EVALUATING COMMUNITY-BASED WELFARE INITIATIVES

Prepared by:
Kimberly Goodman
Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EVALUATING COMMUNITY-BASED WELFARE INITIATIVES
MAY 21, 2001
ARLINGTON, VA

1. INTRODUCTION

The Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network, funded by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance (OFA), held a 1-day workshop to explore strategies for evaluating and monitoring community-based initiatives to serve welfare recipients and low-income individuals. State and local community officials were invited to discuss issues related to the devolution of welfare and outreach efforts to community organizations. Participants included State representatives, key Federal representatives from the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and representatives of community-based organizations (CBOs) and researchers. See Appendices A and B for copies of the workshop agenda and participant list.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), passed in 1996, dramatically changed welfare policy. The act established a new form of aid known as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) to replace Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the former federal cash welfare program for poor families. TANF provides funds to the States via block grants and places a 5-year lifetime limit on federally assisted cash benefits for most families.

Historically, many community-based organizations have supported welfare reform informally by providing intensive services to meet needs of the low-income population. These services include child care, emergency housing, job training, mental health counseling, mentoring, parenting classes, post-employment support services, life-skills training, substance abuse treatment, teen-pregnancy prevention services and transportation. More recently, many TANF agencies have started to formally contract these services to meet the needs of TANF population. As the role of CBOs in the delivery of welfare-related services increases, it is important to gauge the success of these arrangements. Currently there is little research examining the involvement and impact of CBOs in welfare reform, and the evaluation of faith-based organizations (FBOs) is especially scarce. This workshop addresses concerns related to monitoring and evaluation, strategies for supporting CBOs, and how to approach contracting with CBOs. Following are some of the key issues addressed:

- What have been the impacts of devolution on state and local TANF offices?
- How can community-based organizations help TANF offices serve clients better?
- What are some promising initiatives at the State and local level?
- How are States and counties conducting outreach to CBOs?
- What are some evaluation measures that affect program design considerations when States and counties are planning local service delivery strategies?
- How should States and counties evaluate and monitor community-based initiatives?
- What are some technical assistance considerations for States and counties as well as community-based organizations?

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Samara Weinstein, Deputy Director of the Office of Family Assistance, ACF, DHHS, opened the workshop by providing an overview. She explained that the idea behind this workshop came from an interest in devolution and how States/counties are handling it. Recent research has shown that one impact of devolution seems to be an increased need for community organizations to take on a larger role in assisting State/local governments in delivering services to the TANF and low-income population.

Representatives were chosen from States that are either currently engaged in successful community-based initiatives or that have indicated an interest in learning more about community-based initiatives. States selected represent a cross section from different geographical regions, urban/rural, and State/county administered TANF programs. Speakers and participants included:

- Representatives from 9 State TANF offices, the District of Columbia, and 2 County TANF offices.
- Representatives from five Federal offices, which include two Federal departments.
- Representatives from leading research firms.
- Representatives from CBOs providing services to TANF and low-income individuals.

Lois Bell, Director of Technical Assistance and Training Division, OFA/ACF/DHHS, welcomed the group and emphasized the importance of using research to answer questions regarding the translation of policy into practice and the success of the various policy options when implemented. She emphasized that the purpose of the workshop was to explore strategies for evaluating and monitoring community-based programs serving TANF and low-income individuals, and reminded the audience that "welfare reform is a process and not an event."

Paul Purnell, project director for the Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network, facilitated the introductions and asked participants to briefly state the outcomes they hoped would result from the workshop. He encouraged participants to share their expertise, ask questions, and network. He challenged participants to consider how the information shared might be applied back in their offices. Deputy Project Director Blake Austensen followed, providing information about the Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network and giving a general overview of the Rural Peer Technical Assistance workshop. The workshop was divided into the following topic areas:

- Federal Perspective—Evaluating Community-based Welfare Initiatives
- Devolution and its Impact on Community-based Welfare Reform Initiatives
- State Perspectives on Devolution and its Implications for Evaluation of Community-based Welfare Initiatives
- Local Perspectives on Devolution and its Implications for Evaluation of Community-based Welfare Initiatives

3. A FEDERAL PERSPECTIVE—EVALUATING COMMUNITY-BASED WELFARE INITIATIVES

Howard Rolston, Director of Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE), shared ideas about evaluating community-based welfare initiatives. With the devolution of welfare reform, there has been a significant increase in new players involved in services to low-income families. There are many more CBOs with which a State or county TANF program now interacts and provides funds. While there has been an important set of changes in the delivery of service offered to the "at risk" population or "near welfare" population, we lack a systematic knowledge of these changes. It is important to look at what these services are, how they get delivered, and their geographic distribution.

Mr. Rolston emphasized the need to ask questions about the effectiveness of FBOs and how FBOs compare to other programs. More specifically, he posed the following questions:

- Why don't we know anything about the effectiveness of FBOs and how FBOs compare to other programs?
- What would it take to learn about the effectiveness of FBOs?

To address these questions, researchers should determine outcomes with the program versus outcomes without the program. Individuals could be randomly assigned to one of two groups: control or experimental. The control group—individuals who did not go through the program and who did not receive assistance—must be a group of people who are similar in all relevant respects to those who did go through the program and received assistance. Then researchers must compare the two sets of outcomes. Mr. Rolston suggested that, at this time, researchers do not have comparable groups when looking at the effectiveness of FBOs. One participant expressed concern about the ethical implications of randomly assigning individuals to a control group versus an experimental group.

Mr. Rolston also cautioned the audience to look critically at programs' claims to have high success rates. When making such claims, often people examine groups only at program exit rather than at program entry. This may result in different success rates. For example: A program that claims to have an 80 percent success rate at point of exit—but had a 75% dropout rate—actually has an overall success rate of 20%, when looking at the success of all individuals who entered the program. In comparison, a program that claims to have a 50 percent success rate at point of exit—but had a 50% dropout rate—has an overall success rate of 25% of individuals from program entry.

4. DEVOLUTION AND ITS IMPACT ON COMMUNITY-BASED WELFARE REFORM INITIATIVES

The Project on Devolution and Urban Change—commonly referred to as "The Urban Change Project"—is a multidisciplinary longitudinal study of welfare reform. It addresses a series of questions about how localities are working with the CBOs in their service areas to provide services. Representatives from agencies that provide funding for this project introduced this section by sharing the types of information they hoped to obtain from the project. Elizabeth Lower-Basch, Federal Project Officer at the Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in DHHS, and Laura Tiehen, Federal Co-Project Officer for the Economic Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture offered questions relevant to their offices that they hoped would be addressed:

- How have things changed since welfare reform was implemented in these areas?
- Which services are in demand?
- How do CBOs mediate the effects of the policies that the localities have implemented?
- What are the food, security and hunger issues of low income women both on and off TANF in the four cities?
- How is the food stamp program being implemented at the county level?

4.1 The Urban Change Project: Caseload Discussion

Urban Change Project Overview	
Goal:	To understand how welfare agencies, poor neighborhoods, and low income families in big cities are affected by changes introduced by PRWORA of 1996.
Study sites:	Cuyahoga (Cleveland), Los Angeles, Miami-Dade, and Philadelphia
Time frame:	1997 – 2003

Project Components	
Implementation study:	Examines the experiences of local welfare agencies in putting new welfare initiatives into practice. It attempts to answer the question: How is policy translated into practice?
Individual-level impact study:	Uses in-person surveys and administrative records to measure changes and shifts in employment, material hardship, family circumstances and family structure.
Neighborhood indicators study:	Assesses changes using quantitative data for indicators such as crime rates, infant mortality, and property values.
Ethnographic study:	Studies effects of changes by intensively examining nearly 40 families to understand more detailed information (e.g. how families are coping).
Institutional study:	Examines how new policies and funding mechanisms affect nonprofit institutions and neighborhood businesses.

Thomas Brock, a senior research associate of Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), began his presentation by providing an overview of the Urban Change Project (see table above). He stated that the goal of the Urban Change Project is to understand both the implementation and effects of the 1996 welfare reform law in four large urban counties and their major cities. The counties are Cuyahoga (Cleveland), Los Angeles, Miami-Dade, and Philadelphia. These locations are considered “urban laboratories,” yielding results that cannot be generalized across all of America. Nevertheless, these cities were defended as “good urban laboratories” for the following reasons:

- Most welfare recipients are now living in big cities.
- Most of the welfare dollars are going to these big cities.
- From an organizational perspective, many of the challenges in welfare reform seem greatest in urban environments where larger welfare bureaucracies are most resistant to change.

The caseload levels and trends across the four sites were discussed. While caseloads have declined in all counties, the rate of decline varies across sites, with Los Angeles County's rate of decline being noticeably less than that of other counties. It was also noted that for every percentage point decline in caseloads, there is also a percentage point decline in work participation requirements. In fact, for all study sites, work participation requirements are now much lower than 50 percent, due to the large caseload declines. The work participation requirements are now 0 percent in Miami-Dade, less than 2 percent in Philadelphia and Cuyahoga, and less than 10 percent in Los Angeles County, due to caseload declines.

Nevertheless, work activity *rates* are not declining as caseload size and work participation rates are declining. While the data are imperfect, it appears that work activity rates have actually increased since welfare reform. In all study sites, unsubsidized work was by far the most common activity among program participants in 1999-2000. Not surprisingly, the increased emphasis on work activity has also increased spending on welfare to work programs for all four counties.

While caseload reduction trends are similar across sites, state time limit policies vary considerably. In some counties like Cuyahoga, short-term transitional assistance and transitional jobs programs are available after time limits. However, in other counties such as Miami-Dade, there are no special pre- or post-time limit services and many more families leave the rolls because of sanctions than time limits. Differences in time limit policies and implementation of time limits were discussed, as well as the issue of what is happening to families who have been cut off of welfare. According to Cuyahoga and Miami-Dade officials:

- Many are working or find work quickly once time limits or sanctions are imposed
- Food stamps, Medicaid, and day care are offered
- Partners and family members may provide support
- A few qualify for SSI.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Brock noted that food stamps, Medicaid, and day care are becoming as important as cash assistance as families transition off TANF and move onto the pathway of self-sufficiency. He noted the following top concerns of welfare officials:

- How to help the hard-to-employ
- How to promote employment retention
- How to plan in an uncertain environment.

4.2 The Urban Change Project: Institutional Study Discussion

Barbara Fink, task leader on the Project on Devolution and Urban Change, continued the presentation, with findings from the institutional study. This project component, which looks at community institutions and their relationship with welfare reform, is based on interviews with program directors in community-based organizations. The study addressed issues such as mission, staffing, budgets, services offered, what the service providers know about welfare reform, and views and perceptions of welfare reform policies.

Ms Fink provided an overview of the research model for the study, including research questions to be addressed, and a description of the types of service providers studied. Research questions included the following:

- What do service providers know about welfare reform?
- Have service providers experienced changes in what the people they serve want and need?
- Are institutions adapting to changing needs?
- What challenges confront service providers, and how can welfare departments help these organizations to succeed?

The data were collected in the 1998-1999 time frame. The sample consisted of 106 organizations spread across the four Urban Change sites. Organizations in two to three neighborhoods in each of the urban change sites were recruited. These were the same neighborhoods studied in the ethnography and program implementation components of the Project.

A diverse sample of service providers included both small grass roots organizations and large established organizations. Nonprofit organizations comprised 80 percent of the service providers sampled, while the remaining 20 percent of organizations consisted of for-profit and government agencies. Main services provided by the organizations consisted of the following: adult education and employment preparation (GED and ESL classes, vocational training), child care, basic needs (food banks, soup kitchens, services for the homeless), health, school and youth. Approximately one third of organizations sampled were faith based. While faith may be at the center of some FBOs, others may be only "religiously affiliated"; it was noted that it is not always possible to distinguish between the two types of FBOs. Ms. Fink emphasized that 50 percent of FBOs in this study provided basic needs, and that 70 percent of basic needs providers were faith-based.

Major Findings

What do service providers know about welfare reform?

The Institutional Study found that organizations' staff knew relatively little about welfare reform. Of those who did know something, 7 out of 10 mentioned time limits. The table below displays knowledge of welfare reform, by site.

	Cuyahoga County	Los Angeles County	Miami-Dade County	Philadelphia County
Expressed some knowledge about welfare reform	25 (83%)	13 (68%)	13 (59%)	26 (93%)
No evidence of knowledge about welfare reform	5 (17%)	6 (32%)	9 (41%)	2 (7%)

No differences were found between the knowledge rates of faith-based and non-faith-based service providers. Rates among the different types of service providers were all similar with the exception of health service providers, which displayed lower rates of knowledge.

Have organizations experienced changes in what recipients want and need?

- Immediate, but limited, changes were reported as a result of welfare policies.
- The greatest change occurred in education and training providers—half of these organizations reported changes in participation. More specifically, about one-third of the education and training providers experienced increases in participation, and one-fifth experienced decreases. All of the decreases reported occurred in Philadelphia; four out of five of the education and training providers in Philadelphia experienced such decreases.

- In Philadelphia, during the first year of welfare reform, when implementation began, welfare was focused on getting recipients into and through an 8-week job search. This drew participants away from the education and training providers. Caseworkers have a very important role in communicating the policies and communicating to recipients what is available and allowable under new policies.

- During the first year of welfare reform, caseworkers were not clearly communicating new welfare policies. This contributed to the decline in participation at this time. In 1998, however, this trend was reversed when policies were clearly communicated to participants, and increases in participation occurred.

- Most basic needs providers did not report major changes in demand. One exception is Cleveland, due to specific time limits or sanctioning policies that increased the demand for emergency services. Several of the basic needs providers found an increase in demands directly tied to the recipients who had been sanctioned.

Are institutions adapting to changing needs?

- While changes in service provision were minimal, a handful of education and training providers have changed their curriculums to be in line with the workforce policies. They have done this by shortening courses and adding job readiness components.

- Some education and employment preparation organizations gained funding through new contracts, although this occurred mainly with organizations that already had connections with welfare departments.

- Some organizations provide opportunities for recipients to work in community service jobs. These were organizations in Cleveland and Miami at the time of the institutional study.

What challenges confront organizations?

- Communicating new policies.

- Sending consistent messages to clients. Welfare departments may send a message that any job is a good job. Many of the education and training organizations, however, send the message that recipient should be getting a good job that is enough to support their families.

- Working with "harder to serve" population. There is an emphasis on getting clients into the workforce as soon as possible, encouraging programs to adopt shorter courses. There is a segment of the population, however, that may need to work at a slower pace in order to enter the workforce.

- Securing new funding. Most organizations were pessimistic about securing new funding. Although there were new funding sources, organizations felt that there was more competition for these funds.

How can welfare departments help service providers to succeed?

Ms. Fink concluded her presentation by stressing that governments and social service organizations are closely linked in providing these services. Welfare policies and the actions of caseworkers are fundamental in determining what happens to these providers. Communication is a crucial issue—TANF departments must continue to communicate the basics of the new policies to help CBOs plan effective service strategies and to become more proactive. For more information and to see publications from this study, visit www.mdrc.org/WelfareReform/UrbanChange.

5. STATE PERSPECTIVE ON DEVOLUTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY BASED WELFARE INITIATIVES

Lois Bell moderated this section of the workshop, which explored strategies of ambitious State initiatives implemented in California and Indiana.

5.1 California—CalWORKS

Gordon Scott, regional advisor for California DSS shared an overview of California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS). This program provides support and services to eligible needy California families. It emphasizes participation in work through a work first approach and seeks to create a safety net for children and reduce child poverty.

The program, serving all 58 counties in the State, is operated locally by county welfare departments. CalWORKS expands county flexibility through single allocation for administration, employment, and childcare/support services. It provides incentive funds based on exits to employment, increased earnings, and diversion. Through regional advisors, CalWORKS strives to share promising practices, promote an awareness of county issues, and increase an understanding of diversity. Counties have options as to how employment services are provided (nonprofit, profit, CBO/FBO). Most contracts have performance criteria and all contracts go through the RFP process.

The legislation of CalWORKS required an independent, comprehensive statewide evaluation of the program. RAND was the winning contractor. The evaluation has two parts. The first part tracks the process of CalWORKS implementation, and the second explores the impact of CalWORKS on current welfare recipients and their transition to self-sufficiency, and on possible future recipients. The evaluation varies in scope for both the process and impact analyses, depending on the research questions and data availability. Certain research activities will be statewide. Others will concentrate on 6 focus counties (Alameda, Butte, Fresno, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and San Diego counties) or 18 follow-up counties.

For reports and analyses of findings to date, visit www.rand.org/CalWORKS. All of the reports are made available on RAND's Web site. The final report is due in October 2001. For an overview of the evaluation that includes a more detailed description, visit www.rand.org/publications/DB/DB252/DB252.pdf. All of the reports are made available on RAND's Web site. The final report is due in October 2001.

5.2 Indiana—FaithWorks

This section continued with Thurl Snell, deputy director of the Division of Family and Children for Indiana Family and Social Services Administration, who provided an overview of FaithWorks Indiana. In 1999, Indiana launched this program to proactively implement the Charitable Choice provision of the 1996 PRWORA law. This provision encourages States to help FBOs provide government-funded services to low-income families and protect the religious character of FBOs and religious freedom of families or individuals.

This year in Indiana, approximately 40 organizations, including large partnerships and individual congregations, are providing job readiness activities, mentoring, summer youth projects, and services to non-custodial parents. The majority of services are funded with TANF block grant. There is no funding set aside for FBOs. They compete on a level playing field with traditional providers who make up the majority of the providers receiving service.

There is nothing different about performance measures for FBOs; the same standards are set for all service providers. Faithworks helps by providing an understanding of how to navigate and become comfortable on that competitive playing field. Faith-based contracted providers, like traditional providers:

- Have at least one site visit during the course of a contract period to assure compliance with all regulations including compliance with charitable choice provisions
- Are reimbursed through performance based contracts that pay for participant outcomes.

The first year of FaithWorks Indiana resulted in more than 40 faith-based contracts—totaling close to $3.5 million—awarded by the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration's Division of Family and Children. The program provides outreach, education, and technical assistance to FBOs, outlined below:

Technical Assistance:

- 400 FBOs assisted
- Regional Workshops and one-on-one consultation.

Assistance that includes:

- Charitable Choice provisions
- Needs assessments
- Funding opportunities, proposal writing, and reporting
- Establishing a 501©(3)
- Social service development
- Options for partnering with existing providers in lieu of direct contracting.

Public Information and Education:

- 1-800-599-6043
- www.in.gov/faithworks.

Ms. Snell also emphasized the benefits of utilizing FBOs:

- Unique ties in local communities
- Level of trust and respect from neighborhood residents above that which is found in non-faith-based organizations
- Proximity of neighborhood-level services to clients.

More information may be obtained from www.in.gov/faithworks.

5.3 Indiana—IMPACT

Matt Raibley, Program Manager for the Division of Family and Children's Indiana Manpower and Comprehensive Training (IMPACT) Program, continued the discussion of Indiana's welfare initiatives. This program provides services designed to help recipients of food stamps and TANF achieve economic self-sufficiency through education, training, job search and job placement activities.

The IMPACT program contracts for services to support welfare recipients. Contracts are designed around unit costs and outcomes. While contracting with FBOs can be challenging, Raibly explained that by encouraging partnerships with large institutions (e.g. Goodwill) and FBOs, IMPACT has been successful. Local Offices of Family and Children hold bidders meetings to inform potential bidders of the local contracting procedures and of services needed in the local community. Current providers often attend meetings as well to obtain and share information. Mr. Raibly acknowledged that while competitiveness exists, the organizations "realize that they really need each other to be successful."

IMPACT also seeks to address a broad range of barriers that clients may have in locating and maintaining employment. For more information, visit www.state.in.us/fssa/families/impact/index.html.

6. LOCAL PERSPECTIVES ON DEVOLUTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY-BASED WELFARE INITIATIVES

Margaret Washnitzer, director of the Division of State Assistance, Office of Community Services, ACF, DHHS, moderated this section, which further explored community perspectives and the implications of expanded community involvement in welfare reform.

6.1 Fairfax, VA

Margo Kiely, director of the Fairfax County Department of Systems Management for Human Services in Virginia, spoke of the importance of citizen involvement. Prior to FY 1998, decisions regarding funding nonprofit, community based human service organizations were made through formal contracts without consistent policies / requirements or accountability criteria. In FY 1998, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors adopted a new system, which created a $4.2 million competitive funding pool for programs offered by community organizations and non-profits aimed at:

- Providing support for services that are integral part of the County's vision and strategic plan for human services
- Serving as a catalyst to community-based organizations, both large and small, to provide services and leverage resources
- Strengthening the capacity to provide human services to individuals and families in need through the effective and efficient use of resources
- Helping build public/private partnerships and improving coordination and collaboration.

A yearly planning and priority-setting process is guided by citizen committees and based on community input. Citizen committees work with staff to implement the process by assessing data and community needs, soliciting public input, proposing funding priorities and selection criteria, reviewing proposals, and making funding recommendations.

Moreover, in FY 2000, the Community Funding Pool process was combined with the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) process to form the Consolidated Community Funding Pool. There is now one priority-setting process, one application process, and one selection process for over $7 million in combined funding.

Lessons Learned:

Importance of real citizen involvement. Often citizens are not involved in setting policies or making funding decisions. Citizens must actually do the work and make the hard decisions. Citizens must struggle to decide which services are better, while staff support their work. It is also important to get out into the community in order to understand community needs. This helps to collect information not only on present needs, but also on emerging needs.

Importance of strategically aligning citizen decision making groups with tasks. The membership in each group should be appropriate to the tasks at hand.

How to sustain the commitment of the governing body. Many approval checkpoints should be built along the way. This way the people feel they own this process and they have delegated it, rather than feel that they have been sidelined altogether from the process.

Importance of capacity building in the community. Offer training in performance management, grant writing, and working with boards. Develop the capacity of nonprofits to reach a professional level of service.

For more information, visit www.co.fairfax.va.us/service/ccfp.

6.2 Buncombe County, NC

Jim Holland, contract manager for Buncombe County DSS in North Carolina, described how his county has developed and implemented TANF plans that can be tailored to specific county dynamics. He described Buncombe, a county of 206,000 people in which the primary employer is the health care industry. While many jobs are available, few of those jobs provide the livable wage of $13/hr.

TANF caseloads continue to decline, although, as other counties have noted, *a drop in caseloads does not translate to self-sufficiency*. Mr. Holland emphasized the importance of organizations collaborating to serve the needs of the community. As he explained, "We cannot do what we do in a vacuum. This is why we contract." Organizations must communicate on a regular basis about the populations they serve. Buncombe has an infrastructure in place that allows data sharing between agencies. Interagency agreements provide a foundation for the trust that allows activities such as this to take place.

In establishing any service or function, Buncombe determines the following criteria:

- What the result is that we actually want to achieve
- Cost of the service
- How to pay for the service (either using benchmarks with a flat fee or using a performance-based model). By looking at the desired outcome, this may help us to determine which is better.

Further discussion centered on the two types of payment: benchmarked and performance based. Since the county refers relatively few numbers to consumer credit counseling, it makes sense to pay for these services on an as needed or performance based basis. With Goodwill, on the other hand, benchmarks are used.

It takes vigilance to assure that all the steps from designed implementation are accomplished (both on the side of DHSS and the contractor's side). Buncombe has set up procedures that trigger each of the monitoring processes. It was noted that there is a tendency to believe that performance based contracting is the only way to assure that a contractor completes a task timely and efficiently. The Buncombe County experience has shown that understanding the desired results, calculating what it takes to get there, and effective training/monitoring can make benchmarked payment successful.

6.3 Washington, D.C.

Rev. Dr. Lois A. Poag-Ray, director of the Pilgrim African Methodist Episcopal Church Job Connection (Pilgram A.M.E. Job Connection) in Washington, D.C., shared her organization's approach to helping needy families. The program is funded through a contract for "Work and Training Related Services for Welfare Reform," awarded by the District of Columbia DHS. It is the mission of The Job Connection to move TANF recipients to self-sufficiency through a professional team that engages customers in individually tailored plans of activities. Rev. Poag-Ray attributes the faith-based philosophy to the program's success. She offered the following statement about the Pilgrim Job Connection:

> *Clearly, we understand the laws regarding the separation of Church and state. Nevertheless, we view this program as an extension of our outreach ministry…. Our goal is more than simply getting people into just any type of work. Our mission—in fact our commitment—is to engage customers in identifying and developing their God-given gifts and talents, and to move them into more positive and productive life choices, as they journey towards more meaningful and fruitful living, which results in their economic self-sufficiency.*

The Job Connection offers four primary services:

- **Job Choosing:** Customers meet with staff to identify skills, interests and values. An individual plan is developed that focuses on job-seeking skills and strategies.
- **Job Getting:** Employment Specialists offer assistance with resume and cover letter preparation, interview skills, and organization of job preparation activity.
- **Job Keeping:** Staff assists with organizing and orienting customers to their new workplace. Staff provides on-going individual counseling and case management.

- Long-term Follow Up: Supportive services are offered for the months following successful stabilization on the job. Such services may include assistance with financial planning, managing home and family life, and designing work space accommodation.

A program of this nature can not be staffed by volunteers. Motivational experts serve as life-skills specialists and conduct the orientation. This orientation is a motivational, transformational exercise. Rev. Poag-Ray explained, "We try to transform ideas about who we are, who they are, and the possibilities that are available to them."

7. CONCLUSION

Further discussion addressed audience/participant questions. The need for collaborative efforts between organizations and the importance of community investment and involvement were overarching themes. Margaret Washnitzer concluded this workshop by passing out a handout that summarized and contrasted family, community, and agency outcomes. Outcomes for these three levels were contrasted for the following dimensions: national goals, units of measure, type of change, dimension of change, duration of change, and aggregation level (see Appendix C).

Blake Austensen concluded by facilitating the evaluation and feedback of the workshop and by offering his observation of three key themes: communication, coordination and cooperation. These themes were the elements of success noted throughout this workshop.

APPENDIX A:
AGENDA

AGENDA

Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families

EVALUATING COMMUNITY-BASED WELFARE INITIATIVES

Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
Doubletree Hotel
300 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, Virginia
May 21, 2001

8:00 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.	**Registration**
8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**Welcome and Opening Remarks** *Samara Weinstein, Deputy Director, Office of Family Assistance, ACF, DHHS*
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	**Introductions and Workshop Overview** *Lois Bell, Director, Technical Assistance and Training Division, OFA/ACF/DHHS* *Paul Purnell, Project Director, Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network, AFYA, Inc.*
9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	**Federal Perspective- Evaluating Community-Based Welfare Initiatives** *Howard Rolston, Director, Office of Planning, Research , and Evaluation (OPRE), ACF, DHHS*
10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	**Break**
10:15 a.m. – 11:45 p.m.	**Devolution and its Impact on Community-Based Welfare Reform Initiatives** *Barbara Fink, Task Leader, Project on Devolution and Urban Change, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (New York, NY)* *Thomas Brock, Senior Research Associate, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (New York, NY)* Introductory Comments by: *Elizabeth Lower-Basch, Federal Project Officer, Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS* *Laura Tiehen, Federal Co-Project Officer, Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture*
11:45 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.	**Lunch**
1:15 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	**State Perspective on Devolution and its Implications for Evaluation of Community Based Welfare Initiatives** *Gordon Scott, CalWORKS, Regional Advisor, California DSS* *Thurl Snell, Deputy Director, Indiana Family and Social Services Administration, & Matt Raibley, IMPACT Program Manager, Division of Family and Children* *Moderator: Lois Bell, Office of Family Assistance*
3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.	**Break**

3:15 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.	**Local Perspective on Devolution and its Implications for Evaluation of Community-based Welfare Initiatives** *Jim Holland, Contract Manager, Buncombe County DSS (North Carolina)* *Margo Kiely, Director, Fairfax County Department of Systems Management for Human Services (Virginia)* *Rev. Dr. Lois A. Poag-Ray, Director, Pilgrim African Methodist Episcopal Church Job Connection, Washington, DC* *Moderator: Margaret Washnitzer, Director, Division of State Assistance, Office of Community Services, ACF, DHHS*
4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	**Wrap-Up/Evaluation**

APPENDIX B:
PARTICIPANT LIST

Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network

Evaluating Community-based Welfare Initiatives

Doubletree Hotel
Arlington, VA

May 21, 2001

P A R T I C I P A N T L I S T

S P E A K E R S

Lois Bell
Director
Technical Assistance and Training Division
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9317
Fax: (202) 205-5887
E-mail: lbell@acf.dhhs.gov

Thomas Brock
Senior Research Associate
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
16 East 34th Street
New York, NY 10016
Phone: (212) 532-3200
Fax: (212) 684-0832
E-mail: thomas_brock@mdrc.org

Barbara Fink
Senior Research Associate
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
16 East 34th Street
New York, NY 10016
Phone: (212) 340-8646
Fax: (212) 684-0832
E-mail: barbara.fink@mdrc.org

Jim Holland
Contract Manager
Buncombe County Department of Social Services
40 Coxe Avenue
P.O. Box 7408
Asheville, NC 28802
Phone: (828) 250-5781
Fax: (828) 255-5845
E-mail: hollanj@buncombe.dss.dhr.state.nc.us

Marguerite Kiely
Director
Fairfax County Department of Systems Management for Human Services
Peninno Building
12011 Government Parkway, Suite 942
Fairfax, VA 22035
Phone: (703) 324-5638
Fax: (703) 324-7572
E-mail: mkiely@co.fairfax.va.us

Elizabeth Lower-Basch
Social Science Analyst
Human Services Policy Division
Office of the Assistant Secretary for
Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 404E
Washington, DC 20201
Phone: (202) 690-6808
Fax: (202) 690-6562
E-mail: elowerba@osaspe.dhhs.gov

Rev. Dr. Lois Poag-Ray
Executive Director
Pilgrim A.M.E. Job Connection
1673 Rosedale Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: (202) 396-7750
Fax: (202) 396-1987
E-mail: cray@pilgrimjobconnection.com

Matt Raibley
Program Manager
Division of Family and Children
IMPACT Program
402 West Washington Street
W363-MS10
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: (317) 232-2002
Fax: (317) 232-4615
E-mail: mraibley@fssa.state.in.us

Howard Rolston
Director
Office of Planning Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9290
Fax: (202) 205-3598
E-mail: hrolston@acf.dhhs.gov

Gordon V. Scott
Regional Advisor
California Department of Social Services
CalWORKS Program
744 P Street
MS 14-44
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 653-5528
Fax: (916) 654-1295
E-mail: gscott@dss.ca.gov

Thurl Snell
Deputy Director
Division of Family and Children
402 West Washington Street
Room 372 West
Indianapolis, IN 46226
Phone: (317) 233-3542
Fax: (317) 232-4490
E-mail: tsnell@fssa.state.in.us

PARTICIPANTS

Laura Tiehen
Research Economist
Food Assistance and Rural Economy Branch
Food and Rural Economics Division
Economic Research Service
United States Department of Agriculture
1800 M Street, N.W.
Room S2088
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 694-5417
Fax: (202) 694-5642
E-mail: ltiehen@ers.usda.gov

Margaret J. Washnitzer, DSW
Director
Division of State Assistance
Office of Community Services
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W. (West Wing)
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-2333
Fax: (202) 401-5718
E-mail: mwashnitzer@acf.dhhs.gov

Samara Weinstein
Deputy Director
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-6953
Fax: (202) 205-5887
E-mail: sweinstein@acf.dhhs.gov

Michelle Bensenberg
Lead Evaluator
Texas Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 149030
Mail Code W-340
Austin, TX 78714-9030
Phone: (512) 438-3733
Fax: (512) 438-4675
E-mail: michelle_bensenberg@dhs.state.tx.us

Carolyn Colvin
Director
Department of Human Services
Government of the District of Columbia
2700 Martin Luther King Avenue, S.E.
801 East Building
Washington, DC 20032
Phone: (202) 279-6126
Fax: (202) 645-4079
E-mail: carolyn.colvin@dc.gov

David Gruenenfelder
Manager
Illinois Department of Human Services
Bureau of Program Design and Evaluation
100 South Grand Avenue East
Springfield, IL 62762
Phone: (217) 785-0754
Fax: (217) 557-0473
E-mail: dhs9690@dhs.state.il.us

William Hudgens
Database Administrator
Florida Department of Children and Families
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Building 3 Room 465
Tallahassee, FL 32308
Phone: (850) 487-1597
Fax: (850) 921-1806
E-mail: bill_hudgens@dcf.state.fl.us

Mark Kleczewski
Planning Director
Minnesota Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, MN 55755
Phone: (651) 297-4819
Fax: (651) 297-5840
E-mail: mark.kleczewski@state.mn.us

George Kurian
Statistical Analyst
Colorado Department of Human Services
Office of Performance Measurement
1575 Sherman Street
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: (303) 866-3192
Fax: (303) 866-5488
E-mail: george.kurian@state.co.us

Suzanne Marshall
Assistant Chief
Program Evaluation/Automation
North Carolina Department of Health & Human services
Division of Social Services
325 N. Salisbury Street
MSC 2420
Raleigh, NC 27699-2420
Phone: (919) 733-7831
Fax: (919) 733-0645
E-mail: suzanne.marshall@ncmail.net

Sandra Miller
Assistant Director
Arkansas Department of Human Services
Division of County Operations
Office of Program Planning and Development
P.O. Box 1437
Slot 1220
Little Rock, AR 722
Phone: (501) 682-8250
Fax: (501) 682-1597
E-mail: sandra.miller@mail.state.ar.us

Jason Perkins-Cohen
Policy Analyst—TANF Monitoring Unit
Government of the District of Columbia
Department of Human Services
Income Maintenance Administration
645 H Street, N.E.
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: (202) 698-3900
Fax: (202) 724-2041
E-mail: jcohen@ima.dcgov.org

Chester Ray
Program Director
Pilgrim A.M.E. Job Connection
1673 Rosedale Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: (202) 396-7750
Fax: (202) 396-7411
E-mail: cray@pilgrimjobconnection.com

Stacy Rodgers
Chief of Staff
Department of Human Services
Government of the District of Columbia
2700 Martin Luther King Avenue, S.E.
801 East Building
Washington, DC 20032
Phone: (202) 279-6126
Fax: (202) 645-4079
E-mail: stacy.rodgers@dc.gov

FEDERAL PARTICIPANTS

Brenda Benesch
Policy Analyst
State and Local Initiatives
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 447D
Washington, DC 20201
Phone: (202) 260-0382
Fax: (202) 690-8252
E-mail: bbenesch@osaspe.dhhs.gov

Charlotte Bristow
TANF Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
West Central Hub—Dallas
1301 Young Street
Room 945
Dallas, TX 75202
Phone: (214) 767-0164
Fax: (214) 767-8890
E-mail: cbristow@acf.dhhs.gov

Ann Burek
Senior Program Specialist
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-4528
Fax: (202) 205-5887
E-mail: aburek@acf.dhhs.gov

Michael Dubinsky
Program Analyst
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-2442
Fax: (202) 205-3598
E-mail: midubinsky@acf.dhhs.gov

Eileen Friedman
Program Manager
TANF/Child Care
Administration for Children and Families
Region III
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
150 S. Independence Mall West
Suite 864
Philadelphia, PA 19106-3499
Phone: (215) 861-4058
Fax: (215) 861-4070
E-mail: efriedman@acf.dhhs.gov

Ronald Juergens
Community Services Liaison
Administration for Children and Families
Region X
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
2201 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98144
Phone: (206) 615-2550, ext. 3034
Fax: (206) 615-2574
E-mail: rjuergens1@acf.dhhs.gov

Paul Maiers
Program Specialist
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
901 D Street, SW
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-5438
Fax: (202) 205-5887
E-mail: pmaiers@acf.dhhs.gov

Dennis Minkler
Program Manager
TANF/Child Care
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Northeast HUB
26 Federal Plaza
Room 4114
New York, NY 10278
Phone: (212) 264-2890, ext. 137
Fax: (212) 264-0013
E-mail: dminkler@acf.dhhs.gov

Peg Montgomery
TANF Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region III
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
150 South Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-3499
Phone: (215) 861-4015
Fax: (215) 861-4070
E-mail: pmontgomery@acf.dhhs.gov

Mary Ellen O'Connell
Director
State and Local Initiatives
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue. S.W.
Room 447D
Washington, DC 20201
Phone: (202) 260-0391
Fax: (202) 690-8252
E-mail: moconnel@osaspe.dhhs.gov

Tom Schindler
TANF Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region V
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 886-9540
Fax: (312) 886-5373
E-mail: tschindler@acf.dhhs.gov

Joseph Smyth
Statistician
Administration for Children and Families
Region V
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601-5519
Phone: (312) 353-2571
Fax: (312) 886-5373
E-mail: jsmyth@acf.dhhs.gov

Lisa Washington-Thomas
TANF Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-5141
Fax: (202) 205-5887
E-mail: lwashington@acf.dhhs.gov

Larry Wolf
Program Analyst
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
350 L'Enfant Promenade
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-5084
Fax: (202) 205-3598
E-mail: lwolf@acf.dhhs.gov

CONTRACT STAFF

Blake Austensen
Deputy Project Director
Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
AFYA, Inc.
6930 Carroll Avenue
Suite 1000
Takoma Park, MD 20912
Phone: (301) 270-0841, ext. 215
Fax: (301) 270-3441
E-mail: baustensen@afyainc.com

Robin Dade
Administrative Assistant
Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
AFYA, Inc.
6930 Carroll Avenue
Suite 1000
Takoma Park, MD 20912
Phone: (301) 270-0841, ext. 217
Fax: (301) 270-3441
E-mail: rdade@afyainc.com

Kimberly Goodman
Research Assistant
Caliber Associates, Inc.
10530 Rosehaven Street Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
Phone: (703) 219-4379
Fax: (703) 385-3206
E-mail: goodmank@calib.com

Jeanette Hercik
Subcontract Manager
Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
Caliber Associates, Inc.
10530 Rosehaven Street Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
Phone: (703) 385-3200
Fax: (703) 385-3206
E-mail: hercikj@calib.com

Paul Purnell
Project Director
Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
AFYA, Inc.
6930 Carroll Avenue
Suite 1000
Takoma Park, MD 20912
Phone: (301) 270-0841, ext. 214
Fax: (301) 270-3441
E-mail: ppurnell@afyainc.com

APPENDIX C:
CONTRASTING FAMILY, COMMUNITY, AND AGENCY OUTCOMES

APPENDIX C: CONTRASTING FAMILY, COMMUNITY, AND AGENCY OUTCOMES INTERVENTIONS, STRATEGIES, AND ACTIVITIES PRODUCE CHANGE IN:

Outcome Level	Family Level	Community Level	Agency Level
National Goals	Low-income people become more self-sufficient. Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive systems.	The conditions in which low-income people are improved. Low-income people own a stake in their community.	Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved. Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results.
Units of Measure	Consumers, clients, individuals, families, enrollees, participants, households	Wards, boroughs, counties, townships, parishes, SMSAs, districts, neighborhoods, territories	Agency, program, employee, groups, departments, projects, bargaining units
Type of Change	Family Functioning, Attainment, and Achievement	Systems Functioning, Systems Capacity, or Community Conditions	Capacity or Performance
Dimensions of Change	■ Income ■ Education ■ Family functioning ■ Transportation ■ Employment ■ Housing ■ Basic needs ■ Community involvement ■ Substance abuse ■ Child care ■ Health	■ Public policy ■ Equity ■ Civic capital ■ Service & support systems ■ Economic opportunity	■ Governance ■ Linkages and relationships ■ Compliance ■ Cultural sensitivity and diversity ■ Equity ■ Workforce environment ■ Planning, measurement, and evaluation ■ External communications ■ Information management
Duration of Change	Endures beyond the agency's investment	Endures beyond the agency's investment	Stops when agency's investment stops
Aggregation Level	Agency or program	Agency or State	State or agency

Table modified from a working paper entitled "A Ladder to the Twenty-first Century" from the CSBG MATF Committee on Scales & Ladders to the CSBG Monitoring and Assessment Task Force. July 1, 1997.