



The
UNIVERSITY
of VERMONT

Vermont Legislative Research Shop

Innovations in Welfare Reform

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 changed welfare from a federal entitlement program to a state run assistance program. The states have been awarded control over welfare policy and design through a block grant. The four underlying principles of welfare reform are;

- Cumulative lifetime and employment time limits
- Increased child support enforcement
- Reduction in teenage pregnancy
- Creation of work programs and supportive services (Camissa 1998, p.72)

The decentralization of control has allowed states to develop innovative welfare programs under the augsments of the four principles stated above.

Innovations serving Children and Youth:

Many states have developed creative strategies to promote health children and families by utilizing TANF funds. State efforts have focused on child welfare, early childhood development, Head Start, childcare expansion, and youth development programs (Lovejoy, 2000). For example, in El Paso County, Colorado TANF funds have been used to prevent family crisis and the need for family intervention. A kinship care program has been established where children are able to leave the welfare system as soon as a supportive extended family member has been identified (Lovejoy, 2000). The state of Ohio has developed a Early Start program where home visits are made to teen parents and families with children under the age of three who are on TANF or are at risk of child abuse, neglect, or developmental delay. In 1998 Kansas created a state-federal partnership to fund early childhood development through Early Head Start; TANF funds which have been transferred to the Child Care Development Block Grant have been coupled with federal Head Start funds to provide full day, full year care to up to 500 infants and toddlers. The Michigan Family Independence agency has worked with the Michigan Department of Education to issue 47 competitive grants to school districts thereby enabling them to crease before and after school programs for low income children (Lovejoy, 2000).

Under the PRWORA annual bonuses are awarded to states that have most successfully reduced the proportion out of wedlock pregnancies to total births without increasing the abortion rate. The Department of Health and Human Services awarded \$100 million in bonuses to California, the District of Columbia, Michigan, Alabama and Massachusetts (each state will receive 20 million) for achieving the nations largest decreases between 1994 and 1997.

Innovation in Work Programs

PRWORA requires that all welfare recipients enter the workforce within two years, as well as end lifetime assistance within five years. However, within these lenient federal guidelines states are allowed/ encouraged to provide innovative welfare to work programs, along with stricter time requirements for assistance. When planning welfare reform, policy makers pinpointed the obstacles recipients had in entering the workforce. The idea was to create programs that would enable people to become self-sufficient. Two of the primary obstacles outlined were lack of transportation, and job training.

Welfare recipients face an uphill battle not only with attaining jobs, but also finding transportation. Dana Reichert, a welfare reform policy analyst for National Conference of State Legislatures, states that "many jobs are out of reach for welfare recipients, but not because they lack the skills to get those jobs. The growth in the U.S. economy has created many new jobs. Two out of three are located in suburban areas and, in some cities, jobs are outside the range of public transportation." States need to develop programs that would allow welfare recipients to access these suburban jobs.

Connecticut has answered the call by developing a feeder bus that transports riders from bus stops to major employment sectors. It works with local transit providers to extend its hours to accommodate later shift changes and work schedules from the area's main retail district. Bridges to work in Colorado contracts with the local bus provider to connect inner-city workers with suburban employment area. In addition, the Colorado program provides monthly bus passes for riders who have secured jobs, and guarantees a ride home in case of an emergency (Reichert, 2000). Other transit alternatives are vanpooling or shuttle services. These options provide transportation in areas where public transportation has not been previously accessible.

Another key to welfare reform is a tiered job training system. Often welfare recipients are not possessing adequate job skills to enter the private sector. A system where recipients participate in job training, community service jobs, or trial jobs allows them to become self-sufficient in incremental steps.

Wisconsin has implemented this ladder system. Although federal law requires employment with two years, Wisconsin has mandated that every person receiving assistance enter the workforce immediately. If one is not deemed ready to enter the private sector they are required to participate in a 40hr a week job training and community service program (Wiseman, 1999: 8). In addition to job training programs, Washington provides incentive payments to agencies and contractors for placing recipient in long-term and high-paying jobs. Specifically, a bonus of up to \$500 is available for service providers who place recipients in jobs for a minimum of 12 weeks (National Conference of State Legislatures, 1997).

Welfare Reform Results

There are different methods for states to choose from when administering follow-up studies; many states have a combination of methods. In a 1999 follow-up study of the welfare reform, a steep drop in caseloads was reported in every state. More single parents have left welfare for work than ever before, more adults on welfare are working, fewer Americans are living in poverty, and the number of people on welfare is lower than any other year since 1969 (Stateline, 2001). By law, each state is required to place a higher percent of welfare recipients into jobs each year. However, almost 50% of the people who leave welfare are unable to find a job on account of their low level of education (Stateline, 2001). The jobs which welfare leavers are able to find tend to not have vacation time, sick leave, or health insurance benefits. Individuals are then left one crisis away from returning to assistance (Stateline, 2001). When an individual begins working, the rent for his/her subsidized apartment is raised, yet food stamps and tax credits may shrink by as much as \$600 a year (Stateline, 2001). Former welfare recipients tend to find jobs that pay minimum wage, which is not enough to support a family. The study found that 50-70% of recipients are currently employed or have work earnings. The state of Mississippi is the only exception, with 35% of respondents working at the time of the survey (NCSL, 1999). As a result of the 1996 welfare reform, Medicaid enrollment has declined by 7.4% between the years of 1995 and 1997. Approximately 675,000 low-income people lost their Medicaid as a direct result of the welfare reform; over 400,000 of this population were children (Stateline, 2001). Another effect of the reform is that the poorest fifth of single mothers and their children have lost ground. Every state reports a drastic increase in the demand for emergency food and shelter (Stateline, 2001).

Researchers suggest that state legislatures in the future should

- Offer more job training so recipients can acquire and keep better jobs;
- Improve access to child care, transportation, drug treatment, and mental health counseling; and
- Extend services beyond the pool of welfare recipients to include the working poor.

Conclusion

The following tables, with information provided by the Census Bureau, depict how the state of Vermont compares to other states across the Nation. As one can see, Vermont has one of the lowest poverty levels, awards large cash grants, and has very low caseloads comparatively.

TANF Caseloads, March 1999

State	Recipients	Percent Change (93-98)
California	1,818,197	-25%
New York	828,302	-30%
Illinois	382,937	-44%
Texas	313,823	-60%
Pennsylvania	312,364	-48%
Ohio	282,444	-61%
Michigan	263,583	-62%
Florida	198,101	-72%
New Jersey	175,223	-50%
Washington	174,099	-39%
Tennessee	152,695	-52%
Massachusetts	151,592	-54%
Minnesota	140,128	-27%
North Carolina	138,570	-58%
Georgia	137,976	-66%
Missouri	135,383	-48%
Louisiana	111,074	-58%
Indiana	109,675	-48%
Puerto Rico	107,447	-44%
Kentucky	99,560	-56%
Arizona	92,467	-52%
Connecticut	90,799	-43%
Maryland	89,003	-60%
Virginia	88,910	-54%
New Mexico	80,686	-15%
Iowa	60,151	-40%
Oklahoma	56,640	-61%
Rhode Island	53,859	-12%
DC	52,140	-21%
Alabama	46,934	-67%
Hawaii	45,515	-17%
Oregon	45,450	-61%
West Virginia	44,367	-63%
South Carolina	42,504	-72%
Colorado	39,346	-68%
Mississippi	38,426	-78%
Nebraska	34,662	-28%
Maine	34,108	-50%
Kansas	32,873	-62%
Arkansas	29,340	-60%
Wisconsin	28,863	-88%
Alaska	28,020	-20%
Utah	26,428	-50%
Nevada	20,283	-42%
Vermont	18,230	-37%
Delaware	16,581	-40%
New Hampshire	16,090	-44%
Montana	15,508	-55%
Guam	8,620	-69%
South Dakota	8,445	-58%
North Dakota	8,355	-55%
Virgin Islands	3,533	-6%
Idaho	2,897	-86%
Wyoming	1,770	-90%

Maximum Monthly Cash Assistance:**Percent of People Living in Poverty, 1998**

State	Value	State	Value
Alaska	923	New Mexico	20.4
Hawaii	712	Louisiana	19.1
Wisconsin	688	West Virginia	17.8
California	682	Mississippi	17.6
Vermont	639	New York	16.7
Connecticut	636	Arizona	16.6
Massachusetts	579	Montana	16.6
New York	573	California	15.4
Rhode Island	554	North Dakota	15.1
New Hampshire	550	Texas	15.1
North Dakota	549	Oregon	15
Washington	546	Arkansas	14.7
Minnesota	536	Alabama	14.5
Oregon	503	Oklahoma	14.1
Montana	461	North Carolina	14
Michigan	459	South Carolina	13.7
Utah	451	Kentucky	13.5
South Dakota	450	Georgia	13.5
Maine	439	Tennessee	13.4
Kansas	429	Florida	13.1
Iowa	426	Idaho	13
New Jersey	424	Nebraska	12.3
Pennsylvania	421	Rhode Island	11.6
New Mexico	389	Pennsylvania	11.3
Delaware	388	Ohio	11.2
Maryland	388	Michigan	11
Illinois	377	Hawaii	10.9
Nebraska	364	South Dakota	10.8
Ohio	362	Wyoming	10.6
Colorado	356	Nevada	10.6
Virginia	354	Maine	10.4
Nevada	348	Delaware	10.3
Arizona	347	Minnesota	10.3
Wyoming	340	Illinois	10.1
Florida	303	Vermont	9.9
West Virginia	303	New Hampshire	9.8
Missouri	292	Missouri	9.8
Oklahoma	292	Kansas	9.6
Indiana	288	Connecticut	9.5
Georgia	280	Indiana	9.4
Idaho	276	Alaska	9.4
North Carolina	272	Colorado	9.2
Kentucky	262	Iowa	9.1
Arkansas	204	Utah	9
South Carolina	201	Washington	8.9
Texas	201	Virginia	8.8
Louisiana	190	Wisconsin	8.8
Tennessee	185	Massachusetts	8.7
Mississippi	170	New Jersey	8.6
Alabama	164	Maryland	7.2

State	Percent Employed	Average Hourly Wage	Percent Returning to Cash Assistance
Alaska	65%	\$10.52	38%
Arkansas	58%	\$6.99	22%
Arizona	57%	\$7.47	35%
California	61%	N/A	7%
Colorado	65%	\$8.00	20%
D.C.	60%	\$8.13	24%
Florida	57%	\$6.00	N/A
Georgia	59%	N/A	11%
Illinois	63%	\$7.41	28%
Indiana	64%	N/A	N/A
Kansas	58%	N/A	35%
Kentucky	58%	N/A	N/A
Maryland	50%	N/A	25%
Massachusetts	71%	\$8.47	18%
Missouri	65%	N/A	14%
North Carolina	69%	\$7.25	17%
New Jersey	65%	N/A	35%
New Mexico	58%	\$6.00	20%
New York	53%	N/A	21%
Pennsylvania	58%	N/A	N/A
Texas	59%	\$6.35	28%
Utah	56%	\$7.34	N/A
Virginia	55%	\$7.10	17%
Washington	59%	\$7.00	19%
Averages	60%	\$7.43	23%

Source: National Conference of State Legislatures. <http://www.ncsl.org>

Reference

Census Bureau. www.census.gov

Lovejoy, Anna. 2000. "Serving Children and Youth Through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant." *National Governors Association*.
www.nga.org/Pubs/IssueBriefs/2000/000204TANF.asp#Summary.

Reichert, Dana. "Getting to Work: Providing Transportation in a Work-Based System" National Conference of State Legislatures <http://www.ncsl.org/statefed/WELFARE/TRANSCHEM>

National Conference of State Legislatures. 1997. "Top 14 of Welfare Innovations."

<http://www.ncsl.org/statefed/WELFARE/INNOVATE.HTM>

National Conference of State Legislatures. 2001. "Tracking Welfare Reform: Designing Follow-up Studies of Recipients Who Leave Welfare" <http://www.ncsl.org/statefed/welfare/TRACKBRF.htm>

Tweedie, Reichert and O'Connor. 1999. "Tracking Recipients after They Leave Welfare." National Conference of State Legislatures. <http://www.ncsl.org/statefed/welfare/leavers.htm>

Stateline. 2001. "Welfare Reform," *Stateline* April 2001. <http://www.stateline.org>

Wiseman, Michael. "In the Midst of Reform: Wisconsin in 1997" *ANF Discussion Paper 99-03* June 1999

Compiled by Michelle Bellavance and Sarah Fisher on May 1, 2000. Updated by Julie Britt, Thomas Miller, and Robyn Schmidek on April 25, 2001.