikely to be exhaustive.)

Assistance with the EITC

As we have noted earlier, one-stops have less of a direct role in the provision of the EITC as compared to the other work supports. Despite this different role, several one-stops we spoke with embrace the idea that they are a logical place for low-income workers to receive assistance in applying for the credit. As we noted, one site is a certified Volunteer Income Tax Assistance location, and thus is staffed with trained volunteers who can help people complete their taxes. Another site provides tax assistance to customers throughout the entire year. Others partner less formally with local agencies to assist workers in completing their paperwork during tax season.

Helping Non-Custodial Parents

We found that few one-stops overall provide much assistance to non-custodial parents seeking to address issues of child support, but two of the one-stops do have programs worth noting. One center that actively seeks to assist such parents administers and receives funding for a program called Parents' Fair Share, which helps non-custodial fathers with employment services, peer support groups, and mediation with the custodial parent. Another one-stop has a court liaison available to assist non-custodial parents find sufficient work to fulfill their child support obligations. The liaison also works with both the one-stop and the child support enforcement agency to ensure compliance with child support requirements.

Transportation Assistance

Transportation assistance is an area where many one-stops have devised practices to best meet the local needs of their customers. In one site, "mobility specialists" (provided by the local transportation department) meet with customers to create plans for customers to navigate between work, home, child care, training, and any other locations. Several sites have implemented sliding-scale van services that carry customers to jobs, job interviews, health appointments, and the one-stop center for an affordable price (for instance, one dollar) and that are available to all customers in need.

Health Insurance and Health Care

Two sites have particularly notable practices relating to health care. In one site, health department workers come to the one-stop several times a week to assist customers in enrolling in Medicaid. Another site has links and makes active referrals to nearby health clinics to assist customers who do not qualify for Medicaid but who need medical treatment.

Comprehensive Provision of Information

We found that several sites offer comprehensive and frequent orientations in which all the partners and programs available are introduced. These orientations provide customers with another method of learning about available programs and allow the one-stop to communicate consistent information to a number of customers all at once. Another helpful practice several sites have adopted is to provide a highly comprehensive set of referral information (in a packet or via computer), which describes available resources and lists contact information and directions about how to access assistance.

Serving Diverse Populations

A number of one-stop centers have begun programs to reach out to underserved populations in their communities and, thus to increase their access to the one-stop's services. For example, several sites offer workshops and services in languages other than English in order to assist job seekers fluent in other languages. One site, located in an area where agriculture dominates, has an extensive outreach program to migrant farm workers. Another site hopes to begin more recruiting through local Spanish-language churches.

Native American tribes often have separate tribal entities that administer employment programs and social services, and sometimes such services are inadequately funded or lack necessary infrastructure. Thus, working closely with a nearby one-stop center can benefit both sides—the one-stop center is able to improve its visibility among the Native American population, and the tribal entities are able to ensure their populations receive more services. One of the one-stop centers we spoke to allocates staff to travel to the local reservation once per week to provide employment assistance to reservation residents. In another site, a local

Native American organization comes on-site regularly to recruit for its summer youth employment program.

Other frequently underserved populations are youth and ex-offenders. One site has opened a satellite center at the local alternative high school to capture a population typically disengaged from employment services—but for whom employment may serve as a preventive measure against future problems. A second site works closely with the county jail to coordinate and provide pre-release services to nonviolent offenders.

Maximizing Local Resources

For nearly all of the one-stops we spoke to, funding constraints pose a major barrier to providing more comprehensive services. One center did not have money to cover staffing for the resource room. Having a strong, established relationship with the local community college allowed the one-stop to establish a mutually beneficial arrangement that remedied the problem. The community college made staffing the resource room a credited course; thus, students were able to staff the resource room, freeing up one-stop staff for other, more targeted activities (including providing access to work supports). In addition, all customers who utilized the resource room were enrolled at the community college as non-degree students. This allowed one-stop customers to access campus programs and services available to non-degree students and also engaged customers, who may never have taken a college course before, in the offerings of the community college.

Barriers to Service

In the course of our interviews with one-stop directors, we asked which barriers they perceived as preventing them from providing the work supports under discussion. We also asked them what they wished they could do, but are currently unable to do, to facilitate their work in general. Answers to both questions illuminate the common needs of one-stops, which often cut across size, geography, and population served, as well as directors' interest in developing a seamless place of service for their clients to meet a number of work-related needs. It is not surprising to anyone in the workforce development field that the most commonly mentioned barrier is a lack of resources. Indeed, a perception of scarce resources underlies many of the other concerns expressed. Directors mentioned child care more often as a wish than a barrier, although some directors clearly feel a lack of child care impedes their work. Finally, with some frequency directors mentioned more intangible and less common barriers, such as attitudes or turf struggles with other agencies.

Resources, Staff, and Facilities Concern Many One-Stop Directors

It was no surprise that nearly every single one-stop director we spoke with mentioned a need for more funds. As noted earlier, most of the one-stops we talked to are feeling increased pressure from the recession and the associated layoffs, slowdown in employment opportunities, and increase in customers. They are feeling pinched in providing even the most basic services.

Directors spoke of needing additional resources for three main reasons, two of which pertain to staff. Some directors would like funds to hire more staff, while others would like funds to hire better qualified staff. For example, the director of a one-stop in a small urban area spoke of having so many customers, her staff could only meet with individual clients for a maximum of 25 minutes. She felt it would be ideal to have more money to pay for staff to spend more one-on-one time with customers. The director of a suburban one-stop mentioned that having staff with more expertise would allow her to find more on-the-job training slots for customers and thus provide them with more work experience. The director of a small rural one-stop felt that the lack of a diversified staff on-site limited the one-stop's ability to accept or assist with work supports applications.

The other common reason one-stop directors would like more funds is to increase work space. Issues around facilities arose frequently during our conversations with one-stop direc-

Profile of a Small, Rural One-Stop

The one-stop center is fairly isolated from other services in the county. The nearest building is at least 10 miles in any direction. A staff of 16 serve between 400 and 600 customers per month, approximately 30 percent of whom seek intensive or training services. Although the TANF agency is an on-site partner, work supports related to TANF are not fully integrated into the fabric of the one-stop. The on-site TANF agency staff work solely with current TANF recipients and do not function as eligibility specialists for all other one-stop customers. Other customers need to seek additional assistance from a WIA Title I case worker.

Although a small one-stop in a rural area, the center provides access to many work supports. Customers are able to access information and apply on-site for subsidized child care, transportation assistance, food stamps, and cash assistance through either an appointment with the TANF agency worker, an appointment with the WIA Title I liaison, or through pamphlets and applications on display in the resource room. The one-stop does not provide information about the EITC, although some case workers may address it with customers individually. Custodial and non-custodial parents can access information about child support but would then be referred to the appropriate, off-site agency. The one-stop also provides information about publicly funded health insurance, but customers are referred to an off-site agency to access the program.

In addition to offering a medium level of access to work supports, the center provides access to a large number of other on-site programs and services. Vocational rehabilitation is an active on-site partner and offers a num-

continued...

tors. Repeatedly, they explained that they might like to have TANF agency staff on-site, for example, but that one reason they were unable to do so was the lack of space for that extra person to have a desk and a computer. Lack of space also hampers one-stop directors from accomplishing some of their other goals, such as having a clothes closet available to allow customers to choose appropriate interview clothes from among donated items or providing more classes on-site. Space was such a concern at one center that when asked about barriers, the administrator responded that "our number one, two, and three barriers are space, space, and space. We are afraid to advertise our services because we just can't handle more clients with such limited space...we're sharing desks."

A perceived lack of resources means that one-stop directors feel their staff do not have time for "extras." Unfortunately, what are often considered extras can be elemental to carrying out the one-stop's responsibilities. For example, staff training appears to be conducted very minimally. One-stop directors sometimes referred to monthly or quarterly staff meetings as a time for staff to get "trained" in the availability of work support programs. Given the vast number of programs one-stop staff need to know about, as well as the array of community resources available, a short session every month or two appears unlikely to constitute enough time for training.

Child Care Is a Common Barrier

A number of the one-stop directors we spoke with mentioned child care as a bar-

rier for customers seeking services from the one-stop. One-stop directors said they are hampered by resource and space constraints from providing child care on-site, and they felt this is a serious limitation in their ability to assist customers. As the director of a large urban one-stop put it, having on-site, drop-in child care—particularly sick child care, off-hour care, and infant care, all of which are expensive or hard to find in the general community—would allow parents to participate in training programs, to apply for work supports, and to conduct a job search much more easily.

Transportation Is Perceived as a Barrier in All Geographic Areas

Concerns about transportation came from rural, urban, and suburban one-stops. Most directors believe they cannot influence decisions about public transportation and so are at the mercy of funding streams and public agencies with which they have little influence. Rural sites had difficulty helping clients navigate the long distances to their offices, while urban and suburban sites wrangled with public transportation offices to modify bus lines to accommodate their locations. Clients' difficulty in getting to one-stop centers limits their ability to apply for available services.

Profile of a Small, Rural One-Stop (continued)

ber of programs and workshops specific to disabled customers. Workshops offered include job search, resume writing, and interviewing. Computer classes and Internet classes are provided on-site as well. Customers are commonly referred to GED classes, veterans' programs, substance abuse treatment, mental health services, vocational education, and a truck driving training school.

As is common with some rural areas, the county is heavily reliant on one industry, and thus plant closings immediately affect the economy of the region and increase utilization of the one-stop. Without more employers entering the region, however, workers who are trained in one industry may have difficulty finding work. Therefore, new training is critical to finding employment. The one-stop has been able to pool Trade Adjustment Assistance money from plant closings and provides training programs to all customers interested in new or upgraded skills, about 60 percent of the clientele.

In addition to the Trade Adjustment Assistance money, the one-stop has an active board whose vision is to provide quality employment and training services to both job-seeking customers and the business partners. This vision drives the process of engaging more partners and potentially more businesses by developing on-the-job training programs.

Attitude and Turf Issues Plague Some One-Stops

We have already noted how the attitude of one-stops toward work supports and toward services for TANF clients varied across the sites, and how it then affected their provision of work supports for customers. Clearly, a negative attitude toward these populations and programs presents a substantial barrier to provision of services. Another factor is the attitude toward providing work supports at all. One-stops that operate under the assumption that it is either not their job to provide access to these work supports, or that in their current

capacity they are not truly able to offer access to the programs, had a strong barrier to providing services. A related aspect is that in some areas, one-stop directors felt that attempts to provide access to work supports would be perceived as a grab for turf from the TANF agency and that this would jeopardize their working relationships and their ability to function.

Conclusion

The intention of creating a one-stop delivery system was to make the workforce development system more user-friendly for both job-seekers and employers. As the name implies, the one-stop system was also created to offer a range of services, including job search assistance, training, supportive services, and services for employers, at one location. Under WIA, however, the federal government did not mandate how each local workforce area should establish partnerships, determine the lead agency for running the one-stop, or provide access to various programs. As is evident from this survey, there is great variety among one-stop centers in all aspects of operation, including resources and program accessibility.

Results from this survey offer some insight into potential reasons for high accessibility of work support programs, as well as low accessibility. Collocation or a close working relationship with the TANF agency is an important factor for accessibility, particularly for programs such as publicly funded health insurance, food stamps, and cash assistance. In addition, it seems that one-stop directors' attitudes about the provision of work supports at the one-stop affects the accessibility of programs. Rural one-stops, and those in smaller counties, tend to have fewer staff and other resources and are often geographically isolated. These factors may combine to make it harder for rural areas to offer access to many work supports. Despite significant barriers to service provision—lack of resources, staff, facility space, child care, and transportation, and attitude or turf

Profile of a Large, Urban One-Stop

The center, located in a large urban area, is part of a network of 30 one-stops in the county. A staff of over 50 serve approximately 1,500 customers per month, with about 70 percent of customers utilizing intensive or training services. The TANF agency is not an on-site partner; instead, the one-stops use an interagency referral form to ensure access for customers and accountability within the system.

The center provides on-site access to the EITC by assisting customers online or through an active referral to the local library. Child care is also available through a child care representative on-site, and generally customers are able to apply for child care services the same day they come in. Access to child support is not available on-site and customers are referred to the local Attorney General's office for information or assistance. All customers who receive expanded or individualized services have access to transportation assistance in the form of bus tokens and gas reimbursement. The center provides access to food

continued...

Profile of a Large, Urban One-Stop (continued)

stamps through a weekly outreach program and an active referral to the TANF agency office. Both publicly funded health insurance and cash assistance are provided through active referrals to the local TANF agency office. These referrals involve the completion of a form developed with the cooperation of several agencies. One-stop staff receive confirmation that a customer has kept an appointment at whichever agency is charged with helping him or her access a given service.

The one-stop also provides various other services, including referrals for stress management, counseling, domestic violence, and financial aid. On-site programs include workshops on job search skills, computers, interviewing, resume writing, financial management, and coping with change. The center serves a diverse population of dislocated workers, TANF recipients, Unemployment Insurance recipients, and a steadily increasing population of customers who had worked in high-paying industries.

issues—many sites created innovative approaches to providing a vast array of services to one-stop customers.

One-Stop Centers Can Help Families Through Access to Work Supports

Although federal legislation does not mandate that one-stop centers provide access to the seven work support programs we have examined, the centers do appear to be in a prime position to help the unemployed and underemployed access services that could help them obtain and retain employment, as well as support their families. An increase in available resources would undoubtedly help many one-stop centers provide better information and access to needed programs. Yet even without increased resources, many sites could improve by adopting some of the practices of those sites that manage to provide high access in the current environment. The most important of these practices is to establish a close relationship with the local TANF agency and with other relevant agencies, such as child support enforcement. Working closely with these agencies can help one-stop centers determine whether collocation is a possibility and whether it would be helpful to customers and staff. Even if collocation is not viable in a particular area, one-stop center staff can improve their work support referral system, as well as their process of informing customers of the programs available.

Work support programs should not be tainted with the stigma of outdated ideas of the kind of person who might need a public benefit. Health insurance, tax credits, food for families—all of these work supports are available to help many different kinds of people in many different situations. The underlying premise of these supports is that they will make jobs easier to obtain and easier to keep for those who receive them. One-stop centers focused on assisting their customers in finding and keeping employment would do well to help them access work support programs.

Appendix A: Methodology

The information in this report is based upon 33 telephone surveys with directors or managers of one-stop centers. The surveys were conducted between December 2002 and March 2003. There are over 600 one-stop centers across the United States, although not all are defined as "main" one-stops, since some are "satellite." We focused our survey on only main one-stop centers, because some satellite one-stop centers have distinctly reduced services.

Since WIA services are generally provided through locally based systems, we based our sampling process on counties, as defined by the 2000 Census. There are 3,141 counties in the U.S. We stratified counties by size and by region, in order to select a reasonably representative sample, although the sample is clearly too small to attempt statistical inferences or quantitative analysis. It seemed a reasonable assumption that services provided in one-stops might vary by region, and it certainly seemed plausible that services might differ according to the size of the county and its population.

Using Department of Commerce definitions, we divided the 50 states and the District of Columbia into four regions: Northeast, South, Midwest, and West (see Appendix B for a list of states categorized by region). We included one-stops from each region in our sample, roughly in proportion to the share of the U.S. population living in that region. We also stratified the counties by size, dividing them into 10 categories according to county population as measured in the 2000 Census, ranging from less than 10,000 people (nearly 700 counties) to over 2 million people (11 counties). (See Appendix C for a complete list of the size categories, and the number of one-stops in each category within our sample.) In the analysis of the surveys, we have collapsed these 10 categories into three (small, medium, and large) for simplicity's sake.

Once we had divided the nation's 3,141 counties by population and by region, we began randomly selecting counties within which to sample a one-stop center. Within each randomly selected county, we searched by zip code to find a main one-stop (as noted, we avoided satellite one-stops). Some counties did not have main one-stops, in which case we returned to our list of counties and randomly chose another. Naturally, not all the one-stops we contacted were willing or able to participate in the survey. Our response rate was about 60 percent. We conducted our survey over the phone, with the director or manager of the one-stop. Due to the unpredictable response patterns, we did not achieve the exact distribution

across states, regions, and counties we would have liked. Nonetheless, we were able to speak to one-stop representatives from small, medium, and large counties, and from across the country.

One note about this process is that some states have more counties in proportion to their population than other states. This made them more likely to be selected into the sample. Although we do not believe this is a serious failing, some states do appear more than once in our sample, so that the 33 one-stops we interviewed are located in 22 different states. As it turned out, this gave us an opportunity to check on consistency of one-stop services within states.

Appendix B: Number of One-Stops in Sample, by Region

Region	States	Population	Share of U.S. Population	Number of One-Stops from Region Included in Sample
Northeast	CT, ME, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT	54 million	19%	6
Midwest	IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI	64 million	22%	7
South	AL, AR, DE, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV	100 million	36%	11
West	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, WY	61 million	23%	9*

* Includes the three Utah sites, eliminated from most of the analysis in the paper.

Appendix C: Number of One-Stops in Sample, by County Size

	County Size & Population	Number of Counties in U.S.	Total U.S. Population Residing in Counties of This Size	Counties of This Size Included in Sample	Within Counties, Type of One-Stop Surveyed		
					Urban	Suburban	Rural
Large	Greater than 2 million	11	38,257,056	4	4	0	0
	1 - 2 million	23	31,988,794	4	2	1	1
Medium	500,000 - 999,999	78	55,342,839	6	2	4	0
	250,000 - 499,999	119	41,640,329	6	4	2	0
Small	150,000 - 249,999	128	24,324,180	4	1	2	1
	80,000 - 149,999	282	30,806,346	4	1	1	2
	40,000 - 79,999	472	26,066,993	2	0	0	2
	20,000 - 39,999	680	19,552,052	0	0	0	0
	10,000 - 19,999	652	9,558,584	1	0	0	1
	Less than 10,000	696	3,884,733	2	0	0	2

Endnotes

1 National Association of Workforce Boards. (2000). *Putting your WIB on the political map: Tips on marketing, communications and public relations.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at www.nawb.org/pdf/pub-5-2000.pdf.

2 General Accounting Office. (2002, July). *Workforce Investment Act: States and localities increasingly coordinate services for TANF clients, but better information needed on effective approaches.* Washington, DC: Author, p. 8. Note that this number includes the 25 states that require TANF to be a partner in the one-stop system, although, as noted, TANF does not necessarily have to be collocated at the one-stop.

3 General Accounting Office, 2002, pp. 8 & 12.

4 For more on the survey process, please see Appendix A: Methodology.

5 For more specific information about each work support (except transportation assistance), please see Patel, N., Greenberg, M., Savner, S., & Turetsky, V. (2002, June). *Making ends meet: Six programs that help working families and employers.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy. Much of the descriptive material in the sidebars is drawn from that report.

6 Pavetti, L., Maloy, K., & Schott, L. (2002, June). *Promoting Medicaid and food stamp participation: Establishing eligibility procedures that support participation and meet families' needs.* Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

7 Note that most youth are typically not served through one-stop centers, but through youth service providers who receive WIA funds through grants and contracts.

8 Workers who were raising one child in their home and had family income of less than $29,201 (or $30,201 for married workers) in 2002 may be eligible for an EITC of up to $2,506 in 2003. Workers who were raising two or more children in their home and had family income of less than $33,178 (or $34,178 for married workers) in 2002 can receive an EITC of up to $4,140. Workers who were not raising children in their home but were between ages 25 and 64 on December 31, 2002, and had income below $11,060 (or $12,060 for married workers) can receive an EITC of up to $376.

9 Johnson, N., Llobrera, J., & Zahradknik, B. (2003, March). *A hand up: How state earned income tax credits help working families escape poverty in 2003.* Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

10 Child Care Bureau. (2003, January). *Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) report to Congress.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

11 Mezey, J., Greenberg, M., & Schumacher, R. (2002). *The vast majority of federally-eligible children did not receive child care assistance in FY 2000: Increased child care funding needed to help more families.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

12 U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2003, April 24). *Food Stamp Program monthly data.* Retrieved from http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/fsmonthly.htm, on May 29, 2003.

13 Food Research Action Council. (2003, May 5). *Current news and analysis.* Retrieved from http://www.frac.org/html/news/fsp/03febhtml, on May 29, 2003.

14 Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2001). Unpublished data collected through a survey of state Medicaid officials.

15 Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services. (2002). *CMS statistics 2002.* Retrieved from http://cms.hhs.gov/researchers/pubs/CMSStatistics'BlueBook2002.pdf, on May 29, 2003.

16 Cohen Ross, D., & Cox, L. (2002, June). *Enrolling children and families in health coverage: The promise of doing more.* Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured.

17 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. (2003, January 30). *Fiscal year 2002 number of children ever enrolled in SCHIP—Preliminary data summary.* Retrieved from http://cms.hhs.gov/schip/schip02.pdf, on May 29, 2003.

18 Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured. (2003, January). *The uninsured and their access to health care.* Retrieved from www.kff.org, on May 29, 2003.

19 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2003, February). *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF): Fifth annual report to Congress.* Washington, DC: Author, Table 2:7.c.

20 Information on General Relief programs comes from Gallagher, J.L., Uccello, C.E., Pierce, A.B., & Reidy, E.B. (1999, April). *State general assistance programs.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/ga_main.pdf, on June 19, 2003.

21 Turetsky, V. (2003) *Child support trends.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy. Based on Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement, FY 2002 preliminary data report, April 2003.

22 Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement. (2003, April 29). *Child support enforcement FY 2002 preliminary data report.* Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/pubs/2003/reports/prelim_datareport/, on May 30, 2003.

23 Lyon, M. (1999, May). *Characteristics of families using Title IV-D services in 1995.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

24 Administration for Children and Families, 2003.

25 General Accounting Office. (2003, May). *Child care: Recent state policy changes affecting the availability of assistance for low-income families.* Washington, DC: Author.

26 The National Tax Assistance for Working Families Campaign. (Undated). *EITC fact sheet.* Retrieved from http://www.eitc.info/resources/pdf/fact_sheet.pdf, on May 29, 2003.

27 Bernstein, J. (2003, May 28). *Economic snapshots.* Retrieved from http://epinet.org/content.cfm/webfeatures_snapshots, on June 3, 2003.

28 Waller, M., & Berube, A. (2002, September). *Timing out: Long-term welfare caseloads in large cities and counties.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

CLASP

CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY

1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005

202.906.8000 main
202.842.2885 fax

www.clasp.org

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").