

June 2001

**NATIONAL
HEALTH
POLICY
FORUM**

TANF and

Work Support Services:

On the Job in

Greater Philadelphia

April 18-20, 2001
Philadelphia

The
George
Washington
University
WASHINGTON DC

■
SITE VISIT REPORT

Contents

Acknowledgments	ii
Background	1
Program	2
Impressions	3
Agenda	7
Federal and Foundation Participants	11
Biographical Sketches— Speakers and Panelists	12

SITE VISIT REPORT

Site Visit Managers:

Lisa Sprague and Randy Desonia

Site Visit Coordinator:

Dagny Wolf

Research Assistant:

Wakina Scott

National Health Policy Forum

2131 K Street, NW, Suite 500

Washington, DC 20052

202/872-1390

202/862-9837 (fax)

nHPF@gwu.edu (e-mail)

www.nHPF.org (Web site)

Judith Miller Jones, Director

Judith D. Moore, Co-Director

Karen Matherlee, Co-Director

Michele Black, Publications Director

NHPF is a nonpartisan education and information exchange for federal health policymakers.

Acknowledgments

“TANF and Support Services: On the Job in Greater Philadelphia” was the first in a series of site visits focusing on welfare reform and children’s health issues, made possible by the generosity of the David and Lucile Packard and the W. K. Kellogg Foundations.

The Forum thanks Feather Houston, Sherri Heller, and Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare staff for their enthusiasm for and assistance with this project. Special appreciation is due to Nancy Norcross, who served as day-to-day liaison with Forum staff.

Don Jose Stovall and Yvonne Norman were kind enough to host site visitors in their facilities and to arrange for visitors to meet other county assistance office staff. Fred Bostwick was particularly helpful in putting together panels focusing on Philadelphia employers. Linda Blanchette and Nellie Sepulveda arranged for participants to visit a Greater Philadelphia Works regional service center and to talk with staff. Gary Walker agreed on short notice to share his experience with faith-based organizations and social welfare programs.

An NHPF site visit is always a complement of contributions from many participants. The Forum is grateful to all speakers, panelists, and advisors, as well as to federal site visitors for their lively interest.

TANF and Work Support Services: On the Job in Greater Philadelphia

BACKGROUND

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 redefined cash assistance to low-income families from an open-ended entitlement to a temporary support program focused on moving recipients into employment. After two years of assistance payments, recipients are required to work in order to remain eligible for benefits. The law also set a five-year lifetime limit on federally funded welfare benefits.

At the time PRWORA was enacted, Pennsylvania was one of only seven states without any type of state welfare reform initiative under way. The state moved quickly to develop a completely new program. In spite of predictions of disaster (then-Mayor Ed Rendell of Philadelphia forecast a “train wreck”), the program seems to have moved people away from cash benefits without multiplying social ills such as homelessness, crime, and child endangerment. Progress has been sufficiently marked that, in 1999, Pennsylvania was one of ten states to be awarded a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services bonus for moving clients off the welfare rolls and into jobs.

Administration

Pennsylvania administers a statewide welfare program with offices in each county. Broad policy issues and regulatory decisions are addressed in Harrisburg, but local welfare offices have considerable latitude in shaping program operations and developing alliances with other community resources. Separate county-administered agencies play a role in some aspects of the program, such as child-care subsidies for clients no longer receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

TANF

Poor families with children must meet general eligibility requirements, including citizenship, residence in Pennsylvania, and a Social Security number. Adult recipients must seek employment or participate in an employment training program. (Some may be exempt because of personal circumstances such as a temporary or

permanent disability.) A recipient is required to enter into an “Agreement of Mutual Responsibility” with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW); this is a written action plan outlining what the recipient will do to work toward self-sufficiency. If an application is made for cash assistance for a dependent child living in the home, the applicant must cooperate with paternity identification and child support requirements. Receipt of TANF is limited by statute to 60 months in a person’s lifetime. Pennsylvania requires a person who has received cash assistance for more than 24 months to work a minimum of 20 hours per week. Cash assistance benefits are issued via a statewide electronic benefits transfer system.

Support Services

A variety of needs must be addressed if a client is to have the confidence and indeed ability to get and keep a job. Some of these were highlighted in Philadelphia, as outlined below. Others, such as food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, will be explored later in NHPF’s site visit series.

Employment and Training. The state contracts with service providers—county governments in some locations, nonprofit and for-profit organizations in others. In Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation manages a number of programs and contractors. Work Opportunities is a statewide transitional jobs program for those who have not found unsubsidized work through other programs. Greater Philadelphia Works (GPW) the city’s welfare-to-work program and a U.S. Department of Labor Welfare to Work competitive grantee, has been funded with both federal and state dollars. GPW established eight neighborhood-based centers where clients receive case management services and referrals to service providers. The Transitional Work Corporation is a partnership among the state, GPW, and the Pew Charitable Trusts to provide transitional jobs for welfare recipients unprepared to find jobs on their own. The state has new plans in the works to increase its emphasis on job retention and advancement.

Medical Assistance. National research has shown that, once welfare reform eliminated the link between eligibility

for cash benefits and eligibility for Medicaid, many welfare recipients moving from welfare to work failed to receive the Medicaid benefits for which they were eligible. Pennsylvania advocates and officials were among the first to address this problem, and the state identified cases and worked to restore Medicaid benefits that had been improperly terminated. Ongoing monitoring, necessary to assure that new recipients are appropriately informed, continues.

Child Care. The demand for child care has escalated with the movement of many women from welfare to work. Delaware county officials report that their supply is adequate to demand; in contrast, Philadelphia faces a shortage of quality affordable care. Local advocates have identified the child care subsidy as the most problematic issue surrounding welfare reform. In addition to the shortage of providers, complication arises from the split in programmatic administration, whereby the child care subsidy for TANF clients is administered by the Office of Income Maintenance, while the subsidy for those who have left cash assistance is overseen by the Office of Children, Youth, and Families. Transition between the two is not always smooth, especially since work requirements differ.

Transportation. Some 44 percent of Philadelphia's job placements have been in the suburbs (compared, for example, with about 20 percent in Chicago), creating a need for transportation options beyond the standard commuter pattern. Philadelphia was awarded \$1.3 million under the federal Job Access Program created in 1998. When regulatory minutiae tied up the funds for a year, the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) advanced that amount to city non-profits to allow plans to proceed. SEPTA has remained a willing partner, and other organizations have made transportation arrangements targeted to particular neighborhoods and employers as well.

PROGRAM

On April 18, after traveling to Philadelphia, site visitors heard an opening presentation by a University of Pennsylvania researcher who has studied social policy implementation in the city extensively. This overview of city and state program development provided context for subsequent site visit activities. The Department of Public Welfare's deputy secretary summarized history, operations, and issues from the state agency perspective.

The second day began with a discussion of advocacy concerns, particularly relating to the interaction of TANF with support programs such as Medicaid. Site visitors then traveled to the Frankford-Kensington Regional Service Center to meet with its director and her counterparts from other service centers operated by GPW. The GPW director

was also on hand to describe the overall program and highlight its client and employer outreach campaign. At the Philadelphia County Assistance Office, the afternoon program comprised a presentation by the county director, discussion panels representing employment/training contractors and employers who hire TANF clients, and an exploration of the potential role of faith- and community-based organizations in providing services to welfare clients and leavers.

The site visit's last morning began with a panel discussion spotlighting child care issues. A visit to the Delaware County Assistance Office allowed participants to compare suburban facilities and programs to those earlier observed in the inner city. Transportation issues are a particular concern in suburban areas where city transit services are thin.

IMPRESSIONS

TANF Realities

■
TANF clients moving into the workforce represent a major part of the drop in case-loads, but other clients have dropped out voluntarily.

Voluntary leavers may have other sources of income, or may be trying to make it on their own rather than have to participate in a job training program, obtain a court order for child support, or disclose substance abuse, domestic violence, or other family issues. This population cohort, critical to substantiating the full impact of welfare reform, is difficult to track in urban areas where sheer population volume makes it unlikely that many are known personally by caseworkers.

■
Some clients with significant employment barriers are getting close to the five-year cut-off.

Of particular concern to advocates are those who do not speak English, the disabled, and domestic violence victims. The state's new Maximizing Participation Project is designed to focus on how such clients can be brought into the workforce. Corresponding efforts will be made to pursue Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits for those who may be eligible. A new Time Out program proposes to give clients time "off the clock" to transition to new employment and the life adjustments it entails. It is unclear to what extent Pennsylvania will allocate state funds to continuation of benefits after five years.

■

A fundamental question yet to be addressed is how to define who is employable.

State officials caution against a list of conditions that represent legitimate obstacles to employment, fearing it would motivate many to pursue one of the exempting designations. A preferable approach seems to be determining a level and source of support services necessary to make someone employable or, where no feasible package of support services will suffice, to secure alternative income, such as SSI.

■

Welfare reform, like any fundamental social policy change, proceeds in stages.

In part, its progress is a matter of changing expectations. Clients approaching the five-year limit may well have expected at one time to be welfare recipients indefinitely. Anyone who goes on the TANF rolls now has a clearer understanding of time limits. DPW employees have also had to change their frame of reference, developing new skills to assist and encourage clients in job-seeking. Policymakers considering reauthorization should be cautious about extrapolating from patterns observed in the initial stages of welfare reform.

■

The “poverty system” is predicated on beneficiaries who have lots of time—who can, for example, spend all day in a clinic waiting room.

Similarly, redeterminations for cash assistance, Medicaid, or food stamps typically can be accomplished only during standard business hours. When beneficiaries become employed, they can no longer tolerate such delays, yet may have no alternative service providers. Redesigning support services to cater to a working clientele is a complex process; the pace at which it may be proceeding is not clear.

■

There appears to be little consideration of noncustodial parents in the whole program matrix.

Indeed, male involvement is noticeably absent. Because TANF arose out of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), a program targeted to single mothers, it is this group on whom job search and training programs are focused. Many AFDC policies discouraged marriage, and their effect lingers; many women in the welfare system are single. Given that among PRWORA’s goals are promoting marriage and strengthening the two-parent

family, participants noted that greater attention to the employability of fathers might be in order.

■

Faith-based organizations may be able, willing, and ideally placed to provide support services for welfare leavers.

Such organizations have played little role in welfare reform in Philadelphia so far. However, as part of its Community Solutions initiative, DPW will be issuing requests for proposals specifically to enlist faith-based organizations’ participation in providing services to clients.

Administration

■

A state-administered program promotes greater uniformity in policies and operations throughout the state.

State control also facilitates Pennsylvania’s ability to implement welfare initiatives quickly. DPW has been able to revise policies and programs as problems have been identified. For example, the state instituted rapid payment to regulated childcare providers to help them maintain fiscal stability. Three recent examples are the Community Options initiative for contracting with faith-based organizations, the Maximizing Program Participation effort aimed especially at medically exempt clients, and the Time Out option for clients nearing the 60-month limit.

■

Pennsylvania’s DPW, indeed any state welfare agency, faces the difficult task of creating at the state and local level an integrated set of services from what one site visitor called a “hodgepodge” of federal programs and funding streams.

Various programs and services converge at a single point, the client, at the local level. At the federal level, different agencies, committees of jurisdiction, and funding authorities work against program design coherence.

■

Pennsylvania has emphasized client choice in implementing welfare reform, a policy that has had particular impact on job training and child care services.

In both cases, the recipient is provided with numerous options and potential providers and may need assistance in selecting an appropriate provider or program.

■
While there is an adversarial history between DPW and Philadelphia advocates, today both sides acknowledge a reasonably good working relationship.

Advocates have played an important role in bringing critical issues to full discussion. The state has been willing to listen to the advocacy community and has established a number of advisory committees that deal with issues such as Medicaid/SCHIP coordination, TANF/Medicaid delinking, and planning for the post-60 months period.

■
State computer systems are inadequate to the complexities of coordinating TANF and other welfare-to-work services provided by the state.

Clients being served by multiple programs have separate records in each, even when they may be going back and forth. Their cases cannot be tracked on a longitudinal basis. This problem, recognized and lamented by welfare system stakeholders on all sides, does not seem to have a workable short-term solution. The state's plans to pursue a long-term solution (with, inevitably, a substantial price tag) were not explicated during the site visit.

Training, Placement, and Continued Employment

■
Job placement is just the first step; long-term job retention is key to making welfare reform a success.

Keeping a job requires not only appropriate skills and behaviors, but also a constellation of life support services such as child care and transportation and, possibly, assistance with issues such as literacy and substance abuse. A parent without reliable day care or help in dealing with an abusive relationship likely is not a candidate for long job tenure.

■
The state does not conduct an assessment of clients' abilities, experience, and training needs before the client is expected to select a work-readiness, job-search, or training program to enroll in.

A client's enrollment in various job-preparation and placement programs is determined in part by her preferences and in part according to the "cascade chart"—that is, referrals to education and training programs after solo attempts to secure

employment have failed. There is little means of assuring that clients choose the program most suited to their needs.

■
There does not appear to be in place a performance measurement mechanism that would allow DPW to determine which employment/training contractors are most effective.

Perhaps in the service of client choice, the referral process does not attempt to reward good contractor performance by channeling more clients to more effective programs.

■
Contractors who operate employment and training programs do their own assessments of client skills and needs in order to provide an appropriate mix of training, education, and support services.

Some contractors are able to provide an array of support services, including counseling for mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence problems.

■
Employment contractors must satisfy two sets of expectations by providing employers with skilled and reliable workers and by giving clients the skills and the self-confidence to secure and especially to retain employment.

Failing to fulfill this double challenge, the contractors believe, would stigmatize them as simply the source of ex-welfare recipients.

■
While county assistance offices and other contractors may have job developers on staff, there has been little or no organized effort by the state to enlist and support the employer community in hiring and retaining welfare clients.

Particular employers who hire clients are recognized and appreciated, but a market-based analysis of employer needs, capabilities, and preferences was not in evidence.

■
Transportation to work can be addressed at the local level.

For example, Delaware County arranged for affordable bus service to transport clients to a part of the county where jobs were plentiful but the metropolitan bus service did not reach. Bus stops were scheduled near residences and day care centers; financial assistance in the form of passes also is available. In Philadelphia, where many clients find employment in suburban counties, substantial commuting time—often complicated by child care arrangements—can be a major problem.

Child Care

■

Access to mainstream regulated child care is not difficult for those eligible for the subsidy.

Several providers mentioned they had no waiting lists. Care is harder to come by during the night and on weekends, though evidence is more anecdotal than statistical. Qualified day care for special needs children is in short supply. Even with mainstream care, the absence of waiting lists should not be read as evidence of universal access. There is some indication that the transition from Office of Income Maintenance contractors (who administer child care benefits for TANF recipients) to Children, Youth, and Families offices (who pick up when a TANF case closes) is so difficult to navigate that some clients do not bother to try.

■

A majority of clients in Philadelphia appear to choose relatives and neighbors to care for their children, rather than enrolling children with regulated day care providers.

Reasons commonly cited for preferring relative/neighbor care are convenience and cultural comfort; however, money clearly plays a role as well. The child care subsidy paid by the state is the same regardless of the type of care chosen, but payments are made directly to clients who opt for relative/neighbor care (as opposed to going directly to licensed providers). Direct subsidy payment represents a source of income, not all of which necessarily goes to the care provider. Payment may also be factored into the household budget if the caregiver is (for example) a boyfriend. There is no mechanism to enforce actual payment of a client's legally required copayment.

■

Transfer of child care cases from one agency to another when cash assistance stops is a source of delay and error.

Different eligibility requirements (such as work hours per week) can be confusing to clients. Some differences favor TANF clients; for example, the live-in boyfriend of a woman who was never on TANF but receives a child care subsidy must be working at least 25 hours a week if the subsidy is to continue. The employment status of the live-in boyfriend of a TANF client is not considered in making decisions about eligibility for a subsidy.

■

Background checks for child abuse and felony convictions, required of employees of regulated providers, are controversial with respect to relative/neighbor caregivers and so far have not been required by the state.

Both advocates and DPW staff are concerned about this issue, but all agree that it is extremely problematic to separate and balance the legitimate claims of child protection and parental choice.

■

The requirement to furnish paternity and child support information has led to notable success in the state's collection of child support payments, but is uncomfortable or even frightening for some clients.

Receipt of a child care subsidy is contingent on providing the information and court order necessary to institute child support enforcement proceedings. This is a state mandate, not part of the federal statute. Many noncustodial parents would rather be providing money directly to their families than repaying past welfare benefits to the state.

Medical Assistance

■

Philadelphia was the first locale in the state (and one of the first in the country) to address systematically the erosion of Medicaid coverage when cash assistance stopped.

Advocates were extremely active in drawing attention to the situation; working with the state, they have developed outreach and training measures along with a high level of media and public awareness.

Philadelphia

■

Welfare reform has been a source of considerable political disagreement.

The mayor in office at the time of enactment had sharp differences on the subject with both the governor and Washington. One apparent result was the sending of mixed messages to welfare clients, who consequently were confused about how seriously to take the new five-year time limit.



Greater Philadelphia Works, which is at the end of its Department of Labor grant money, apparently will have to shut down this fall (2001).

Some of the contractors who operate its regional service centers may be able to continue to provide services under new DPW contracts, though some existing contracts in addition to GPW's will terminate. While praising the organization's outreach efforts to welfare clients and employers, the state has declined to provide ongoing funding to GPW itself. GPW staff feel they still have a valuable mission to pursue. It may be that the state, in looking at its remaining caseload, is shifting resources to job retention and advancement projects.



The Transitional Workforce Corporation (TWC), a GPW contractor, works with clients referred because they are likely to need additional help in securing and retaining employment.

During their first six months, TWC clients work 25 hours per week in subsidized jobs, also spending ten hours in development programs that emphasize basic reading and math skills, GED preparation, and computer training. Jobs last for up to six months and participants receive cash bonuses for moving into unsubsidized work and for job retention. TWC makes follow-up with both client and employer standard post-hiring practice.



Philadelphia was characterized by one speaker as a "last in, first out" economic model.

The city has not enjoyed the fruits of the long economic boom period to the same extent as most other locales and expects to feel the effects of a downturn sooner and more sharply. The potential impact on welfare caseloads is cause for concern.

Agenda

Wednesday, April 18, 2001

- noon Bus departure for Pennsylvania [*Union Station, Washington, DC*]
- 3:00 pm Check-in at headquarters hotel [*Philadelphia Renaissance Hotel at the Airport*]
- 3:30 pm OVERVIEW OF WELFARE REFORM IN PENNSYLVANIA
[*Salons VII and VIII, Philadelphia Renaissance Hotel*]
Mark Alan Hughes, *Distinguished Senior Scholar*, Fels Center of Government,
University of Pennsylvania
- What were the critical issues debated prior to enactment of Pennsylvania's welfare reform legislation?
 - What were the forces in play in implementing PRWORA?
 - What are the key socioeconomic factors defining welfare reform in Philadelphia?
 - What are the current and future issues for welfare reform in Pennsylvania?
- 4:15 pm THE VIEW FROM THE STATE:
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE (DPW) PERSPECTIVES
Sherril Z. Heller, Ed.D., *Deputy Secretary*, Office of Income Maintenance, Pennsylvania
Department of Public Welfare
- What are the key TANF policies adopted in Pennsylvania?
 - How are responsibilities for TANF and related work-support services apportioned among state agencies?
 - What initiatives has the department undertaken to educate clients about both their responsibilities and the work-support programs available to them?
 - What are the characteristics of the TANF population in Pennsylvania? How does Philadelphia differ from the rest of the state?
 - How has Pennsylvania used the greater flexibility under PRWORA to coordinate the multiple programs affecting welfare-to-work? How do federal financing and policies promote or work against interagency collaboration?
 - What efforts are made to track TANF leavers and their continued access to other services for which they may be eligible? What information system redesign has this entailed? What is known about clients who have left TANF but are not employed?
 - How is the Community Solutions initiative designed to encourage the involvement of faith-based organizations?
 - What are the secretary's priorities for the program between now and when the first beneficiaries reach their five-year limit? What is expected post-March 2002? How will the Time-Out Program be implemented?
- 5:30 pm Adjournment
- 6:15 pm Bus departure for dinner at D'Ignazio's Towne House

8:30 pm Bus departure for headquarters hotel

Thursday, April 19, 2001

8:00 am Breakfast available, followed by discussion [*Salons VII and VIII, Philadelphia Renaissance Hotel*]

8:30 am PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES: ADVOCACY PERSPECTIVES

Catherine Carr, *Executive Director*, Community Legal Services

Patricia Redmond, *Health Director*, Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth

- How do clients view welfare reform and have their opinions changed over time?
- What do clients see as the principal barriers to getting and keeping a job?
- How has the transition from cash assistance to work affected client access to other benefits (for example, Medicaid, food stamps)?
- What role do advocacy organizations play in advising the state on welfare policy?
- What are the emerging (or remaining) policy and programmatic challenges facing Pennsylvania's welfare program?

9:30 am Bus departure for Frankfort-Kensington Regional Service Center

10:00 am SERVING CLIENTS IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS:
GREATER PHILADELPHIA WORKS

Linda Blanchette, *Director*, Greater Philadelphia Works

Nelida Sepulveda, *Director*, Frankfort-Kensington Regional Service Center, and staff

- How are clients referred to this program? How are the needs of the client identified? What are the most prevalent needs?
- What services are available to clients and what provisions are made to accommodate their particular needs?
- Has the clientele changed since the doors were first opened?

noon Lunch

12:30 pm Bus departure for Philadelphia County Assistance Office headquarters

1:00 pm WELFARE REFORM IN THE INNER CITY [*Room 602, Philadelphia County Assistance Office*]

Don José Stovall, *Executive Director*, Philadelphia County Assistance Office, and staff

- What strategies were adopted to facilitate the adjustment of Philadelphia DPW staff and operations from AFDC to TANF?
- How has the intake process changed? Is the Philadelphia DPW caseworker a single point of contact for support services as well as cash assistance? Who else is involved? How is the client referred to education, training, or job search programs?
- What steps have been taken to ensure that the delinking of cash and medical assistance did not result in loss of Medicaid benefits?
- What programs have been adopted or are contemplated to promote employment retention and continuity?

- 3:00 pm A JOB IS THE GOAL: THE EMPLOYMENT PERSPECTIVE
Larry Moulder, *Workforce Planning Supervisor*, United Parcel Service
Jay Spector, *Executive Director*, Jewish Employment Vocational Services
Richard Greenwald, *President*, Transitional Work Corporation
- What are the roles and responsibilities of the state, the city, Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation and vocational-service contractors? Does referral volume respond to the quality of service provided?
 - On what basis are clients referred to a particular education, training, or job-search program?
 - Are there specific programs to support job retention?
 - Who is hiring TANF clients? How are employers identified and assisted?

- 4:30 pm A BROADER LENS: COMMUNITY AND FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS
Gary Walker *President*, Public/Private Ventures (PPV)
- Why did PPV decide to work with faith-based organizations? How does it become involved with communities and faith-based organizations? What programs are currently being funded that use faith-based organizations as service providers? How does PPV define “faith-based” as opposed to “faith-related”?
 - What lessons might PPV’s experience with literacy training offer to organizations seeking to serve TANF and post-TANF clients?
 - Given the various types and capacities of faith-based organizations, what range of roles might they play?

5:30 pm Adjournment, followed by bus departure for reception and dinner

6:00 pm Reception, with invited Philadelphia guests [*White Dog Café*]

7:30 pm Dinner, NHPF participants only [*White Dog Café*]

9:00 pm Bus departure for headquarters hotel

Friday, April 20, 2001

8:00 am Breakfast available, followed by discussion [*Salon IV, Philadelphia Renaissance Hotel*]

- 8:30 am MINDING THE CHILDREN: THE CHILD CARE PERSPECTIVE
Sharon Ward, *Director for Child Care Policy*, Pennsylvania Citizens for Children and Youth
Debbie Coleman, *Director*, Philadelphia Child Care Resources Network
Maritza Vasquez, *Program Director*, APM Community Child Care
- Who administers the child care subsidy? How do benefits and eligibility requirements differ for TANF and non-TANF clients?
 - Is there an adequate supply of available child care in greater Philadelphia? How much of it is regulated? What options do clients have, and what do they choose?
 - To what extent does the state or the city monitor child care quality?
 - What is required of clients in terms of child support enforcement?

10:00 am Bus departure for Delaware County Department of Public Welfare

10:30 am WELFARE REFORM WHERE THE JOBS ARE [*Delaware County Assistance Office*]

Yvonne Norman, *Executive Director*, Delaware County Assistance Office, and staff

- With public transportation designed largely with commuters to the city in mind, what resources are available to clients for travel to jobs within the county? What arrangements exist with the municipal transportation authority?
- With what other agencies and groups does the Delaware County Assistance Office work to provide support services to clients? Are there standing interagency committees?
- What is the Maximizing Participation Project (MPP)? What clients will it serve? Why was Delaware County chosen as a pilot site? Will the MPP address the needs of exempt clients who are coming up on their five-year limit?

12:30 pm Bus departure for Union Station, Washington, DC, box lunch provided

Federal and Foundation Participants

Catherine Brown

Legislative Aide
Office of Representative Langevin
U.S. House of Representatives

Yvonne Carrasco

Senior Program Officer
David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Christine Devere

Analyst in Social Legislation
Domestic Social Policy Division
Library of Congress
Congressional Research Service

Neleen Eisinger

Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator Conrad
U.S. Senate

Cynthia Fagnoni

Managing Director
Education, Workforce and Income Security Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office

Traci Gleason

Legislative Fellow
Committee on Finance
U.S. Senate

Gale Harris

Assistant Director
Education, Workforce and Income Security Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office

Stephanie Monroe

Staff Director
Subcommittee on Children and Families
Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions
U.S. Senate

Ann McCormick

Social Science Analyst
Office of Human Services Policy
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy and
Evaluation
Department of Health and Human Services

Canta Pian

Director
Division of Economic Support for Families
Office of Human Services Policy
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy and
Evaluation
Department of Health and Human Services

Michael Rious

Senior Legislative Assistant
Office of Representative Wynn
U.S. House of Representatives

Carolyn Yocom

Assistant Director
Health Care Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office

NHPF Staff

Judith D. Moore

Co-Director

Lisa Sprague

Senior Research Associate

Randy Desonia

Senior Research Associate

Jennifer M. Ryan

Senior Research Associate

Wakina Scott

Research Associate

Dagny Wolf

Program Coordinator

Biographical Sketches— Speakers and Panelists

Linda Blanchette is director of Greater Philadelphia Works.

Catherine Carr is executive director of Community Legal Services, Inc. (CLS), an organization she has served in a number of positions since 1984. CLS is a nonprofit law firm that provides free legal services to indigent Philadelphians in civil matters. Ms. Carr has held positions with the Education Law Center and the Public Interest Law Center, as well as teaching appointments at both the Temple and University of Pennsylvania law schools. She received her J.D. from the University of Pennsylvania and her B.A. degree from Yale University.

Richard Greenwald is president and chief executive officer of the Transitional Work Corporation (TWC). Prior to the start of TWC in the fall of 1998, he was vice president for government relations with America Works, a for-profit company that placed welfare recipients into private-sector jobs. Mr. Greenwald has worked with government leaders at the federal, state, and local levels developing welfare-to-work strategies. He has held positions with the Environmental Protection Agency and in the Superfund Program in New York City. Mr. Greenwald received a master's degree from Columbia University and completed his bachelor's degree at Connecticut College.

Sherri Z. Heller, Ed.D., is the deputy secretary for income maintenance with the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, with overall responsibility for the operation of 104 county assistance offices statewide and a budget of \$2 billion. Her career in public service has included positions with the state Department of Education, the Pennsylvania State Senate, and Lancaster County, where she served for a period as county administrator. Dr. Heller holds a bachelor's degree from Franklin and Marshall College and earned her doctorate from Harvard University.

Mark Alan Hughes, Ph.D., is distinguished senior scholar at the University of Pennsylvania's Fels Center of Government and a nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution's Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. From 1993 to 1999, he was vice president for policy development at Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia. There, he helped develop the Transitional Work Corporation and create the \$17 million Bridges to Work Demon-

stration for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Earlier, Dr. Hughes was on the faculty of Princeton's Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He holds degrees from Swarthmore College and the University of Pennsylvania.

Larry Moulder is the workforce planning supervisor for the Philadelphia Air Hub of United Parcel Service. He began his career with the company as a part-time loader in 1987. By 1991 he was a full-time hub supervisor, joining the human resources department a year later. Mr. Moulder is active in Delaware County, serving on the School to Work Coordinating Council and the board of the Transportation Management Association. He holds a bachelor's degree from Immaculata College.

Yvonne "Jackie" Norman is executive director of the Delaware County Assistance Offices. She has worked for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for more than 30 years, beginning as a caseworker trainee. She is a member of the Workforce Investment Board and the governing board of Child Care Matters, a state early childhood initiative that oversees grants to child care centers.

Patricia Redmond is health advocacy director at Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth (PCCY). Under her direction, PCCY conducts advocacy studies and projects on barriers to health care and provides support to a range of community health insurance outreach and enrollment efforts. Ms. Redmond serves on the National Advisory Committee to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Covering Kids program. She holds a graduate degree in English from the University of Pennsylvania.

Nelida Sepulveda is director of the Frankford/Kensington Regional Service Center, a Greater Philadelphia Works facility operated by Impact Services Corporation.

Jay Spector is president and chief executive officer of Jewish Employment and Vocational Service (JEVS), an agency that provides a wide range of counseling, vocational, and rehabilitation programs to the Philadelphia community. Mr. Spector has been with JEVS since 1979. Earlier, he was director of planning for the Area Manpower Planning Council. He holds bachelor's and master's degrees from Pennsylvania State University.

Don José Stovall is executive director of the Philadelphia County Assistance Office.

Sharon Ward is director of child care policy for PCCY, a partner in the Child Care Matters. She came to Philadelphia in 1997, taking the position of program director with the Jobs Policy Network. From 1990 to 1997, she served as an elected member of the Albany, New York, City Council, where she chaired the finance and environmental committees. Prior to her election, she worked for Citizen Action of New York. Ms. Ward holds a B.A. degree from the State University of New York at Albany.

Maritza Vasquez is program director for the APM Community Childcare Center.



National Health Policy Forum

2131 K Street, NW, Suite 500

Washington, DC 20037

202/872-1390

Fax 202/862-9837

