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ABSTRACT

OVERVIEW
With the advent of welfare reform, low income families now face a radically changed environment in which to provide for themselves and their dependents: one in which, for the first time in two generations, there is not guaranteed federal income supplement. Concurrently, the portending “devolution” of federal dollars and program authority to states and localities may further change other systems by which service providers help families meet their basic needs. As a result, the affordable housing system and the workforce development systems are forced to interact in a new fashion to best assist their clients in facing this new environment.

The Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative in Boston, Massachusetts is an effort in which housing, workforce development and social service agencies are coming together in response to these issues to intentionally design new methods of cooperation and create a network of self-sufficiency services for tenant families. The purpose of this document is to analyze issues relevant to the Collaborative’s formation and to provide recommendations for undertaking the Collaborative.

First, I present a brief overview of the issues affecting this change of environment, welfare reform and devolution. Second, I describe issues of achieving self-sufficiency and a continuum of employability. Third, I discuss three program models of workforce programs: the human capital development model, the labor force attachment approach, “incubator” programs. These programs work to move clients through stages of employability. Fourth, I present three models for how community based, workforce development programs network with communities, employers and other program to assist clients find and keep employment. The three models are the Hub-n-Spoke model, the Intermediary model and the Peer-to-Peer model. Finally, I draw upon lessons from the analyses of service delivery issues and networking issues to make recommendations for the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
The FSSCollaborative is an ongoing process as this document is being written. As such, making recommendations requires some balancing between where the group is now, where the thinking seems to be headed and where the process might ultimately wind up. In part, I adopt the following three phase recommendation in order to accommodate the evolving nature of this process.

Having examined models of workforce development program design and network design, I propose that the FSSCollaborative should evolve to achieve a network which functions as a Hub-N-Spoke network Incubator program. (Hub-n-Spoke network is one in which the program itself establishes linkages with both the community to be served and employers. An incubator is characterized by open program entry and exit, a tight link between skills training and job development and ongoing assessment.) The recommended three phase Collaborative implementation is designed to achieve that end. However, each phase represents an improvement on the preceding phases. As such, the value of the Collaborative is not dependent upon development of the entirety of the model presented here.

The first phase FSSCollaborative provides key linking supports within Collaborative agencies in order to create a smoothly functioning network of existing players. It is a modest effort to improve upon the existing “preCollaborative” relations among agencies with a focus on “glue” holding the Network together and not on additional layers of services and administration. In the second phase, the FSSCollaborative adopts elements of an “Incubator” program model through the creation of an enhanced assessment program and further linkages with external workforce development service providers. The third phase, the FSSCollaborative enhances the Collaborative’s networking capacity by improving ties with employer.
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I. THE CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

Never give up on your dreams, because when you reach within yourself it’s surprising the things you may find.
-Paula Cardoza, MBHP Family Self-Sufficiency Program Participant

Chapter Summary: This chapter is to provide an introductory summary of environmental changes which have stimulated the formation of the FSSCollaborative. First, I provide background on the recently enacted changes to welfare system and suggest impacts that these changes may have on systems of housing and employment and training. Second, I discuss devolution of funding to state and local levels of government. Again, I suggest how these changes may impact the service delivery systems of subsidized housing and workforce development.

For more than a generation, the affordable housing system, the welfare system and the workforce development systems have existed in what might be termed a casual equilibrium. 2 Enhancing the prospects of low-income families’ prospects, such as those in subsidized housing, to achieve economic self-sufficiency was seen as a desirable goal. Many programs and efforts were launched with “carrots” to help families realize this goal. The existing HUD Family Self-Sufficiency program, for example, provides incentives for Section 8 voucher and certificate holders who sign a contract committing themselves to certain steps toward becoming economically independent.3

---

2 I will use the term “workforce development” as a broader term to encompass training as well as range of other employment services.
3 The most lucrative incentive is the creation of an escrow account to hold money that would otherwise be paid in rent due to a rise in tenant’s income. Although the tenant is still paying more per month, they are entitled to the escrow funds. Over five years, this can readily total in the thousands of dollar when the tenant completes the self-sufficiency contracts. Tenants also have access to case management assistance through the program.
However, with changes in welfare regulations, low-income families now face a situation of loss of entitlement to any income security. Concurrently, the federal government is “devolving” funding decisions to more local levels of government in the form of block grants which states and localities will administer themselves. As a result, housing providers and workforce development providers are forced to reconsider how they deliver their individual services and, more so, how the two distinct categories of providers can interact in order to best assist their clients face this new environment.

A. WELFARE REFORM

When President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibilities and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act on August 22, 1996, the federal entitlement to a guaranteed income for low-income families ended. Additionally, individual states are now granted far greater flexibility in establishing eligibility and administering the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), formerly the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, funds than has ever been the case previously.

The Massachusetts’ version of welfare reform is reputed to be among the most severe in the country. Families face time limitations for how long they may receive benefits of twenty-four months consecutively and sixty months over the one’s lifetime. Figure 1-1 provides a short synopsis of some of the key elements of Massachusetts’ new welfare program. (Please see

---

4 I use both terms, TANF and TAFDC, in this document.
The TAFDC program includes specific work related requirements. TAFDC heads of household who are not considered “exempt” (either because their youngest child is school age or because they are disabled or are caretaker for a disabled child) currently face a requirement to work or perform volunteer service (or, for families in emergency shelter, look for a job) at least 20 hours per week in order to continue receiving benefits. Importantly, for non-exempt, work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1-1: Key Elements of Welfare Reform in Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant cut of 2.75%:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All “non-exempt” families will receive a reduction in grant amount. Exemptions are granted for families with a child under two or under 3 months if child born on welfare; people with disabilities; caring for a disabled child or spouse; teen parents in school; non-parent caretakers receiving a grant only for child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time limits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months out of 60 months. Extensions can be granted for fully cooperative recipients. Months when the recipient is exempt do not count toward the 24 months. 60 months lifetime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workfare:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone whose youngest child is school-age must complete at least 20 hours of paid or unpaid work outside the home. Those who do not comply with Workfare may lose the entire grant. Persons enrolled in job training programs still need to complete 20 hours of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learnfare:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No benefits for children under 14 if parent is not able to provide documentation of school attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment of Earnings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those subject to the grant cut are allowed deductions from earnings after the first four months on assistance equal to $30 and 50% remainder; others get deductions equal to $30 and 33% of remainder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Cap:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No benefits will be given for a child born to family on assistance unless mother was pregnant with child when she first went on assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen parents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to waiver of grandparents, teen parents must live with their own parents or in a structure setting. Teen parents lose grant for self and child if not in school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance, Bulletin, November 1995.*

mandated families, employment training activities do not count toward the 20 hours per week.
Furthermore, if an “exempt” head of household takes a job or begins a training program, they lose their exempt status. That is, if they leave the job or the program, they become work mandated despite their previous exemption. Work mandated families have sixty days from their annual recertification to meet the work requirement or face loss of benefits.

**B. THE “DEVOLUTION” OF FEDERAL FUNDING**

In addition to welfare reform, the portending “devolution” of federal dollars may further change the systems by which service providers help families meet their basic needs.

1. What is “Devolution?”

“Devolution” is a term I use to describe three concurrent changes in the federal system of funding poverty alleviation and other programs. First, the term most specifically refers to the devolution of funding decisions from the federal to the state level of government. While the federal government may continue to provide broad guidelines, states and localities will have far greater flexibility in setting eligibility and priorities (such that as discussed with respect to welfare reform above) in areas such as housing and workforce development.

Second, funding programs are in an ongoing process of being transformed from a system of many narrowly defined program categories to one consisting of a small number of larger and more flexible categories. States will receive funds, typically, in a relatively small number, of broadly defined block grants.
Third, devolution is accompanied by a reduction of overall levels of federal support. These reductions are driven partially by the perceived increases in efficiency as a result of the more streamlined funding system. However, in large they reflect the trend toward less political support for governmental efforts at poverty alleviation and income redistribution.

2. Possible Broad Outcomes

While, as stated above, the process is in early stages, several emergent policy thrusts are likely to be central to future systems of service delivery.

First, states will demand increased efficiency on the part of providers. As stated, overall funding levels are being decreased forcing the system to do more, or at least as much, with less. As such, funding may come down to the provider level in bigger program pieces covering broader program activities and seeking more over-arching outcomes.

Second, due to lack of financial and administrative capacity, the states are not likely to transform the small number of block grants back into the large array of narrow categorical funding programs formerly employed at the federal level. This will likely re-enforce the desire to provide broader less-categorically specific funding.

Third, and again as a mechanism for controlling costs, it is likely future funding will place an increased emphasis on transition from the use of governmental support to a position of non-reliance. Time limited welfare receipt is an obvious example of a benefit moving from being
an entitlement to one that is transitional in nature.

C. IMPACTS ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND TRAINING SYSTEMS

1. Impact of Welfare Reform

For providers of affordable housing, welfare reform dramatically increases the incentives to provide self-sufficiency services to tenants. Although, many community based or socially progressive housers\(^5\) have always seen it as part of their role to offer such services, now housers confront a new fiscal reality. Tenants facing a loss of a TAFDC income and food stamps will struggle to meet the many demands on what money they do possess: survival needs for themselves and their children, utilities and rent. It is reasonable to assume that, even for those in the position of having a rent level based on their income, this balancing act will result in an increase in unstable tenancies and rent delinquencies.\(^6\)

It is as yet unclear to what degree workforce development providers will face an increased demand for their services as a result of welfare reform.

2. Impact of Devolution

---

\(^5\) In this document, I make reference to “housers,” “housing providers” and “housing agencies” referring in all cases to community based, typically non-profit providers of subsidized housing. In the particularly context of the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative, “housers” extends to include the Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership which does not own housing but does administer Section 8 vouchers and certificates among other housing related activities.

\(^6\) Tenants in affordable housing are not at direct risk of eviction due to loss of welfare income because rent is calculated as a percentage of income. The implementation of minimum rent standards would create such a direct risk.
Using the term “devolution” to describe changes in the funding environment generally, as above, the housing system itself convulsing with talk of numerous and potentially radical changes. The partially implemented Reinventing HUD Blueprint of 1994, for example, created four broad category grants out of what had been more than sixty separate funding programs. Public Housing Authorities, for example, are facing a steady decline in operating support. Congress has failed to give support for new Section 8 housing certificates and vouchers. Additional discussions continue to percolate regarding the Section 8 “vouchering out” placed based subsidies, minimum rent levels, reductions in overall levels of support and expiring use properties. In the background of these deliberations looms the possibility that housing subsidies, like welfare, will also become “transitional,” that is, available for only certain periods of time with the emphasis on transitioning tenants into the market system.

The funding system for workforce development is facing a similar degree of devolution upheaval. Publicly funded job training is available through an overlapping scope and clientele. Despite efforts to improve the administration of the vastly complicated and overlapping array of categorical programs, the system is widely seen as overly rigid, poorly organized and of dubious value to employers. One Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program administrator reportedly tells clients not to inform prospective employers that they participated in a JTPA funded training.

---

As a result, the employment and training funding system is facing what may be a large overhaul. Bills currently before the 105th Congress are calling reductions in funding from 15% to 40% and for the creation of as few as three consolidated block grants to states in place of the myriad of programs currently available. Additionally, the emergence of new program models such as Massachusetts’ private “One-Stop” Career centers further changes the complexion of the workforce development system. (For further discussion of One-Stops please see Chapter 5.)

3. Possible Responses to the New Environment: The HMO “Threat”

Service provider agencies, which have been created in the current categorically driven, atomized funding environment, will face pressure to work together to craft new partnerships capable of meeting the challenges of devolution: of achieving greater fiscal efficiencies and broader programmatic outcomes. The remainder of this document is dedicated to just such an effort, the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative. Yet, it is worth briefly discussing an alternative system.

One of the expressed concerns on the part of FSSCollaborative participants is that large, for-profit, health maintenance organization (HMO) style entities will sweep in to commandeer contracts in social services, welfare and workforce development as they have in the medical field. In the words of the director of one state’s welfare agency:

Good intentions and efforts are worn down by the forces of turf protection and funding streams. We must focus our efforts on comprehensively strengthening
families, perhaps through an analogue to health maintenance organizations
broadened to be family maintenance organizations (FMOs). FMOs are needed to
harness the financial horses to pull together a fragmented system into a seamless
whole that galvanizes the desired outcomes. This will come as a very worrisome
proposal to some social welfare advocates.  

Promises of great fiscal efficiency at a time of public austerity would prove to seductive for
many an administrator or elected official. Why is this considered a threat on the part of
Community Based Organizations (CBOs)?

Beyond sheer survival instincts, which are understandable, there is the fear that a for-profit
organization, which, like any corporation, is accountable to shareholders first and foremost,
will devise mechanisms to reduce services to boost the bottom line at the expense of poor
families.

Many for-profit hospitals and HMO’s control costs through managed care systems. In the
health care field, managed care has sometimes included the use of capitation rates, the
narrowing of diagnostic and testing freedom of physicians and the establishment of restrictive
eligibility criteria. While there is nothing inherently problematic with managed care, a concern
on the part of CBOs is that drive for profits will lead to manipulations of the articulated

---

demand of service resulting ultimately in a reduction of services to the community.\(^9\)

Secondly, HMO’s and other large organizations, have the capacity to achieve economies of scale in many aspects of service provision through their sheer size. Many administrative and other functions can be centralized and made much more efficient than a local community based organization can achieve. Again, there is nothing bad about savings due to economies of scale. CBOs and other local voices are concerned about the degree to which cost-cutting measures affect the quality of services.

Lastly, moving from a local non-profit based system to a distantly held for profit system ultimately represents a transfer of resources and, to varying degrees, power over those resources from community held organizations to shareholders in HMO.

4. The Combination of Welfare Reform and Devolution

As welfare reform places greater stress on service delivery systems, as stated, and service providers respond the challenges of devolution (and the perceived challenge by large providers) by working more cooperatively, as is the FSSCollaborative, what are the effects of both of these occurring simultaneously?

The answer is that no one can really say. What makes these “shocks” to the service delivery

---

\(^9\) Interestingly, this focus on service demand is in stark contrast to CBOs which frequently face the criticism that they are overly focused on supply of service and are not outcome drive.
system so notable is that the great unknowns which lie herein. To what degree will the loss of welfare benefits stimulate former recipients to seek employment? Will there be affects on family structure and stability, access to informal or familial sources of income? Will devolution generate home grown responses to issues of poverty or a race to the bottom as states seek to offer less support in hopes of encouraging the poor to move out? In short, it is worth stating explicitly that no one can readily predict what affects will result from the changing environment in which the FSSCollaborative is being launched, in which low-income families will seek to meet their basic needs. What can be said is that all indications are many low-income families will seek to re-enter the workforce and that community based organizations will need to work more closely together to assist families in these efforts.
II. PATHWAYS TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY

“We may have changed welfare as we know it, but we clearly haven’t changed the labor market as we know it,”
-Paul Harrington, Northeastern University Center for Labor Market Studies

Chapter summary: This chapter is to lay the groundwork for the programmatic design of the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative (FSSCollaborative). First, I will offer an introductory discussion of the transition to self-sufficiency. Second, I will discuss issues related to "employability." Third, I will break the continuum into three discrete categories of degree of employability.

A. THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY CONTINUUM

To consider how to facilitate the transition from reliance on governmental entitlements to economic self-sufficiency, one must first consider what constitutes “self-sufficiency.” Self-Sufficiency is a term without a precise definition. At the simplest and most intuitive level, one could define self-sufficiency as the state at which a family does not depend on governmental subsidies for their well-being. However, governmental support comes in multitudinous and sometime covert forms ranging from direct TANF payments to low-income families to mortgage interest tax breaks to the wealthiest of home owners. Additionally, one could consider other non-market supports such as private supports from churches and voluntary organizations which may not have government funding or even informal family support.

Nonetheless, though we lack consensus on a definition, my discussion of “self-sufficiency”

10 Quoted in “Panel to study welfare changes effects on city” Boston Globe, November, 1996.

11 It appears that virtually every commentator on the topic makes this observations. For fuller discussion of definitions of self-sufficiency See: Rachel G. Bratt and Langley C. Keyes, “New Perspectives on Self-Sufficiency: Strategies of Non-Profit Housing Organizations,” (unpublished draft, 1997).
will focus on the economic and bureaucratic meaning of the term, that is, not dependent on
direct governmental income supports for an extended period of time.\textsuperscript{12} Although, in recognition
of the nature and range of governmental and regulatory subsidy, self-sufficiency can be
considered a measure along a spectrum of such supports.

Viewing self-sufficiency as a point on a spectrum creates an operational perspective in which
becoming more self-sufficient is a process of moving along that spectrum and not necessarily
attaining a single event or static state. Given that individuals will start at various points along
this continuum, then, providing programmatic assistance to families working to reach self-
sufficiency is the ongoing process of offering services that are appropriate and responsive to
the particular point along the continuum and concurrently integrating services into a long range
plan.

To consider a measure of economic self-sufficiency, it is worth stating that families can gain
income from one of several sources: informal or familial ties, governmental entitlements, or
employment. With the loss in governmental welfare payments, for many only informal support
and employment are left. It is difficult to design a programmatic method of increasing
someone’s access to informal support. Thus, self-sufficiency is tightly linked with one’s
ability to obtain and maintain employment. In order to get a snap shot of where along the “self-

\textsuperscript{12} Herr, Halpren with Conrad, “Changing What Counts: Rethinking the Journey Out of Welfare”
(Erikson Institute, 1991), p.2. The authors go beyond “economic/bureaucratic terms” to discuss self-sufficiency as
being when “welfare as a way of life is no longer an option.” Time limits on welfare receipt change the utility of
what is termed a “subjective” definition.
sufficiency continuum” an individual falls, where one must get a measure of their employability.

B. EMPLOYABILITY

One can look at employability as a combination of skills, work readiness and available support structures. Additionally, employability is impacted by emergent crisis situations and physical and mental disabilities. These characteristics, each discussed below, are inter-related.

1. Employability Skills

a. Basic Skills

The basic “3Rs” approach to skills has been the main pre-requisite for entry employment for generations. Many argue that as a result of largely technology driven, structural changes in the economy, employers are now seeking “higher order” cognitive abilities and that basic ability to read, write and do simple math is not enough. Frank Levy and Richard Murnane have defined a set of “New Basic Skills” that are increasingly seen as pre-requisites for employment: “solid literacy, command of basic mathematics, the ability to communicate and work with a variety of people, an interest in solving problems.” Clearly, these go beyond the 3Rs of previous generations. However, contrary to general impressions of “new basic skills,” it is worth stating that they do not extend as far as advanced computer literacy or college education.

13 Murnane and Levy, Teaching the New Basic Skills, (New York: The Free Press, 1996), p. 32. See also: Harry J. Holzer, What Employers Want: Job Prospects for Less-Educated Workers (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996). The fact that reading, writing and arithmetic have come to be known as the 3Rs, as wonderfully anachronistic as it is, might tell us something about our educational system right there.
Additionally, and also contrary to casual impressions, it appears the economy continues to
generate job opportunities: job growth has grown faster than population in every one of the
last three decades.14 “Job opportunities are being created, and the great majority of them do not
(and in the years just ahead probably will not) require a college education.”15 However, the
living standard achieved through employment, can be less than in the previous generation on
account of falling relative wages within both the manufacturing and the service sectors.16

While opinions about the degree to which “old basic” versus “new basic” skills are necessary
for entry level employment may vary, evidence suggests that achieving a non-poverty wage
over long term participation in the workforce requires more than “minimum skills,” however
defined. Over ten years ago, the Committee for Economic Development noted that “mastery of
the old basic(s) may be sufficient for entry-level jobs, but because of the constantly changing
nature of work, minimum skills are not sufficient preparation for career advancement.”17
Trends in declining wages and increased skill demands have only increased since that time.

14 Blank, Rebecca M. “The Employment Strategy: Public Policies to Increase Work and
Earnings,” (Northwestern University, 1992), p.4.

15 Harrison and Weiss, “Workforce Development Networks: CBOs and Regional Alliances in

16 See: Murname and Levy, “Why Today’s High School Educated Males Earn Less Than Their
Strategy...”.

17 Quoted in “Defining and Assessing Basic Employability Skills: Practitioners’ Views and
Resources” (Center for Human Resources at Brandies University, 1996). Emphasis added. See also: Harrison
and Weiss, “Workforce Development Networks...”.
b. Skills in a Local Context

In considering measuring employability, the relationship of employability skills to the local labor market determines to what degree an individual must be able to demonstrate these skills to achieve a specific outcome. "Where local employers are primarily looking for relatively low-skilled, entry level workers, communities often establish relatively low standards for employability." Despite national trends toward higher skill levels, as above, the durability and potential for expansion of the local market will determine whether these communities are relegating such employees to long term low wages or job instability in times of market downturn.

2. Work Readiness

Another component of employability can be termed work readiness or work maturity. A person can be said to be work ready when she or he possess traits such as promptness and the ability to work within accepted workplace cultural modes of dress and speech. This set of attributes can be distinct from one’s skill level. Both, and more, are required to be fully employable.

The concept of work readiness is, like employability, under-going some reconsideration as employers are expressing desire for higher level readiness. One observer of labor markets comments, "Just showing up for work on time, working, and doing what the boss says will no
longer suffice. Even relatively unskilled workers... must have sufficient social skills to deal with co-workers and customers.\textsuperscript{19} Work readiness is also a variable and contextualized concept particularly with respect to racial, ethnic and class differences. The dominant work culture is largely a representation of middle class, white America in its speech and dress among other attributes.\textsuperscript{20}

3. Support Structures

Third, to be considered employable, a person must have available the support structures necessary to attend work on a daily basis. Support services may include child care, transportation or health care.

In addition to discrete services such as child care, there are emotional supports to be considered. When someone has been away from the workplace for a substantial period of time, they are likely to encounter enhanced anxiety upon facing the everyday stress factors of employment. A long unemployed, public housing resident participating in a discussion on economic development issues reported that she was too intimidated to get on the Orange Line during morning rush hour because of the presence of all those people with brief cases and reading and wearing suits.\textsuperscript{21} Such intimidation would be greatly magnified in many

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{19} ibid.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21} Tenant (name withheld), Mission Main Hope6 Economic Development Focus Group session, June, 1996.
\end{flushright}
workplaces. Another element of support is the positive reinforcement and assistance a trainee may receive (or fail to receive) in their home, from their family and in their community.

4. Crises

Regardless of skill or work readiness level, many people’s employability is compromised by emergent (though sometimes chronic) issues such as substance abuse or domestic violence. In the family context, it may be the case that one member facing such issues creates such a strain on other members that the family’s stability is threatened even though the bread winner may be otherwise employable. For example, the issues of an adolescent in trouble with school or a suddenly ailing relative may continually pull a mother away from employment or a training program. The issue here is not the mother’s skills level, degree of motivation or work maturity.

5. Disabilities

Similarly, many fully motivated and skilled individuals may be deemed unemployable due to a physical or mental disability. With respect to the welfare reform “shock” pushing TANF recipients into the workplace, it is reasonable to assume that some people who have relied on welfare income may be physically or mentally unable to work but that this fact has gone undiagnosed. The notion of a “continuum of self-sufficiency” incorporates an outlet valve for disabled persons who are disabled. Similarly, it may be found that AFDC receipt will have also masked a range of issues, such as asthma, depression or substance abuse for which may be
difficult to qualify for disability entitlements due to the fact that SSI and SSDI programs are facing the many of the same constraints as TANF.

How common these conditions will prove to be is not known. In a national survey of AFDC recipients and applicants prior to their participating in a job program, “More than one quarter indicated that they could not participate because they or family member had health of emotional problems. “ A full five out of six indicated they had at least one significant barrier (these included child care and transportation among other barriers) to participating in an employment program. While it may be that these self-estimates are biased upwards on account of the respondent’s detachment from the workforce and perhaps general low self-esteem, the percentages are startlingly high.\(^{22}\)

6. Interrelationship of Elements of Employability

The above employability elements can vary independently and inter-relate in complex ways. Thus, while each measure has a conceptual “floor” rating below which one is unemployable, one may compensate a lack in one area with a greater ability in another. Some degree of lack of skills, for example, may be overcome by being very work ready and having a great support structure. Support structure plays an integral role in overcoming barriers associated with crises or disabilities to achieve employability. For example, the usually subsidized, “sheltered” work environments in which many disabled persons work can be considered an example where a

support structure has been expanded to include the employer itself.

C. CREATING CATEGORIES ALONG THE CONTINUUM: THE THREE THIRD

Although, as stated, an individual can fall at any point along a finely grained continuum of self-sufficiency, the continuum can be divided into categorical groupings that can be helpful in program planning. As such, one can create three categories: the almost employment ready, those needing a moderate amount of preparation to become employment ready and those needing an intensive amount of preparation to be employable. For conceptual purposes, we will consider these categories as thirds of the population: the top third, the middle third and the third third.  

The top third are the most job ready program participants, those who need comparatively little in the way of service elements to get into the workplace. Many of these persons could (and often do) find employment without any programmatic intervention whatsoever. Others in this category can benefit from basic job search assistance activities.

The middle third are “moderately disadvantaged.” Some of these people might be able to find employment without a great deal of assistance but would benefit from remedial education and/or skills training. Others seem to be able to perform adequately in training settings but

23 I just can not bring myself to call these folks “the bottom third.”
have demonstrated difficulty in maintaining employment.

The “third third” are individuals who are severely detached from the workforce. These individuals typically have little if any previous work history or familiarity with workplace norms; many have very low level of formal education; some have limited English language ability; some read at a very low level if at all; for many have more than one of these statements are true.

As convenient as the three thirds shorthand is, and I will continue to employ it, the actual proportions are likely to be different. Evaluations of the well-studied Project Match welfare-to-work program in Chicago place the percentages at 36% top third; 40% middle third, and 24% third third. A provider of job placement services for welfare recipients in Boston related anecdotally that 20% of their clients need very little help, 60% need more help and 20% need a great deal of help. In a national JOBS program survey, “one third... have test scores that...would make it difficult for them to obtain or keep jobs.” Thus, to the degree that test

---

24 Herr, and Halpren, “Lesson from Project Match for Welfare Reform,” (Erikson Institute, 1994.), Table 2. Herr and Halpren make more sophisticated, ten category, delineation of progress achieved by participants over a three-year study period. I grouped categories into top third: employment related “steady progress;” middle third: some progress, third third: “no measurable progress” or “progress, then slipping back.”

25 Neil Silverston, Work Source Inc. Meeting at Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership, April 1997. Work Source clients would already have had to demonstrate a relatively high level of motivation to make it into this rough sample. Thus, the estimate may be skewed toward the top thirds.

26 op. Cit., Hamilton and Brock with Farkas, p.xvii. This figure is made higher by widespread deficiencies in math skills. The report then comments “Little is known about the role e that math skills play in helping welfare recipients secure and keep jobs.”
scores relate to skills, it may, in fact, be a third of the population that is profoundly disadvantaged. However, as stated, employability is a composite of a variety of hard to measure elements.
III. ISSUES OF PROGRAM DESIGN

...most conventional training programs simply fail to provide training in skills valued by employers.

-Edwin Melendez, “Working on Jobs”

Chapter summary: This chapter describes workforce development program design and specific elements of service. First, I set out the core service elements present in the many approaches to assisting people find employment. Second, I discuss important considerations in assembling these services into a program focusing on three models: 1.) Human Capital Development, 2.) Labor Force Attachment and 3.) “Incubators.” As part of this discussion, I present how different program models affect the choice and method of delivery of core service elements. Third, I relate these program models and core services to the employability categories described in Chapter Two. Additionally, the chapter includes case studies of how successful programs are designed and operated. Finally, I draw very brief, key lessons from the models and case studies for the FSSCollaborative.

A. CORE SERVICE ELEMENTS

1. Overview

Charting a pathway from reliance on income supports to greater economic self-sufficiency is a highly complex process. Project Match in Chicago Illinois distinguishes ten distinct routes of progress (or lack of progress) for individuals making efforts to transition from welfare to employment. In response to this complexity (and, presumably, in response to a myriad of regulatory pressures, funding specifications and other preferences) programs intending to facilitate this process have evolved in many different directions. However, all models of program design is to help clients advance up through the three thirds of the self-sufficiency continuum. Virtually every effort can be broken down into a set of program elements outreach, assessment, case management, basic education/occupational skills training, job readiness

27 op. Cit., Herr and Halpren.
training, job search activities, job development. 28 These elements or a sub-set of them are linked into a sequential order which corresponds with larger theory of program design and implementation. (Please see Models of Program Design below.)

2. Basic Definitions

For purposes of clarity, I spell out basic definitions of service elements. While many are quite obvious, it may be useful to make distinctions where grey areas might appear. Following the basic definitions, I discuss how different program models affect the choice and method of delivering sets of core service elements.

a. Outreach

People must come in the door to start the process. Some programs are mandated by, for example, state welfare agencies. Other programs must advertise and market the availability of services. Still others rely on word-of-mouth or self-referral.

b. Assessment

Assessment is the process of determining a given individual’s base line employability.

Assessment of program participants is essential because, simply, it determines “who gets what.” 29 Assessment is also a difficult service to design and implement effectively. “On one
hand, an overly elaborate assessment process could eat up resources, delay entry into program components and employment and reduce overall program participation. On the other hand, inadequate assessment procedures ... could lead staff to refer participants to activities that do not succeed in increasing their employability.” 30

Assessment procedures can combine various elements of gathering information about a participant’s employment or educational background, literacy or math testing and occupational skills testing. However, assessment extends beyond testing and professionalized interpretation of testing. There is also what is termed “performance based” assessment. “Through the use of portfolios of student work, demonstrations, group projects and other types of activities, performance-based assessment looks directly at how individuals use their knowledge and skills in realistic situations rather than measuring skills indirectly through some form of...test.” 31

Elements of assessment such as interviewing and the use of open ended questions can be designed as performance based measures. Whether termed performance based assessment or not, professionals report developing an overall sense of a client’s employability though careful observation and seasoned interpretation of responses. 32 However, many programs face constraints of time and resources to create a setting in which they can model realistic

30 Ibid.

31 op.Cit., “Defining and Assessing ....”

workplace situations.

As a version of performance based assessment, many skills training programs utilize Outreach and intake procedures as Assessment tools. Minor and surmountable barriers are erected which a potential participant must navigate in order to enrol in the program. For example, someone inquiring about the program will be asked to schedule and then keep several appointments for interviewing and testing partially in order to demonstrate their level of interest and organizational capacity. These programs believe that they are assessing and screening out clients who would not succeed in the program otherwise.

c. Case Management

Case management refers generally to assistance provided to an individual in accessing workforce development resources. Activities of a case manager includes case planning, tracking of a case over time and providing linkages to support services. Intensity of case management can vary widely. Some programs are very formal about drafting an articulated plan with many interim steps and goals, often in conjunction with an assessment of employability and interest. Other programs rely much more on the client to thread together a plan for themselves. Similarly, the degree of programmatic involvement in making referrals and linkages to support services, such as child care, transportation or assistance with health issues, varies greatly.

33 op. Cit., Neil Silverston. Also, Paul Clancy, HomeBuilders Institute. Meeting Boston Housing Authority, April 1996. Other training programs reportedly consider the practice useful, as well.
d. Job Readiness Training

Job Readiness training, as distinct from Skills Training, is an effort to improve trainees’ “work maturity,” that is, their ability to conform to workplace norms and reach basic standards of reliability as discussed above. *(Please see Chapter 2.)* Readiness programs focus primarily on teaching job norms, often through intentional modeling these norms in the program. For example, trainees may be sanctioned, in some cases dismissed from the program, for being late to class. It is typical for these programs to combine readiness training with job search activities.

e. Basic Education/Occupational Skills Training

Basic education programs provide remedial math, literacy or language instruction. Some programs lead to a high school equivalency General Equivalency Degree (GED). Other programs focus primarily on English as a Second Language instruction. Skills training programs provide instruction in a specific trade meant to lead to employment in that trade. For example, a program may provide the skills necessary to become certified as a Nurse Aide. There are numerous skill specific programs in most community. Many federally funded programs, through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), fall into this category. In Boston, there are numerous programs ranging from home health aide training to basic carpentry. Additionally, community colleges, labor unions and trade schools operate skills programs for a vast array of jobs.

f. Job Search Activities
Job search assistance can involve a range of activities including posting job leads, helping to establish contacts with employers, forming peer support “job clubs,” resume writing assistance interviewing practice and range of similar activities. Many skills training programs and also Job Readiness programs include job search activities.

g. Job Development

Job Development refers to actually contacting employers to find out about job openings on behalf of clients. This type of activity also varies widely from simply making information available to clients about openings (which borders on job search activity as above) to actually getting up-front commitments from employers to hire a certain number of program clients.

B. MODELS OF PROGRAM DESIGN

1. Overview of Models

Workforce development agencies integrate a set of core service elements into a single program. How the program is designed affects the choice and delivery of the core services. There are two broad models into which such programs can be placed: Human Capital (or “train first”) programs and Labor Force Attachment (“work first”) programs. This division into two models comes largely from the literature surrounding welfare-to-work programs. These two models can also be useful paradigm for examining and drawing lessons from a broader range of workforce development activities. In addition to Human Capital and Labor Force Attachment

34 See: Gayle Hamilton, et.al., “The JOBS Evaluation...,” and Judith M. Gueron, et.al., “From Welfare to Work” The terminology is in common use and may have earlier origins.
models, I present a third, hybrid, program design, the “Incubator” Model.

In brief terms, “train first” programs emphasize training as a means to employment while “work first” programs attempt to get clients into paying jobs immediately or as soon as they are ready to do so. The importance of understanding the two models stems from the fact that the two have known to produce different outcomes and the implications each model has on individual elements of service.

In recent years, emphasis has moved between these two program designs as studies of their respective effectiveness have been produced. In general, the evidence suggests that a successful Human Capital program is able to achieve higher earnings for persons in the top third or at the high end of the middle third, that is, higher earnings for those who would probably have gained some employment without programmatic intervention. A successful Labor Force Attachment program, meanwhile, is able to get more people employed and account for greater total increase in earning, that is, achieve employment for a larger portion of the middle third.

35 In various studies on the topic MDRC associates “work first” approaches with 1980 programs and human capital with the 1990s. Indeed Bill Clinton’s successful 1992 presidential campaign trumpeted a “Human Capital” approach (See: David Ellwood “From Social Science to Social Policy (unpublished draft, 1996)). However, work first programs are still gaining importance. One might consider President Clinton’s willingness to sign the welfare reform law of 1996 and recent efforts to promote jobs in the private sector through tax incentives and the “bully pulpit” as a switch from Human Capital to Labor Force Attachment on the part of the Administration.

One can infer that some of those placed into entry level jobs through a “work first” approach may be earning less than they would have with training and that, conversely, some of those who participated in a training program but did not experience a successful outcome might have found a job and had an earnings increase had they focused on placement initially. What seems to be missing from the literature is what the effects are over the long term, five years and beyond.

The approach adopted by a given program determines what services are offered, the sequence in which services and the manner in which service elements are offered. Below are brief discussions of the models and how they affect the delivery of the service elements.

2. Human Capital Development Model
   
a. Description
   The Human Capital model (Please see Figure 3-1.) places an emphasis on engaging with the client as an individual to establish employment goals and developing a service plan through which the client attains these goals.

   The plan, as indicated by the “train first” label for this program model, often begins with Assessment and referral to Basic Education/Occupational Skills Training services.

   b. Implications for Core Services
   Human Capital programs often take a holistic approach in which employment issues are seen in
Assessment in a Human Capital program, for example, typically includes not only the factors of employability as described above but also can include an inventory of service needs. Similarly, such programs often include case management services which assist the client in meeting their goals in a variety of ways. Outreach varies greatly even within Human Capital model programs. While the support service linkages and case planning services allow some programs to attract with more middle and third clients, other programs, either to ensure quality placements in workplaces or keep completion rates high to attract funding, pre-screen
in order to attract only candidates with a high likelihood of success. While many Human Capital programs do engage in job readiness, job search, job development and job placement activities, they are typically secondary to education, training and case management or at least case planning services. (Please see Case Studies in this chapter for the QUEST Program and the Transitions to Work Collaborative for two Human Capital program examples.)

3. Labor Force Attachment Model

a. Description

The Labor Force Attachment approach (Please see Figure 3-2) encourages clients to find and begin paid employment as soon as possible. As such, “work first” programs begin the service sequence with immediate job search activity or a very short job readiness training.

b. Implications of Approach for Core Services

The “work first” approach has direct implications for the delivery of core services. For example, in the broadest sense, a Labor Force Attachment program lets the market conduct the assessment. Many “work first” programs engage clients with assessment elements such as interest surveys, but the purpose is to guide job search and job development activities. Backing this approach is the notion that for the majority of participants the workplace itself is a better place to enhance one’s skills and employability than any training program. As stated before, there is some evidence particularly from the California GAIN program, supporting this
assumption at least in the short to medium term.\textsuperscript{37}

Some "work first" programs also engage a client in case planning exercises but usually there is little effort to provide social service linkages. If the client is "employable" then they are, by definition, able to secure and maintain these services on their own. Some Labor Force Attachment programs offer short skills training and readiness programs. The Boston Career

Links, for example, has a two week “SOS” Program for clients who do not succeed in finding work through initial job search activities. However, for most Labor Force Attachment programs job development and job placement services are the heart of the operation. The question of what happens to clients who remain, by the market’s assessment, unemployable remains a troubling one.

An interesting example of how a program can be built around job development activities is the for-profit America Works company originally from New York and now active with welfare-to-work contracts in several locations. AmericaWorks extends job development to actively selling an employment package including a four month probationary employment period during which America Works functions as a temporary agency of sorts: employers pay America Works the full wage and America Works passes on minimum wage to the employee. The employer has the option of keeping the person at the conclusion of the probation. (The position must be a full time slot with benefits. Wages are reported to average $8 per hour.)

4. The “Incubator” Model

a. Description

I wish to draw specific attention to a hybridized program type, what I term an “Incubator”, because of the many notably successful programs which utilize this model. Like a Labor Force Attachment program, an Incubator typically puts large emphasis on employment as soon

38 Information on AmericaWorks from research conducted by faculty and members of the MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning Urban Labor Markets class, spring 1996.
as possible and emphasizes job development and placement activities. Like a Human Capital approach, an Incubator builds an individuals employability through skills training and often, individualized case management support. (Please see Figure 3-3.) In the Incubator approach, clients are placed into a skills training component program and are constantly evaluated for “graduation” into jobs brought in by Job Development staff. Instead of following a pre-existing class schedule, the client is kept in the “Incubator” until achieving their own individual employability.

Two much praised programs, CET and Cleveland Works, are Incubators which have been very successful at starting with low-skilled unemployed persons and moving them into sustainable employment in relatively short period of time. (Please see CET Case Study this chapter.)

b. Implications on Core Services

An Incubator has two operational characteristics which steer the delivery of core service
elements: “open exit” based on constant multi-staff performance based Assessment and the linkage of Job Development with Skills Training, Job Readiness Assessment activities.

An “open exit” program is one in which clients may graduate at any time by leaving the program for employment as opposed to graduating by fulfilling a specific set of predetermined requirements. Although there may be interest surveying and even testing to put the clients in the optimal Skills Training Incubator there is no formal up-front Assessment of employability per se. Thus, assessment is ongoing and performance based as trainers, case management staff and job developer staff continually re-evaluate a clients’ employability.

**Case Study 3-1: CET: PROGRAM DESIGN**

The San Jose, California Employment and Training (CET) program is likely the most well studied agency of its type in the country. Edwin Melendez comments: “CET’s reputation as the ‘program that works’ is well established.” CET is a, indeed one might say the “incubator” labor force attachment model program.

Not only does CET have “open exit,” (which is part of what defines an Incubator) but the program is also “open-entry,” that is, there is no set beginning to class sessions. Individuals join as soon as they are able to, without waiting for a specific time lines. (It is unclear whether there are capacity limitation that may delay entry to the program. But there are no program design related delays.) The “open-entry” element is at least partially dependent on a high level of sophistication in the design of curriculum which not only integrates people joining a class at different times but also combines Basic Education and Skills Training into the same lesson plan. Similarly, the instructors need to be high quality in order to work with students at a variety of skill levels moving at different paces and even attempting to learn different material in the same classroom.

*Sources: Edwin Melendez “Working on Jobs...”, Bennett Harrison, et.al, “Building Bridges...” and numerous others*
The other defining factor behind an Incubator is the sophisticated curriculum and teaching approach which compresses Skills Training, Basic Education, Work Readiness and Assessment into a single environment. Basic math and literacy lessons are integrated into Skills Training instruction. Incubator programs typically incorporate a heavy “work modeling” approach. The expectations and surrounding of the program mirror those of a workplace.

Individuals move through the curriculum at their own pace.

In Boston, an interesting model of an “Incubator-esque” program is a company called Work Source.

Similar to America Work, Work Source is a for-profit, temporary agency model assisting welfare recipients transition to employment.

What is unique is that Work Source has been able to place a team of six temporary workers with a large local employer, Partners Health Care (a partnership of Mass General Hospital and Beth Israel Hospital), which experiences high staff turnover in entry level positions. Individual temp-team members roll into permanent employment as positions become available and as they are deemed fully employment-ready in the judgement of the Partners staff.

---

**Case Study 3-2:**

**QUEST: PROGRAM DESIGN**

QUEST, in San Antonio, Texas, is another extremely well documented effort to provide workforce development services. The program is a very particular version of a Workforce Development model. Program participants are recruited, screened, trained and placed in predetermined types of jobs for which QUEST has already secured guarantees from employers.

QUEST has an interesting outreach and assessment method which is in keeping with the fact that QUEST itself is part of a broader empowerment campaign. Participants are recruited mostly through word-of-mouth and screened by local community residents not for skill or educational level but for their level of motivation and also their willingness to “give back” to the effort, in terms of volunteering and mentoring, after their training.

*Sources: Ernesto Cortes, Jr., MIT Community Organizing Seminar, Bennett Harrison, et.al, “Workforce Development...” and others.*
with whom they work and the Work Source staff. As such, the temp team is a mini-Incubator functioning within the confines of the employer. In about one year of operation, the “temp-to-perm” project has rolled 9 people into full time jobs with an average stay of 2 to 4 months on the temporary team. No participants have been dropped from the temp-to-perm team.39

---

**Case Study 3-3: Transition To Work Collaborative: PROGRAM DESIGN**

The Transition to Work Collaborative (TTW) is an interesting new program in Boston offering employment and training services to heads of households in transitional shelters. TTW is a new collaborative venture of job training agencies and eleven family transitional shelter programs led by Project Hope.

TTW is a “Human Capital Development” model program with the distinction that it relies heavily on an elaborate individual career planning mechanism called the Economic Literacy Program (ELP). The ELP consists of five group sessions during which the participants assemble their own individual economic development plan. Another feature of the TTW is its heavy reliance on providers outside of the Collaborative for services.


*Source:*

---

**C. RELATION OF PROGRAM DESIGN MODELS TO “THE THREE THIRDS”**

It is tempting to relate the Program Models as discussed to the three functional categories of the self-sufficiency continuum, “The Three Thirds” (*Please see Chapter 2.*), in the following manner.40

---

39 Information on Work Source from meetings with staff person Neil Silverston, April 1997 and June 1996.

40 It is so tempting to translate the models in this way, in fact, that the formative FSSCollaborative (what I will call the “pre-Collaborative”) has, for the short term at least, adopted just such an approach. See discussion below “Lessons for the FSSCollaborative.”
- The Top Third, the most employable, are best served by a Labor Force Attachment model (or perhaps an Incubator) which will get them in the workplace the fastest.
- The Middle Third, those with some employment disadvantages, are best served either by a Human Capital program (or, again, perhaps by an Incubator program) which will take time to improve upon individual's employability.
- The Third Third, those with profound employment disadvantages, will either be served by a Human Capital program with extensive Basic Education and Skills Training offering.

As sound as this appears, this approach, if taken too rigidly, fails to take into account the fluidity along the continuum of clientele and/or the difficulty of accurately assessing any individual's employability state. Toby Herr and Robert Helpren have the following critique for the "standard" ... welfare-to-work model:

"[The standard model] views leaving welfare as a predictable, linear experience that can be accomplished within a short time frame: a direct straight-forward progression in which an individual is initially on welfare but not working or in training, then participates in an education/training program or a job-readiness class, then enters employment and leaves AFDC and then continues upward in the labor market without returning to welfare."^41

Instead, the Project Match lesson is that "exits from welfare are unpredictable and non-linear."

^41 op. Cit., Herr and Helpren, p.4.
For example, Herr and Halpern describe a large group of people who cycle in and out employment and welfare use.\textsuperscript{42} This group, which in this construct would be considered the “middle third,” does not seem reliant so much on the type of service pathway as above, as on the ongoing support and case tracking as part of any program model.

Secondly, the efficiency with which some Incubator programs have helped people transition from the “middle third” or even the “third third” into employment is striking. Thus, in contrast to the three thirds model outlined above, Incubators have shown effectiveness at working with people from all three thirds. Incubators seem to possess the ability to move persons up through the continuum. (I propose that at least some of the success of the Incubators may be attributable to linkages outside of the program. \textit{Please see Chapter Four}.)

\section*{D. BRIEF LESSONS FOR THE FSSCOLLABORATIVE}

All Program Design models have advantages and some capacity to move people into the work place. Human Capital models may promote higher incomes for some. Labor Force Attachment programs lead to more employment for more people. Incubator models under certain circumstances seem to offer bright promise for getting people employed quickly and addressing the needs of a broad range of clients. Additionally, case management seems a beneficial service element for any program model.

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}
In considering lessons from these models, I treat the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative, which does not offer a broad range of services itself, as part of a larger workforce development system. The way in which the Collaborative inter-relates with this local system can be characterized according to the above models which, as presented, largely describe stand alone programs. As such, in the short to medium term, the FSSCollaborative can act as a modified Human Capital Development program by assessing clients to steer them toward the most appropriate program model as resources permit. In the long term, however, the FSSCollaborative should seek to develop an Incubator-like functionality.

43 One interpretation of this approach is that the Collaborative is acting as a gatekeeper to services swinging between Human Capital Development and Labor Force Attachment approaches. However, the very act of working with a client through assessment and case planning is indicative of a Human Capital Development model. An alternative perspective is that the CDCs within the FSSCollaborative, on account of very limited existing case management capacity, act as Labor Force Attachment model while MBHP, which does have case management staff, represents an entry point to a Human Capital Development program. (Please see Chapter 5.)
IV. ISSUES OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT NETWORKS

Chapter Summary: First, I discuss how finding a job relates not only to one’s employability but also to one’s formal or informal contacts with would-be employers. Second, I describe how community based programs can play a role in creating and enhancing such a network for clients and describe three forms such networks can take. Third, I relate these models to the self-sufficiency continuum presented earlier. Drawing on the same Case Studies used earlier, I describe how some successful programs have created a workforce development network. Lastly, I pull out brief lessons of importance to the formation of the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative.

A. MODELS OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT NETWORKS

1. Introduction

It has been argued that people find jobs through a sometimes subtle combination of employability and contacts. Furthermore, contacts vary in effectiveness in terms of enhancing one’s job opportunities. When these contacts, or “ties,” do not exist organically, for whatever multiple, complex and inter-related reasons, a workforce development program (typically in concert with some sort of employability services per Chapter Two) seeks to remedy the situation by forging the necessary ties on behalf of clients. Such programs rely on two sets of relationships: the relationship between the program and the client, and the relationship between the program and employers. Thus, the program represents a network stretching from families in the communities who are the program’s clients to employers.

---


45 Sociologist Mark Granovetter has shown that people who are younger, more poorly paid, and more dissatisfied with their employment tend to have found their job through “long chains” of many relationships and to have relied on “strong ties,” that is, very close relationship. Conversely, those relying on
Bennett Harrison and Marcus Weiss have established a model of three types of Community Based Organizations (CBO) workforce development networks: the Hub-N-Spoke Network, the Peer to Peer Network and the Intermediary Network.  

2. Hub-N-Spoke Model

The “Hub-N-Spoke” network is one in which a CBO plays a central role in what can be a rich web of relations from family to employer. (Please See Figure 4-1) A key characteristic of a successful Hub-N-Spoke program is establishing legitimacy with both the community and employers. (For two examples, please see CET and QUEST case studies this chapter.)

shorter chains and weaker ties, such a casual and professional relationships, report generally higher job satisfaction. Granovetter, Mark S., Getting a Job, (Harvard University Press, 1974), p.41-61. See also: Granovetter, Mark S., “The Strength of Weak Ties,” American Journal of Sociology 78 (1983).

2. Peer To Peer Model

A Peer-to-Peer Network has no dominant, central actor but is a collection of agencies with a “shared secretariat to achieve the workforce development/employment and training objectives that no one of the member groups can attain on its own.”47 (Please See Figure 4-2)

In Peer to Peer networks individual network members have established credibility to a certain community of families or to local employers. Not every member has both types of

47 Ibid, p.79.
relationships, but within the range of peer members both sets need to be in places. The "shared secretariat" serves to establish inter-peer links in order that any one member may "borrow" the legitimacy of any other members' tie to a community or an employer.

3. Intermediary Model

An Intermediary Network is one in which a regional entity, typically one with a pre-existing legitimacy within the ranks of employers, plays a central role. Examples of intermediaries are large local companies, a public/private planning agency, a quasi-public agency of a community college. Examples are the Regional Alliance of Small Contractors of the Port Authority of
New York/New Jersey and Lawson State Community College in Alabama.\textsuperscript{48} (Please see Figure 4-3.)

\section*{B. RELATIONSHIP OF NETWORKS TO EMPLOYABILITY}

\subsection*{1. The Nature of Ties}

The models of workforce development networks presented above provide a useful understanding of the overall design of such networks. However, in relating network models to program designs it is also useful to consider the nature of the links themselves.

\textbf{a. Operational Ties}

First, it is worth establishing an operational understanding of ties. Ties result in what types of action? Sociologist Arthur Himmelman has developed a refined set of terminology in order to make distinctions between different levels of collaboration. There are degrees of interrelatedness ranging from “networking” to “coordination” to “cooperation” to “collaboration,” each describing different joint activities by the parties involved\textsuperscript{49}. (Please see Figure 4-4.) These degrees are not qualitative: Collaboration is not necessarily better than another form of working together. Neither are always there clear lines between the different degree. The semantics of this particular nomenclature are not important in and of themselves. Instead, the scheme is designed to help partners recognize

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{48} \textit{Ibid.}, p.214.
  \item \textsuperscript{49} In order to attempt to keep distinct general networking discussion from this more precise usage, I use quotation marks when discussing Himmelman’s “networking.”
\end{itemize}
Figure 4-4. Terminology for Levels of Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>level of partnership</th>
<th>activities</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>sharing of information to facilitate desired outcome</td>
<td>A training agency informs housing agency staff of times and places for training in order to facilitate referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>altering activities to accommodate a partner agency</td>
<td>The training program changes a class schedule so that it does not conflict with a tenant meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>sharing of resources</td>
<td>The training agency agrees to offer classes in the community room at the housing development and prioritizes tenants for participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>sharing of planning, resources, risks and returns in order to enhance each partner’s capacity</td>
<td>The training agency and housing agency jointly design and seek support for a program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arthur Himmelmann, "On the Theory and Practice of Transformational Collaboration: Collaboration as a Bridge from Social Service to Social Justice."

that different degrees of interaction are possible and determine what level of cooperation is needed to accomplish a specific outcome.⁵⁰

b. Quality of Ties

Second, while there is no magic recipe for making a collaborative community, four factors have been identified that, while short of prerequisites, are seen as important to contributing to an environment conducive to collaborative activity. These are inter-locking and enduring personal and professional relationships among key players; mutual interest; a financial nexus of

---

interests; and, a shared vision of some future outcome.\textsuperscript{51}

Understanding some of the subtleties of partnership is particularly useful in considering how the FSSCollaborative may interact within the workforce development network. Developing and finding the four characteristics is likely to be important initially in establishing the trust within the FSSCollaborative itself to commit to the process of designing and implementing the program. Additionally, as the Collaborative matures and reaches out to network with other providers, local communities and employers, these same characteristics will again need to be considered and nurtured.

\section*{2. “Pushing” and “Pulling”}

Embedded in the notion that networks can enhance someone’s job prospects by facilitating connections to employers is the idea that the three categories of employability (indeed, the entire Self-Sufficiency continuum of which “The Three Thirds” are a useful representation) is not a static state but itself is subject to what can be termed exogenous changes. The lines between categories of thirds and between the top third of employability and those who are actually employed can be shifted. Network function, therefore, not to move someone up through the employability continuum as was discussed regarding program design, but instead shift the definition of “employability” itself around the three thirds.

\footnotesize
One can identify two types this shifting which I term “pushing” and “pulling.” (Please see Figure 4-5) Employers willing to dip down further into the continuum to hire can be said to be “pushing down” the lines or, metaphorically, the barriers, of employability. Similarly, potential employees can elevate themselves within the continuum by “pulling” down the lines or barriers from below. With the barriers/lines “pushed” down from above or “pulled” down from below, those who were at the top of the top third, who otherwise are nearly employment readily are hired into positions.
The most powerful factor influencing an employer to push down the lines is the state of the labor market. In times when business is good and orders are up, an employer needing to add staff will be more willing to take a chance on a borderline employable candidate. If business is bad, the same employer needs fewer staff and may select only the most employable and qualified. Individuals holding positions previously may find themselves back in the top third. The lines which had been pushed back have moved again leaving them in the job seeker category. Others, who in a strong market may have needed only job search activities to become employed, may find themselves needing to work on occupational skills, those who already need remedial work find themselves further back on the continuum.

Analogously, potential employees can be said to move through the continuum by “pulling” back the lines of employability. An individual can pull back the lines through a high degree of motivation to succeed, usually backed by a high level of support. There is a fine distinction between “pulling back the lines” and moving up through the continuum as a result of gaining more proficiency in the elements of employability outlined in Chapter Two. In fact, while it is easy to distinguish “pulling back the lines” from occupational skill level or literacy and math ability, one could consider this enhanced motivation as a more robust form of work readiness. One that goes beyond workplace norms to a pronounced desire to succeed.
3. Networks

A workforce program which offers Network related intervention is attempting to “push down

Case Study 4-1. CET: NETWORK DESIGN
CET has long-standing and deep connections to the communities from which it has drawn its clients. The program seems able to use its innovative program design (Described below) to translate this legitimacy to a high degree of motivation by individual participants.

CET has a strong Job Development component. Significantly, the Job Development activities are tightly linked with the Occupational Skills Training component. Individual employers contribute to the relevance of curriculum design though Industrial Advisory Boards. Additionally employers donate equipment to CET and many past managers and supervisors for employer companies now work as trainers at CET.

Sources: Edwin Melendez “Working on Jobs...”, Bennett Harrison, et.al, Building Bridges....” and others.
the barriers,” for program clients, through ties to employers. Simultaneously, the most effective networks use their ties to the community to enable clients to “pull the lines barriers” from below. Using the terminology of Arthur Himmelman introduced earlier in this chapter, one could consider this activity as the program moving from to a more engaged level of partnership, moving from informational “networking” to an altering of activities indicative of “coordination.”

a. Ties to the Community

Through high quality durable ties to the community, a program can boost an individual’s level of motivation inspiring them to pull down the lines/barriers of employability. Most notably, multiple evaluations of the CET program cite the program’s network capacity as a factor in its demonstrated success. In the QUEST example, the training program emerged out of multi-year community organizing efforts which had a much broader goal of political empowerment. CET, though not explicitly linked to an organizing campaign, is grounded both formally and informally in the ethnic, religious and labor organizing base of central California. (Please see CET and QUEST Case Studies this chapter.)

Other programs which are not part of a larger social movement similarly cite their ability to motivate clients because of their close ties to the community. The successful Incubator

---

program ClevelandWorks reports that the fact that counselors and trainers come from the same community, racial, ethnic, class and racial background as the clientele lends tremendous legitimacy to program efforts outside of issues of program design.\textsuperscript{53}

Clients more easily identify with the staff, believe that they themselves can also become employed and, thus, are motivated to work hard.

\textbf{b. Ties to Employers}

The second mechanism by which a Network can push down the barriers of employability categories, and the much more common one, is through ties to employers. The simple model is: this person who might otherwise be a borderline applicant is more likely to get hired if they have the imprimatur of the Network program. Such a Network functions with

\begin{quote}
\textit{Case Study 4-2. QUEST: NETWORK DESIGN}

QUEST has strong ties to both its local constituency and local employers. Similar to CET, QUEST also comes from strong roots in the Latino communities and these roots seem to increase the ability to find and maintain motivated trainees. This process is institutionalized via the “community screening” described above. Industrial Area Foundation organizer Ernesto Cortes described the peer pressure message at these assessments as “We worked REALLY hard to get this [referring to the long campaign to secure the resources for QUEST] and we don’t want to screw it up.”

Job Development activities have been successful in securing commitments from private local companies. In the QUEST example, it appears the sheer political muscle of the COPS/Metro Alliance community organizing campaign has brought employers to the table. QUOTE Yet another interesting aspect of QUEST is the insistence that all jobs in which trainees are placed pay above poverty wage. Industrial Areas Foundation, in fact, is waging a campaign that on such livable wage jobs should be available for public subsidies of training support or tax abatements.

\end{quote}

little difference than most hiring processes in which employers count on referrals from existing employees or other known commodities who can stand behind the applicant. Only in this instance, the process is made formal and, to some degree, institutional.

c. Three Network Models

All network models, by definition, engage in this “pushing/pulling” process. However, the Hub-N-Spoke Network programs seem to be the most efficient. First, Peer-to-Peer Networks and Intermediary Networks both involve an extra link, when compared to Hub-N-Spoke, between the clients and the employer. In Peer-to-Peer models, there is the link between the CBO, which has ties to the families, and the secretariat which has ties to an employer. A similar arrangement exists for Intermediary models. (Please see Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4 above.)

In the Granovetter’s terms, the programs’ attempt to provide the “weak tie” between trainee and employer is made a more inefficient “longer chain.” These models must devote resources to minimizing the transaction cost of this extra link.

Some Hub-N-Spoke models have proved remarkably effective at motivating clients to “pull down” the barriers and increase their own employability. The agencies discussed with this capacity, CET, QUEST and ClevelandWorks, are all Hub-N-Spoke model programs. The ability to “pull down” may be particularly closely associated with streamlined linkages. The participants may need to see the connection to the employer more clearly in order to maintain

54 See: Kirschenman and Neckerman “We’d Love to Hire Them But...”.
the increased motivation.

C. RELATIONSHIP OF NETWORK MODELS TO PROGRAM DESIGN

Conceptually, there is no reason that any one of the Networks models could not function smoothly with any of the Program Design models described in Chapter Three. For example, an Intermediary Program could operate with a basic Human Capital approach, as do the training programs at Lawson State in Alabama or as a Labor Force Attachment model, as does the Small Contractors Alliance of the Port Authority of New York/ New Jersey. Similarly the three models on each axis could be matched: CET and QUEST are both Hub-N-Spoke, one is an Incubator and the other a Human Capital program; and so on. A more interesting consideration is are there combinations that facilitate greater re-enforcement of program design by networks that result in enhanced outcomes?

1. Ties to Employers and Program Design

Some programs have been able to craft relations with employers in such a way so as to go beyond improving the job development and job placement activities (which are the most direct programmatic manifestations of program to employer tie) to affect other service elements. Most notably, many successful programs use network ties to end-of-line employers to gain employer involvement in designing and operating skills training elements. In this instance, the

55 In this case, the Small Contractors Alliance is not actually an employment program but a program to facilitate access to Port Authority contracts for small, often minority owned contracting firms. Yet, the design of the networking relationships make the comparison to an employment program valid. Harrison and Weiss, “Workforce Development Networks...,” p.214.
intensity of the relationship has moved from "coordination," in the form of some willingness to

Case Study 4-3. Transition To Work Collaborative: NETWORK DESIGN

The Transitions to Work Collaborative (TTW) is a Peer to Peer network model: Ties to Community are established by member housing agencies. As traumatic and destabilizing as homelessness is, a shelter program can establish strong ties with families. The shelters have frequent contact with the clients, are likely to have established a therapeutic relationship and have good information about families.

Ties to Employers from the program occur through the participation of the Boston Career Links One-Stop Career Center (BCL) or Job Training Alliance member agencies. Intra-Collaborative Relationships, those between TTW members, also must be considered. In short, the presence of multiple players creates additional linkages in the chain between families and employers. As such, communication across these players needs to flow smoothly in order to maximize the benefits to the client.

alter activities, that is push down the barriers to “cooperation” or even “collaboration,” in the form of an employer sharing resources or building the capacity of the program.

While, as stated, any Network model should be able to achieve this type of re-enforcement of program design with network design, Hub-N-Spoke model networks have demonstrated great programmatic success in engaging in just this. Similar to the above discussion on the relationship of lengths of chains to strength of pushing and pulling of employability lines, Peer-to-Peer models and Intermediary models rely on a more attenuated series of ties. Secondly, Intermediary networks and, usually, at least one member of a Peer-to-Peer network typically start with some organic or natural tie to one or more employer. It may be that the strength of this tie places less of a burden on the central program (either the Intermediary or the secretariat or member trainers of the Peer-to-Peer) to build the relationship by integrating the employer into Skills Training program elements.

2. Ties to Community and Program Design

With respect to ties to the community, some programs, notably Hub-N-Spoke Networks have achieved an enhanced ability to “pull” down employability barriers through motivating trainees, as discussed. How do these ties interact with program design?

The answer may be that the philosophy guiding the core services is imbued with the notion of self-empowerment or self-efficacy. While empowerment is normally conceived of in political or economic terms, self-efficacy focuses more specifically on individuals gaining control over
their lives. Suzanne Wenzel defines self-efficacy as “confidence in one’s capability to perform specific, challenging behaviors.”6 Programs stemming from an empowerment tradition or philosophy, it appears, build a qualitative measuring of self-efficacy in Assessment, the promotion of self-efficacy into skills training/basic education and the marketing of self-efficacy into job development. Thus, the ties to the community through empowerment oriented activities and organizations influence program design and help promote the “pulling” down of barriers.

D. BRIEF LESSONS FOR THE FSSCOLLABORATIVE

The key product of networking is maximizing the encouraging employers to push down and clients to pull back the lines of employability. While any model can accomplish this through relationships to community residents and employers, Hub-N-spoke models accomplish it most directly. Furthermore, Hub-N-Spoke networks have demonstrated the greatest agility in integrating Network Design with Program Design. Thus, while if not replicating a Hub-N-Spoke model outright, the FSS wishes to emulate that model’s success by developing the same types of relationships. The FSS Collaborative should adopt a structure that approximates a Hub-N-Spoke model network.

V. THE FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY COLLABORATIVE

"Collaboration has become almost a buzzword for something that needs to happen when money is scarce. This is neither all wrong nor all bad."

-Suzanne Morse, “Building Collaborative Communities"

Chapter Summary: First, I provide background regarding the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative. Following, I make specific recommendations for the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative drawing on the above lessons of Program Design and Network Design. I recommend that the FSSCollaborative move through four phases to function as an Incubator-Hub-N-Spoke Network program. Last, I discuss a planning process and timeline for implementing these recommendations.

A. COLLABORATIVE BACKGROUND

The Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative is a joint effort of nine Boston agencies to assist low-income families in subsidized housing, particularly those impacted by welfare reform, gain economic self-sufficiency through enhanced linkages between the housing and employment training networks. (Please see Figure 5-1.)

Figure 5-1. Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative Participating Agencies

- Nuestra Comunidad Development Corporation
- La Alianza Hispana
- Morgan Memorial-Goodwill
- Madison Park Community Development Corporation (MPCDC)
- Whittier Street Health Center (WSHC)
- Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership (MBHP)
- Roxbury Multi-Service Center (RMSC)
- Codman Square Neighborhood Development Corporation (CSNDC)
- Federated Dorchester Neighborhood Houses (FDNH)

To date, the Family Self-Sufficiency Collaborative has not achieved any formal status and, thus, has no formal membership. Therefore, this list may change over time.
In the most general of terms, the Collaborative has been conceived as follows. Housers provide access to (and a degree of case management support for) tenant families. Neighborhood service providers provide linkages to necessary supportive services and, perhaps, case management assistance. Workforce development providers offer training expertise and linkages to a broader range of training and placement agencies.

1. **Leading to the FSSCollaborative**

There are several key antecedents to the FSSCollaborative. Between 1991 and 1994, Federated Dorchester Neighborhood Houses, Codman Square Neighborhood Development Corporation and Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership formed a collaborative to operate the “At Home in Codman Square” program. At Home in Codman Square (AHCS) was a federally funded successful homelessness prevention program which provided stabilization services to high-risk families in CSNDC housing. In the final year of operation, AHCS began to more actively assist tenants in accessing employment and training services. However, the program was not renewed for funding in 1994 and was discontinued.

Following AHCS, the same agencies sought to replicate the model on a much broader scale including neighborhood based health care providers and active in multiple neighborhoods. The agencies collaborated in writing a large funding proposal for the “Neighborhood Based Family Self-Sufficiency Program” which received close consideration by a national funder, The Pew Charitable Trust. Ultimately, however, the application was not funded. Reasons for not receiving financial support include the large scale, “Cadillac” nature of the program, the sense
that the participants were not collaborating in an ongoing manner but were only together for purposes of seeking funding and a reluctance to support case management on the part of the private sector.

With the AHCS experience and the failed Pew application fresh in mind, Collaborative participants started coming together late in 1996 to rekindle discussions about working together. As detailed in Chapter One, the environment in which these discussions take place is changed by welfare reform, and devolution of federal funding. Early Collaborative discussions in late 1996 and early 1997, lay the groundwork for a pro-active cooperative response to devolution, that is, the perceived threats of “HMO” and privatization. The Collaborative was explicitly discussed as a mechanism through which to achieve economies of scale and cross-cutting outcomes which are predicted to be necessary in the near future.

In March and April of 1997, Collaborative activities turned to launching short term efforts to assist welfare reform impacted tenants. These activities form the basis for the “preCollaborative” as described below.

2. Collaborative Membership

Participation in the Collaborative on the part of individual agencies has not been the result of any pre-set guidelines or sense of what services and institutions should be involved. Instead, the players have come together in an informal process of both building from pre-existing relationships and establishing new ones. The Collaborative can be viewed as three
neighborhood partnerships (Dudley, Lower Roxbury/Madison Park and Codman Square) inter-
stitched with other institutions with a broader, less neighborhood based focus.\footnote{59}

Within each of the neighborhood partnerships is a housing provider and another local non-
profit. It is anticipated that between the two agencies in each grouping, the capacity will be
found and/or created to conduct Collaborative activities as discussed below. Each of the three
neighborhood based groupings represent a different institutional arrangement. In Codman
Square, a Community Development Corporation (CDC) is partnered with a settlement
house/social service agency, CSNDC and Dennison House-FDNH. In Dudley, a CDC is
partnered with a social service/training agency with similar traditionally strong ethnic heritage,
Nuestra CDC and La Alianza Hispana. In Madison Park, the housing provider is matched with
a neighborhood health center, MPCDC and Whittier Street HC. (This is in direct contrast,
incidentally, to the Pew funding application effort in which each of three neighborhoods
created a partnership between a neighborhood health center and a community development
corporation.) While each of these partnerships is distinct, it is notable that in each pair the

\footnote{58 The Grove Hall neighborhood, through participation of Roxbury Multi-Service Center could represent a fourth neighborhood. However, RMSC is something of a unique case in that it is, like La Alianza or Dennison House, a neighborhood based service agency, but it does not have a similar pre-existing relationship with a neighborhood housing provider. However, MBHP has numerous Section 8 certificate and voucher holders and other relationships in the Grove Hall neighborhood where RMSC is based. While RMSC has been an important early proponent of collaborating, the less concise housing partner, and the departure of Director Zulene Grey-Allen, has left the agency’s relationship to the Collaborative unclear as of this writing.}

\footnote{59 This break down of Collaborative roles is meant for clarifying purposes only. Several of the agencies involved blur this line between neighborhood and metropolitan based. La Alianza, for example, which I include as a neighborhood partner to Nuestra, could easily be considered a broader training provider agency. Conversely, Morgan Memorial, discussed here as a non-place based entity, does have a working relationship with Madison Park DC in the Orchard Park development.}
agencies involved have multi-year relationships and are extremely close together physically.

The roles of other participants are less clearly defined at this time. Morgan Memorial-Goodwill provides linkages to the world of employment and training and extensive expertise in workforce development issues. Similarly, Federated-Dorchester Neighborhood Houses (in addition to its role as the umbrella organization for Dennison House in Codman Square) provides important linkages to necessary supportive services and expertise in areas such as child care and elder care.

MBHP plays two roles in the Collaborative. A large number of MBHP Voucher and Certificate holders live in Boston inner-city neighborhoods including the specific service areas of the three participating CDCs. MBHP has numerous other, neighborhood based relationships through asset management trainings for CDCs, community organizing efforts and other initiatives. However, MBHP is also a metropolitan area wide program with programmatic commitments to housing choice and mobility of low-income families. Thus, MBHP participates as both a neighborhood agency and a regional entity.60

3. Workforce Development System and One Stop Career Centers

The FSSCollaborative is coming into being not as a major provider of comprehensive workforce development services but as an effort to integrate with the existing system to

---

60 This dichotomy is entirely in keeping with MBHP’s history. In 1991, MBHP was formed through the merger of the Boston neighborhood focused Boston Housing Partnership and the regional Section 8 administrating entity Metropolitan Housing, Inc.
enhance self-sufficiency outcomes for tenant families. As such, the existing systems of workforce development services itself plays a key role in the Collaborative's activities. While there a range of providers and activities in the workforce development system, I focus on new resources available to welfare recipients.

A.) One-Stop Career Centers

Within the constellation of workforce development providers, the new One-Stop Centers play an important role. The defining notion of a One-Stop Career Center is to offer comprehensive and Labor Force Attachment model activities at one convenient location. One of the defining elements of a One-Stop is “universality,” that is, providing services for all types of customers from welfare recipients long out of the workplace to bank executives looking to change high level jobs. Massachusetts was one of seven states selected by the Department of Labor in year to develop One-Stop centers as a national demonstration project. There are seven One-Stop Career Centers in the state chartered by the local Regional Employment Board. In Boston, there are three centers: The Boston Career Links, the Work Place and the Job Net.

Interestingly, the Massachusetts One-Stop Centers, unique among the national demonstration states, are set up on a “competitive model.” That is, they are competing to achieve performance based standards not only as a group but among each other as individual providers. One-Stops are funded, at least partially, based on performance indicators such as a number of members

---

and number of job placements. There is a real possibility that over time the less successful
One-Stops, either through governmental action or via the performance based funding system,
will go “out of business.”

Additionally, Massachusetts One-Stops Career Centers are in a delicate political situation in
two other respects. Firstly, One-Stop Centers have to an extent supplanted the pre existing
Division of Employment and Training (DET) as the state’s employment and training entity.
The DET offices in Roxbury, for example, were shut down as the new One-Stops came on line.
This translates into lay-offs and a loss of bureaucratic power for DET. As a result, bills have
been introduced in the state legislature both in 1996 and 1997 to eliminate or curtail the One-
Stop center’s activities. Additionally, the state is being sued on behalf of DET workers under
the allegation that the creation of the One-Stop Centers violated a state act governing
privatization of services.62

In addition to Beacon Hill politics, One-Stops face some legitimate questions about their
mission and capacity. One-Stops were initially charted and designed to offer universal assess
to job services to a very broad array of clients. This would include everyone from the new
college graduate seeking career counseling to the long-time office working needed skill
sharpening to the inner-city resident with more profound detachment from the labor force.

this debate is the fact that, independent of their performance, One-Stop Centers are seen as a program of the Weld-
Celucci Administration. With what is likely to be a hotly contested gubernatorial election scheduled for 1998, a
change in which administration could also alter the balance in the DET-One-Stop struggle if it has not been resolved
by that time.
However, in their implementation, the One-Stops have become a key element in the Weld’s Administration’s welfare reform implementation. Work mandated TAFDC recipients are being referred in large numbers to One-Stop Centers for services. The words of one One-Stop administrator, “Then welfare reform backed its truck up to our door,” betray a frustrated if not downright distasteful view at being asked to focus on a population of comparatively service intensive job-seekers. To be fair, not all One Stop workers exhibit such an attitude. Another One Stop Center administrator described their services in these tones: “If (One Stop) Career Centers don’t work for people who have traditionally benefitted from the public system, then Centers don’t work.” In the political environment above, the Career Centers face great pressure to fulfill a welfare reform mandate for which, in the assessment of some One-Stop administrators, they were not originally designed.

b.) Other Services for TAFDC Recipients

Although One-Stop Centers have received a great deal of attention, there are other service models which are available to recipients of TAFDC which are potentially valuable to FSSCollaborative tenants.

For example, there is support available for welfare recipients to participate in a “Skills Plus Program.” These programs, operated by a range of provider including Collaborative participant Morgan Memorial-Goodwill, are less than one month in length and focus on job

---

63 Quotes from meetings between various One Stop Centers directors and FSSCollaborative agency staff, April, 1997 and May 1997.
readiness. They are targeted for “middle third” persons whom the placement focused One Stops are having trouble serving. In keeping with the states’ support for Labor Attachment programs, a client needs to be referred to a Skills Plus program from a One Stop center; that is, they need to have taken some job search activities prior to engaging in the readiness program. Following “Skills Plus” a client is typically referred back to the One-Stop for more training. It is unclear how successful “Skills Plus” programs have been to date.

Additionally, the state funds a “Supported Work Program” (SWP) site for local areas. The Cambridge and Metro-North area, for example, is served by the Just-a-Start Corporation Supported Work Program. SWP is similar to the temporary agency model discussed above with regards to the Work Source company. (Please see Chapter 3.) Clients are placed in pre-developed jobs and for a period of time work on the SWP payroll which is supported by company payments, as with any temp agency. After that period (typically 12 weeks but it can be up to 39 weeks), the company is expected to hire the client permanently. (To date this has been the experience for Just-A-Start.) Unlike a typical temp agency or the Work Source, SWP programs offer an up-front readiness and basic skills (mostly office skills) training that can last for up 12 weeks.

Due to the relative intensity and duration of the services, the SWP makes the greatest attempt to accommodate lower middle or third clients. Limited and anecdotal evidence suggests that the programs have had great success to date even with clients of very limited educational
background and experience, provided these clients have sufficient motivation to work\textsuperscript{64}. To date, it is unclear how many clients these attractive programs have the resources to serve.

4. Note on Nature of Recommendations

The nature of the recommendations included in this document are meant to be specific enough to put programmatic flesh on the bones of the general Collaborative impulse which has brought the agencies together in the first place. Yet, the recommendations are not meant to offer a detailed blueprint of service delivery. Instead, while outlining a broad direction for the Collaborative, the recommendations are to allow for learning on the part of the participants. Obviously, any recommendations herein may or may not be adopted during the preCollaborative summer planning period.

B. COLLABORATIVE PHASES

Following I describe a set of phased recommendations for the formation of the FSSCollaborative. While the phases are conceived of as sequential, one leading to the next, each also represents an improvement over the preceding state. As such, benefits of the Collaborative accrue to clients (and participating agency) immediately and are not contingent necessarily upon finding the resources and building the relationships to reach the third phase depicted in this document.

---

\textsuperscript{64} Meetings between Supported Work Program provider staff and Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership staff. May, 1997.
1. The FSS “preCollaborative”

  a. Description

The FSSCollaborative such as it exists at this writing, May 1997, has yet to attain any formal or contractual status. I will refer to this current and formative status of the group as the “preCollaborative.”

Despite its lack of formal organization, the pre-Collaborative has begun to plan and operate “pilot projects.” The pilot projects, which are being launched without additional resources, are to conduct targeted outreach to tenants at-risk of losing income due to welfare reform; identify the most employment ready tenants; and connect those tenants with appropriate placement services. If resources allow, tenants who are not assessed as currently employable may undergo further assessment and referred to training services.

Additionally, the preCollaborative will continue the existing planning and coordination process leading to a consensus among participants about the further direction of the Collaborative. This process will culminate in a proposal for the Collaborative which will be used to acquire the resources necessary to carry out the decided upon activities.

b. preCollaborative Program Design: Addressing Employability

The FSS preCollaborative is a modified Human Capital model program, spread across multiple agencies. (Please see Figure 5-2.) Typical of Human Capital programs, the preCollaborative begins with an assessment and places a focus on individual case planning. The reason I refer to
the design as a modified is that the first-segment assessment discussed below may be implemented in such a fashion as to readily and swiftly refer a large number of people to Labor Force Attachment programs. This remains to be decided. Another reason the program can not be considered pure Human Capital Development is that the preCollaborative itself does not offer any training or education, but relies instead on outside providers.

1.) Outreach
In the preCollaborative, housing agency staff perform some degree of outreach and intake. The form this will take has been the subject of discussion. Nuestra Comunidad has indicated a preference for “starting small” by focusing on tenant known well to staff particularly those that volunteer at the CDC office. In Codman Square, discussions are to be held with the Resident Organizer staff and Dennison House as to how best to conduct outreach. For MBHP, outreach may take the form of targeted mailings, phone calls and conducting outreach through unit inspection and recertification activities. It is planned that Collaborative participants will share outreach activities. For example, if an event were held in Codman Square providing information about workforce development activities and offering initial Assessment, it is planned that both Codman Square NDC tenants and nearby MBHP voucher holders would be invited.

2) Assessment

The assessment step has already received a good deal of attention from the partner agencies. In fact, it is the most concrete example to date of the preCollaborative working jointly. After several discussions, it has been decided that, at least initially, the assessment will be segmented into two phases. The first, a general intake, interest survey and employment history performed by housing agency or neighborhood social service agency staff. The arrangement may vary with the staffing levels of the individual agencies. (See discussion below under Case Management.) Staff from participating agencies have worked together to craft a prototype of the initial assessment instrument. This prototype will be revised by other Collaborative agencies and also reviewed by staff of a local One-Stop Center.
Clients who are assessed as employable are referred to a One-Stop Career center for job search services. Clients not perceived of as employable are to receive a second assessment, perhaps one that includes a small battery of tests and interpretation performed by employment and training agency staff. (The FSSCollaborative is currently seeking resources to fund this service.) From there the client may be referred to a training program, One-Stop Center or other appropriate agency.

3) Case Management

Individual housing agencies (or neighborhood partner agencies) are able to offer varying degrees of case management, case planning, case tracking and follow up. The different staffing levels at the individual housing provider participant agencies creates a planning difficulty for the Collaborative. The Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership has six Family Advocate staff positions who will provide this Case Management function for MBHP Section 8 voucher and certificate holders. CDCs have a lesser staff capacity to fill this role. CDC administrative staff have indicated that existing staff (or the existing staff of the partner neighborhood social service agency) will be able to at least provide the initial assessment but not case management. If the Collaborative can find resources to develop further case management capacity, it is not yet clear whether housing provider or their neighborhood partners within each neighborhood would offer the service.

4) Other Core Elements

The preCollaborative creates no additional capacity to offer basic education, skills training, job
readiness, job search and job placement services. Instead, the Collaborative will rely on the existing local service delivery system for these services.

c. preCollaborative Network Design: “Pushing” and “Pulling”

The Peer to Peer Model most neatly matches the current state of the FSS pre-Collaborative.65

---

65 MBHP plays a distinct and central role within the “Peer-to-Peer” network. MBHP has been the primary driving force behind the formation of the Collaborative including bringing the most resources to bear on issue through employment of a “Collaborative Coordinator.” However, MBHP’s ties to external parties do not indicate the use of another model. Instead, MBHP has filled the role of a Peer-to-Peer’s “shared secretariat” at least until the formalization of the Collaborative.
Though composed of numerous peer agencies, the preCollaborative has only the barest sense of the "shared secretariat" which serves as the central point a Peer-to-Peer network. In the preCollaborative there are over-lapping activities, a common assessment tool and protocol and common planning efforts. In fact, the existing preCollaborative is only a slight strengthening of the set of mostly informal ties which existed between the institutional players beforehand.

1.) Ties to Community

The Peer-to-Peer preCollaborative assumes that housing providers have sufficient ties with tenants to successfully attract people to participation in preCollaborative assessments. However, whether the ties between the housing providers and the communities of tenants are of a nature to enhance the motivation of program participants, that is, "pull down" the barriers, is an open question.

2.) Ties to Employers

The nature of the links between the preCollaborative and employers probably represents the least well developed set of relationships. There are, in fact, no direct links to employers. The preCollaborative relies almost exclusivity on those of placement and training agencies which are outside of the Collaborative. (The agencies within the preCollaborative that have ties to employers, but, those ties are available only to those who go through individual training programs and the preCollaborative does not have capacity to fund these trainings.) As such,
the preCollaborative has little independent capacity to encourage employers to “push the barriers” of the employability continuum.

3.) Ties to Other Providers

The FSS preCollaborative, as stated, relies on external providers for the delivery of core service elements. Thus, the strength and quality of the relationship between the Collaborative and these agencies will determine the success of preCollaborative activities. In the preCollaborative, the relationship between the Collaborative and other providers is one of, in the terms of Himmelman, “networking,” that is, limited to information sharing.

4.) Intra-collaborative relationships

As a Peer-to-Peer model, the preCollaborative has also to consider the relationships between the agencies in the Collaborative or intra-Collaborative relationships. The reason these relationships are particularly key is that, in the Peer-to-Peer model, agencies “lend” their pre-existing ties to the Network. Only if peer agencies are sufficiently well networked among themselves will they be able to “borrow” on each other's ties.

The main mechanism through which these ties are lent and borrowed upon is the shared secretariat central node of the Peer-to-Peer network. In the case of the preCollaborative, as stated, this central element is largely undeveloped. However, the preCollaborative and the “pilot projects” can serve two important roles in developing this secretariat: informing the planning process and nurturing the underpinnings of the Collaborative itself.
a.) Building a Shared Secretariat

The planning aspects of the preCollaborative are meant to result in the acquisition of resources to build the central node. Lessons from the “pilot project” will inform this program design. For example, if none of the families who, as a result of the initial employability Assessment, achieve employment through the subsequent referral to a Career One Stop Center then that aspect of the program (either the Assessment, the quality of the referral or the services of the One-Stop) needs to be seriously reconsidered.

b.) Building a collaborative Collaborative

The existing preCollaborative, as skeletal as it may be programmatically, furthers the agencies’ ability to develop the level of shared view of the project, the sharpened vision and unsharpened elbows, necessary to successfully collaborate on any complex and important joint venture. One can consider the preCollaborative in terms of the four previously identified factors which contribute to an environment conducive to the collaborative activity: inter-locking and enduring personal and professional relationships among key players; mutual interest; a financial nexus of interests; and, a shared vision of some future outcome. The FSSCollaborative is in a position where these conditions are largely in place.

I.) Personal/Professional Relationships


67 op Cit., Keyes, et.al., “Networks and Nonprofits...”
Almost all of the individual participants have long standing relationships with one another through years of involvement in the Boston community development environment. In fact, there are probably well over one hundred years of Boston neighborhood experience around the table at each Collaborative meeting.

The one institutional player which has not been deeply involved in community based efforts is Morgan Memorial-Goodwill and, correspondingly, the Executive Director of Goodwill does not seem to have the long personal knowledge of the other Directors and staff. While this lack of familiarity can be seen as indicative of the lack of institutionalized contact between community based housing providers and the world of employment and training, it is also the case that Morgan Memorial has recently adapted its mission to move beyond its traditional activities of working with disabled populations to work with non-disabled low-income populations. There are other job training and placement agencies with far greater histories of cooperation with affordable housing. However, both in terms of its institutional engagement with the Collaborative and the openness and enthusiasm displayed by the leadership, Morgan Memorial is building a positive relationship with the other Collaborative partners. Additionally, two other Morgan Memorial staff beside the Director have worked with housing agencies before and, to some of the other participants, are known entities.

---

68 This shift represents something of a full circle for Morgan Memorial. Historically, the institution worked with general low-income local neighborhood clientele for close to fifty years before shifting to focus on working with disabled persons during the depression era. See: Joyce S. Tavon, Neighbourhood Based Services for the Poor: Re-examining Morgan Memorial and the Settlement House Movement” MIT, Department of Urban Studies and Planning Master’s Thesis, (unpublished, 1993).
ii.) Mutual Interests

The participating Collaborative agencies have an implicit mutual interest in enhancing the ability of low-income residents to access and benefit from self-sufficiency services. Training and service providers bring technical capacity and ties to employers but have traditionally had trouble attracting targeting population groups and providing long term support for trainees after program completion. Housers, in contrast, have the “organic” longitudinal relationship with tenants and some ability to target specific groups. This simple construct, which is the base on which the Collaborative has been founded, demonstrates the mutual interests of these two groups of players.

iii.) Financial Nexus

The financial nexus at which the parties come together is two-fold. First of all, welfare reform threatens the tenancy of TAFDC receiving families providing a financial interest for housers. Training and support agencies have a similar financial incentive to provide services to welfare recipients. Additionally, the theory that a Collaborative better positions the participating agencies for a post-devolution funding environment creates another potential financial nexus for all parties.

iv.) Shared Vision

Were one to take a poll of Collaborative participants about their “vision” of the desired outcome of the Collaborative the responses would likely be very similar regarding helping people find and keep jobs. However, the depth and specificity of this vision might be found to
be different between players, or, for some people with little experience in workforce
development, lacking altogether. For example, are we, the Collaborative, after any jobs or
good jobs? Do we understand the service implications of the ongoing nature of the Case
Management involvement? Are we able to articulate the steps that need to be taken to achieve
this vision? The preCollaborative allows the players to come together to gain expertise but
also to find commonality on these issues.

e. Outcomes

As a result of having committed to the establishment of the preCollaborative and the “pilot
projects” the clients and participating agencies of the FSSCollaborative will have improved the
ability of tenant families to learn of and move through the existing employment and training
system. Even short of additional improvements to the system as outlined below, the operation
of the preCollaborative is likely to result in employment and self-sufficiency outcomes (though
probably on a limited scale) which would not otherwise have been achieved.

2. First Phase FSS Collaborative: Formalization

a. Description

The FSSCollaborative “First Phase” Network is an improved and formalized version of the
existing preCollaborative. The First Phase Network focuses on enhancing the intra-
Collaborative linkages between partner agencies. Secondly, the First Phase strengthens ties to
other service provider agencies which are not part of the Collaborative.
As with the preCollaborative, housing (or neighborhood partner agency) staff provide outreach into the community, perform an initial assessment, make referrals as appropriate and offer a degree of case management services. New to the FSSCollaborative, however, are the development of a shared or cross-agency informational capacity and an enhanced effort at forging ties to other providers.

Unlike the activities of the preCollaborative which are conducted essentially on the margins of
pre-existing workloads of the individual agencies, the new First Phase activities demand time and resources dedicated to the FSSCollaborative itself. How such resources are acquired is part of the work for the summer planning process. Consensus regarding the institutional structure for the activities also need be reached.

1.) Informational Capacity

As a central feature to the First Phase Network, there is also a developed central information network capacity. The goal of the informational capacity will be to provide housing provider case management staff up to date accurate information about training program availability, requirement and eligibility standards. The system may be extended to include intake and assessment activities or to facilitate follow up with clients. The informational technology aspect of the program may include any other elements, as well. Specific design of the informational will take place through the summer planning process.69

2.) Ties to Other Providers

As with the preCollaborative, the First Phase does not offer extensive employment and training services within the FSSCollaborative and is, instead, reliant on external service providers. In the First Phase, links with these providers will be made stronger and probably more formal. Through active networking, the FSSCollaborative agencies will gain a functional

---

69 Please see discussion above under Nature of Recommendations. The purpose here is not thoroughly consider and explain how the Collaborative partners could be served through technology. Instead, I wish to highlight broad mechanisms through which the Collaborative may achieve its goals for clients.
understanding of the service environment and then to explore what level of cooperation might be possible between the Collaborative and individual providers. It is anticipated that such linkages will take the form of, minimally, the timely and accurate sharing of information regarding trainings and other program opportunities and in some circumstances the establishment of feedback mechanisms between external providers and the FSSCollaborative (particularly housing based case management staff).

The goal of the effort is that referrals between FSSCollaborative partners and external agencies (as well as those between FSSC partners) are made less idiosyncratic, more well-informed and more appropriate. As a result, clients are much less likely to get “lost” in the system. If a client does not have the educational background to complete a given program the trainer does not just send the client out with a list of other resources in hand but is able to discuss the issues with the FSSCollaborative housing agency case manager who can work with the clients to create another plan.

The establishment of this extra-Collaborative ties to other service providers will conducted through systematic outreach to individual agencies and through existing multi-agency organizations such as the Job Training Alliance. Collaborative partner agencies already have numerous contacts among and experience with external providers which will be important to the networking activity.

b. Relation to The Three Thirds
How will the proposed First Phase Network meet the needs of clients along the breadth of self-sufficiency continuum? (Please see Figure 5-4.) As discussed in Chapters Three and Four, addressing these needs most successfully demands confronting issues of both employability and networking: what you know and who you know.

1.) Employability

As with the preCollaborative, the FSSCollaborative First Phase Network represents a modified Human Capital Development approach purveyed across multiple providers. The distinction is that linkages with a subset of external providers within the system have been strengthened.

2.) Networking

Again, as with the pre-Collaborative, the First Phase Collaborative represents a Peer to Peer Network model, however, the First Phase has developed a greater “shared secretariat” than has existed previously. Not only will different agencies will be sharing the same intake/assessment protocols, but there will be some centralized information and referral function. This function may in fact be performed by a separate unit within one of the partners or as a new entity.

a.) Ties to community

The First Phase Collaborative does little to improve ties to the community over what exists in the preCollaborative. The streamlined information and referral system will enable the Case Management staff to better target services, and this enhanced credibility should lead to greater
ties with the tenant communities. While the First Phase Collaborative could make efforts to promote these activities (through newsletters, events and peer groups to both encourage individual clients and develop greater ties with tenants) structurally, there is no augmentation of these capacities in the First Phase Collaborative.

b.) Ties to Employers and Other Providers

At this stage, it is only through enhancing relationships with other providers that First Phase Collaborative has the capacity to establish or improve upon ties employers. As discussed, the First Phase represents and intentional effort to enhance ties to other providers. This networking activity is meant to establish what can be pictured as an “inner-ring” of providers with whom the Collaborative has improved linkages. In the terminology of Arthur Himmelman, the relationships have progressed from an information sharing “networking” stage to a willingness to alter activities “coordination” stage. (Please see Chapter 4.)

While the Collaborative formed in a self-selected manner, described as “existential” by one participant, promoting ties to external parties will be to a degree more methodical and intentional. Selecting partners for this activity is, therefore, a crucial and delicate activity. Utilizing the four indicators of social capital previously discussed, (Please see Chapter 4.) the Collaborative will seek out partner agencies with which it has or can develop personal/professional relationships, mutual interests, a financial nexus and a shared vision. The phased implementation strategy of the Collaborative allows for some nurturing of such aspects as the program evolves.
c. Positive Outcomes

As with all proposed stages of Collaborative development, the Fist Phase Collaborative represents an improvement on the preceding stage, in this case, the preCollaborative. The development of a centralized and efficient informational capacity will make much more accessible employment and training services to tenants. This coupled with outreach to tenants and follow up from housing providers and the beginnings of developing ties to training and other providers, will move many more people into the employment and training service system than would have other sought services.

d. Potential Shortcomings

The First Phase Collaborative Network has numerous potential problems which need to be explored in order to improve the design.

1.) Reliance on Existing System Capacity

The First Phase Collaborative Network is an approach that gears up and makes more fluid the existing system. As such, it is left with many of the same gaps and potential problems as exist within that system. For example, there exist chronic service shortages particularly English as a Second Language slots and accessible child care. Relatedly, the First Phase Collaborative’s reliance on external capacity is particularly stark with respect to any “demand side” workforce development services, as discussed above.
2.) Importance of Assessments

This model places a heavy reliance on what is an extremely streamlined assessment procedure. As stated earlier, Assessment is a difficult procedure under any circumstances. (Please see p.) It may be discovered in the preCollaborative phase, that the efficacy of the two segment assessment is limited or uneven across agencies or even individual case management staff. Case management staff have expressed skepticism about the ability to measure employability in such an abbreviated process due to the presence of underlying support service needs. 70

3.) The Third Third

The First Phase Network makes little accommodation for the “Third Third.” These people, according to the assessment procedure, are unlikely to benefit from either short term placement or training program.

3. Second Phase FSS Collaborative: Elements of an Incubator Program

a. Description

1.) Structure

The Phase Two FSSCollaborative represents an effort to introduce elements of successful Incubator programs. The Phase Two FSSCollaborative is not an effort to pile on more services. For example, the program does not create any new training capacity and it only augments preCollaborative case management and child care capacity. The new program

70 Assessment WorkGroup Meeting, Morgan-Memorial, MBHP, April 1997.
elements are instead designed to improve the FSSCollaborative’s ability to act as a network participant within the larger workforce development system.

Central to the Phase Two FSSCollaborative is the creation of what I term the Enhanced Assessment Program. The FSSCollaborative, which as stated does not offer extensive services itself, is greatly reliant on assessments and the ability of clients (supported to a degree by case management and by networked relationship) to navigate the offerings of external providers. Thus, improving the quality of assessments is a prerogative for development of the Collaborative. Additionally, as evidenced by Incubator program model, assessment can be improved through integration with other core services and the creation of a supportive yet challenging environment. Thus, the Enhanced Assessment Program (EAP), as envisioned goes beyond merely providing more in depth skills and interest related assessment to create a programmatic entity capable of creating such an environment and incorporating other service elements such as assessment, case planning and, to a degree, work readiness.

Additionally, as part of Phase Two, the FSSCollaborative will attempt to integrate program activity more fully with existing providers with whom the Collaborative has nurtured a cooperative relationship.

The Phase Two FSSCollaborative remains generally structured as in Phase One. Housing provider staff still account for the case management function. However, the central element of the Collaborative has moved beyond the informational and networking function of Phase One
to take on the explicit programmatic function of the EAP. Similar to the considerations for Phase One, these functions could be structured either as an independent entity created by Collaborative participants or as a contracted service of one or more Collaborative participants or external providers. This decision as to how to structure the program will be informed by the progress of the Collaborative through the planning and early phases.

b. New Program Elements

1.) Enhanced Assessment Program

The Enhanced Assessment Program, as envisioned, can combine numerous core workforce development services into one program activity: assessment, case planning and, to a degree,
work readiness training.

One element of the program will be to provide increasingly sophisticated levels of testing and observation. Morgan Memorial-Goodwill Industries, for example, has developed a variety of assessment packages employing a wide battery of tests which are meant to test for appropriateness of a client for specific training programs and jobs. The Enhanced Assessment Program will have the capacity to go beyond the preCollaborative and First Phase two-segment assessment to employ such methods as is deemed beneficial.

A model of case planning in a programmatic setting is the Economic Literacy Program of the Transitions to Work Collaborative. This program, operated by the Women’s Institute for Housing and Economic Development, assists family shelter clients create a plan for employment in the context of providing a broad overview of the economic forces affecting individual’s opportunities. Clients attend a series of sessions by the end of which they have written, with their case managers, an individualized employment or training plan. (Please see Chapter 3 Transition to Work Collaborative Case Study.)

Thirdly, the Enhanced Assessment program may offer work readiness lessons and training. These lessons could take the form of classroom sessions on employment expectations and practices as are found in job readiness programs. The program itself could adopt “work modeling” attributes: requiring that trainees approach the program as one would a job in terms of promptness, conduct, dress, etc. It is quite likely that any such functions for the EAP would
need to be created in conjunction with a One-Stop center, a “Skills Plus” provider, or a “Supported Work Program” provider.

By bringing together these elements, and also by working more closely with other service providers as described below, the EAP may achieve a broader sense of a clients’ employability. An assessment of a client’s performance through the range of activities performed by a multi-disciplinary group of staff (EAP staff, housing based case managers and, as possible, staff of training and placement agencies) will approximate the performance based assessment used in Incubator programs.

2.) Cooperative Arrangements with Other Providers

The Phase Two FSSCollaborative will seek to improve upon the network relationships established with training and provider agencies through the preCollaborative and Phase One. The goal is to thread the activities of these providers, that is, the skills training and job development and placement core service elements, into the functioning of the EAP.

Programmatic linkages are made even more cooperative than in the First Phase. It may be possible that agencies would conduct outreach sessions at housing developments, for example. There may be agencies interested in prioritizing Collaborative clients for services, sharing transportation assistance plans, adjusting time and location course, even work jointly on harmonizing curriculum between the EAP and skills program. Ultimately, the FSSCollaborative seeks to develop relationships whereby training and placement partners work
with Collaborative and/or participant agency staff in jointly assessing and delivering services to clients.

c. Relation to the Three Thirds

1.) Employability

The Enhanced Assessment Program is to be designed to function as a mini-Incubator. As stated, an Incubator utilizes ongoing “open-exit” assessment of employability through linking job development with skills and readiness training. (Please see Chapter 3.) The FSSCollaborative approximates this function by threading the training and placement activities of external providers, with whom the FSSC has developed quality cooperative relationships, with the Incubator atmosphere within the EAP. Ideally, the program will be designed in a modular fashion in order to approximate an open-entry format as well.

The FSSCollaborative will work toward establishing relationships with placement and training agencies that will be willing to communicate with Collaborative staff on client progress and even jointly assess clients’ employability. However, the notion of an “open-exit” graduation, may be strained within the EAP. Nearly all training programs utilize a finite exit, one based on completing a pre-set curriculum. Thus, clients selecting a Human Capital approach may “graduate” from the EAP to a training program at any time when an appropriate match is found, but are unlikely to be in an open-exit situation once in a training program.

The Phase Two Network begins to break down the overly rigid assessment driven triage system
evident in the preCollaborative and First Phase Collaborative. One of the more obvious gaps in
the preCollaborative and Phase One model is the lack of programmatic engagement available
for the”third third.” the least employable clients. The Phase Two FSSCollaborative EAP
begins to provide a mechanism for meaningful engagement with people in the third third. Any
clients who does not “graduate” or who bounces back and forth between a training program
and the EAP might revise their economic self-sufficiency plans to more accurately reflect what
for them is the next step. Additionally, such a client might be approached about the need for
greater support services.

2. Networking

The Phase Two FSSCollaborative is, like its predecessors, a Peer-to-Peer model Network.
Phase Two does have a far more established “shared secretariat” presence in the form of the
Enhanced Assessment Program. Additionally, linkages to some outside providers have been
strengthened.

a.) Ties to Community

The Phase Two FSSCollaborative does not significantly alter relationships between the
agencies involved and the community of families who may seek its services. The
establishment of a programmatic entity, the EAP, allows for some more structured relationship
building and improved motivation through program activities, but does not, in and of itself,
affect the nature of the relationships.
b.) Ties to Other Providers and Employers

The Phase Two FSSCollaborative attempts to affect ties to employers through increasingly strong ties to external providers. As discussed, this set of relationships is important to the ability of the Phase Two model to achieve an Incubator functionality. In Phase Two, some of the “inner ring” of providers established through the earlier phases are more fully integrated into the Collaborative. (It may even be that the Collaborative decides that in order to pursue this strategy selected agencies need to be invited to become part of the Collaborative itself.)

Again, to frame the nature of these links in Arthur Himmelman’s nomenclature, the relationship between these providers and the Collaborative has progressed from “coordination,” willing to alter activities for mutual gain, to “cooperation” willing to share resources and accountability.

As these relationships represent a greater level of integration and commitment, the same considerations discussed with respect to selecting partners in Phase One applies in Phase Two. Forging and managing these relationships will be an ongoing challenging element of the Collaborative.

d. Positive Outcomes

The Second Phase Collaborative represents an improvement upon the system created through the pre- and First Phase Collaborative. As such, even if development stops at this Phase, due to resource availability or other resources, if the Collaborative continues to operate at a Phase Two level, tenants will be better served than under previous and existing system. In addition
to getting more clients into the system in a more well informed and tracked fashion, as was the
case in Phase One, the Second Phase is makes greater efforts to discover and promote the
employability of the clients through the Enhanced Assessment Program. Additionally, for the
many middle third or third third clients who the placement-oriented One Stops are not the
answer, the Second Phase begins to establish more operational linkages with training and
educational providers.

4. Third Phase FSSCollaborative: Elements of Hub-N-Spoke Network

a. Description
The Phase Three FSSCollaborative Enhanced Network is an effort to further increase the
networking capacity of Collaborative. Having formalized intra-Collaborative links in Phase
One, improved links to providers outside the Collaborative in Phases One and Two and
improved the central programmatic element of the Collaborative in Phase Two, Phase Three
represents the next stage of network evolution: in providing the ability of the Collaborative to
network with and with employers and at least pay attention to the ties to communities of
families.

1.) The “Demand Side”

a.) Job Development
The Third Phase FSSCollaborative will develop the capacity to provide or influence job
development and placement services. While in the First Phase the Collaborative establishes
some degree of formalized interaction with One-Stop Centers and other agencies filling this
role, a question to be asked is whether the services are sufficient? If the availability, quality, or targeting of these services are not adequate, the Second Phase could tighten its ties with placement providers, enhance the relationships with employers itself, create dedicated staff within an existing provider or contribute to overall system capacity.

Additionally, it there are various state and federal incentives available to encourage the hiring of welfare recipients. The state of Massachusetts “Full Employment Program” provides a subsidy to employers under certain conditions. Similarly, the state “Supported Work Program” offers employers the chance to hire welfare recipients on a probationary status. It is possible that the availability of federal incentives will increase in the years ahead as it has become an important part of the Clinton Administration’s welfare reform agenda.71 As such, in addition to job development services in general, the FSSCollaborative will need to consider whether the providers are keeping pace with the changing topography of incentives.

Again, there may or may not be a programmatic role for the FSSCollaborative but there is likely to be the need for some player within the workforce development system to be entrepreneurial in utilizing these incentives to the maximum benefit of clients. While, in the words of one placement specialist, “A subsidy alone doesn’t make success,” it may be that the type of holistic approach the FSSCollaborative combined with a subsidy would spell positive employment outcomes for clients. Thus, the FSSC should pay particular attention to these

subsidy programs.

b.) Intermediary Work Opportunities

Even if the job linkages are adequate for top and middle third clients, the FSSCollaborative should consider the demand side of the network for lesser employable clients. The experiences of welfare-to-work programs and supported employment for the disabled both point to the need to find or create intermediary work-like opportunities. Evaluators of Project Match advocates many mini-steps between welfare dependency and economic independence for individuals in what this paper terms the “third third:” “The activities people perform in their roles as parents and members of communities can be pulled into the policy framework and used as stepping stone and indicators of movement toward economic independence.” Individuals are introduced to the world of work in lesser demanding settings and expectations are steadily increased over time. Many “incremental ladder” rungs can be defined such as moving from performing unscheduled to scheduled volunteer hours, or from community internships, to subsidized work, to part time unsubsidized work to full time work.72

As part of the Massachusetts TAFDC program, non-exempt recipients who have failed to find employment must perform twenty hours of community service per week in order to remain eligible for benefits. The state Department of Transitional Assistance provides a list of agencies where one can fulfill this requirement, however, there does not appear to be any systematic attempt to ensure that the nature of the volunteer work relates to one’s employment}

72 \textit{op Cit.}, Herr and Halpren, p. 7.
goals or enhances one’s employability. Developing a set of relationships between the Collaborative and cites for community service workers can be developed part of Phase Three “demand side” approach. These relationships would help improve the quality of the volunteer experience for the client and, perhaps, the value of the volunteer work for the organization. It may be possible for the individual FSSCollaborative agencies and/or the central EAP to create and manage such positions.

2.) Community Outreach Enhancement
Efforts may need to be undertaken to strengthen the ties of the housers in the Collaborative to constituency communities. In addition to the types of outreach and contacts utilized through preCollaborative and Phases One and Two, new measures will likely need to be adopted. One method of increasing is through community organizing campaigns. While it is unrealistic that the existing institutional players within the FSSCollaborative will successfully participate in or launch a community organizing oriented approach to workforce development, the FSSCollaborative should seek to be knowledgeable of and, to what degree possible, facilitate links with such efforts and other trusted networks.

b. Relation to the Three Thirds

1.) Networking: Moving toward Hub-N-Spoke
The Phase Three Collaborative represents a shift away from a strict Peer-to-Peer Network Model and closer to a Hub-N-Spoke Model. (Please see Figure 5-6.) With the strengthened ability to form ties to employers, both through other providers and through Phase Three
demand side approaches, the FSSCollaborative assumes a central role in the network stretching from client families to the Collaborative possibly to other providers and ultimately to employers.

Figure 5.6 Third Phase FSSCollaborative Network Design

a.) Ties to Employers and Other Providers

In the Third Phase, the Collaborative makes a concerted effort to ensure that connections to
employers are sufficient, that is, that these ties encourage and entice employers to hire program clients, to push down the lines on the employability continuum. Again, as with previous phases, the Collaborative relies heavily on other providers for these connections. However, in Phase Three these ties are explicitly examined and, if necessary, either amended or bypassed if the Collaborative seeks to develop its own such capacity. In particular, the FSSCollaborative will keep an active involvement in creating intermediary work opportunities. The relationships between these providers and the Collaborative progressed another step from Himmeleman’s “cooperation,” the sharing of resources, to “collaboration,” the mutual enhancement of capacity.

b.) Ties to Community

As stated above, the Phase Three FSSCollaborative needs to intentionally consider how to improve the quality of ties to community. It is unlikely that the FSSCollaborative could launch a community organizing effort on its own. However, the Collaborative could support activities designed to tap into existing and trusted networks.

For example, neighborhood faith communities such as churches and mosques, could be approached. The Boston 10 Point Coalition, a group based in African American churches, is given much credit in the City’s recent reduction in inner city violence. Notably, by many accounts the 10 Point Coalition worked cooperatively with Boston Police Department, other law enforcement agencies as well as a wide range of social service and youth services providers in implementing a broad approach to issues of crime and security. Could an analogous alliance
be forged around issues of workforce development and welfare-to-work? The Industrial Areas Foundation, whose organizing led to the creation of QUEST in San Antonio, are also becoming active in Boston.

Were such organizing to occur it should be possible for the FSSCollaborative to recruit from such an effort people who are also tenants of Collaborative housing agencies (or refer tenants to the organizing campaign) to participate in the FSSC program. As with "ties to employers," these suggestions may or may not be feasible. However, during the Third Phase, the Collaborative should analyze and evaluate the nature of the ties to the community and devise ways to directly or indirectly enhance those links.

2.) Employability

The development of quality intermediary work opportunities which contribute to a long term individual employability plan has the potential to allow the FSSCollaborative to engage with "third third" clients in a much more effectual manner than is present in earlier phases.

C. FSSCOLLABORATIVE PLANNING PROCESS

1. The Phased Program Development

The recommended phased implementation of the FSSCollaborative is designed to allow for the evolution of the program. As partners within the Collaborative become better able to work together and with and the external workforce development system, the client communities and
As conceived, the development of the FSSCollaborative will occur according to the following timeline. *(Please see Figure 5-7.)*

**Figure 5-7. Proposed FSSCollaborative Time Line**

**May 1997 to September 1997 preCollaborative:**
- **planning:** develop consensus on direction of Collaborative
  - intraCollaborative formalization
  - secure ongoing funding
- **program:** operate “pilot projects”
  - networking with ongoing providers

**September 1997 to March 1998: Phase One FSSCollaborative**
- **planning:** design and creation of EAP
- **program:** develop and operate central informational program
  - ongoing networking with external providers

**March 1998 to December 1998: Phase Two FSSCollaborative**
- **planning:** evaluation of and strategy for improving ties to employers
  - evaluation of and strategy for improving ties to community
- **program:** operation of EAP

**January 1999: Phase Three FSSCollaborative**
- **planning:** continued planning (not yet considered)
- **program:** demand side approach fully operational
  - community ties enhancement program operational

**Note:** program activities are cumulative through phases.

Each successive phase of the Collaborative is dependent on the development of new or strengthening of existing relationships. As such, time itself is a resource for the Collaborative, time in which to seek out collaborative partners at the various levels.

One can not simply create relationships over night with, for example, a large local employer. These need to be invested in and built slowly. As such, a two-year period during which the FSSCollaborative
reaches its mature shape is proposed. It may be that two years is a foreshortened period in which to nurture the ties as envisioned. However, it is not too short a time important initial contacts are intentionally established and the programmatic context within which the relationships are framed and made useful is constructed. Nonetheless, the two year time frame is, like the entirety of the Collaborative, to be discussed and decided upon through the initial planning period.

The phased evolution of the program allows for a method of sequential “creaming” of less service-intensive clients. As FSSCollaborative develops more sophisticated interventions in client’s connections to the workplace, so to will the needs of clients who are not succeeding through the existing system and early Phases become more pressing. While “creaming” is typically a term used as a negative critique of a program in this context, the strategy is to allow for the development of continued expertise. Additionally, as noted previously, the environment in which these activities is altered to the point where there is no sure understanding of how the various elements (welfare reform and devolution) are going to interact. The sequential creaming is an attempt to understand how these factors are playing out while still offering beneficial services to at least some clients. Obviously, it is the intention of the Collaborative that the learning curve of how to deliver services capable of assisting a broader range of clients is as short as possible.

73 Robert Putnam describes *six hundred years* of social capital investment in Northern Italy that to this time, in his estimation, contribute to its cooperative prowess in comparison to social capital impoverished Southern Italy. See: Robert Putnam, “The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and the Public Life,” *The American Prospect*, 13 (spring).
2. Considerations of the Process of Collaborating

However, the Collaborative needs to be aware of and consciously forward the process of collaborating itself. Writing about multi-party collaborative processes, Barbara Grey defines three stages details three phases of collaborative efforts. *(Please see Figure 5-8.)* A Pre-Negotional Problem Setting Phase, the Direction Setting Phase and the Implementation Phase.

![Figure 5-8: Stages in Collaborative Process](image)

**The Pre-Negotional - Problem Setting Phase**
- shared definition of issue
- determine nature of existing relationships
- agree on value of collaboration
- commit to collaboration
- decide on who else needs to be involved and what else needs to happen

**The Direction Setting Phase**
- conduct data gathering
- determine organization structure and governance
- consider how to create capacity

**The Implementation Phase**
- build constituency - get buy in from the “trenches”
- build external support - articulate outcomes to the community
- structure agreement ensure monitoring, compliance and accountability


This construct is a useful one through which to explicitly analyze the Collaborative to date and the proposed recommendations. In general, the activities since the earliest meeting late 1996 represent the pre-Negotional Phase, the summer planning session constitutes the Direction Setting Phase and the activities starting fall of 1997 and beyond, the Implementation Phase.

Currently, however, there are pre-Negotional activities which have yet to be undertaken. Notably, the relations between the players remains vague and the decision regarding what,
specifically, “needs to be done,” has not been made. Thus, by Grey’s prescriptions, the Collaborative need take a step to finalize the pre-Negotional activities in order to move forward. This step is takes the form of coming to consensus around what type of services and in what form the Collaborative will deliver or harness for clients.

Secondly, there are pre-Negotional and Direction setting activities which in these recommendations are extended through the Implementation phase. For example, the necessary activity of “deciding who else needs to be involved” which Grey places in the pre-Negotional phase, in these recommendations, is a subtle process of nurturing and intensifying relationships with other provider and occurs slowly through the Implementation phase of the FSSCollaborative. Partially, this represents a refutation of the notion that one could determine all relevant parties without beginning to substantially engage the problem. Additionally, there is in these recommendations a recognition that necessary linkages between housers, for example, and the broad array of workforce development programs are simply not there at present.

3. The Sequence of Phases

The ordering of the Phases presented herein are described in terms which match the theoretical network construct which frames this document. (First Phase: intraCollaborative ties are emphasized. Second Phase: external providers are more fully developed. Third Phase: ties to communities and employers are the focus.) Institutional reality, however, is not likely to be so concise. Opportunities to act on relationships will present themselves out of keeping with the
above somewhat arbitrary sequence. Perhaps, for example, early on, an employer or placement agency will be anxious to work with the Collaborative on developing a relationship around the state Full Employment Program. Thus, the collaborative will need to exhibit great flexibility in adjusting to such occurrence. The phased approach of working with a basic outline with continued re-evaluation should accommodate this flexibility.

Secondly, it is likely that during the preCollaborative phase program planning (summer of 1997), participants may elect to reassemble some elements of the various phases in a different order. For example, if there is consensus around the importance of enhancement of community ties, it may be that the Collaborative chooses to begin these activities (which are likely to represent long term engagement) immediately.

4. Long Term

With the process described herein, the FSSCollaborative increasingly strengthens the potential of the effort to respond the changing environment of welfare reform and devolution.

First, the program design and network enhancement steadily maximizes the opportunities for tenants to achieve initial employment. More far reaching, however, the ongoing involvement of the Collaborative agencies over the phases allows for the development of the capacity to continue to work with tenants to address self-sufficiency issues. Initial employment is only one step and one not likely to end poverty. The long term vision of the Collaborative should allow tenants to continue to revisit the employment, training and placement system in order to
advance through jobs to higher levels of earnings.

Second, devolution and restriction of federal funding will continue during the course of the Collaborative phases. As such, the governmental funding programs which provide the vast majority of the support for the participating agencies’ core activities (housing or CDCs and MBHP, training for Morgan Memorial, for example) will themselves likely have been reorganized through devolution. As the phases have progressed and a high trust, working partnership has developed, participating agencies, either through informal ties or through the Collaborative itself, will be in a position to adapt to these funding changes.

The farthest seeing vision of the Collaborative is that by developing increased program efficiencies, through implementation of a program such as the one recommended, the agencies would be able to jointly approach ongoing governmental sources in a post-devolution era and wrap Collaborative services into core activity funding streams. This is contingent on too many variables to be a concrete piece of the Collaborative plan at this point. However, in the years ahead, the Collaborative should be in better position to offer community-based services to tenants in almost any foreseeable scenario than would be the case without such as partnership.
VI. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

I was afraid at first. The (FSS) contract was a commitment to better myself. What if I couldn't do it? But my counselor helped me. Now I'm a systems analyst...Most of all, my daughter, who lived with me in drug treatment centers and housing projects, can now see that it is possible to turn your life around.

- Barbara McNeil, FSS Program Participant\textsuperscript{74}

The environment in which low-income families work to meet their needs and community based organizations operate to assist them is facing potentially radical changes as a result of welfare reform and the devolution of federal funding.

Examining models of workforce development service delivery and network design I propose that the FSSCollaborative should evolve to achieve a network which functions as a Hub-N-Spoke network Incubator program. The recommended three Phase Collaborative implementation is designed to achieve that end. Additionally, each phase represents an improvement on the preceding system and is valuable even if all phases are not implemented.

The first phase FSSCollaborative provides key linking supports within Collaborative agencies in order to create a smoothly functioning network of existing players. It is a modest effort to improve upon the existing “preCollaborative” relations among agencies with a focus on “glue” holding the Network together and not on additional layers of services and administration. The First Phase creates a central informational capacity facilitating linkages between Collaborative

agencies. Additionally, the First Phase launches an effort to discover, invent and develop enhanced relationships with providers of workforce development services such as job training providers and job placement agencies. The goal is move these ties from a state of basic information sharing to one of “cooperation,” in which the Collaborative and the parties alter scheduling or other activities and share resources as possible for mutual gain.

The second phase, the FSS Collaborative adopts elements of an “Incubator” program model. The creation of an Enhanced Assessment Program significantly strengthen the Collaborative’s ability to engage and assess clients, particularly those who are not currently employment ready. Additionally, linkages with a select set of external workforce development agencies are further strengthened to intertwine training and placement services with the assessment and case planning activities.

The third phase, the FSS “Hub-N-Spoke” Collaborative enhances the Collaborative’s networking capacity beyond the realm of service providers to strengthen ties with employers and communities. Linkages with employers are boosted through an effort to create and implement a range of employment options from volunteer work to subsidized employment to unsubsidized jobs. It is anticipated that the Collaborative will work jointly in this effort with the “inner ring” external service providers. The Collaborative will seek to enhance linkages to tenant families through community organizing activities and by establishing ties with trusted community based entities.
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