

PROMOTING PERFORMANCE IN TANF PROGRAMS

SUMMARY REPORT

Using Rapid Response funds provided through ACF/OFA Central Office, Region VIII TANF staff planned, developed and staged a workshop explicitly focused on performance and performance considerations in the TANF Program. Spanning three days, the workshop was held on July 29 – 31, 2003 at the Warwick Hotel in Denver, Colorado.

A total of 36 participants engaged in the discussions and deliberations of issues involved in performance considerations. These participants consisted of 25 State TANF policy and data management staff from the Region VIII States of Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming, 4 county level staff, and 7 Federal TANF staff.

The report contained herein, provides the following:

	Pages
▪ Agenda	2 - 4
▪ Summaries of the individual workshops	5 - 31
▪ Workshop evaluation summary	32-33
▪ Conference participants	34-36
▪ Citation of handouts	

PROMOTING PERFORMANCE IN TANF PROGRAMS

TUESDAY, JULY 29, 2003

10:00 a.m. REGISTRATION

12:30 p.m. INTRODUCTIONS & WELCOME
Thomas Sullivan, Regional Administrator

12:45-2:00 p.m. USES OF ADMINISTRATIVE DATA
Professor Garth Mangum, University of Utah

Overview discussion on uses of administrative data to effectuate policy and TANF service decisions.

2:00-3:15 p.m. STATE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
Mary Kay Cook, Colorado
Hank Hudson, Montana
Helen Thatcher, Utah

Roundtable discussion on approaches to enhancing performance (including indicators, methodologies, and corrective action steps).

2:00-3:15 p.m. STATE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
Mary Kay Cook, Colorado
Hank Hudson, Montana
Helen Thatcher, Utah

Roundtable discussion on approaches to enhancing performance (including indicators, methodologies, and corrective action steps).

3:15-3:45 p.m. BREAK (In room)

3:45-5:00 p.m. IN-STATE SYSTEMS AND STATE IT DEVELOPMENTS
Colorado CBMS – Connie Haynes
Utah E-REP – Ann Kump
Wyoming IRIS - Ken Kaz

On line performance reporting innovations in the three R08 state systems being developed.

5:00-6:00 p.m. HAPPY HOUR (Attitude/Altitude Adjustment)

WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 2003

- 7:30 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST**
- 8:30-10:00 a.m. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK BEHIND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT**
Margaret O'Brien Strain, Ph.D., Sphere Institute
- Thinking analytically when using data to manage programs
- 10:00-10:30 BREAK (in room)**
- 10:30-12:00 PROACTIVE STEPS TO INCREASE WORK PARTICIPATION**
Professor Garth Mangum
- Concrete steps that states may take to increase work participation by TANF households, with focus on partnering actions with WIA, Job Service, Community and Faith Based Organizations.
- Noon-1:30 WORKING LUNCH: "The Champion in You"**
Darryl Collier
- The light touch on issues involving enhanced performance in the work place.
- 1:30-3:00 p.m. MEASURING PERFORMANCE & ESTABLISHING EFFECTIVE GOALS**
Margaret O'Brien Strain, Sphere Institute
Susan Diaz, Mesa County, Colorado
Rebecca Jacobs & Cheryl Schnell, El Paso County, Colorado
- Issues involved in establishing meaningful performance measures that promote efforts for greater achievement among field level staff.
- 3:00-3:30 p.m. BREAK (in room)**
- 3:30-5:00 p.m. USING COMMUNITY RESOURCES TO ENHANCE WORK PARTICIPATION**
Kevin Richards, Colorado (Point)
John Houggen, North Dakota (Counterpoint)
Helen Thatcher, Utah (Facilitator)
- Point/counterpoint discussion focusing on merits/issues involving faith and community organizations and other non-profit organizations in efforts to promote work participation.

THURSDAY, JULY 31, 2003

- 7:30 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST**
- 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. REVIEW OF TANF DATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**
Dianne Foss, Region VIII
Jim Chandler, Region VI
- Overview of what is transpiring. Discussion of problems affecting states in reporting, transmissions, coding and work participation. Discussion to focus on TANF data collection and TANF policy issues in current enabling legislation relative to TDRS, HPB and CRC, as well as data transmission, policy impacts, error flag noticing, FTP requirements, submittal dates, corrective action planning and actions.
- 10:00-10:30 a.m. BREAK** (In room) and time provided for check out.
- 10:30 – Noon PERFORMANCE MANGEMENT IN GOVERNMENT – OHIO’S PERFORMANCE CENTER**
Neva Terry, Ohio Dept. of Job and Family Services
Kevin Giangola, Ohio Dept. of Job and Family Services
- The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Office of Research, Assessment, and Accountability’s experience in developing performance management.
- Noon -1:30 p.m. WORKING LUNCH – “THE NEW WORKING POOR”**
Jack Tweedie, National Conference of State Legislatures
- What makes them different from many of our previous customers.
- 1:30 p.m. BREAK** (in room)
- 1:30 – 2:45 p.m. FUTURE WORK PARTICIPATION CONSIDERATIONS IN LIGHT OF REAUTHORIZATION**
Mack Storrs, Office of Family Assistance, Washington, DC
- Discussion focused on legislative update, EITC, ASPE/OFA administrative data project and state retooling of programs in light of reauthorization.
- 2:45-3:00 p.m. CLOSING REMARKS**
Thomas Sullivan

USES OF ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

Professor Garth Mangum, University of Utah

Summary Points:

- **The main advantage of administrative data is its cost and consistency; namely it is available and does not have to be created from scratch.**
- **The limitations of administrative data were illustrated by a Utah study in which those coming out of poverty, according to survey data, was at 45%, while administrative data was showing it at 15%. The large discrepancy between the two types of data could not be explained.**

Professor Mangum began his presentation discussing a study of two groups of public assistance recipients, over the course of several years. They wanted to find out what happens when people go off public welfare/assistance. To track these two groups they used both administrative data and surveys. In Utah, the Department of Workforce Services lets you track from a central source what services people are using, such as Medicaid/Medicare and TANF, and also whether people appear on employer wage rolls or unemployment. The surveys were done by the Social Research Institute at the University of Utah with a sample size of 407. What they found in using both administrative data and surveys is a wide discrepancy in the results. The survey showed that 55% of people moving off welfare stayed poor. The administrative data showed the number as 85%. It was difficult to tell what caused the difference. Was there data not reported? Maybe the survey picked up on an underground economy. One thing that they found was that the integrity of the group sample was not maintained. One of the unavoidable conclusions is that there are limitations on administrative data involving, for example, the reliability of projections.

One conclusion drawn from both the survey and the administrative data is that getting people off welfare was working, but getting them out of poverty wasn't. According to Professor Mangum, people are going "from welfare poor to working poor". Very few became employed at a salary that allowed them to move out of poverty. The definition of poverty used to be 50% of median income. It's now 33% of median income, and even with this lower level, more people are staying poor.

That last part of the presentation covered what use the state of Utah made of the information gleaned from administrative data and the surveys, in response to a question from Kevin Richards of the Colorado Department of Human Services. The Family Employment Program changed very little, according to Helen Thatcher of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, and there has been no follow up so far. The Department of Workforce Services uses the data to inform the legislature and to argue an approach to various programs, such as Partners in Education and economic development. It's also used to bolster requests for funding. Lastly, the information is used when working with partners like the education community, to focus on the areas that most need help and that would most benefit from support.

**Handouts: Attachment 1: From Welfare Poor to Working Poor
Attachment 2: WIA Employability & Co-Enrollment**

STATE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Mary Kay Cook, Colorado
Hank Hudson, Montana
Helen Thatcher, Utah

Summary Points:

- **States rely on different methods to gauge performance management, and those methods are subject to environmental conditions unique to those States. For example, in a State Supervised-County administered program, Colorado relies on one performance measure and implements rigorous field reviews directed towards the content of the County plans. In a State operated program such as Utah's within a combined workforce agency, numerous employment related measures are focused upon. In a mixed State situation such as Montana with numerous non-governmental service providers and contracted providers, particular attention is paid to implementing a wide range of performance measures and requiring performance standards in the contracting process.**

In this roundtable presentation, three states with three different methods of providing services to clients were discussed. In Colorado, services are provided by the counties, which are supervised by the state. In Utah, all programs are administered by the state. In Montana, the state contracts out services to the private sector and non-profits. The benefits and drawbacks of these systems were discussed.

Mary Kay Cook, Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency, Colorado WORKS Section Manager, began the discussion using a power point presentation that clearly outlined a variety of considerations involving performance management. In Colorado, counties administer social services and have much local flexibility in how this is done. They are required to devise a plan and written policy, and an annual performance contract between the county and the state is required by state statute. The indicator used for performance ratings is the Work Participation Rate (WPR). The state reviews a monthly report on WPR and provides this number to the counties. If the WPR is not achieved, the state implements a corrective action plan which offers guidance to the county. Counties with a significant deficit in WPR are required to develop a performance improvement plan.

All counties in Colorado have a Program Review every 4 years. The purposes of the review, which is mandated by state statute, are to verify compliance with state and federal regulations, verify compliance with county plans and policies, to identify best practices to share with others, and to provide hands on training and technical

assistance. Prior to the on-site visit, there is a questionnaire completed by county staff and sent to the state. The state collects information from its administrative data, selects case samples, and staff with expertise in the appropriate areas review the county plan and questionnaire. Each on-site review has entrance and exit conferences, which are used to highlight the positives. Each county can also select site visits for state staff to attend, for example, partnerships, referral resource locations, etc. Follow up after the review includes a letter to the County Director, and checking on the response to compliance issues. During this whole procedure, the method of operation is not to act as auditors, but to listen to the county staff, and to be continuously fine-tuning the processes used.

The benefits to the counties of the Program Review:

- Independent validation of program operations
- Positive feedback and recognition for program improvement
- On-site access to training and technical assistance
- Validation and documentation for management and supervisors
- Building rapport between county and state staff

The benefits to the state Department of Human Services:

- Meeting statutory oversight requirement
- Identifying training needs
- Staying in touch with county successes and concerns
- More able to provide federal staff with what they need
- Fulfilling a requirement from the State Auditor's Office

One other major benefit to both state and counties is the identification of best practices, and the ability to share these with other counties. In summary, Performance Management in a devolved system is very challenging.

The next presenter was Helen Thatcher, Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS), Employment Services Program Manager. In Utah, the state administers all social services. There was some debate on the measures to be used in determining the success of the programs, as measures could be classified as outcome measures, process measures, strategic measures or efficiency measures. Where you sit dictates in part which measures you tend to be interested in – with local offices tending towards local process measures, while at the State level there tends to be more interest in efficiency and statewide measures. Additionally, the types of services being provided need to include certain activities. Thus, for example, if what is being measured are the intensive services being provided, then case management has to be factored in, whereas if the focus is on core services, case management functions and activities do not play as central a role. Utah DWS decided to measure on the job seeker side the increase in salary after using the services provided, as well as the rate of employment retention. Other results to be monitored are:

- Positive closure rates
- Cost per customer served (the Workforce Investment Act is driving this measure)
- Cost per customer getting employment
- Number of cases opened each month
- Number of people getting their GEDs

In Utah, the State DWS is moving towards development of eligibility and accuracy measures, but part of the debate has been uncertainty on how to measure what the employment counselor accomplishes in terms of quality and evaluating how the state employees were providing service to the clients. These measures need to be useful to the supervisors as well as the employees.

The final portion of Ms. Thatcher's presentation was a look at the Office of Management and Budget's uniform evaluation metrics, called "common measures". These were developed to have common performance measures of programs with similar goals. They apply to job training and employment programs as well as to additional programs such as housing assistance, and are intended to provide a consistent definition for performance. Using these common measures is expected to go into effect in 2004.

(Post Conference Note: Regional office staff checked into the matter with ACF Central Office staff. They are aware of the "common measures" promulgated by OMB, and provided feedback to OMB on the commonalities and differences of the measures as they involved TANF. Because those measures are seamless in terms of current TANF data collection (and anticipated data collection in the future), the introduction of the measures will not increase the reporting burden on States.

The last section of the roundtable was led by Hank Hudson, Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services, Human and Community Services Division. He spoke in the context of Montana where they are now administering a block grant (with a large variety of service providers and involving county governments as well as for profit and non-profit contract providers) from what used to be an entitlement program (operated solely through county government). Welfare reform moved the State toward contracting out employment services, training and case management. The issue that has consequently evolved for the state is, how do you manage contractors?

Montana has instituted performance standards for their contractors that encompass the requirements of the federal government and the reporting requirements for the state. These are generally under the rubric of core elements in their performance plan, with the first two core elements focused on Federal and State performance requirements, the third core element involving individuals who are not performing, a fourth involving SSI, and the fifth centered on local performance measures. Among the standards are:

- Advancement and retention for teens in school
- Prevention activities participation

- Participation in job readiness activities
- The operation and reporting on individuals in an SSI track

There are also standards for locally determined outcomes. Contractors receive bonuses for getting data entered quickly, and there are supportive services for those contractors who are not meeting the standards under their plans.

Handouts: Attachment 3: Performance Measurement in the Colorado WORKS Program

IN-STATE SYSTEMS AND STATE IT DEVELOPMENTS

Connie Haynes, Colorado CBMS

Ann Kump, Utah E-REP

Ken Kaz, Wyoming IRIS

Summary Points:

- **The three state systems discussed entailed different approaches to upgrading state information systems from the former FAMIS systems, particularly in their development of performance management reports. Colorado's CBMS will be replacing the Medicaid, Food Stamps, and TANF (COIN and CACTIS) systems. Its performance reports will be able to be directly generated by individual requests through something called DSS for performance reports. Utah's E-REP will initially be replacing the TANF (FEP) and Child Care systems, and eventually Food Stamps and Medicaid – subject to the resolution of policy matters involving Federal interpretation of primary and benefitting programs. E-REP will be relying on the data warehouse available to all agencies to generate reports that are generated through YODA which bores down to the individual level. Wyoming's IRIS, modeled on the system implemented in a New England state will be capable of generating numerous inquiry reports on performance, but the State has not mandated the adoption of specific performance measures.**

Connie Haynes of the Colorado Department of Human Services began by discussing the Colorado Benefits Management System (CBMS), which is the state's new reporting system. There is a reporting tool that produces predefined reports for federal and state information on daily, weekly and monthly schedules. Most information is available online, both new and legacy data, at the local and the state level. The system has all the usual programs and a few more. A report on the time of processing a client, with the number and kinds of services, is built into the system. The eligibility system and work program system are merged. With all the data in one system, querying becomes much easier. The development of online reports (through DSS), and the ability to generate immediate reports online is enhanced.

Ann Kump of the Utah Department of Workforce Services spoke of E-REP. The system is designed to meet the needs and wants of various groups. So far it's being used only for TANF and child care cases. When the system was being designed, a close look was taken at what reports would be needed in addition to the required federal reports. Reports that were currently being generated were examined to see if they were still pertinent. The system draws from the State's data warehouse, so that each agency can develop their own reports from the collected data. Also available will be YODA – (Your Online Data Access) - which will have canned, prewritten queries that can be used across agencies. The requirements for the generic reports that will be made available from E-REP are that they have universal appeal and can be used by any worker, office, or region in the state. Also the cost has to be reasonable, and the data

reports timely and accurate.

The final presentation was from Ken Kaz of the Wyoming Department of Family Services. He spoke on the IRIS (Integrated Resource Information System), the new information system that will be implemented by 2005 merging systems for POWER (TANF), Food Stamps, Medicaid, POWER Work Programs, Quality Control, Food Stamp Employment and Training, Child Care, and Overpayment Recovery). Using the Beacon System from Boston as a framework, IRIS will be joining two systems with many programs. Some of the features will be:

- Interactive interviews with clients
- Providing alerts to the worker
- Scheduling and calendaring to help workers manage case loads
- Automatic notice generation

Right now the performance reports are being designed, with the intention of having them be web-based, and date stamped.

The anticipated results from the new system are:

- Improved worker productivity, quality and timeliness
- Single client ID for all programs
- Ability to research and clarify policy online through the rules engine that is being introduced
- Elimination of redundant information and reports

Cost savings are anticipated in the areas of reduction of staff turnover, increased proficiency to detect fraud, and the ability to consolidate the programming needs of the agencies. The systems are for assisting workers in managing their cases. They are not set up for management of worker performance, although they could be. IRIS has regular canned reports, and is introducing ad hoc reporting which is web based. One thing that's already been noticed is the use of reports in ways not intended.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK BEHIND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Margaret O'Brien-Strain, Ph.D., Sphere Institute

Summary Points:

- **Thinking analytically and take performance measures as a start, not as the end product.**
- **When doing information comparison, the data may be measured in different magnitudes or units. Two options are available to get an accurate comparison, normalization of the data or graphing on two different axes.**
- **In doing subgroup analysis, focus on differences that matter for services.**

Dr. O'Brien-Strain gave a presentation on thinking analytically about performance data. The summary below is outlined in greater detail in her handout, "Thinking Analytically about Performance Data: A Toolkit", which explains numerous of her observations using TANF data from her work and studies in San Mateo County, California. Thinking analytically takes measures as a start, not as the end product. Her advice is to not think of performance measures as answers to questions, but rather use them to trigger new questions. These new questions should be ones that will guide performance improvement. Examples of questions to ask:

- Why has this measure changed?
- Do specific subgroups perform differently?
- How does this year's data compare to previous years?

When framing your questions involving performance, be aware of the intent of the measure, any additional information you would want about the measure, and how you could use the additional information to guide agency activities. Different measures serve different purposes. Summary measures are used for high level monitoring or public reporting. Dimensional measures are used for understanding statistical changes, finding key subgroups, etc. Details on specific cases are used for investigating or acting on specific concerns. In your toolkit for questioning reports include distributional information, looking beyond just the average; time series information, examining trends and comparing your data to others; subgroup information, breakdowns by client characteristic; and cohort information, comparing similar groups at different times.

When doing information comparison, the data may be measured in different magnitudes or units. Two options are available to get an accurate comparison, normalization of the data or graphing on two different axes. In normalization, the measurements are adjusted by some rule to make them comparable. Graphing on two axes shows time trend data for one line on the left axis and the same time trend for another line on the right axis. This is very useful for data that is expressed in different units or that have very different magnitudes. When charting data over time, look for evidence of the effects of policy changes or external factors such as the economic environment. These trends will often need a long time trend to be detected.

In doing subgroup analysis, focus on differences that matter for services. These include such things as English language skills, family size, gender and geography. In cohort analysis, watch for attrition and consistent definitions.

Some data concerns to watch out for:

- Small populations create highly variable measures
- Appropriate time period to consider may differ by measure
- Data for the most recent months is the most unreliable
- Missing data can skew results
- Data cleaning and other technical changes can dramatically alter findings

The ideal systems characteristics for analysis are plenty of historical data, flexibility and the ability to customize, ability to link to other data, and the ability to perform with more complex statistics. To work with performance data, it's highly recommended to regularly bring together a forum of people, those with specialized knowledge about performance measures, programs, data systems and finances.

Handouts: Attachment 4: Thinking Analytically About Performance Data: A Toolkit

PROACTIVE STEPS TO INCREASE WORK PARTICIPATION

Professor Garth Mangum, University of Utah

Summary Points:

- **A variety of actions and activities can be used to increase work participation, and the handout material in the plastic folders provided to workshop participants have a number of suggestions.**
- **His focus was on human capital investment and the need to strengthen educational and vocational skills so as to secure employment as well as moving beyond poverty.**
- **Key to making education available through TANF programs is the State's creativity in merging with other programs, particularly those of WIA, and defining work activities in such a way as to maximize educational opportunities.**
- **The discussion made it clear that there are a variety of issues confronting the States in moving towards such goals by relying on education.**

Professor Mangum led a discussion of what steps states could take to increase work participation by TANF households, touching on aspects of partnering with other agencies, and community and faith-based organizations. His research has shown that long term work experience and/or at least one year of classroom training is essential for keeping a job and moving up. He reminded the audience that the poverty threshold has become outmoded. He was particularly pleased with the handouts contained in the plastic binders provided to workshop participants because of the wealth of ideas presented therein to advance and promote work participation and educational involvement. They include:

- MDRC's September, 1999 report entitled: **PROMOTING PARTICIPATION – How To Increase Involvement in Welfare-to-Work Activities**
- CLASP's discussion on **Post Secondary Education and Rising from Poverty**

Professor Mangum's points led to a lively discussion of different considerations that affect the State's ability to implement work participation requirements and to stimulate increased work effort on the part of TANF recipients and TANF staff. In Utah, support for clients getting an education is tied to them working a minimum number of hours. This leads to issues with child care subsidies and their availability, and with what actually qualifies as employment. Many of those going into education would normally come off the list of clients counted towards work participation if staff failed to take into account work requirements. Ken Kaz, Wyoming Department of Family Services, noted that his state has such support for those getting their BA degrees through their State funded SAFSA program, but participation has been very small.

In cases where the employability process will be long term, Utah has a concern for getting them through in the time available, which in Utah is the State's 36 month time

limit. It takes work experience plus training through the years, and needs to be planned out in the case management process between the DWS worker and the customer. Jack Tweedie, Director, Children and Families Program, National Conference of State Legislatures, pointed out that in many states, employment retention bonuses and a lot of other incentives related to education are being squeezed out by budget crunches.

John Hougen, North Dakota Department of Social Services, brought up the issues of states that have large tribal populations and the inability to stimulate increased work participation where employment opportunities are few and far between and work experience slots are sewn up for/by a variety of employment and training programs. Hank Hudson of the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services echoed those sentiments, adding that tribes in his state run their own programs and there is a dichotomy between the services and opportunities for TANF recipients on the reservation and off. In South Dakota, according to Rich Jensen, SD Department of Social Services, work participation comes from cases between the second month (after the first month's intake) through their fifth month (by the sixth month, clients are leaving assistance). In consequence there tends to be a big problem for increasing work participation accomplishments and long term work participation accomplishments with the heavy turnover experienced in that State. In other words, there's a short window in which to have an effect on the client. Kevin Richards, Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency Supervisor, wondered about how to maximize the work participation rate while still focusing on the individual.

Professor Mangum then spoke about his experience with faith-based organizations in Salt Lake City. This was a use of a combination of resources, both government and community, to assist those who needed services. The community involvement assisted the case managers and expedited clients receiving services. One caveat mentioned is the problem of sustainability - many community organizations that come into being to provide a service fade away.

Handouts:

**Attachment 5: MDRC's September, 1999 report entitled:
PROMOTING PARTICIPATION – How To Increase Involvement in
Welfare-to-Work Activities**

**Attachment 6: CLASP: BUILT TO LAST: Why Skills Matter for Long
Run Success In Welfare Reform**

**Attachment 7: MDRC: INVOLVING EMPLOYERS IN JOB RETENTION
AND ADVANCEMENT FOR LOW INCOME WORKERS.**

**Attachment 8: FINDING JOBS FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS THROUGH
PERFORMANCE BASED CONTRACTING, Burt Barnow and John
Trutko**

THE CHAMPION IN YOU

Darryl Collier

Delivered as part of the working lunch, Darryl Collier's comedic routine focuses on the need to raise the bar to reach one's goals and strive for accomplishments as a personal and individual choice. The session illustrates examples of how to turn individual performance up a notch. Collier brought the audience to this point by urging them to dig down deep to see the level that the individual never thought possible to achieve. The motivation to achieve lies within the depths of one's consciousness, and frequently only requires a magic switch to turn it on. That Champion within us is not only good for the business world, but it works well in all aspects of life. We all like to win, but how to do it is more valuable than the win itself.

MEASURING PERFORMANCE AND ESTABLISHING EFFECTIVE GOALS

Margaret O'Brien-Strain, Ph.D., Sphere Institute
Susan Diaz, Mesa County, Colorado
Cheryl Schnell, El Paso County, Colorado

Summary Points:

- **Creating the statistics is just the prelude to using them. Performance measurement systems often don't work because all the focus (and budget) are on getting the measures.**
- **Using the measures is frequently harder than expected. Recognizing data errors requires substantial program knowledge. Program managers may not be used to interpreting data. Measures can't always be unambiguously interpreted. Monitoring for external factors is critical to your measures. Do not settle for summary statistics. Make sure you have breakdowns by client subgroups.**
- **Local flexibility permits localities to react to client needs without waiting for an adjusting bureaucratic or political apparatus.**
- **Local control also means a strong accountability factor at the county.**
- **Meaningful performance measures are mission and value based, measurable, useful, and make sense at a local level.**
- **Workforce centered engagement with families, without addressing any barriers that may exist, leads to recidivism.**

The first part of this presentation, from Dr. O'Brien-Strain, focused on the issues around collecting performance/outcome data. A good performance/outcome measure is meaningful, reliable and practical. A meaningful measure is relevant to the audience but clearly linked to agency activities, understandable and clearly defined, and comparable over time or across organizations. A reliable measure accurately represents what is being measured, is not susceptible to manipulation, and is in balance or complementary with other measures. A practical measure is feasible to collect in a timely manner, and can serve as a proxy for other measures.

The first step in collecting the data is to translate what you want to measure into data elements, such as population, time period, and criteria. This usually leads to refinement and sometimes substantial changes in the measures. The next step is to match the data elements to the systems that will collect them. These systems could be administrative data, agency management systems or external data collection. Even administrative data can be a collection challenge due to inaccurate or incomplete data, inflexible reporting systems, lack of follow up data and the fact that administrative data systems often overwrite without saving historical data. One solution to this challenge is data warehousing.

The next step in data collection is to develop protocols for external partners, such as community-based organizations. The difficulties in working with external, community-based agencies include widely varying technical capacities, inconsistent practices, different reporting requirements from public and private funders, and an unwillingness to share data. The last step in collecting the data is fine tuning the process. Building additional forms or fields into already existing functions expands the ability to capture pertinent data. Use of high cost data collection, such as surveys, can be done as needed. Reviewing research findings often turns up protocols and some baseline findings, as well as historic data.

In conclusion, remember that creating the statistic is the prelude to using it. Performance measurement systems often don't work because all the focus (and budget) is on getting the measures. Using measures is frequently harder than expected. Recognizing data errors can require substantial program knowledge. Program managers may not be used to interpreting the data collected. Measures can't always be unambiguously interpreted. Monitoring for external factors is critical to understanding changes in measures, and don't settle for summary statistics. Make sure you have breakdowns by client subgroups. If outcome measures are balanced, it helps with budgeting.

Susan Diaz, Division Director, Self-Sufficiency Programs of Mesa County (Grand Junction), Colorado, spoke on promoting performance in TANF programs. Mesa County uses local control and funding flexibility to meet the needs of low-income families. They offer intervention and prevention services at the local level through community collaborations and partnerships.

They have found that outcome expectations and outcome measures change in a local environment. Because of local flexibility they are able to react to client needs without waiting for a bureaucratic or political apparatus to make adjustments. Local control also means a strong accountability factor at the county level. The local County Commissioners and local Workforce Development Board have high expectations for customer service and outcomes. These factors contribute to a value based policy and decision making environment.

Value based policies make problem solving and defining outcomes easier. On a local level it is easier to communicate values and consciously live them every day. Among the values of the Mesa County Department of Human Services:

- Quality customer service
- Community involvement and collaboration
- Program accountability and integrity
- Compassion
- Innovation, creativity and flexibility

The Mesa County Colorado Works Program (TANF) is committed to promoting

meaningful, long-term self-sufficiency, and maximum block grant flexibility through collaboration, innovation and creativity. Some of the programs they offer are GED and ESL classes, public transportation, assessment and training services, quality child care initiatives and assistance, and job readiness training. To provide these services, they have performance based contracts with providers, most of whom are non-profit organizations.

The county uses intensive case management and intervention services to avoid sanctions and to prevent situations from becoming crises. In monitoring cases, they use case reviews and case staffing. To affect the participation rate of their clients, the staff is dedicated to monitoring and training. There also must be a balance struck between serving people and meeting the measures. Lastly, meaningful performance measures are mission and value based, measurable, useful, and make sense at a local level.

The final presentation was from Cheryl Schnell of the El Paso County (Colorado Springs) Department of Human Services. She spoke on the team-based approach that the county uses to deliver TANF services, which utilizes a system of outcome measures and performance goals. One caution is that workforce centered engagement with families, without addressing any barriers that may exist, leads to recidivism.

The advantages to working in teams:

- More success in implementing complex plans, more able to generate energy and interest in new projects
- More creative solutions, better at solving problems
- Ability to build commitment and support, more people to implement ideas
- Different approaches from the various strengths of the members

Policies and procedures were put into place to guide the teams. Team performance outcomes and performance standards were developed that applied across teams. All teams were also encouraged to generate one additional outcome or goal specific to the team that the team could take ownership over. Team outcomes and standards are also incorporated into individual worker's performance plans.

Over 70 programs are administered by the El Paso County Department of Human Services. They have a staff of 350, and 90 community partners that deliver economic assistance, child care, child welfare, adult and administrative support services. The county also has a Contract Management Unit, which is responsible for providing high quality contracting services. One of the primary objectives of the Unit is to enhance the achievement of good performance and financial accountability from contractors, based on well-defined, measurable outcomes.

Handouts:

Attachment 9: Challenges in Developing Measurement Systems for Performance Indicators.

Attachment 10: Measuring Performance/Establishing Effective Goals– Mesa County

Attachment 11: Measuring Performance/Establishing Effective Goals-El Paso County

Attachment 11: Mesa County, Colorado Works Program

USING COMMUNITY RESOURCES TO ENHANCE WORK PARTICIPATION

Kevin Richards, Colorado Department of Human Services
John Hougen, North Dakota Department of Social Services
Helen Thatcher, Utah Department of Workforce Services

Summary Points:

- **The question to keep in mind is how can community groups forward the mission of the counties and State.**
- **Community and faith-based organizations are not a panacea, particularly in light of ad hoc nature and tendency to shift attention and focus over time away from the interests of the poor and needy.**
- **Such organizations work best at serving the whole person, connecting the people and families in need to mentors and role models.**
- **Association with such organizations does provide connectivity to positive communities.**
- **In the present budget environment, expansion of services will probably come from community and faith-based organizations.**

In this wide ranging issues exploration of Bush administration initiatives, the discussion focused on aspects of concerns involving faith and community organizations and other non-profit organizations in efforts to promote work participation within the public assistance population. Main speakers were the State TANF Program Directors of Colorado and North Dakota, facilitated by the Utah TANF Director.

Kevin Richards, Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency, has been appointed as the Faith-based Liaison for the Department. He spoke of his experiences at both the county and the state level. He brought to the attention of participants a variety of statistics and activities underway in Colorado, including:

- 75% of adults are on assistance for less than 60 months; those on assistance for longer periods constitute 1% of the caseload
- 4 out of 5 individuals do not come back after their TANF episode
- In the prior discussion by two Colorado counties, both counties have significant numbers of community and faith based contractors, including:
 - Family Partners
 - Families and Schools Together (FAST)
- In Colorado, collaboration with available community resources has occurred in La Plata County, Archuleta County (involving Fatherhood, Transportation and Community Investment) and in Logan County (literacy, transportation and domestic violence)

Through the work he has done, he has seen that operating with community and faith-based organizations can have a significant impact on work participation in the welfare program. Partnership with these organizations makes available services that otherwise would not be obtainable by the clients. Many of the programs thus made available provide supportive services that can respond before a situation becomes a crisis. The question to keep in mind is, how can community groups forward the mission of the counties and state?

John Hougen, North Dakota Department of Social Services, humorously pointed out a variety of countervailing issues that arise in regard to working with community and faith-based organizations, particularly in rural dominated states. One of the difficulties he sees is educating organizations on what is needed for TANF participants. When state funding and resources are strapped (as North Dakota TANF has experienced in the past several years), community and faith-based organizations and activities take money that otherwise would have been spent for programs that are state based. The problem that arises is that most of the community organizations are strictly local and don't operate at, nor have the vision, at the state level. Critically important in that regard is the State's ability to offer alternative services (to faith based organizations) statewide is extraordinarily problematic in cash strapped situations. In summary, there are considerable numbers of issues involving such organizations, including:

- TANF appeared at a time when numerous community and faith based organizations were experiencing funding reductions; unfortunately, filling in for services with state funds is seen as a way of making up for lost funding;
- Difficulties arise when ministers see the availability of funds for themselves - namely as a means of supporting the congregation and engaging in building improvements;
- With very small numbers of State agency staff to inform and guide the public as well as counties, it is very difficult to marshal and sustain the energy and time to try to shape the inquiries and questions from community organizations and faith based service providers who are unfamiliar with a host of issues involving public assistance populations;
- Among the difficulties encountered is the focus on community building at the local level, whereas the state's interest is across multiple communities;
- Where one or two denominations predominate, it can prove difficult to deal with the concerns of members of other denominations – particularly when it comes to matters of alternative service provision;
- In highly rural states it does come down to matters involving serving so few numbers of clients that are geographically dispersed over vast distances;

In the discussion that followed the concluding remarks, Helen Thatcher reminded the audience of the Pew Charitable Trust foundation discussions found at <http://www.religionandsocialpolicy.org>. Helen elicited a variety of comments and reactions from both speakers and the audience on issues that do arise in utilizing the community and faith based organizations.

- Community and faith-based organizations are not a panacea, particularly in their ad hoc nature and tendency to shift attention and focus over time away from the interests of the poor and needy;
- Such organizations work best at serving the whole person, connecting the people and families in need to mentors and role models (e.g. Shasta County)
- Association with such organizations does provide connectivity to positive communities.
- In the present budget environment, expansion of services will probably have to come from community and faith-based organizations.

Handout: Attachment 13: Interfaith Community Services

REVIEW OF TANF DATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Dianne Foss, US Department of Health and Human Services, Region VIII
Jim Chandler, US Department of Health and Human Services, Region VI

Summary Points:

- **There is strong concern in Washington, DC that only 43% of the TANF population is being served.**
- **Equally concerned are the state's that assertions that the reporting systems designed for TANF ARE NOT designed to count anything that does not go into the work participation rate calculation.**
- **It is uncertain when and if welfare reform reauthorization will pass in this calendar year. Until such time as more definitive action is taken, the word in data reporting is to proceed as usual with submittals, transmissions, edit checks, etc..**

An overview was given of what is happening at the legislative level involving welfare reform reauthorization that will impact the states in reporting, transmissions, coding and work participation. A comparison was made between current law, H.R. 4, and Option H from the Senate Finance Committee. The presenters went over in detail a comparison of work participation requirements under H.R. 4 and Option H. Some of the provisions in the new legislation would affect how the data from the states is counted. Under current law, only 43% to 44% of the people receiving assistance are doing activities that count toward work participation, and of these, 27% are in subsidized work. For 2003, reporting is in essentially the same format. Under the reauthorization legislation (if passed), FY 2004's High Performance Bonus will be reduced from \$200 million (and seven performance measures) to \$100 million (and four performance measures) focused on the work measures.

The caseload reduction credit will be released in combination with the work participation rate, but it is presently uncertain as to when those releases will occur. The "SuperAchiever" credit feature of welfare reauthorization proposals was discussed at length by Mack Storrs, in response to a request from Sergio Lugo for clarification. The Office of Management and Budget, pursuant to Circular A-76 (involving outsourcing) is looking at privatizing data and IT jobs, and this will undoubtedly come into play in DHHS and ACF. A thorough dissection of the Data Transmission Status Report was done to demonstrate how it is used to check how the states are doing in getting their information in to the federal government.

Much of the remaining discussion involved a comparison between current law, H.R. 4, and Option H from the Senate Finance Committee. Some provisions, such as individual waivers for states, will expire. The goal of the new legislation is to increase

work participation and increase core hours to 24 hours a week. Under the latest compromise proposals being entertained in the Senate Finance Committee is a tier approach that is being considered to give partial credit for work participation under 24 hours a week. Other provisions include \$100 million matching grants for marriage promotion, and \$50 million for abstinence programs.

The open discussion looked specifically at how the new legislation affects data processes. Option H wouldn't change how states transmit data and it would change how data would be extracted, according to John Hougen of the North Dakota Department of Social Services. This led to a consideration of the differences between H.R. 4 and Option H in what measures were to be met, how they can be met, and how the data can be collected and validated, as well as how the data collection requirements would impact the local workers. Utah State program and data staff advised other states in the workshop that they had conveyed their strong exceptions to the Congressional Research Service's models on Utah's likelihood of achievement of work participation rates. The session ended with a lively discussion on data that is not collected, but which seems to be driving the welfare reform reauthorization debate. At various times it was repeatedly pointed out that the TANF Data Reporting System (TDRS) only reports on what is countable, and therefore the assertions that only 43% of the eligible population is being served is fraught with disinformation. The reporting system does not provide a mechanism by which to report non-countable activities – which States report are extensive and not documented – ranging from counseling services to diversion services. The rejoinder to that assertion took on two forms – namely the States could capture such data in their reporting systems should they desire to do so and, secondly, the Congressional delegations do not appear to have heard from the States as to the extent of the services that are, in fact, provided but unreported. Furthermore, the discussion highlighted the significant changes that will occur in data reporting if the reauthorization legislation passes. Those changes will involve shifts to the counting and reporting of case management type activities, in order to gauge the extent of TANF household involvement and engagement in activities, as well as the normal reporting of work activities and outcomes related to employment. Discussion also focused on how states can capture information that is not tracked at the federal level, and is there any way, ultimately, to get consistent data reporting from 50 different states.

- Handouts:**
- Attachment 14: APHSA Senate Finance Proposal Call**
 - Attachment 15: H.R. 4 + Option H treatment of work activities**
 - Attachment 16: Quarterly TANF Data Error Edit Codes**
 - Attachment 17: Congressional Research Service TANF Reauthorization Proposals**
 - Attachment 18: CLASP Analysis: Most States Far Short of Meeting H.R. 4 Participation Requirements**
 - Attachment 19: Status of Welfare Reform Legislation with Focus on Responsible Fatherhood Initiatives**

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN GOVERNMENT OHIO'S PERFORMANCE CENTER

Neva Terry, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services,
Office of Research, Assessment and Accountability

Kevin Giangola, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services,
Office of Research, Assessment and Accountability

Summary Points:

- **Developing a state level mechanism to identify and assess critical performance goals of the agency is crucial in the agency's efforts to promote and promulgate its mission.**

The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS), a state cabinet level department, is responsible for the administration of various human and employment services programs, with a budget of over \$17 billion. The Performance Center was created nearly two years ago to support individual and organizational accountability by providing measures for the strategic plan and the necessary data for determining budgets. The Center has what they refer to as upstream customers, which are the state and local governments, and downstream clients, which is the public. The Center has three objectives:

- To enhance communications
- To establish priorities, facilitate strategic planning, and manage resources
- To institutionalize individual and organizational accountability

The four principles that guide the Performance Center are:

- Accurate and timely intelligence to ensure complete analysis
- Rapid deployment of resources to quickly address problems
- Effective tactics and strategies to ensure proactive solutions
- Relentless follow-up and assessment to ensure problems do not recur

In looking at what should or could be measured, there are both operational areas (such as fiscal, legal or auditing) and program-based areas (such as TANF, food stamps, or child care). The measure development process at the Ohio Performance Center started with measuring what was already known, or process measures. The Center is now moving into outcomes measures which involves multidisciplinary coordination, across counties and offices. The next step is to coordinate with all state agencies that serve the same populations. One thing that has been noticed is that there is a culture change when measures start being taken.

When developing measurements, the Performance Center staff first conduct meetings with ODJFS offices to establish criteria and targets. The staff then processes the data, and prepares overviews and analyses. Next comes quality checks of the data calculations and analyses, followed by a review and opportunity for comments. Any

necessary adjustments are made, and the finalized overview, data, and analysis are sent to the ODJFS offices. Once an office receives the finalized report, a meeting is set up with the Performance Center staff to go over everything. Meetings are not just about the numbers, they include Departmentwide discussion and in depth analysis. All the people involved with the measure are at the table, and critical interrelationships come together at each meeting, enabling collaborative problem solving.

In summary, Ohio staff believe that value is added by the Performance Center in the following ways:

- Measurement development is performed by the staff in cooperation with related offices
- Performance Center staff provide for independent and objective measurement analysis
- Raw data is reported by individual offices or extracted from data systems, then processed, evaluated and assessed by unbiased Performance Center staff
- Performance Center meetings are constructive, informative and entertaining, and provide an opportunity to share ideas, identify best practices, and solve problems.

Attachment 20: Performance Ohio Packet

THE NEW WORKING POOR

Jack Tweedie, Ph.d
Director, Children and Families Program,
National Conference of State Legislatures

SUMMARY POINTS:

- **Available resources will be further limited by new activities and administrative monitoring of additional hours.**
- **New requirements will carry significant penalties.**
- **New strategies will be called for to serve the new working poor**
- **Be prepared for the law of unintended consequences.**

Jack Tweedie has led the National Conference of State Legislatures' endeavors to track states' welfare reform efforts, and to analyze states' policy options as they work with TANF clients to move them into jobs. In speaking about the new challenges for welfare programs, there are questions he believes we should be thinking about as we enter the second stage of TANF. In the current legislative summer recess, it would pay to reflect on where we are and what we should be thinking about doing. He presented questions that states should think about, and should find out more about.

The first area mentioned was caseloads. How is the volume changing, who is coming in the door, who is not leaving, what is driving caseload increase? In the area of money, available TANF carryover is limited, states have less capacity to respond to changing circumstances, and the fiscal conditions of the states will affect TANF programs. In looking at TANF reauthorization, there is a lot of uncertainty. What will happen to state flexibility and state mandates, and what new opportunities will become available?

The next area examined was TANF spending. The majority of states have mature spending patterns, where 100% or more of the TANF money received was spent. The rapid build-up of TANF reserves has slowed markedly, and a substantial minority of states has less than 50% of one year's basic assistance spending in reserve. Spending cuts are built into the logic of many states' TANF reserve investments. Spending of funds on cash assistance is down to 33%, as opposed to a high of 73% in 1995. Child care assistance, which was well under \$1 billion in 1994, is now \$5.4 billion, 19% of TANF spending.

Given the fiscal condition of the states, the next area looked at was where are the cutbacks taking place. At least 15 states have scaled back efforts to help TANF recipients in welfare-to-work programs. At least 11 states have cut or proposed cuts in assistance to the families with the most severe problems in becoming eligible for work. In at least eight states, funding has been cut for transportation assistance for TANF recipients who are working or participating in work programs. In at least ten states,

basic cash benefit levels, cash benefits for working families, or eligibility for cash benefits has been cut or is being considered for cuts. Some states have reduced or eliminated teen pregnancy prevention efforts as well as programs aimed at responsible fatherhood. Some 32 states have reduced income eligibility limits, instituted waiting lists, increased the co-payments that families must make for child care, reduced funder payments, or are proposing to take such steps.

In looking at the new working poor, there is some good news. They mostly go to unemployment, not to welfare first. They have fewer barriers to employment, having had work experience and some education and training. The available strategies to move them off welfare and back into jobs are diversion, support services and non-cash supports, and child care and transportation programs to keep them employed. The funds that are at risk are child care, Medicaid, transportation and outreach such as food stamps. Those that are moving from welfare to self-sufficiency are vulnerable to cuts in funding, since they still depend on government assistance. Moving these people into work situations will demand collaboration between education and workforce programs. In those cases with significant barriers to employment, how do we design programs to meet the tough challenges - abuse, mental health issues, learning disabilities?

Finally, the potential effects of TANF Reauthorization in its current forms was examined. State flexibility will be reduced, and available resources will be further limited by new activities and administrative monitoring of additional hours. Then there is the difficulty in meeting new requirements that carry significant penalties. New strategies will be called for, and one should always be prepared for the law of unintended consequences.

Handouts: Attachment 21: TANF: The Second Time Around
Attachment 22: State Fiscal Responses to Welfare Reform during Recession, Institute for Research on Poverty

FUTURE WORK PARTICIPATION CONSIDERATIONS IN LIGHT OF REAUTHORIZATION

Mack Storrs,
Office of Family Assistance, Administration for Children and Families

Summary Points:

- **The full engagement model envisioned in welfare reform reauthorization calls for family self-sufficiency plans for all cases, including child only cases**
- **The data implications of the new legislation are significant**

In this discussion focused on new legislation, administrative data projects and state retooling of programs in light of reauthorization, the first part of the discussion looked at the statistics from the past. In looking at FY 2002 expenditures, what was noticed was that a large portion was in the category, "other". What is contained in this is unknown, so capturing data, reporting it accurately and backing it up with documentation is essential. In addition to expenditures, the caseload, poverty rates and child poverty statistics over the last few years were examined. Some of the challenges that remain are:

- Wages that are above minimum but below poverty level
- Clients with multiple barriers to gaining and retaining employment
- Developing effective models of barrier reduction and post-employment support

The main elements of TANF in the reauthorization are:

- Full engagement
- Work and other participation
- Healthy marriage promotion and research
- Welfare and workforce integration waivers
- Child support enforcement improvements

The full engagement model envisioned in welfare reform reauthorization calls for family self-sufficiency plans for all cases, including child only cases. It also calls for regularly reviewing the progress of each case. The States have flexibility in how the plans and reviews are done. These remarks sparked an impassioned discussion of the ability of states to effectively monitor full engagement, particularly involving child only cases. Several state representatives expressed their consternation at this anticipated requirement in welfare reform reauthorization since the possibility of having to track child only cases has never been discussed in the circles in which they travel. Most states don't have systems in place, and the frequency of monitoring will have a major impact on the work load of state employees.

The next aspect to be examined were the changes in what counts towards work participation, and how many hours were needed. The concept of partial credit was laid

out, and how it would function in a typical agency. The possibility of parents with children under 6 years old needing only 20 hours to get full credit is in the Senate draft, albeit it had not been included in H.R. 4.

The Healthy marriage promotion and research has the overarching purpose to "promote child well-being". There are matching grants for states, territories and tribes to build services and seed programs. Also included are funds for demonstrations, research and technical assistance, which is available for public and private entities, including community and faith-based organizations. The Abstinence Education program is also up for reauthorization. It was suggested that agencies should be lining up partners for multi-year projects, should this section of the reauthorization bill be approved.

The welfare and workforce program integration waivers would help with automated data systems development. The intention is to make these programs work better together for the client families. There would be a focus on employment achievements, and addressing all TANF purposes in the State plan. To improve program performance, agencies would set performance goals for each purpose, measure and report performance, revise data reporting to improve management, and address areas that need special attention. Research and technical assistance would also be made available.

To enhance child support enforcement, states would be encouraged to give former TANF families all child support collected on their behalf. The reauthorization would also provide Federal matching funds for child support "pass-through" payments to TANF families, require states to review and adjust orders for TANF families every 3 years, collect "user" fees from non-TANF families, and lower the threshold for passport denial to \$2,500.

The data implications of the new legislation cover engagement, a one-year phase-in for tracking and monitoring; participation of the service provider and client reporting systems; data validation and verification; performance measurement, connecting client outcomes with case management activities; and automated systems support. Administrative data projects will need to transform data into information, identify key indicators of performance, and develop flexible software tools for program management and performance management.

Handout: Attachment 23: Reauthorizing TANF

EVALUATION

There were a total of 18 respondents (no Feds included, totaling 9 participants).

1. Positive comments (or otherwise) you may have :
 - Best parts were discussions among participants rather than the presentations themselves.
 - Food was excellent (9 commentators);
 - Seating was difficult (2 commentators)
 - It is always nice to see counterparts from other States and knowing we are in the same boat.
 - The first day seemed slow, the second day was better – enjoyed the opportunity to interact.
 - Exceeded expectations
 - Very good facility (4 commentators)
 - Very knowledgeable presenters (2 commentators)
 - Good variety of topics (2 commentators)
 - The whole three days – good planning and presentation
 - Discussions between States were good and people felt comfortable to speak/
 - Regional staff were great hosts. I felt that I could talk openly about my concerns that I have from a State perspective.

2. Describe the benefits to your program that you anticipate as a result of this workshop.
 - Helps focus on data needs. Helps us know that we are on the right track.
 - A better understanding of issues within other States
 - Helps to stimulate problem solving and identification of issues (2 commentators)
 - Preparation for upcoming reauthorization (4 commentators)
 - We might make some serious changes.
 - Better development of performance evaluation data for the program and the agency (2 commentators).
 - Better knowledge of what to ask our statistician
 - Best practices from Mesa County

3. Identify what was most useful about this workshop.
 - Meeting Regional and other Federal staff (3 commentators).
 - The opportunity for sharing of information (State-State; Federal-State) (9 commentators)

- Upcoming key issues to be prepared for the future (2 commentators).
- John Hougen reinforcing that doing faith based in rural areas very difficult to follow regs. And meet the needs.
- Tables weren't wide enough (2 commentators) or should have been configured for roundtables
- I plan on presenting some of the info. To a committee we have just started
- Understanding the implications of "full engagement" in reauthorization
- Performance evaluation presentations were very good and timely

4. How could this workshop have better met your needs?

- More open forum discussions
- A session where on-hands faith based, community based and government joint efforts have been successful. Eash should be representative of a different effort/program.
- More time focused on changes and their impact and strategies.
- Mack's session on the last day was most interesting and should have been early on so he wouldn't have run out of time and felt rushed.
- The sharing of information was refreshing.
- Speaking more to what appropriate outcomes might be.
- Discussion of weaving in client's real needs while working with the Federal requirements.
- Bigger room

Conference Workshop Participants and Speakers

Joseph Barela: Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency, Colorado WORKS Program Specialist, # 303-866- 5389; e-mail: joe.barela@state.co.us

Jim Chandler: U.S. DHS/ACF, Dallas, TX.; # 214-767-4066; e-mail: jchandler@acf.hhs.gov

Darryl Collier: e-mail: darryl.collier@qwl.com

Mary Kay Cook: Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency, Colorado WORKS Section Manager, # 303-866-4404; e-mail: Marykay.cook@state.co.us

Tim Cox: Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency, Colorado WORKS Program Specialist, # 303-866- 2882; e-mail: tim.cox@state.co.us

John Dernovish: U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1141; e-mail: jdernovish@acf.hhs.gov

Susan Diaz: Mesa County (Grand Junction, CO.) Department of Human Services; # 970-248-0871

Sherri Dugan: Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services, Human and Community Services Division, P. O. Box 202952, Helena, MT 59620-2952. Email: sdugan@state.mt.us

Dianne Foss: U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1144; e-mail: dfoss@acf.hhs.gov

Kevin Giangola: Ohio Department of Family Services, Office of Research, Assessment and Accountability; # 614-644-5739; e-mail: giangk@odhs.state.oh.us

Connie Haynes: Colorado Department of Human Services, Denver, CO. # 720-570-5322; e-mail: constance.haynes@state.co.us

Vicky Herring: U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1155; e-mail: vherring@acf.hhs.gov

John Hougen: North Dakota Department of Social Services, Bismarck, North Dakota; # 701—327-1715; e-mail: sohouj@state.nd.us

Hank Hudson: Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services (DPHHS) -Human and Community Services Division, P. O. Box 202952, Helena, MT 59620-2952. Email: hudson@state.mt.us

Rebecca Jacobs: El Paso (Colorado Springs, CO) County Department of Human Services.

Courtney Jarchow: Director, Children and Families Program, National Conference of State Legislatures; 303-364-7700; e-mail: courtney.jarchow@ncsl.org

Rick Jensen: South Dakota Department of Social Services, Pierre, South Dakota; #605-773-3348; e-mail: richj@dss.state.sd.us

Ken Kaz: Wyoming Department of Family Services, Cheyenne, WY.; # 307-777-5841; e-mail: kkaz@state.wy.us

Ann Kump: Utah Department of Workforce Services, Salt Lake City Ut., # 801-526-9630
e-mail: akump@utah.gov

Ed LaPedis: U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1166; e-mail: elapedis@acf.hhs.gov

Sergio Lugo U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1170; e-mail = slugo@acf.hhs.gov

Garth Mangum Bountiful, Utah 84010, (801) 296-9380; e-mail: grthmang@aol.com

Pam McIntyre: Utah Department of Workforce Services, Family Employment Program (FEP) Policy Specialist, # 801-526-9374; e-mail: pmcinty@utah.gov

Doug Melby: North Dakota Department of Human Services, 600 E Boulevard Ave, Bismarck, ND 58505. # 701-636-2437; e-mail: someld@state.nd.us

Cathie Pappas: Utah Department of Workforce Services, Family Employment Program (FEP) Policy Specialist, # 801-526-9760; e-mail: cmpappas@utah.gov

Terry Perlmutter: U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1200; e-mail: tperlmutter@acf.hhs.gov

David Powell: Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency, Colorado WORKS Program Specialist, # 303-866- ; e-mail: david.powell@state.co.us

Kevin Richards: Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Self Sufficiency Supervisor, # 303-866-2054; e-mail: Kevin.richards@state.co.us

Cheryl Schnell - Kubes: El Paso (Colorado Springs, CO) County Department of Human Services; 719-444-5301.

Sydney Schock: Cass County Social Services, Fargo, ND;
Ellen Sevall: Wyoming Department of Family Services, Cheyenne, WY.; # 307-777-7290; e-mail: eseval@state.wy.us

Peggy Staley Wyoming Department of Family Services, Cheyenne, WY.; # 307-777-5218; pstale@missc.state.wy.us

Mack Storrs: Office of Family Assistance, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. DHS, Washington, DC; #

Margaret Strain: . # 650-558-3980; e-mail = mstrain@si.org

Neva Terry: Ohio Department of Family Services, Office of Research, Assessment and Accountability

Helen Thatcher: Utah Department of Workforce Services, Employment Services Program Manager # 801-526-4370; e-mail: hthatch@utah.gov

Lorraine Trudell: U.S. DHS/ACF, 1961 Stout St., Denver, 80294; # 303-844-1155; e:mail = ltrudell@acf.hhs.gov

Jack Tweedie: Director, Children and Families Program, National Conference of State Legislatures; 303-856-1546; e-mail: jack.tweedie@ncsl.org

Jim Valness: South Dakota Department of Social Services, Pierre, South Dakota; #605-773-3493; e-mail: jimv@dss.state.sd.us