RAPID RESPONSE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR
TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)
Regions II and III TANF Directors Meeting
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
April 26 - 27, 2005

Overview

The enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) in 1996 provided States the flexibility to develop TANF programs geared toward assisting families achieve self-sufficiency. The requirement that an increasing proportion of a state's TANF caseload participate in specified work activities that encourage self-sufficiency is a significant feature of the PRWORA legislation. States in Regions II and III have been successful in helping families move to work, addressing the goal of self-sufficiency and meeting the required participation rates with the assistance of the caseload reduction credit.

PRWORA, which was to expire on September 30, 2002, has been extended through a series of continuing resolutions while reauthorization legislation is considered by Congress. Though reauthorization of the TANF statute has not yet occurred, the proposed bills each include some level of increase to the number of hours of work required each week and the percentage of the caseload that must be working. Proposed legislation also includes either an elimination or recalibration of the caseload reduction credit that allows the state to lower its required participation rate. An employment credit has also been proposed that would allow states to include, for a period of time, those who have recently left TANF due to wages.

The Regional Offices regularly hold meetings for State TANF Directors and policy managers to focus on issues impacting the operation of the TANF Program. These meetings provide an opportunity to promote and enhance collaboration and partnerships within the region, among states and with the Regional Office. During such a meeting in New York City on August 24-25, 2004, participating Region II/III ACF TANF directors and staff discussed the current challenges of increasing work participation in their TANF programs and the expectation that these requirements would increase with TANF reauthorization. The participants identified this as an issue and suggested Regional Office assistance in convening a meeting centering on such specifics as work participation rate calculations, what gets counted as well as strategies for improvement. The Region II/III work group continued and with Regional staff, a meeting was planned to learn from well performing States with higher participation rates or States which had overcome barriers to improvement.

Meeting Summary

Day One

Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview
Mary Ann Higgins, Regional Administrator, Region II

Mary Ann Higgins welcomed the participants to this meeting and indicated that this was a continuation of an earlier, well received meeting of Region II/III States/jurisdictions in New York City in August 2004.

Eileen Friedman, TANF/Child Care Program Manager Region III and Dennis Minkler, TANF/Child Care Program Manager Region II, provided an overview of the organization of this meeting. **A copy of the agenda is presented in Appendix A.** All participants, including TANF Directors, State policy staff and Federal staff present, briefly introduced themselves. **The participant list is presented in Appendix B.**

State TANF and Work Participation Data
Andy Bush, Director, Office if Family Assistance
Grant Collins, Deputy Director
Shantel Anderson, Office of Family Assistance (OFA)

Andy Bush, outgoing Director of ACF's Office of Family Assistance (OFA), then provided a brief overview of the status of Welfare Reauthorization addressing some of the differences between House and Senate versions of the bills under consideration. It was indicated that the timing of passage of legislation was uncertain and that it could eventually become tied to the federal budget reconciliation process. Further discussions centered on funding, work participation rate "goals", "full engagement" and caseload considerations, including "child only" cases.

Ms. Anderson provided detailed reports for each of the participating states in Regions II/III and the presenting states (Georgia, Illinois and Texas) containing data on elements impacting the work participation rate in the TANF program as well as other TANF program/financial data. A comparison of various program aspects for the participating states was provided. Ms. Anderson reviewed this information with participants and answered questions regarding the data. Participants were very interested in this information.

Discussions included such issues as:

- Job search is underutilized as a participation activity, Illinois and Maryland staff noted it had been successfully used as a pre-application/diversion activity,
- Emphasis on "front end" interviews,

- There's a need for getting "credit" for activities such as diversionary activities which are not counted in the rate but contribute to employment and self-sufficiency,
- Correlation between high participation rates and goals of self sufficiency,
- Use of full family sanctions, and
- Difficulties in engaging/counting people with barriers such as mental health.

During these discussions Grant Collins discussed the difficulties in counting individuals whose cases were closed and also discussed use of techniques such as a match of IV-A cases against OCSE's National Directory of New Hires (NDNH) data match.

Mr. Bush also discussed the possible impacts of reauthorization legislation which might allow for "partial credit" to address efforts made by mental health recipients who might not be expected to work 30 hours without risk of further mental health deterioration.

State TANF Program Overview

Marva Arnold, Director, Division of Human Capital Development, Illinois Department of Human Services

Ms. Arnold presented a litany of factors that contributed to the success in Illinois that resulted in a FY 2003 58% work participation rate in which 60% of adults were working in unsubsidized employment. She joined the Illinois Department of Human Services in 1997 during TANF implementation in Chicago. Illinois administers a dynamic program in which processes previously successful are updated to address new requirements.

Success was based on the following factors:

TANF in Illinois is an outcome oriented program with worker accountability in which staff can lose their jobs if outcomes are not met. There are quarterly meetings before the hierarchy to review performance. Data analysis is used to set goals and alter outcomes in a fluid process. Case workers are promoted in-house. When additional staff were needed, Bachelor degrees were required. This laid the foundation for a paradigm shift – TANF was important.

Partnerships with business were important to job development, e.g. contracts with United Parcels Service.

The Department merged Food Stamps, Medicaid, TANF and other services, and co-located staff as a tool to improve efficiency and case handling. This was done with knowledge aforethought that a high proportion of clients do not reach their destination when referred to off-site locations. Co-location leads to quick resolution of problems and facilitates billing 30 hours of work activities due to the proximity of co-located activities, such as, substance abuse and mental health activities.

Illinois stops the clock under a Separate State Program if a client works 30 or more hours. This encourages clients to get entrenched in the workforce, and engenders wage progression. A two thirds income disregard also contributes to participation and deters recidivism since clients do not report unemployment before their disregards lapse.

Illinois' work programs are successful not only because employment contractors were given bonuses for job placements (although for only 15% of slots) but also work experience was structured into the contracts. Contractors assign clients to work sites for the number of hours that are commensurate with the amount of the grant using Fair Labor Standards. Inappropriate reductions in the number of hours or terminations reduce or eliminate the public assistance grants.

Caseworkers are required to perform monthly case management reviews with clients. This helps retention. If job issues surface, case workers intervene with employers or others if necessary. Caseloads were reduced (AFDC 1:450; TANF 1:110) since it takes time to find problems via focused conversations, to note red flags, and to provide services. Caseworkers established job clubs with better outcomes than contractors. They worked on improving interviewing skills and resolving impediments to work, e.g. obtaining treatment for asthmatic children to enable parental employment. Perhaps they did not find more jobs than contractors but they influenced recipients to want and obtain jobs via teaching life skills. Caseworkers were encouraged to reduce barriers to their relationship with clients, e.g. taking them to their desk rather than keeping them in the foyer (separate interviewing stalls). Caseworkers must work from individual case plans to validate client compliance with the plan and to ascertain if the activity was beneficial to the client's quest for work. Thirty hours of work activity are required for all clients in order to receive a grant. Ongoing contact is important to keep the client on track to finding employment. Sanctioning works, and it needs to be used when necessary. Vocational training integrated with community colleges works. In smaller counties one caseworker does all. In larger counties there are different case managers for pre-eligibility and under care management.

A powerful reward system was instituted. Benchmarks, e.g. percent of clients entering employment, were established, and best performance was rewarded with recognition in the newspaper, $250 bonuses given to local offices for purchases of refrigerators, microwave ovens, etc. Plaques were given to locals meeting performance standards at annual meetings.

A measure of their success is that only 200 cases have reached the 60 month limit since July 2002. An analysis is performed at the 48th month to determine why the client is not working and to resolve any problems. This is all done with one of the nation's lowest administrative cost rates.

In closing, Mr. Bush asked why their participation rate is decreasing. Ms. Arnold explained that the current climate in Illinois is that the administration has changed. TANF is no longer a novelty. During the late nineties the economy improved, and their business partners subsequently faded away. Success breeds less money. They have lost 2,500 caseworkers due to funding reductions and have reduced diversion activities. Less funding results in lower participation rates. Additionally, the economy went down. He also solicited what managerial focus would she recommend to other States in order to focus on increasing participation rates. Ms. Arnold recommended that performance outcomes be established to address what progress is expected, that all staff including managers be held accountable, and that this message be reinforced through repetition to locals.

Working Lunch

Diane Baillargeon, President Structured Employment Economic Development Corporation (SEEDCO)

A synopsis of the presentation follows:

Introduction

Good afternoon. I'm Diane Baillargeon, the president of Seedco. I'd like to thank Dennis Minkler for inviting me here to speak to you today. I am going to talk to you today about our most important workforce development initiative, the *EarnFair*® Alliance, which is a network of 10 New York City faith-based and community organizations, or FBCOs, for which Seedco provides financial and management oversight. I hope that by the time I am done, I will have given you reason to think about what these organizations can bring to your workforce development initiatives.

I began my career working in the government sector. From 1984 to 1989, I worked for the New York City Human Resources Administration, New York City's social welfare agency, first as director of its Office of Policy & Economic Research, then as Deputy Administrator for Policy and Program Development. From 1993 to 1994 I was Deputy Commissioner for Policy Management in New

York State's Department of Social Services. So I have tremendous respect for the challenges of working in government, and for the people who do that work and bring about continual improvement in how government serves people.

In addition to my personal experience working in government, much of the work I do now as president of Seedco relies on the willingness of government partners to innovate and be flexible and take chances with us, and on us.

About Seedco

Seedco is a national nonprofit community development intermediary that was founded by the Ford Foundation in 1986. Our mission is to create opportunities for low-wage workers and their families. We focus on strengthening communities by integrating workforce and economic development strategies that support small businesses and prepare people to enter and remain in the workforce. In everything we do, we keep an eye toward learning and then contributing that learning back to the field. Our website is at www.seedco.org.

The History of the *EarnFair* Alliance

As I have already suggested, the story of the *EarnFair* Alliance demonstrates the potential of FBCOs to play a unique and powerful role in meeting local TANF requirements. But what *really* needs to be in place to make this kind of program work?

I'll start with a brief history of the Alliance and how our work in this area got started. In 1997, my longtime partner Bill Grinker and I were called in by the New York Community Trust to work on a program they had begun two years earlier, called the Neighborhood Strategies Project, or NSP. It was a "collaborative" with three local FBCOs: Citizens Advice Bureau in the Bronx, Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation in Harlem, and St. Nicholas Neighborhood Preservation Corporation in Brooklyn. Our work with NSP involved helping the FBCO partners move from *planning* to *doing*.

“Serendipity is the mother of invention,” and around this time the U.S. Department of Labor issued an RFP for competitive funding for welfare-to-work initiatives. We encouraged the three CBOs to apply under the aegis of the corporation we had founded, which was called N-PAC, for the Non-Profit Assistance Corporation. We called our program NSP Works and received a first-round grant of $5 million.

Fortuitously, at about the same time Bill was offered the presidency of Seedco, and he accepted on the condition that N-PAC be made a subsidiary of the organization. That move gave N-PAC, and NSP Works, access to Seedco’s management, administrative, and fiscal infrastructure.

At this point, I have to say, we didn’t know a lot. The contracts were not performance-based, and we had to work intensively with the local TANF agencies. The model that emerged positioned FBCOs to do what they do best—relate directly to clients in their communities—while N-PAC served as a provider of management services and infrastructure.

The program surpassed all its outcome targets and placed an average of about 200 people in jobs annually, which was about 65 percent of enrollees, at an average starting wage of $8.20 an hour. We attributed its success directly to the FBCOs’ involvement. The model was one of 18 programs nationally to receive a Promising Practices Award from the U.S. DOL.

The grant ended three years later, but with the success we were seeing, we didn’t want to stop. The Human Resources Administration of New York City, or HRA, issued an RFP for a 100-percent performance-based workforce development contract. Obviously the contract required scale. We invited four additional FBCOs to join a network of seven (including the charter three NSP Works sites), and we bid on and won a $7-million contract. HRA took a big chance on us, a group working with this new model of networked FBCOs. The network expanded to 12 before ultimately settling back to 10, which is the number of FBCOs the Alliance comprises today.

The Alliance Model

The basic model of the Alliance was fairly straightforward. It involved referrals of TANF recipients to our FBCOs by HRA. At the FBCOs, enrollees had access to a comprehensive package of job-readiness and training programs, career advisement, soft skills education, and the like. It was a model you could find in many places. What made it unique was the network and the process.

We were able to offer intensive technical assistance to the FBCOs in the network, and we shared the financial risk of the performance-based contracting. The way we did this was by paying out half of the contract amount to each FBCO on a line-item basis, regardless of how they were performing. The other half of the contract was paid according to achievement of performance milestones.

We took a cue from HRA in developing SmartStat, our chief management tool that Seedco uses to keep sites focused on their performance. SmartStat is an outcome-driven data analysis process modeled after HRA's VendorStat, which is in turn modeled after COMPSTAT (Computerized Statistics), the system the New York City Police Department used in the 1990s to make crime-fighting strategies more data-driven. SmartStat helps us jointly analyze the choices that lead to positive or negative results, and to identify ways in which the initiative can improve. In this way HRA really helped make us better at what we were trying to do.

The other thing that our model let us uniquely do was to put in place an infrastructure that took a great deal of the burden off the sites to develop materials, track their outcomes, and the like. We developed a job-readiness curriculum, a Web-based MIS system, and other similar tools that were implemented at each of the sites and provided a common template for serving clients and managing information.

So, it may have been a run-of-the-mill model, but it *proved we could compete.* We achieved our placement targets and our retention rates. HRA was satisfied and pleased with our results and increased the size of our contract. At this point we really started to build, adding on to our "vanilla" program.

Building the Alliance

Seedco wanted the Alliance's approach to workforce development to be highly employer-driven. In 2001 we launched the *EarnFair*® LLC, a flexible staffing company that contracted employees to employers on a trial basis, essentially sharing with employers the risk of hiring someone with barriers to employment. We launched sectoral initiatives in the healthcare and IT industries, to help train workers to meet the specific needs of employers in high-growth fields and place more people in jobs that were connected to career ladders. We began looking for innovative ways to link the Alliance's workforce development initiatives to Seedco's economic development work, assisting and boosting small businesses which create 75 percent of all new jobs in the U.S. economy.

At this point we also began focusing more on asset-building programs that would help make it easier for the FBCOs' jobseeker clients to make ends meet and stay employed. If you think about it, this is actually another element of an employer-driven strategy, because employees who are stretching their incomes to meet their families' basic needs are more likely to be able to stay in their jobs, reducing the expenses associated with high turnover. We created and launched our *Earn*Benefits℠ initiative to connect workers to government benefits, such as Food Stamps and the EITC, as well as some private benefits that Seedco created, including an emergency family loan to help prevent eviction and childcare emergencies and the like.

In fall 2003, the success of the Alliance up to that point prompted us to apply, with our FBCOs, for WIA funding to operate the Workforce1 Career Center in Upper Manhattan. We won the contract, which we saw as a critical step in helping to ensure that FBCOs not be left out of the WIA-funded workforce development system. Three Alliance FBCOs have workforce development staff stationed at the center. Seedco as the center's operator—a function we never contemplated when Seedco was created two decades ago. The shift has required us to beef up our own capacity by hiring more staff with specialized expertise and investing heavily in information technology.

Today, the Alliance is helping people achieve long-term success by focusing on outcomes beyond contracts—connecting them to career ladders and real strategies for building assets and getting on the path to self-sufficiency.

Results and Replication

Today, Seedco:

- Has leveraged $40 million for our community partners in the Alliance.
- Places about 7,000 people a year in jobs.
- Has a TANF job-retention rate 15 percent higher than anyone else's in the city.
- Has the City's lowest TANF recidivism rate.
- Has *Earn*Benefits up and running as a portal to self-sufficiency and long-term engagement in the workforce.

We are in the process of applying to HRA for renewal with an expanded Alliance of 29 New York City FBCOs, including some that specialize in particular special populations such as ex-offenders and non-custodial parents. We're in the early stages of replication of the Alliance in target sites including Jefferson County, Alabama (with a pilot network of five FBCOs), and Memphis, Tennessee, where we are working with the Community Foundation of Greater Memphis to launch a network of six FBCOs providing *Earn*Benefits services. We are in conversation with the Casey and Blank Foundations about launching *Earn*Benefits in Atlanta, Georgia, and with the Casey Foundation about a planned Alliance and *Earn*Benefits FBCO network in Baltimore, Maryland.

Conclusion

I hope I've given you reason today to believe that FBCOs can do this work and enhance your outcomes because of their strong roots in their communities. The challenges are to find ways to bridge issues relating to scale, to centralize management processes, and to ensure access to sufficient capital and overall resources. In the case of the Alliance, Seedco was the crucial link in the chain, as a management intermediary that could connect FBCOs to resources, provide capitalization and share financial risk.

It is also crucial that the work be outcome-driven. In this regard, the 100-percent-performance-based HRA contracts were good for keeping Seedco focused on outcomes with the Alliance. It was also helpful to us to cross-market our workforce programs with our economic development initiatives and to maintain an employer-driven focus.

Finally, it is vital to leverage resources. For the Alliance, Seedco used private philanthropy to jumpstart the process before applying to HRA for funding and, ultimately, connecting TANF recipients with the larger WIA system through our contracts to operate Workforce1 Career Centers.

With these prerequisites in place, FBCOs can be highly beneficial to your employment and training initiatives. I'd be happy to talk individually with you about this in greater detail. Thank you for your attention and enjoy the rest of the conference today.

State TANF Program Overview

Donna Gunter, Unit Manager, Division of Family and Children Services, Georgia Office of Family Independence

CY's 2002 low participation rate engendered a new look at their operations. Mr. Grant Collins did a simulation of an administrative proposal that would improve their work participation system. Subsequently management issued a directive mandating that the participation rate be increased by 50% within six months. Policy, strategy, contracts, training, and data reports were reviewed to design a new model of their work delivery system. It was promptly developed. This strategy focuses on:

- Education – TANF clients are educated at the point of application on the goals of the program,
- Engagement – TANF clients with a work requirement are engaged in work activities immediately upon approval of their application, and
- Monitoring – TANF clients are monitored consistently and frequently to ensure adherence to program requirements.

At the initial TANF application, clients are given an orientation. Potential job ready clients are required to perform two weeks of job search activities prior to finalizing their application. Non-job ready applicants may bypass job search depending on accommodation needs. After the application is completed the client enters an appropriate work track. The strategy is to engage the client as quickly as possible. Monitoring is accomplished by specialized staff who validate that recipients are complying with their requirements. Clients who don't comply are promptly sanctioned.

Georgia changed its sanctioning policy. Previously the policy provided for a 25% reduction for the first offense. Termination for life on the second offense was on the books but in reality it did not happen since clients could reapply after case closure. A one time per issue conciliation process was available. Policy was changed to require a three month 25% reduction on the first offense and case closure for three months on subsequent non-compliances. A single conciliation process regardless of the number of issues was adopted. Other program changes included the elimination of the exemption for having children less than one and the community service definition was amplified.

Two major contracts were negotiated focusing on primary work activities. Job placement data were closely monitored to ensure positive outcomes. They collaborated with their Departments of Labor and Education.

As a result of these activities Georgia's work participation rate as of February 2005 was 57%. Their lesson learned is what's monitored is what gets done.

A question was asked as to what part of the improvement was due to the new model versus the improvement from better capturing of the data. Changes in the model were considered the major factor for the improvement to include universal engagement and an amplified definition of community service. Previously a fair number of exemptions were granted to mothers with children who were less than one year old.

State TANF Program Overview
Marion Trapolino, Director Welfare Reform Initiatives, Texas Workforce Commission

Ms. Trapolino described Texas' efforts to increase their participation rate as mirroring what was done in Georgia. The Texas Workforce Commission is responsible for work activities, and it contracts with 28 Workforce Investment Boards that further subcontract with myriad community boards to provide services. Major work activities include on-the-job training, job search activity, unsubsidized and subsidized employment, and mandated community service after four weeks.

Initially the Boards were given a low performance expectation of 25%. Low expectations based on reliance on the caseload reduction credit resulted in reduced funding. In order to improve the work delivery system the target was increased to 43% with the same funding. A degree of performance-based contracting was introduced. As a strategy to get individuals into countable activities the boards focused on job search with subsequent mandated community service after four weeks. Their experience has been that higher standards have driven success. It is expected that Texas will be able to meet the 70% standard in the future if funding is not reduced.

Previously a partial sanction system was employed which resulted in sanctioning 33% of clients. This was inferred as not having an impact on encouraging clients to participate in work activities. A full family sanction was introduced in which clients lost TANF, Medicaid and Food Stamps but child care benefits continued. This resulted in a 50% reduction in the adult headed caseload, and the percentage of sanctioned households dropped to 10%. The new sanction policy has had a positive impact on the remaining clients to comply with work requirements. The work participation rate also increased because the drop in the caseload permitted closer scrutiny/monitoring of the significantly reduced caseload despite that they are mostly the "hard to serve".

The policy of disregarding 90% of gross income for four months is also credited with encouraging unsubsidized employment. During CY 2004 67% of participating adults were in unsubsidized jobs.

Ms. Trapolino also addressed differences in case processing in urban versus suburban areas, with suburban areas as a general rule able to place individuals into countable employment activities more readily due to more familiarity with clients and despite the fact that frequently transportation is an issue. It was noted that with respect to rural areas case managers get more creative due to less placement opportunities. Contact is normally outside of the office, and there are closer ties with case management.

Day One Wrap-Up

Following the presentations/discussions all attendees agreed that the day has been full and informative. Participants appreciated the willingness of those presenting to share their experiences and practices. Participants also commented on how useful it is to speak with others implementing similar programs and experiencing the same issues.

Day Two

Review and Feedback

Eileen Friedman and Dennis Minkler facilitated a brief overview of the previous day's content and highlighted the issues raised.

Program Overview

Jason Turner, Consultant Turner Government Operations

Mr. Turner in his discussions concerning his firms experience in a ten cities and foreign country review of TANF or TANF-like programs brought out and elicited from State participants the following points regarding implementing change in government operations:

- The difficulties in implementing change in government operations,
- The view in Europe as to the flexibility provided in the U.S. program and the remarkable change in the TANF caseload,
- The changes in Atlanta in intake, sanction procedures and the local view that they desired more support from the State,
- The need to change missions and measure achievable results,
- The utilization of work participation rates as a goal and monitoring activity down to the caseworker level was key in Atlanta,
- The decentralization of policy makers in Baltimore as a result of the State's establishing goals for its counties in a "loose-tight"

organizational structure,
- The technique of bringing counties in to discuss/negotiate goals,
- A discussion of “Fresh Start” in Baltimore where recipients coming up on their twenty-fourth month of assistance are targeted,
- Discussion of the need to target recipients before key dates (i.e., five year time limit) are reached,
- The recognition in Ft. Worth that with so many players involved in the process and with such a structure it may be preferable to contract out the management function,
- The use of web-based technology to augment program management and data measurement,
- Use of “work lists” as a technique to focus on performance,
- Phenomenon of focusing on results often resulting in data “clean-up”,
- Use of “stretch goals” as a management technique to set high expectations and avoid complacency,
- Discussion of Detroit experience where accountability for contractors was assured utilizing statistical measures and performance based contracts,
- Use of prime and sub-contractors to enhance accountability/performance,
- Utilization of Faith Based Organizations to connect to the “hard to serve”,
- Strong/weak points of faith based organizations as partners, and
- State performance improvements have caused a need to perhaps re-negotiate contracts or increase standards.

Question and Answers
Eileen Friedman, TANF Program Manager, Region III, ACF

Ms. Friedman led the discussion with State and ACF staff regarding a list of questions previously prepared and submitted by participating States which were answered by ACF OFA staff and handed out to all staff the previous day. Central Office staff is considering posting the Qs and As regarding the current TANF program on the ACF website.

Additional discussions/questions centered on the following topics:

- NY staff indicated their concern with the challenges faced with servicing individuals with barriers to engage in work related activities, particularly those with medical conditions and was interested in any structured, useful models,
- Discussions involved New York City’s “We Care” program where the importance of medical assessment was highlighted as key in placing individuals into the appropriate activity,
- NJ discussed the dynamics of its recent TANF caseload increase

as well as its emergency rental assistance program,

- Grant Collins mentioned the use of Family Self Sufficiency Programs and had discussed this with HUD and recommended that State staff contact their Public Housing Authority staff as a resource,
- NY confirmed its understanding of how to treat sanction cases,
- Discussions concerning Separate State Programs (SSP), where it was indicated that currently it was largely up to the State as to whether to develop such programs, but it was also indicated that it was conceivable that future legislation could possibly set standards for data reporting and/or other performance measures in this area,
- Further discussion by OFA staff concerning possible future legislation and the positive impact that additional/expanded activities to be counted and/or definitions (i.e. Community Service) could have an impact on work participation rates,
- Discussions concerning proper documentation were initiated by W. Va. where it was indicated that paper documentation was required for audit purposes, and
- Further discussions concerning documentation of hours also involved counting job interviews, whether client contact was considered documentation, use of exception reports as a management tool for tracking hours, the standard of "reasonableness" and systems of verification and counting employee absence (i.e. "sick leave) as an includable activity

Closing Remarks

ACF Regional and Central Office staff concluded the meeting by reviewing the activities of the past day and a half and solicited comments on what was useful

Participants generally agreed that this meeting was very helpful on two levels:

1) The opportunity to hear from Georgia, Illinois and Texas (and other federal/state and private sector staff) about the policies and practices of those programs that contributed to their success in reaching or improving work participation rates, and

2) The opportunity to discuss this with Regional colleagues (from two regions) and share common issues and experiences.

APPENDIX A

Increasing Work Participation in the TANF Program
Administration for Children and Families
Regions II and III

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
April 26 – 27, 2005

AGENDA

Tuesday April 26th

8:30 a.m. **Registration**

9:00 a.m. **Welcome and Introductions**
Mary Ann Higgins, Regional Administrator, Region II

9:15 a.m. **Andrew S. Bush, Director, Office of Family Assistance**
Grant E. Collins II, Deputy Director, Office of Family Assistance
Shantel Anderson, Program Specialist, Office of Family Assistance

- Achieving High Participation and the Role of Program Management
- Federal Activities to Support TANF Agencies
- State Work Participation Data and Discussion on State Performance

11:00 a.m. **Break**

11:15 a.m. **Illinois Department of Human Services**
Marva Arnold, Director
Division of Human Capital Development

12:30 p.m. **Working Lunch**
Diane Baillargeon, President
Structured Employment Economic Development Corporation (SEEDCO)
Ms. Baillargeon succeeded founder William J. Grinker as

President of SEEDCO, in September 2003. Founded in 1986, SEEDCO creates opportunities for low-wage workers to join the workforce and achieve economic self-sufficiency by engaging with community partners and anchor institutions.

2:00 p.m. **Georgia Office of Family Independence**
Donna Gunter, Unit Manager
Division of Family and Children Services

3:15 p.m. **Break**

3:30 p.m. **Texas Workforce Commission**
Marion Trapolino, Director
Welfare Reform Initiatives

5:00 p.m. **Adjourn Day One**

Wednesday April 27th

8:30 a.m. **Networking Session**

9:00 a.m. **Jason A. Turner, Consultant**
Turner Government Operations
In addition to his experience with welfare reform administration in Wisconsin and New York, Jason Turner has been around the country assisting cities and states as they consider strategies for implementing universal engagement and increasing their participation rates.

10:15 a.m. **Break**

10:30 a.m. **Implementing Work Participation Strategies: Next Steps**
States will continue dialogue to build a strategy to focus on some aspect of participation and discuss their implementation needs, and share plans/next steps.

1:00 p.m. **Adjourn**

APPENDIX B

REGIONS II & III TANF DIRECTORS MEETING
Increasing Work Participation in the TANF Program
New York City, New York
August 24 – 25, 2004

PARTICIPANT LIST

Region II

New Jersey

Barbara DeGraaf, Assistant Director
Office of County Operations
New Jersey Department of Human Services
Division of Family Development
6 Quakerbridge Plaza
PO Box 716
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 588-2406
barbara.deGraaf@dhs.state.nj.us

Donald Forsythe, Chief
Office of Employability Development
Programs
New Jersey Department of Labor and
Workforce Development
P. O. Box 055
Trenton, NJ 08625-0055
(609) 984-6091
donald.forsythe@dol.state.nj.us

Rudy Myers, Assistant Director
Office of Planning and Operations Review
New Jersey Department of Human Services
Division of Family Development
6 Quakerbridge Plaza
PO Box 716
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 588-2414
rudy.myers@dhs.state.nj.us

New York

Barbara Guinn, Bureau Chief
Policy and Program Operations
New York State Department of Labor
W. Averill Harriman State Office Building
Campus Building #12 Room 288
Albany, New York 12240-0001
(518) 457-1228
barbara.guinn@labor.state.ny.us

John Healey, Workforce Program Analyst
New York State Department of Labor
W. Averill Harriman State Office Building
Campus Building #`12 Room 288
Albany, New York 12240-0001
(518) 485-1163
john.healey@labor.state.ny.us

Robert Sharkey, Director of Policy Development
NYS Office of Temporary & Disability Assistance
40 North Pearl Street, 11th Floor
Albany, New York 12243
(518) 486-9599
robert.sharkey@otda.state.ny.us

Puerto Rico

Laura I. Alvarez, Director TANF Program
Administration for Socioeconomic Development
Puerto Rico Department of the Family
G.P.O. Box 8000
San Juan, PR 00910-0800
(787) 725-8081
lalvarez@adsef.gobierno.pr

Javier Perez, Administrative Official
TANF in PR
Roberto H Todd 500 Bus Stop 18
San Juan, PR 00910-0800
787 289-7600 ext. 2520
javperez@adsef.gobierno.pr

Virgin Islands

Lennox C. Zamore, Director of JOBS
Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 308201
St. Thomas, VI 00803
(340) 774-0930 Ext. 4477
zman_vi@hotmail.com

Region III

Delaware

Teresa Printz, Social Services Administrator
Division of Social Services
Delaware Health and Social Services
Herman M. Holloway, Sr. Campus
Lewis Building
P.O. Box 906
New Castle, DE 19720
(302) 255-4425
teresa.printz@state.de.us

Sandy Sarjeant, Chief of Systems
Division of Social Services
The Biggs Building
1901 N. Dupont Highway
New Castle, DE 19720
(302) 255-9774
Sandy.sarjeant@state.de.us

Thomas M. Smith, Employment and Training Administrator
Department of Labor
Division of Employment & Training
4425 North Market Street
P. O. Box 9828
Wilmington, DE 19809
(302) 761-8123
ThomasM.Smith@state.de.us

District of Columbia

Sean French, Acting Program Manager
Income Maintenance Administration
Office of Performance Monitoring
645 H. Street, NE
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 698-3957
sean.french@dc.gov

Brenda Sligh, Deputy Administrator
Income Maintenance Administration
Department of Human Services
Division of Monitoring and Quality Assurance
51 N. Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 724-5633
Brenda.sligh@dc.gov

Maryland

Kevin M. McGuire, Executive Director
Family Investment Administration
Saratoga State Center
311 West Saratoga Street, Room 741
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-7338
kmcguire@dhr.state.md.us

Ken Holiday, Work Program Administrator
Family Investment Administration
Saratoga State Center
311 W. Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-8188
kholiday@dhr.state.md.us

Marilyn Lorenzo, Human Service Administrator I
TCA Manager
Family Investment Administration
Saratoga State Center
311 W. Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-7333
mlorenzo@dhr.state.md.us

Gretchen Simpson, Lead Program Analyst
Training & Policy Unit
Family Investment Administration
Saratoga State Center
311 W. Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-7937
gsimpson@dhr.state.md.us

Vince Kilduff, Manager,
Federal Reporting & Research
Family Investment Administration
Saratoga State Center
311 W. Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-7187
vkilduff@dhr.state.md.us

John Huegelmeyer, Bureau Chief
Bureau of Research & Programs
Family Investment Administration
Saratoga State Center
311 W. Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-8193
jhuegelm@dhr.state.md.us

Pennsylvania

David Florey, Director
Bureau of Employment & Training Programs
PA Department of Public Welfare
Room 428, Health and Welfare Building
P.O. Box 2675
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2675
(717) 787-8613
dflorey@state.pa.us

Carole Rebert, Director
Bureau of Program Evaluation
Office of Income Maintenance
Bertolino Building, 5th Floor
1401 N. 7th Street
Harrisburg, PA 17102
(717) 783-2874
crebert@state.pa.us

Ed Zogby, Director
Bureau of Policy
Office of Income Maintenance
Room 431, Health and Welfare Building
P.O. Box 2675
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2675
(717) 787-4081
ezogby@state.pa.us

Virginia

Mark Golden, TANF Program Manager
Department of Social Services
7 N. Eighth Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 726-7385
mark.golden@dss.virginia.gov

West Virginia

Sue Ellen Buster, Director
Department of Health & Human Resources

Bureau for Children and Families
Office of Children and Family Policy
Division of Family Assistance
Room B-18
350 Capitol Street
Charleston, WV 25305-3705
(304) 558-3796
sbuster@wvdhhr.org

Dan Hartwell, Program Manager II
Department of Health & Human Resources
Bureau for Children and Families
Office of Children and Family Policy
Division of Family Assistance
350 Capitol Street, Room B-18
Charleston, WV 25301
(304) 558-2357
danhartwell@wvdhhr.org

Administration for Children and Families

Shantel Anderson
Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278
(212) 264-2890 ext. 128
sanderson@acf.hhs.gov

Andrew Bush
Director
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
Washington, D.C. 20447
(202) 401-9275
ABush@acf.hhs.gov

Frank Ceruto
Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278
(212) 264-2890 ext. 133
fceruto@acf.hhs.gov

Grant E. Collins II
Deputy Director
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
Washington, DC 20447
202-401-9275
grcollins@acf.hhs.gov

Eileen Friedman
TANF/Child Care Program Manager
Administration for Children and Families
Region III
150 S. Independence Mall West, Suite 864
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
(215) 861-4058
efriedman@acf.hhs.gov

Mary Ann Higgins
Regional Administrator
Administration for Children and Families
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278
(212) 264-2890 ext. 103
mhiggins@acf.hhs.gov

Michael Kail
Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278
(212) 264-2890 ext. 121
mkail@acf.hhs.gov

Dennis Minkler
TANF/Child Care Program Manager
Administration for Children and Families
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278
(212) 264-2890 ext. 137
dminkler@acf.hhs.gov

Peg Montgomery
TANF/CC Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region III
150 S. Independence Mall West, Suite 864
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
(215) 861-4015
pmontgomery@acf.hhs.gov

Lisa Pearson
TANF/CC Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region III
150 S. Independence Mall West, Suite 864
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
(215) 861-4030
lpearson@acf.hhs.gov

Anthony Santomo
TANF/CC Fiscal Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region III
150 S. Independence Mall West, Suite 864
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
(215) 861-4008
asantomo@acf.hhs.gov