



CalWORKs Welfare to Work Participation Study

July 2005

COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
925 L STREET, SUITE 350 * SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 443-1749 * WWW.CWDA.ORG

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Executive Summary	5
I. Introduction	7
<i>Purpose of the Study</i>	7
<i>Background: Welfare Reform</i>	7
<i>Study Process</i>	9
<i>Selection Process</i>	9
II. Current Practices for the Calculation of Work Performance Rates: Recommendations for Change	11
<i>WTW 30 Completion – County Calculation of the WPR</i>	12
<i>Overview of County Responses</i>	12
<i>Finding #1- Participation Verification and Documentation</i>	12
<i>Finding #2- Participating in an Activity – Numerator</i>	13
<i>Finding #3 –Partial Month Participation – Numerator</i>	13
<i>Finding #4 –Aided in the Review Month – Denominator</i>	14
<i>Finding #5 –Sanctions – Denominator</i>	17
<i>How State and Federal Differences Impact the Rate</i>	17
<i>Countable Activities</i>	18
<i>Exemptions and Good Cause</i>	19
<i>How Unemployment Rates Impact the WPR</i>	23
III. County Strategies for Customer/Client Engagement	26
<i>Early Engagement</i>	26
<i>Ongoing Participation and Re-engagement Strategies</i>	27
<i>Customer/Client Engagement</i>	27
<i>Customer/Client and Family Focused Work Plans</i>	28
<i>Monitoring Participation</i>	29
<i>Moving Beyond Non-Compliance and Sanctions</i>	30
<i>Customer/Client Choice – Broad Range of Activities</i>	31
<i>Language-Related Services</i>	34
<i>Post-Employment/Job Retention Services</i>	35
<i>Organizational Structure</i>	35
<i>Performance Standards and Reports</i>	35
<i>Classification of Employees</i>	36
<i>Function: Generic vs. Specialized</i>	36
<i>Training</i>	36
<i>Employee Recognition</i>	37
<i>Budget Impacts</i>	37

IV.	Conclusion and Next Steps	39
	Acknowledgements	40
	Attachments	41
	<i>Attachment 1: County Performance Standards</i>	41
	<i>Attachment 2: County Activities and Specialized Practices</i>	45
	<i>Attachment 3: County Demographics – February 2004</i>	52

TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1: Invited Counties WTW Client Pool- Activities Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Domestic Violence	19
Table 2: Volunteer Counties WTW Client Pool – Activities Mental Health Substance Abuse, Domestic Violence	19
Table 3: Invited Counties: Mandatory Enrollees Who Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements	20
Table 4: Volunteer Counties: Mandatory Enrollees Who Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements	20
Table 5: Fresno County, Orange County, Santa Clara County: WPR Comparative: State Regulations Utilized for WPR versus Federal Regulations Utilized for WPR	21
Table 6: Invited Counties WTW Client Pool Enrolled, Exempt, Sanctioned, Good Cause, Non-Compliance	22
Table 7: Invited Counties WTW Client Pool Enrolled, Exempt, Sanctioned, Good Cause, Non-Compliance	23
Table 8: Invited County Demographics: Population, WTW enrolled, Work Participation Rate, Unsubsidized Employment, Unemployment Rate	24
Table 9: Volunteer County Demographics: Population, WTW enrolled, Work Participation Rate, Unsubsidized Employment, Unemployment Rate	24
Table 10: Invited County Education Level and Language Proficiency	32
Table 11: Volunteer County Education Level and Language Proficiency	32

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) and the enactment of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) made dramatic changes to welfare programs in the United States. In order to meet the legislation's major goal, fostering self-sufficiency through work, states were given significant flexibility to design eligibility criteria, benefit rules and programs that would provide tools for families to transition from welfare to work.

California counties have historically desired to operate meaningful programs that give families tangible tools to improve their lives. Beginning most notably in the mid-1980s with the enactment of Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN), counties tested new models and created new programs aimed at improving customer service. Local governments built partnerships with working-poor families, based on individuals' willingness to take ownership of their lives along with each county's commitment to provide programs that support self-sufficiency.

Since the federal TANF program was enacted in 1996, the employment rates for current and former welfare recipients have increased dramatically. In addition, California has witnessed significant declines in caseloads. Between January 1998 and December 2002, the U.S. Office of Family Assistance reported that TANF caseloads in California dropped by 48.4 percent. Additionally, CalWORKs Performance Incentive funds enabled counties to mount major initiatives to provide comprehensive services to welfare families. Through these county efforts, thousands of parents who were struggling to make ends meet have entered the workforce, backed by a network of services designed specifically to meet their needs.

As the emphasis on work participation rates is increasing at both the national and state level, the County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA) sought to identify and showcase quality Welfare to Work (WTW) programs operated by California counties. To that end, CWDA formed a Work Participation Rate Workgroup tasked with surveying counties regarding their practices and providing useful information for counties and policymakers alike. This report, a product of that effort, reports the findings from two surveys regarding participation rate calculations and promising county efforts to increase participation in Welfare to Work activities.

KEY FINDINGS

Through the survey process, much has been learned. First, flexibility in program design is the major reason for success, and the flexibility in the current law manifests itself in a number of ways. At the state level, California has expanded the services available to customers beyond those prescribed by federal law, in order to meet the unique needs of its customers.

Increasing the types of services that are available to clients gives each individual and family a better chance of reaching the goal of self-sufficiency. At the local level, counties have developed programs designed to meet the needs of each individual being served, rather than a utilizing a cookie-cutter approach. At the individual level, Welfare to Work plans entered into by TANF participants must assess and address the unique needs of each client.

Second, any complete measure of county performance must include participation in activities that meet California rules as well as those meeting federal rules. Because California is committed to building partnerships for success, welfare clients are participating in programs

that are designed to address learning disabilities, domestic violence, mental health and substance abuse, as well as the language and educational needs of individuals and families. In some situations, individuals are determined to be exempt from participating in WTW activities for a specific time period using exemption criteria set forth in state law. However, many of the programs designed to meet the needs of California clients, and most of the exemption criteria, are not countable under federal law. Thus, looking only at federal participation rates paints too narrow a picture of county performance.

Third, instructions provided by California Department of Social Services (CDSS) for the calculation of the WPR lack clarity and direction. Without further clarity, it is not possible to compare rates across counties. Counties that participated in the CWDA surveys do not use the same methodology when determining whether a case is to be included in the denominator and the numerator of the WPR calculation, because they interpret CDSS instructions differently. These different interpretations can have a significant impact on the calculation of statewide participation.

Finally, commitment at the county welfare director level is essential to ensure that welfare clients can make the transition to self-reliance. Articulating a clear vision, setting performance standards, supporting creative approaches to reducing client barriers, allocating adequate resources for specialized services and recognizing successful outcomes all are necessary to build strong partnerships among employees, local communities and working families.

NEXT STEPS

1. Engage in a joint CWDA-CDSS workgroup to clarify specific policies related to the calculation of the Work Participation Rate (WPR). Clarification in the following areas will lead to increased accuracy and continuity in the calculation of the WPR. Policy clarifications may also increase reported county and state participation rates.
 - ✓ Numerator Calculation:
 - a. Define the phrase “participating in an activity”.
 - b. Clarify how to determine hours for partial month participation.
 - ✓ Denominator Calculation:
 - a. Clarify when a county should consider a newly approved CalWORKs case “active” and therefore include it in the denominator.
 - b. Clarify when a case shall be included in or excluded from the denominator when the household contains a family member who has been sanctioned.
2. Disseminate the findings of the report through the convening of a one-day symposium sponsored by CWDA. The symposium will provide a collaborative learning environment to facilitate the distribution of the key findings of the report, to share innovative approaches, and to identify strategies to increase work participation rates throughout the state.
3. On an ongoing basis, encourage collective learning opportunities through the development of conference sessions on customer engagement strategies at upcoming CWDA and CalWORKs conferences.

I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Proposed changes to the TANF program at the federal level, client participation changes mandated by Senate Bill 1104 (Statutes of 2004) and the Governor's proposed budget for 2005-06 continue to increase pressure on counties to meet work participation requirements. TANF Reauthorization is overdue and it is anticipated that action will be taken this year. For all of these reasons, it is imperative that counties position themselves to meet or exceed work participation performance goals.

At this time, however, there is no formal methodology in place to share information regarding work participation rate (WPR) performance and current practices among counties. Although each county reports monthly rates to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), these reported rates are not disseminated. Additionally, disparities exist across counties not only in the monthly rate but also how each county calculates its rate.

In recognition of the many implications of increased federal work participation rate (WPR) requirements and the state-proposed performance measurement system, the County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA) created the WPR Workgroup to investigate, document and share current practices within counties demonstrating sustained high WPR over time. In addition, the workgroup was charged with identifying emerging strategies that could assist counties in attaining higher work participation rates in the future.

Initial discussions within the workgroup identified a need to review the process by which counties report monthly participation data to CDSS. To understand how some counties attain high levels of participation, the workgroup determined that it was critical to understand how participation data was collected and reported by each county. As a result, two surveys were created. The first focused on determining how counties calculate the WPR at the local level and identification of improvements or modifications of the calculation methodology. The second focused on identifying practices to engage and sustain client participation in WTW activities that can ultimately lead to self-sufficiency.

BACKGROUND: WELFARE REFORM AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Congress passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) in 1996. This act created sweeping changes to the country's welfare system through a \$16.5 billion annual block grant program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), which replaced the 60-year-old Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

Congress believed that by increasing states' flexibility to operate the TANF program and provide assistance to needy families, four goals would be achieved:

1. Children would be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives,
2. Dependency of needy parents on government benefits would be reduced through the promotion of job preparation, work and marriage,
3. Out-of-wedlock pregnancies would be reduced and/or prevented, and
4. Formation and maintenance of two-parent families would be encouraged.

Fostering self-sufficiency through work remains the major goal of PRWORA. The act requires states to meet minimum levels of work participation and offers bonuses for high performance

in specific areas. In order to meet participation goals and foster self-sufficiency, states were given significant flexibility to design their own eligibility criteria and benefit rules.

PRWORA requires states to engage a specified percentage of their caseload in specific work and work-related activities. In addition, PRWORA requires individuals to participate in work or work-related activities for a minimum number of hours per week. In 1997, the required minimum participation rate for “all families” was 25 percent. The rate increased each year to a high of 50 percent for 2002 and each year thereafter. The rate for “two-parent families” began at 75 percent in 1997 and increased to 90 percent starting in 1999 and each year thereafter. States are allowed a pro-rata reduction on their participation rate based upon the caseload reduction they realized as a result of welfare reform.

California implemented a state-only program for two-parent families, due to a high degree of concern that the 90-percent two-parent participation rate set in PRWORA could not be achieved. In the most recent report released in November 2004 by the Office of Family Assistance, California met the minimum participation requirements for all families through 2002. However, the main reason California met the minimum was the federal caseload reduction credit. In 2002, California’s required minimum participation rate was reduced to 7 percent as a result of receiving a significant credit for caseload reduction (43 percent). If this credit did not exist, California would not have met the 50 percent participation rate without taking other action to increase participation.

The TANF program, originally authorized for five years, is overdue for reauthorization at the federal level. Bills are currently under consideration in both the House and Senate. The main reauthorization vehicles in each house would impact both the required minimum participation rates and how participation rates are calculated. The Senate bill, currently unnumbered, eliminates the separate two-parent family rate and introduces one rate for all families, beginning at 50 percent in 2006 and increasing by 5 percentage points each year until it reaches 70 percent in 2010. In addition, the Senate bill would eliminate the existing caseload reduction credit and replace it with an employment credit. This credit is capped and the amount of credit states can apply against their participation requirement would decrease over time. The House of Representatives’ proposed bill, H.R. 240, also eliminates the separate two-parent family rate and introduces one rate that increases to 70 percent over the course of several years. Under the House vehicle, the caseload reduction credit would be changed to reflect more recent declines in caseload. Both bills have similar provisions requiring universal engagement of welfare-to-work eligible participants within a specified time frame after they enter the program.

Depending on the final structure of the Reauthorization bill, higher participation rates and potentially lower credits could impact California. However, the universal engagement provisions probably would not greatly affect the state, because California has had similar provisions in state law since 2004. SB 1104 (Statutes of 2004) required universal engagement of recipients in WTW activities; required participation in certain core work activities for a minimum of 20 hours per week; and eliminated prior statute limiting client participation in welfare-to-work activities to no more than 24 months. In general, counties now have a 90-day timeframe to work with each new client to develop and sign an initial WTW plan. The purpose is to engage individuals early in the process in order to increase participation in WTW activities. Eliminating the time limit for WTW participation allows CalWORKs recipients to participate for a longer period of time in the full range of approved activities, enhancing their potential to become self-sufficient.

An additional proposal now before the Legislature would further change the CalWORKs program structure, with the goal of increasing clients' participation in work and work-related activities. As part of his 2005-06 budget strategy, Governor Schwarzenegger proposed a three-year Pay for Performance program in which counties would earn funds based on their performance on several outcome measures and their improvements over time. The Legislature adopted the proposal with a few modifications, including some proposed by counties and other stakeholders. In its current form, the program will provide up to \$30 million during 2006-07 to counties that meet specified standards in three areas. These three areas include the number of CalWORKs recipients who are employed; the rate of participation in federally allowable activities and key state activities such as mental health, substance abuse and domestic violence treatment; and the number of CalWORKs recipients who are employed in the three months after they exit the program.

Key elements of the plan include:

- Requiring the state to work with counties to develop the specific standards on which counties will be measured;
- Allowing 25 percent of earned funds to be spent on eligible families with incomes up to 200 percent of poverty;
- Providing Pay for Performance funds to counties that perform in the top 20 percent of all counties on a standard, in addition to counties meeting the standard.

The pending TANF Reauthorization, enactment of SB 1104, and the likely enactment of a new Pay for Performance program all serve to increase the emphasis on each county's WPR performance. This report is intended to provide insight into how counties can work together and with the state to meet and/or exceed the federal requirements, increase their overall WPR and avoid sanctions.

STUDY PROCESS

Participating counties completed two in-depth surveys. The first survey focused on the calculation of the WPR based on the existing WTW 30 process. Twenty counties participated in the phase of the project. Participating counties included: Alameda, Calaveras, El Dorado, Fresno, Imperial, Kern, Kings, Lake, Mono, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Stanislaus and Yuba.

The second survey focused on each county's CalWORKs/WTW program in an effort to highlight unique approaches to increase work participation. County agencies have a great deal of flexibility within the design of their specific WTW programs. However, very little is known or shared about counties' strategies to successfully engage TANF recipients in work activities. The strategies that counties report using feature a combination of policies, services and administrative procedures that are unique to each county but could provide helpful information and ideas for other counties. Out of the original 20 counties, 18 participated in this phase of the project. Sacramento County and Mono County were unable to complete the second phase due to prior commitments.

SELECTION PROCESS

The 20 counties selected for the study represented rural, suburban and urban areas spread throughout California. Counties could participate in the study by either being invited or by volunteering. To identify 10 counties to invite, the workgroup reviewed six quarters of WPR data for the period of July 2002 through December 2003. Nine of the 10 completed

completed both surveys. The participation rates in these counties, for the month of February 2004, ranged from a low of 36.45 percent to a high of 53 percent as reported to CDSS via the WTW 30.

In addition to the 10 invited counties, the other 48 California counties were given an opportunity to volunteer to participate in the study. The inclusion of volunteer counties ensured that the dynamic differences within the state were addressed. Counties face several challenges in serving the CalWORKs population, including economic conditions, geographic conditions and population diversity. Based on the characteristics of each county (specifically, the size and geographical location, the number of customers served in the CalWORKs program and client demographics such as ethnicity and primary language), 10 additional volunteer counties were selected to participate.

The population of each county participating in the study ranged from 44,533 individuals to more than 3 million individuals. During the study month, February 2004, the number of adults served in the CalWORKs program ranged from a low of 340 adults to a high of 20,749 adults in the counties. Enrollment in the WTW program ranged from 165 to 18,793 adults.

II. CURRENT PRACTICES FOR THE CALCULATION OF WORK PERFORMANCE RATES

The purpose of the first survey completed by all 20 counties was to determine how each county independently interpreted and applied CDSS instructions issued in All-County Letters (ACLs) and All-County Information Notices (ACINs) in order to calculate the monthly WPR for the state-required WTW 30 report. Responses to the survey revealed that all counties adhere to the directions provided in ACL 99-85, ACIN I-16-1 and ACL 03-17, which outline how to complete the WTW 30 report, determine what cases are to be included in the numerator and denominator and calculate the WPR.

Based on the survey findings, policy clarification is needed to ensure consistency in the WPR calculation and to ensure accurate reporting.

However, the study revealed that counties interpret instructions related to the numerator and the denominator differently. The extent to which counties interpret the policies inconsistently impacts the accuracy of the overall WPR calculation. Based on the survey findings, policy clarification is needed to ensure consistency in the WPR calculation and to ensure accurate reporting.

In summary, the survey results give rise to the following recommendations.

1. Clarify and define specific policies and terms related to the calculation of the WPR. Clarification in the following areas will lead to increased accuracy and continuity in the calculation of the WPR. Policy clarifications may help to increase county rates.
 - a. Define the phrase “participating in an activity”. In order to determine whether a case is to be included in the numerator, a county must determine if an individual is “participating.”
 - b. Clarify how partial month participation should be determined for inclusion in the numerator. Basically, when an individual participates for only part of the month, due to an activity ending, clarify how hours of participation are to be calculated.
 - c. Clarify the meaning of the phrase “receive a CalWORKs grant for the month”. Currently, in order for a case to be included in the denominator, a county must determine if a case meets the following condition, “receive a CalWORKs grant for the month.” If a case is determined not to be receiving a CalWORKs grant, it is excluded from the WPR calculation entirely.
 - d. Clarify when cases with sanctioned individuals should be excluded from the denominator. Identify whether the time frame identified in ACL 99-85, ACIN 1-16-01 and ACL 03-17 is accurate, or if all cases with sanctioned individuals (regardless of time in sanction) are to be excluded from the denominator.
2. Recognize that county performance includes both the federally countable work participation rate and state-allowable activities, exemptions and good-cause determinations. Evaluate the existing state-only program for two-parent families to determine whether including this population in the state sample and

the federal WPR calculation would increase the WPR based on the current work participation of this sub-group.

3. Evaluate the possibility of extending job search from six weeks to 12 weeks in counties whose unemployment rate exceeds the federal unemployment rate by 1.5 percentage points. High unemployment rates increase the number of adults in need of CalWORKs and WTW services. Increased unemployment rates may negatively impact a WTW customer's ability to obtain employment within their respective communities.

Each of these findings and recommendations is explained in further detail below.

WTW 30 COMPLETION – COUNTY CALCULATION OF THE WPR

A major goal of the 20-county survey was to determine how each county independently interprets and applies CDSS instructions to calculate its monthly WPR for the WTW 30 reports submitted to the state. Survey responses revealed that all counties adhere to the directions provided in ACL 99-85, ACIN I-16-1, and ACL 03-17, outlining how to complete the WTW 30 report, determine what cases are to be included in the numerator and denominator and calculate the WPR.

However, the survey also found that counties interpret instructions related to the numerator and the denominator differently. The degree to which there is inconsistency in how counties interpret the policies provided by CDSS impacts the accuracy of the WPR calculation. Based on the survey findings, policy clarification is needed to ensure consistency in the calculation of the numerator and the denominator to ensure accurate WPR reporting.

The WPR of the invited counties ranged from a low of 36.45 percent to a high of 53 percent in February 2004. Seven of the counties reported a WPR that was equal to or exceeded 50 percent. Of the volunteer counties, the WPR ranged from a low of 11.2 percent to a high of 41.7 percent. Only two of the volunteer counties had a WPR that was over 36 percent (Alameda and Riverside).

Overview of County Responses

An in-depth analysis of county responses revealed five areas of inconsistency. In order to understand the inconsistencies, each one has been broken into a separate finding. Each finding relates to county specific practices and identifies the potential for variance that could either increase or decrease a county's calculated and reported WPR. This summary is intended to provide a framework in which to evaluate each potential variance, as well as to provide specific information that will assist in improving the WTW 30 process.

Finding #1 – Participation Verification and Documentation

Counties were asked whether client participation was verified during the monthly WTW 30 case review process.¹ All 10 invited counties responded that they had developed verification procedures and were using those processes to research client participation during the preparation of the WTW 30. However, the methods used by counties to verify participation varied greatly. This was consistent with the findings of

¹ Note that any additional procedures used during the WTW 30 process would, to some degree, be a secondary verification as participation generally is documented in client case files and/or the county's automation system by county WTW staff.

the volunteer counties. Two volunteer counties indicated that they also utilized a client self-declaration process for verifying participation in some or all of their activities. One volunteer county indicated that no additional steps are taken to verify client participation during the WTW 30 process – that is, the county relies on the documentation provided by WTW staff in the client file and automated system.

Counties indicated that the manner in which client hours of participation are documented within their automated systems impacts the final determination of whether or not the client is considered to be participating for the required number of hours in a countable activity. This determination impacts the reported WPR. Some counties participating in the study indicated that research at the case manager level, in addition to reviewing information recorded on automated systems, may lead to increased county participation rates.

Finding #2 – Participating in an Activity - Numerator

Counties define the terms “participating in an activity” differently. When evaluating whether a case should be included in the numerator for “All Families Meeting Work Participation Requirements,” survey responses indicated three different methodologies in use across the counties. Counties defined “participating in an activity” in the following ways:

- (1) A client is considered participating when he/she is actually participating in the activity and meeting the mandatory hour requirements.
- (2) A client is considered participating when he/she is scheduled in an activity
- (3) A client is considered participating when he/she is either scheduled or participating in an activity.

Because the number of cases included in the numerator directly impacts the county’s reported WPR, this variance between counties can have a direct impact on the statewide rate.

Finding #3 – Partial Month Participation - Numerator

How a county determines hours of participation impacts the whether or not a client is considered to be participating and, therefore, whether he or she is included in the numerator. The survey found a significant degree of variation between counties in determining client participation when a client participates for only a partial month. Partial-month participation may occur because an activity has ended and the client’s new scheduled activity has not yet begun; a client has stopped attending an activity; the client is enrolled in an educational activity and there is a semester break; etc.

County responses indicated that there are several approaches to this determination; however, the first approach listed is the most common. Each methodology and its potential impact on the county WPR are described below. Partial participation is determined by:

- (1) The actual hours for which the client participated. If the hours are less than the federal requirements, the case is not included in the numerator. This can decrease the county’s reported WPR if the activity ended mid-month and the client is awaiting the start of another activity.
- (2) The average number of hours of participation. This calculation is based on the average number of days the client participated and the client’s

- activity start date. Depending on the hours of participation, this may or may not increase the reported WPR.
- (3) Whether the client participated for the majority of the report month. If the client is determined to have participated for the majority of the report month, the client is considered to have met the participation requirements. This could increase the reported WPR.
 - (4) Successful completion of an activity. This method takes into account the client's hours of participation in conjunction with an evaluation of whether the client successfully completed the activity without dropping out. If the client is determined to have dropped out of the activity, then the client is not considered to have met the participation requirements. This could decrease the reported WPR
 - (5) Whether the partial-month activity is shown as "closed." When a partial-month activity shows closed, participation in the activity is not counted. The case would be considered as not participating and excluded from the numerator. This could decrease the reported WPR.
 - (6) Weekly average participation. The county would convert the client's number of hours in monthly employment to weekly hours and combine the hours with qualifying weekly hours from other activities. Once the total hours are calculated, the hours are compared to standard weekly average. Averaging the hours could lead to a higher reported WPR.
 - (7) Whether the client participated the required hours for at least a portion of the report month. If the client participated the required number of hours for the partial month the case is included in the numerator. Utilizing participation for a partial month instead of a full month could lead to a higher reported WPR
 - (8) Average days participated during the month. Determining the activity start date and calculating an average of days participated during the month, based on that activity start date. This may or may not increase the reported WPR.
 - (9) Average hours of participation over the month. Utilizing an average instead of actual could increase or decrease the reported WPR.
 - (10) The client's planned activity hours for the month. This methodology, which is the least used among this list, may increase the reported WPR.

Finding #4 – Aided in the Review Month - Denominator

Both invited and volunteer counties reported a significant degree of variation within the methodologies used to determine if and when a newly approved CalWORKs case is considered active in the report month. Each county was asked the following question, "For new cases, what date does your county use to determine if the case is active in the report month for the purposes of the WTW 30 (report)?" County responses to this question were inconsistent.

Upon receipt of the monthly list of sample cases generated by CDSS, counties must first determine which cases will be excluded from the review. Excluded cases are not considered in the numerator or denominator and therefore are not considered in the county WPR calculation. For inclusion in the denominator, a case must meet the specifications outlined in ACL 99-86, ACIN I-16-01 and ACL 03-17. Excluded cases include cases that are not aided in the review month.

Responses to the survey indicated that eight different methodologies were being used to determine if a case received a CalWORKs grant for the month and should therefore be included in the denominator. Each methodology and its potential impact on the county WPR are described below. It is important to note that this may be one of many factors impacting the county's reported WPR.

- (1) A new case is considered active in the report month and in receipt of a CalWORKs grant based on the case's Application Date. Counties are required to process applications within 45 days. During the initial eligibility determination, the county is not required to enroll an adult in a WTW activity. The case would be included in the denominator; however, the client is very likely not participating in an activity during this time and therefore would not be included in the numerator. Using the application date is thus likely to decrease the county's reported WPR.
- (2) A new case is considered active in the report month and in receipt of a CalWORKs grant based on the case's Eligibility Determination Date. This may or may not lead to an increased or decreased WPR. However, when compared to utilization of the Application Date, this methodology could increase the reported WPR. Whether this methodology would lead to an increase or decrease would depend on how quickly the county enrolls the adult into an activity and the adult participates in that activity.
- (3) A new case is considered active in the report month and in receipt of a CalWORKs grant in any month in which the case was entitled to cash grant. This can lead to a decrease in the WPR, simply due to processing requirements. For example, a family may apply for CalWORKs during the month of May. Based on processing timelines, the county may retroactively approve a partial grant for May in June or July. Because of this, the case would be included in the WTW 30 denominator for May if it was pulled as a sample case by CDSS. However, a county is not required to enroll an individual into a work activity until it is determined that the family is eligible for TANF – which did not occur until June or July – and so the family would almost certainly be shown as non-participating in May.
- (4) A new case is considered active in the report month and in receipt of a CalWORKs grant for the month based on the eligibility effective date. For the same example as in (3) above, this would mean that the person who applied in May but was found eligible in July was active for the purposes of participation rate calculation starting in July. This methodology could increase or decrease the reported WPR; however, compared to using the application date, entitlement date and/or eligibility determination date, it could have a positive impact on the WPR. Whether this methodology ultimately would lead to an increase or decrease in WPR would depend on when the county enrolls the adult into an activity.
- (5) A new case is considered active in the report month and in receipt of a CalWORKs grant for the month based on the initial date of benefit issuance. Similar to (4) above, this methodology could increase or decrease the reported WPR; however, compared to using the

application date, entitlement date and/or eligibility determination date, it could have a positive impact on the reported WPR. Whether this methodology would lead to an increase or decrease in the WPR would depend on when the county enrolls the adult into an activity.

- (6) A new case is not considered active for the report month in the first month of aid. A new case is considered active in the report month only beginning in its second month of aid. This may lead to an increase in the reported WPR, because this client has a much greater chance of being enrolled in a WTW activity and thus eligible to be included in both the numerator and the denominator. Compared to using the application date, entitlement date and/or eligibility determination date, this methodology could have a positive impact on the WPR.
- (7) A new case is considered active in the report month based on the date a person is scheduled for a WTW activity or the date of the WTW registration. This methodology has the possibility of increasing the reported WPR since this client may have greater chance of being included in both the numerator and the denominator, if the client is not only enrolled but is also participating in an activity.
- (8) A new case is considered active in the report month based on the date the person participated in or attended his/her initial WTW activity. This methodology has the possibility of increasing the WPR since the client has a greater chance of being eligible to be included in both the numerator and the denominator. Compared to using the application date, entitlement date and/or eligibility determination date, this methodology could have a positive impact on the reported WPR.

Instructions issued by CDSS via ACL 99-85, ACIN 1-16-01, and ACL 03-17 do not provide an explanation of how counties are to determine if and when a case is in receipt of a CalWORKs grant. As a result, counties have created their own definitions, as indicated above. Varying definitions directly impact each county's WPR calculation and the overall state WPR. The date used by the county first drives whether or not the case is included in the denominator and then drives whether the case is considered to be participating. For these reasons, it is critical to define when a newly approved case is to be considered an "active" case.

In most counties, there is a period of time between when a client is determined eligible for CalWORKs and when the client is enrolled in or participating in a WTW activity. A recent study conducted by Riverside County study related to participation in the WTW program indicated that more than 25 percent of the clients considered "not engaged" in WTW activities were new applicants who had received TANF for fewer than 30 days. Looking at the data over time, however, Riverside County determined that a significant percentage of these individuals did participate in WTW activities during a 10-month period. Following participants over time provides a clearer picture of the WTW process and the journey of a participant through the system. Point-in-time measures, such as the WPR, provide a snapshot of participation but do not fully reflect what is occurring at the county level.

Finding #5 – Sanctions - Denominator

Survey responses indicated an inconsistent understanding of whether cases containing an unaided (sanctioned) adult or minor head-of-household are to be included in the WPR calculation. Some counties indicated that all cases containing a sanctioned adult or minor head of household were excluded from both the numerator and the denominator when determining the WPR. On the other hand, other counties indicated that they followed the information contained within ACL 99-85, ACIN 1-16-01 and ACL 03-17. The state-issued letters indicate that a case must be included in the denominator when either an adult or minor head-of household was sanctioned for more than three months in a twelve-month period. The counties that are including sanction cases in the denominator experience a decreased participation rate.

When a client fails to show up for his or her initial activity, counties report that it can take up to 130 days to either re-engage the client or apply a sanction to the case. When the client does not attend Job Search or fails to attend an assessment appointment the county must initiate non-compliance procedures per ACL 04-41 and EAS Section 42-721. First, the county must send a notice to the client indicating that a sanction will be imposed if he/she fails to attend a good-cause appointment. The county must schedule the appointment within 20 days of the date of the notice. The client has the right to reschedule the appointment once during this period. This may delay participation for an additional time frame. Per counties responding to the survey, the total time period may be as long as 130 days, up to 90 days to sign the WTW plan under the SB 1104 universal engagement requirements, plus up to 20 days for the initial good-cause appointment, and up to an additional 20 days for a rescheduled appointment.

During the time when the county is providing notice to the client and setting up the good-cause appointment, the case may be selected for inclusion in the sample that is reviewed in order to determine the county's WPR. If this were to occur, the county would be required to exclude the case in the numerator due to non-participation but include the case in the denominator. This results in a negative impact on the county's WPR, lowering the monthly rate, even though the county is adhering to state law.

HOW STATE AND FEDERAL DIFFERENCES IMPACT THE WPR

The WPR calculation completed monthly by each county is based on federal TANF regulations and is not aligned with current CDSS CalWORKs regulations. Conflicts between federal law and state requirements in the areas of countable activities, exemptions and good cause can have a significant impact on each county's work participation performance. When analyzing county performance in CalWORKs, it is thus important to take into account the federally countable WPR, as well as state-countable activities, required state participation exemptions and good-cause determinations made when a client has not participated in a scheduled activity.

Survey counties reported varied percentages of individuals who were enrolled in activities that are not countable under federal law, who were exempt or who were in receipt of good cause for non-participation. Despite the variance, however, these cases had considerable impact on each county's WPR and the overall state rate.

Countable Activities

The study found that enrollment into activities that are required by the state but not countable toward federal participation rates can artificially lower a county's reported WPR. Federal regulations require adults in single-parent families to participate for at least 30 hours per week. To be counted as a work activity for the federal WPR, at least 20 of the 30 hours must be devoted to at least one of nine core activities listed in the chart.

The remaining 10 hours are federally countable if they are in one or more of the nine core activities and/or in three other activities: job skills training that directly relates to employment, education that directly relates to employment and satisfactory attendance in secondary school (only for individuals who do not have a high school diploma or GED).

For adults in two-parent families, a total of 35 hours per week are required. To be counted as work for the federal WPR, 30 hours per week must be spent in core activities and the remaining 5 hours are federally countable if they are spent in one or more of the nine core activities and/or in the three other activities.

California regulations (EAS Section 42-711) require counties to enroll clients into activities that are not allowable under federal law, including assessment and treatment for mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence and learning disabilities. Although an individual may spend many hours participating in the above activities, these hours are not countable toward the federal WPR. This disparity can make a county's federal rate appear much lower than its overall participation rate when state rules are taken into account.

Mental health, substance abuse and domestic violence assessments and activities are critical to the individual and their family. These activities help clients develop the skills necessary to attain work, achieve self-sufficiency, and increase the safety and well being of each family member. Because of the differences between federal and state law, individuals participating in necessary mental health, substance abuse and domestic violence services do not meet the federal work participation requirements unless they are engaged in 30 or 35 hours of federally countable hours each week in addition to their treatment hours.

The total number of clients enrolled into mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence activities varied by county. The percent of total mandatory WTW participants enrolled into one or more of these activities in the invited counties ranged from a low of 2.1 percent in Kern County to a high of 13.4 percent in Orange County (Table 1).

Most counties indicated that between 2.1 percent to 4.9 percent of their WTW participants were enrolled in mental health, substance abuse, and/or domestic violence activities. Two counties exceeded an enrollment rate of 10 percent.

FEDERAL CORE ACTIVITIES

- Unsubsidized employment
- Subsidized employment
- Subsidized public-sector employment
- Work experience
- On-the-job training
- Job readiness assistance
- Community service
- Vocational education
- Providing child care for a community service participant

NON-CORE ACTIVITIES

- Job skills training directly related to employment.
- Education directly related to employment.
- Satisfactory attendance in secondary school.

TABLE 1: INVITED COUNTIES WTW CLIENT POOL -ACTIVITIES
All (Other) Families and Two Parent Families

County	Total Mandatory Participants ¹	Enrolled WTW	Mental Health Services (1)	Substance Abuse Services (2)	Domestic Violence (3)	Total (1,2,3)
Imperial	2653	2391/90%	88/3.3%	7/.3%	4/.2%	99/3.7%
Kern	12,592	7,994/63%	219/1.7%	38/.3%	6/.04%	263/2.1%
Kings	1,850	1,149/62%	145/7.8%	34/1.8%	43/2.3%	222/12%
Orange	9,238	6,726/73%	672/7.3%	60/.6%	506/5.5%	1238/13.4%
San Bernardino	30,699	18,793/61%	544/1.8%	230/.7%	93/.3%	867/2.8%
San Diego	9,958	5,554/56%	183/1.8%	81/.8%	10/.1%	274/2.8%
Santa Clara	9,715	6,746/69%	220/2.3%	136/1.4%	73/.8%	429/4.4%
Stanislaus	5,782	4,529/78%	119/2.1%	79/1.4%	85/1.5%	283/4.9%
Yuba	1,148	838/73%	33/2.9%	13/1.1%	8/.7%	54/4.7%
Statewide	327,994	210,429/64%	7781/2.4%	2180/.7%	3252/1%	13213/4%

WTW25/25A – February 2004, Data Cells 1,28,30,32

The rates in the voluntary counties were somewhat higher than the invited counties. (Table 2) The percent of total mandatory WTW participants enrolled into mental health, substance abuse, and/or domestic violence activities ranged from a low of 2.2 percent in Fresno County to a high of 14.2 percent in El Dorado County (Table 2).

TABLE 2: VOLUNTEER COUNTIES WTW CLIENT POOL -ACTIVITIES
All (Other) Families and Two Parent Families

County	Total Mandatory Participants ²	Enrolled	Mental Health Services (1)	Substance Abuse Services (2)	Domestic Violence (3)	Total (1,2,3)
Alameda	12,614	8941/70%	84/.7%	6/.04%	281/2.2%	371/2.9%
Calaveras	303	165/54%	10/3.3%	8/2.6%	4/1.3%	22/7.3%
El Dorado	704	448/64%	47/6.7%	30/4.3%	23/3.3%	100/14.2%
Fresno	20,407	11,339/56%	239/1.2%	189/.9%	17/.08%	445/2.2%
Lake	1,086	546/50%	43/4%	23/2.1%	3/.3%	69/6.4%
Riverside	14,251	8209/58%	325/2.3%	80/.6%	56/.4%	461/3.2%
San Luis Obispo	1,302	903/69%	19/1.5%	11/.8%	3/.2%	33/2.5%
Santa Cruz	1,486	1021/69%	55/3.7%	16/1%	58/3.9%	129/8.7%
Solano	2,867	2529/88%	43/1.5%	23/.8%	8/.3%	74/2.6%
Statewide	327,994	210,429/64%	7781/2.4%	2180/.7%	3252/1%	13213/4%

WTW25/25A – February 2004, Data Cells 1,28,30,32

These figures demonstrate that counties' actual participation rates were generally higher than their federal-only participation rates.

Exemptions and Good Cause

When an evaluation is conducted solely to determine how the inclusion of cases containing exempt individuals and individuals granted good cause impact individual county WPR's (those situations in which federal and state regulations conflict), the findings reveal a considerable impact. Out of eighteen counties, two-thirds experienced an impact of 15 percent or more. This means that if Exemption and Good Cause cases were removed from the WPR calculation, county rates would increase by 15 percent in two-thirds of the counties participating in this study.

The impact of Exemptions and Good Cause on the participation rate for invited counties ranged from a low of 9 percent to a high of 27 percent. Seven of the invited counties

² Total Mandatory includes enrolled, exempt, sanction, and good cause. Enrolled is the total number of individuals who were enrolled at any time during the month. This count includes non-compliance, employed, and any individual who has been sent a notice scheduling him/her for a WTW appraisal.

reported that at least 15 percent or more of all mandatory enrollees were not participating in the WTW program due to either an exemption or good cause. Of the seven counties, four of the counties experienced rates that exceeded 20 percent (Table 3 Column 3).

It is important to note that there is no statewide information that reflects the number of individuals exempt by exemption category. The number of exempt individuals utilized for this analysis included single parents with a child under one, the only allowable exemption under Federal law. As a result, the percentage increase in the WPR from placing Exempt and Good Cause cases in a separate State program would be somewhat less than the percentages identified above.

**TABLE 3: INVITED COUNTIES: TOTAL MANDATORY ENROLLEES
WHO DO NOT MEET FEDERAL PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS³**

County	Total Mandatory	Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements – Exempt, Good Cause, / % of Mandatory	Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements – Exempt, Good Cause, Non-Compliant/ % of Mandatory**	Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements – Exempt, Sanction, Good Cause, Non-Compliant/ % of Mandatory
Imperial	2653	240/9%	400/15%	424/16%
Kern	12,592	2,228/17%	3,559/28%	5,929/47%
Kings	1,850	348/19%	434/23%	787/43%
Orange	9,238	1,330/15%	1,393/15%	2,575/28%
San Bernardino	30,699	8,138/27%	10,401/34%	14,169/46%
San Diego	9,958	2,400/24%	3,398/34%	5,402/54%
Santa Clara	9,715	2,140/22%	2,819/29%	3,658/38%
Stanislaus	5,782	700/12%	836/15%	1,389/24%
Yuba	1,148	236/21%	284/25%	363/32%
Statewide	327,994	60,850/19%	85,122/26%	141,837/43%

Voluntary counties participating in the study experienced similar impacts on their WPR, however the impact in this group ranged from 7 percent to a high of 31 percent. Six of the nine counties reported that over 15 percent of all mandatory enrollees were not participating in the WTW program due to an exemption or a good cause (Table 4).

**TABLE 4: VOLUNTARY COUNTIES: TOTAL MANDATORY ENROLLEES
WHO DO NOT MEET FEDERAL PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS⁴**

COUNTY	TOTAL MANDATORY	Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements – Exempt and Good Cause/ % of Mandatory	Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements – Exempt, Good Cause, Non-Compliant/ % of Mandatory**	Do Not Meet Federal Participation Requirements – Exempt, Sanction, Good Cause, Non-Compliant/ % of Mandatory
Alameda	12,614	1471/12%	2818/22%	5020/40%
Calaveras	303	93/31%	105/35%	150/50%
El Dorado	704	205/29%	235/33%	286/40%
Fresno	20,407	2082/10%	4191/21%	11,177/55%
Lake	1,086	336/31%	408/38%	612/56%
Riverside	14,251	3712/26%	6038/42%	8386/59%
San Luis Obispo	1,302	204/16%	329/25%	524/40%
Santa Cruz	1,486	306/21%	857/58%	1016/68%
Solano	2,867	210/7%	480/17%	608/21%
Statewide	327,994	60,850/19%	85,122/26%	141,837/43%

³ The percentages might be slightly lower when single parent cases with an exemption for a child under one year of age are excluded from the overall count; however, the data were not available in this level of detail.

⁴ The percentages might be slightly lower when single parent cases with an exemption for a child under one year of age are excluded from the overall count; however, the data were not available in this level of detail.

Counties are required to calculate their WPR rates monthly and report the findings to CDSS via the WTW 30 process. In addition to calculating the monthly WPR for the WTW 30 report, three counties conducted a separate review for the purposes of this study utilizing state regulations to determine their “County Participation Rate.” Fresno, Orange and Santa Clara counties used federal requirements as outlined in ACL 99-85, plus requirements in state regulations, to calculate their county rates. These rates exclude all individuals/cases that were exempt or in receipt of good cause from the numerator and the denominator and defined “countable activities” utilizing CDSS regulations. As demonstrated in Table 5, when counties utilize CDSS regulations to determine the “County Participation Rate,” their WPR increases significantly. The average monthly increase in the WPR over a 12-month period ranged from 15 percent to 30 percent in these three counties alone.

The independent assessments completed by Fresno County, Orange County and Santa Clara County indicate that county performance in California should be based on state law, not just on federal law and federally countable activities.

TABLE 5: STATE REGULATIONS UTILIZED FOR WPR VERSUS
FEDERAL REGULATIONS UTILIZED FOR WPR

Month	Fresno			Orange			Santa Clara		
	State WPR	Federal WPR	Difference	State WPR	Federal WPR	Difference	State WPR	Federal WPR	Difference
10/03	49%	36%	↑ 13%	69%	41%	↑ 28%	65%	48%	↑ 17%
11/03	38%	32%	↑ 6%	82%	51%	↑ 31%	64%	54%	↑ 10%
12/03	43%	24%	↑ 19%	74%	40%	↑ 34%	70%	49%	↑ 21%
01/04	42%	28%	↑ 14%	80%	44%	↑ 36%	63%	52%	↑ 11%
02/04	35%	21%	↑ 14%	82%	50%	↑ 32%	66%	50%	↑ 16%
03/04	38%	22%	↑ 16%	78%	40%	↑ 38%	62%	39%	↑ 23%
04/04	52%	33%	↑ 19%	77%	46%	↑ 31%	65%	58%	↑ 13%
05/05	56%	33%	↑ 23%	78%	45%	↑ 33%	58%	46%	↑ 12%
06/04	47%	25%	↑ 22%	68%	40%	↑ 28%	64%	50%	↑ 14%
07/04	49%	33%	↑ 17%	65%	43%	↑ 22%	60%	52%	↑ 8%
08/04	47%	29%	↑ 18%	63%	47%	↑ 16%	62%	51%	↑ 11%
09/04	53%	29%	↑ 23%	67%	42%	↑ 25%	64%	44%	↑ 20%
Avg.			↑ 17%			↑ 30%			↑ 15%

Exemptions

The inclusion of cases with exempt individuals in the WPR calculation results in reduced rates for all counties and the state as a whole. Federal regulations provide only one exemption from work participation: A single custodial parent caring for a child who is younger than 12 months of age is not required to participate in work activities. The state recognizes this exemption and allows counties to exclude this population from the WPR. Under current California law, counties have the option to shorten the time a single custodial parent is exempt from participation in work activities. In addition, when a single custodial parent has more than one child, the exemption period allowed under California law is limited to 12 weeks. This time limitation may be extended to six months on a case-by-case basis.

California regulations (EAS Sections 42-712.41 through 42-712.49) require counties to exempt individuals from participation in WTW for several reasons beyond the one exemption allowed by federal law.

Federal regulations provide only one exemption from work participation: A single custodial parent caring for a child who is younger than 12 months of age is not required to participate in work activities.

According to criteria developed by the state, counties are required to exempt the following individuals from participating:

1. A child under the age of 16.
2. An individual 16, 17, or 18 years of age attending full-time school in 12th grade or below, or attending vocational or technical school.
3. An individual who is 16 or 17 years of age who has obtained a high school diploma or GED and is enrolled or planning to enroll in postsecondary education.
4. An individual who is 60 years of age or older.
5. An individual who has a disability that is expected to last at least 30 calendar days and that impairs the individual's ability to be regularly employed or participate in a welfare-to-work activity.
6. An aided non-parent caretaker relative who has primary responsibility and providing care for a child who is a dependent or ward of the court, receiving Kin-GAP benefits, or is at risk of placement in foster care.
7. An individual whose presence is required in the home because of the illness or incapacity of another member of the household.
8. The parent or other relative who has primary responsibility for personally providing care to a child six months of age or under.
9. A woman who is pregnant if the pregnancy impairs her ability to be regularly employed or participate in welfare to work activities.
10. An individual who is a full-time volunteer in the Volunteers in Services to America Program (VISTA).

In February 2004, 16 percent of all California WTW mandatory registrants were exempt from participation. Of the invited counties, four counties exceeded the state average. The percentage of exempt individuals per invited county ranged from 9 percent to 24 percent (Table 6).

TABLE 6: INVITED COUNTIES WTW CLIENT POOL⁵
All (Other) Families and Two Parent Families

COUNTY	TOTAL MANDATORY (TM)	ENROLLED/ % OF TM	EXEMPT/ % OF TM	SANCTION/ % OF TM	GOOD CAUSE/ % OF TM	NON-COMPLIANCE/ % OF TM
Imperial	2,653	2,391/90%	238/9%	24/.9%	2/.07%	160/6%
Kern	12,592	7,994/63%	1,435/11%	2,370/19%	793/6%	1,331/11%
Kings	1,850	1,149/62%	333/18%	353/19%	15/.8%	86/4.6%
Orange	9,238	6,726/73%	1,192/13%	1,182/13%	138/1.5%	63/.7%
San Bernardino	30,699	18,793/61%	6,031/20%	3,768/12%	2,107/7%	2,263/7%
San Diego	9,958	5,554/56%	2,400/24%	2,004/20%	0/0%	998/10%
Santa Clara	9,715	6,746/69%	1,485/15%	839/9%	645/7%	689/7%
Stanislaus	5,782	4,529/78%	587/10%	553/10%	113/2%	136/2%
Yuba	1,148	838/73%	223/19%	79/7%	8/.7%	53/5%
Statewide	327,994	210,429/64%	50,911/16%	56,715/17%	9,939/3%	24,272/7%

Source: February 2004 – WTW25/WTW25A

⁵ Total mandatory includes enrolled, exempt and sanction. Enrolled is the total number of individuals who were enrolled at any time during the month. This includes good cause, non-compliance, any individual enrolled in state approved activities and any individual who has been sent a notice scheduling him/her for a WTW appraisal.

The findings for invited counties are consistent with the findings of the volunteer counties, five of which exceeded the state average. The percentage of exempt participants in volunteer counties ranged from 7 percent to 29 percent (Table 7).

TABLE 7: VOLUNTEER COUNTIES WTW CLIENT POOL⁵
All (Other) Families and Two Parent Families

COUNTY	TOTAL MANDATORY (TM)	ENROLLED/ % of TM	EXEMPT/ % of TM	SANCTION/ % of TM	GOOD CAUSE/ % of TM	NON-COMPLIANCE/ % of TM
Alameda	12,614	8,941/70%	1,262/10%	2,202/17%	209/2%	1347/11%
Calaveras	303	165/54%	83/27%	45/15%	10/3%	12/4%
El Dorado	704	448/64%	163/23%	51/7%	42/6%	30/4%
Fresno	20,407	11,339/56%	1,976/10%	6,986/34%	106/.5%	2109/10%
Lake	1,086	546/50%	320/29%	204/19%	16/1%	72/7%
Riverside	14,251	8,209/58%	2,501/18%	2,330/16%	1,211/8%	2326/16%
San Luis Obispo	1,302	903/69%	202/16%	1,95/15%	2/.2%	125/10%
Santa Cruz	1,486	1,021/69%	294/20%	1,59/11%	12/1%	551/37%
Solano	2,867	2,529/88%	210/7%	128/4%	0/0%	270/9%
Statewide	327,994	210,429/64%	50,911/16%	56,715/17%	9,939/3%	24272/27%

Source: February 2004 – WTW25/WTW25A

Good Cause

Counties are required to apply good cause criteria (EAS Section 42.713.2) when clients enrolled in WTW fail to participate. For the purposes of calculating the WPR, counties are required to include individuals who receive good cause for not participating in their WPR calculations. This has a negative impact on the county and state participation rates.

The state average for the percent of individuals determined to have good cause as compared to total mandatory participants was 3 percent for the month of February 2004. Of the invited counties, three counties exceeded the state rate. The percentages ranged from 0 percent to 7 percent (Table 6). Four counties reported that less than 1 percent of the WTW mandatory participants were in a good cause status. This is consistent with the findings of the volunteer counties. Three of the volunteer counties either met or exceeded the state rate of 3 percent. The percentages ranged from 0 percent to 8 percent. (Table 7) Five counties reported a rate of 1 percent or less. More review in this area may be needed to determine county policies and procedures regarding the granting of exemptions and/or good cause.

HOW UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IMPACT THE WPR

High unemployment rates may have a direct impact on the number of adults in need of CalWORKs and WTW services. Higher unemployment can make it more difficult for WTW participants to find work in their communities. The study revealed that 7 of the 10 counties reporting above-average unemployment rates also experienced increased levels of adults on aid as well as increased enrollment in WTW.

Five of the invited counties reported double-digit unemployment rates ranging from 12.8 percent and 17.5 percent for February 2004. These rates far exceeded the state's rate of 6.6 percent and the federal rate of 5.5 percent for the same month. The majority of these counties also reported a higher percentage of adults receiving CalWORKs grants; two-thirds reported a higher percentage of their adult CalWORKs population enrolled in the WTW program as compared to the state average. The six counties that reported unemployment

rates above the state average reported that only 20 percent to 33 percent of their participants had obtained employment during the month of February 2004.

TABLE 8: INVITED COUNTIES DEMOGRAPHICS

Highlighted areas represent counties in which the unemployment rate exceeds the state rate

COUNTY	POPULATION (Individuals)	CALWORKS*/ % OF POPULATION (Adults)	WELFARE TO WORK**/ % OF CALWORKS (Adults)	WPR	UNSUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT*** /(% OF WTW POPULATION)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE***
Imperial	196,000	2,628/1.3%	2,391/91%	50.3%	739/31%	17.5%
Kern	724,900	8,736/1.2%	7,994/92%	53%	2,446/31%	14.0%
Kings	137,000	1,560/1.1%	1,149/74%	34.2%	376/33%	16.3%
Orange	3,017,298	8,116/1.26%	6,726/83%	50%	2,597/39%	3.6%
San Bernardino	1,888,550	20,749/1.1%	18,793/91%	51.6%	7,542/40%	5.5%
San Diego	2,900,000	12,182/4%	5554/46%	52%	2,022/36%	4.0%
Santa Clara	1,718,500	8,815/5%	6746/77%	50%	1,377/20%	6.9%
Stanislaus	481,600	5,176/1.1%	4529/88%	36.5%	1,052/23%	12.8%
Yuba	63,000	1,467/2.3%	838/57%	50%	218/26%	16%
State of California	35,394,062	277,403/8%	210,429/76%	unknown	63,045/30%	6.6%

* CA 237 CW Report Item 8a2 (Cells 69,70, and 71) and 8b2 (cells 87,88, and 89)

**WTW 25/WTW 25A Total Enrolled- Feb. 2004

***February 2004

Half of the volunteer counties that experienced unemployment rates over the State unemployment rate of 6.6 percent also reported a higher percentage of clients receiving CalWORKs grants. Volunteer counties that experienced unemployment rates exceeding 6.6 percent reported that between 17 percent to 23 percent of their participants were employed.

TABLE 9: VOLUNTEER COUNTIES DEMOGRAPHICS

Highlighted areas represent counties in which the unemployment rate exceeds the state rate

COUNTY	POPULATION (Individuals)	CALWORKS*/ % OF POPULATION (Adults)	WELFARE TO WORK**/ % OF POPULATION (Adults)	WPR	UNSUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT/ %OF WTW POPULATION	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE***
Alameda	1,498,000	10,470/6%	8941/85%	36.7%	2901/32%	6.2%
Calaveras	44,533	340/7%	165/49%	34%	59/36%	8.5%
El Dorado	156,299	755/5%	448/59%	28.8%	168/38%	6.1%
Fresno	823,900	15281/1.9%	11,339/74%	21%	2641/23%	15.5%
Lake	65,000	940/1.5%	546/58%	27.9%	119/22%	11.3%
Riverside	1,782,650	11445/6%	8209/72%	41.7%	4180/51%	5.7%
San Luis Obispo	253,118	1073/4%	903/84%	20%	166/18%	3.3%
Santa Cruz	260,000	1185/5%	1021/86%	29%	173/17%	10.5%
Solano	412,336	2753/6%	2529/92%	11.2%	586/23%	6.1%
State of California	35,394,062	277,403/8%	210,429/76%	unknown	63,045/30%	6.6%

* CA 237 CW Report Item 8a2 (Cells 69,70, and 71) and 8b2 (cells 87,88, and 89)

**WTW 25/WTW 25A Total Enrolled- Feb. 2004

***February 2004

Under federal law, if the unemployment rate of the state is at least 50 percent greater than the unemployment rate of the United States, the period of time that the job search activity is countable toward the calculation of the WPR extends from 6 weeks to 12 weeks in a one-year period. The federal unemployment rate for this period of February 2004 was 5.6 percent. For California to qualify, California's rate of unemployment for the same period would need to be equal to or exceed 8.4 percent.

In February 2004, California's statewide unemployment rate was less than the unemployment rates of many of its counties. Thus, counties that exceeded 8.4 percent unemployment could not take advantage of the extended job search provisions in federal

TANF law. For those counties, this limitation may have impacted their ability to move clients into employment early in the WTW process.

It is important to note that 9 of the 18 counties studied (50 percent) had unemployment rates that exceeded 8.4 percent (Table 8 and Table 9). Statewide, 28 counties reported unemployment rates greater than 8.4 percent in February 2004. Although currently prohibited by federal law for inclusion as a countable activity, the extension of the job search activity to 12 weeks would help WTW enrollees who reside in counties that experience high unemployment rates to find employment earlier in the WTW process.

State law provides that job search activities may be extended beyond four weeks (EAS Section 42-711.534). However, when participation in the activity extends beyond four consecutive weeks or six weeks within a federal fiscal year, the activity is not countable under federal law and the county's WPR is negatively impacted. To assist clients, recognize the continuing high unemployment in some counties and eliminate the impact on the WPR the state could establish a state-only program to exclude the above cases from the WPR calculation, absent a change in federal law extending job search activities when specific counties/districts within a state exceeded federal unemployment rates by 1.5 percent.

III. COUNTY STRATEGIES FOR CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT

California counties are committed to developing and administering WTW programs in a manner that best meets our customers' needs. Flexibility is the key. Since the introduction of PRWORA and its implementation in California via the CalWORKs statutes, counties have diligently worked to develop programs that address the barriers that prevent single parents and families from achieving self-sufficiency.

In order to increase the work performance rates statewide, the study counties were asked to share information about how WTW programs are administered in their county. Specifically, the participating counties were asked to share how their unique approaches to meeting customer needs increased work performance rates and client employment.

Counties provided operational information and strategies in the following areas:

- Early Engagement
- Ongoing Participation and Re-Engagement
- Participation Monitoring
- Organizational Structure
- Budget Impacts

EARLY ENGAGEMENT

Research suggests that engaging clients early in the WTW program is half the battle. Once engaged, clients demonstrate a willingness to take personal responsibility for attaining self-sufficiency. Delayed engagement results in lower work participation rates for counties and creates a cycle of non-participation and continued dependence for clients.

Counties participating in the survey identified that informing clients early in the eligibility determination process about work requirements and available support services is critical for improving work participation rates. In fact, the majority of counties participating in the study provide information regarding the WTW program in the client's initial CalWORKs application Intake interview. Case managers of varying classifications, Eligibility Technician to Social Worker, explain work participation requirements.

A SAMPLE OF PROMISING PRACTICES AMONG COUNTIES

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contacting clients prior to their initial appointment through phone calls and reminder mailings.• Conducting or referring clients to orientation sessions the same day a client applies for TANF.• Offering orientation and assessment sessions in multiple languages, in multiple locations, at multiple times throughout the day.• Scheduling orientation and appraisal appointments on the same day. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing transportation to appointments and child care providers when there is not an alternative method of transportation for the client.• Providing clients raffle tickets to orientation and conducting a monthly gift basket drawing.• Utilizing cheerful-looking invitations.• Making second appointment letters more official with clear language about the potential imposition of a sanction. |
|--|---|

Riverside County informs individuals applying for CalWORKs cash assistance about WTW participation requirements prior to the application interview. Initial Contact Case Management (ICCM) staff conduct informational sessions, prior to the application interview, in order to ensure clients understand the importance participation in WTW programs, expectations, and available supportive services.

Delays in a client's participation in his or her first activity often are attributed to their inability to attend scheduled appointments. Most counties indicated that high client no-show rates for orientation and appraisal were due to barriers such as a lack of adequate transportation and child care, substance abuse, domestic violence and/or mental health issues.

ONGOING PARTICIPATION AND RE-ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Early engagement is important but it is not enough to sustain client participation. Counties utilize several methodologies to encourage and assist clients in successfully completing the activities outlined in the WTW plans. Diversity in the activities offered by counties as well as ongoing communication play a key role in helping participants stay in activities and remain motivated. Counties have also developed specific strategies to increase ongoing customer participation as well as re-engage customers during episodes of non-compliance and sanction. Case managers utilize special assessment tools to determine client needs as well as strength-based practices to regularly follow-up with clients, reassess individual and family circumstances, modify employment goals, address barriers to participation/employment, and provide encouragement.

Counties shared specific practices in the following areas:

- Customer/Client Engagement
- Customer/Client and Family Focused Work Plans
- Participation Monitoring
- Moving Beyond Non-Compliance and Sanctions
- Customer/Client Choice- Broad Range of Activities
- Language Services
- Post Employment and Job Retention

Customer/Client Engagement

Counties stressed the fact that successful customer engagement begins early and continues throughout the participant's time in the WTW program. As noted above, giving customers information early in the application process helps to ensure successful outcomes for participants and leads to increased work performance rates. Each county affirmed that customer engagement begins with the first customer contact, but that is only the beginning.

***Counties affirmed
that customer
engagement begins
with the first client
contact – but that is
only the beginning.***

Upon approval for TANF, customers must be notified of the requirement to participate in an orientation/appraisal interview. In most counties, notification occurs through letters sent to the customers. In order to increase participation, Kern County schedules a home visit rather than an office visit for the initial orientation/appraisal appointment. In addition, the participant is contacted prior to the appointment to remind him/her of the date and time. Imperial, Kings, San Diego, Riverside and San Luis

Obispo counties conduct home visits when a client misses his or her first scheduled

appointment. The home visit is used to assess whether the customer has special needs, to assist in reducing family related barriers and to reduce the likelihood of a sanction.

Counties have designed orientation sessions and appraisal processes to meet the needs of the participants. For example, in counties that serve customers that are not proficient in the English language, customers are scheduled for sessions that are conducted in their primary language. Counties have also established sites that are convenient for the customer and provide transportation for individuals who identify the need.

Santa Cruz County conducts orientation sessions for the WTW program during the initial application interview. In Yuba County, both orientation and appraisal are conducted during the initial application interview. Both counties have determined that this process reduces the number of times the participant must attend scheduled appointments, provides the case manager with information about participants needs early in the process, initiates engagement between the client and the case manager and reduces incidents of no-show and non-compliance. In addition to conducting orientation and appraisal during the initial application process, Kings County requires the applicant to participate in an “upfront” job search diversion program. Applicants are screened for the diversion program. If the applicant has emergency needs, additional services are provided.

Imperial County has centrally located orientation and appraisal activities. Orientation and appraisal are conducted in three major cities and transportation is available. Orange County conducts an orientation session immediately upon the conclusion of the application interview. This practice also decreases the number of trips a customer must make and is assisting in increasing the county’s WPR.

Customer/Client and Family Focused Work Plans

All survey counties stressed the importance of the WTW plan and the critical role it plays in customer engagement. To be effective, the work plan must match the interests and abilities of the participant. The message communicated by counties to participants is that self-sufficiency is achieved through work. However, counties understand that the path to self-sufficiency is likely to be different for each participant. Therefore, the WTW plan is centered on the participant’s unique strengths, needs and goals.

Once a participant has attended orientation, appraisal and job search (which may vary depending on his or her needs), the case manager works closely with the participant to select activities that best meet his or her employment and personal success goals utilizing strength-based practices. This approach helps an individual identify his or her existing capabilities and resources. Stanislaus County identified that strength-based practices help identify the abilities and capabilities of the customer, create a collaborative relationship between the customer and the case manager and build on what is working for the customer. Strength-based practices can ensure that individuals are actively involved in making decisions about their future. When the individual has the opportunity to partner in the development of the plan, he or she has a higher degree of commitment and a higher success rate, as demonstrated by the invited counties’ work participation rates.

When an individual has the opportunity to partner in the development of the plan, he or she has a higher degree of commitment and a higher success rate.

According to the survey counties, it is important for case managers to use information from customer assessments, including basic skills assessments; identification of learning disabilities, mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence needs; information from social workers; and evaluations provided by staff and contractors that conducted job search activities, to assist with the identification of activities that will help each participant achieve self-sufficiency. During the appraisal and assessment process, case managers work with individuals to identify family needs including housing, transportation, child care, medical issues, a child with a disability or a child in need of counseling, mental health services, drug and alcohol services, domestic violence services and school attendance issues. Some counties reported that case managers are working together with other professionals, such as social workers in children's services and the participants, to develop coordinated case plans where appropriate.

Counties report that they utilize the WTW plan to clearly identify participation requirements and the consequences of non-participation. The WTW plan:

- (1) Identifies the participant's strengths and addresses the needs of the entire family.
- (2) Is utilized to establish goals for the participant and is revised to meet the participant's needs
- (3) Is a plan that the participant can refer to over time
- (4) Provides a roadmap for the participant by defining what activities are required and the time frames to meet participation requirements to achieve self-sufficiency and avoid sanctions

Monitoring Participation

Monitoring each client's progress is critical to continued participation in program activities. Continuously assessing a participant's progress towards achieving the goals outlined in his or her WTW plan is an essential part of assuring high participation. Progress monitoring allows case managers to recognize the accomplishments of the participants, immediately identify nonparticipation, reengage the participant quickly by helping to resolve barriers that prevent participation and hold participants responsible for achieving self-sufficiency.

The methods utilized to track participation at the case-worker level are fairly consistent between counties. Nine counties reported that they review each participant's progress on at least a monthly basis. These counties rely on monthly attendance reports, employer records, quarterly income reports, personal interactions with customers and progress reports to determine participant progress. Information about participants' progress is obtained from providers, contractors and participants themselves via phone, mail, office visits and e-mail. Three of the nine counties review progress on a weekly basis, depending on the activity in which the participant is enrolled. Communication between case managers and providers/contractors is essential in determining participation and results.

In order to confirm the participant's progress in designated activities, San Diego County case managers utilize information from attendance reports, progress forms and site visits to track each participant's progress. Information is received from vocational and educational institutions, service providers and employers.

Orange County requires case managers to make at least one monthly contact with each participant to discuss the entire case/family situation, including a discussion of attendance and progress in any WTW activity. In addition, each case manager is required to conduct a

minimum of two in-person meetings with the participant to review the participant's progress towards meeting the goals outlined in the WTW plan and assessing individual/family needs. Yuba County utilizes office assistants to monitor participant attendance. The office assistants update attendance records daily and notify case managers regarding non-participation.

Moving Beyond Non-Compliance and Sanctions

Study counties indicated that they use sanctions as a last resort when a participant does not participate in an assigned activity and fails to either establish or follow through with a conciliation plan. Survey responses indicated that counties view the sanction process as a way to encourage an individual to participate in the WTW program; that is, sanctions are not a punishment, but rather an opportunity to motivate an individual to cooperate while identifying and resolving barriers to participation. Curing a sanction restores the grant to its original amount

Generally, WTW participants are subject to sanctions when they fail or refuse, without good cause, to sign a WTW contract; participate in any assigned program activity, including a self-initiated program (SIP); provide required proof of satisfactory progress in any assigned program activity, including a SIP; or accept a job offer that meets criteria specified in the state regulations. The state average for the percent of individuals determined to be in non-compliance as compared to total mandatory participants was 7 percent. Eleven of the study counties reported rates that equaled or exceeded the state rate. (Table 3 and Table 4)

When the county identifies that an individual has failed to comply with one or more of these program requirements, the county is required to send a written notification to the individual. Several counties go beyond the mandated notification process in order to attempt to re-engage the customer during periods of non-compliance. Common practices include phone calls to the participant and scheduled office visits to help determine why the participant was unable to comply with their assigned activity.

Eight of the study counties encourage home visits, in addition to the methods listed above, to assess participant's progress towards achieving the goals outlined in the WTW plan: Imperial, Kern, Kings, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Stanislaus and Yuba. Home visits are used to re-engage the participant, continue the collaborative relationship between the customer and the case manager, identify barriers, establish good cause for non-participation and build on what is already working for the customer. Ideally, home visits can help to prevent sanctions from occurring.

Orange County contacts other case managers to assist in re-engaging the participant. Ongoing service workers for CalWORKs, including ancillary, child care and transportation staff, are assigned to re-engage the WTW participant and work as a team to promote cooperation and compliance and meet the needs of the participant.

Stanislaus County utilizes strength-based coaching and counseling techniques to re-engage participants. If the case manager is not successful in re-engagement, a referral is made to the Building Successful Tomorrow's Team, a multidisciplinary team consisting of social workers, a public health nurse, and a substance abuse counselor. A home visit and assessment are conducted. The team then works in partnership with the participant and the case manager to help prevent or cure a sanction.

The state average for the percent of individuals sanctioned as compared to total mandatory participants was 17 percent in February 2004. Five counties exceeded the state rate. County

sanction percentages ranged from low of less than 1 percent to a high of 34 percent. (Table 6 and Table 7).

A study conducted by Riverside County confirms that individuals sanctioned for non-participation do not remain in the sanction status for a long duration. In fact, more than half of the individuals sanctioned in Riverside County, became exempt, cured their sanction or went off of aid within 10 months. Patience and perseverance can ultimately lead to increased work participation.

Many counties participating in the study indicated a desire to focus concentrated resources on sanctioned individuals. Several counties utilize various outreach strategies to encourage sanctioned individuals to participant. Case managers work with sanctioned individuals to develop strategies to resolve barriers, identify and enroll in activities that support his/her interests and receive supportive services that will lead to self-sufficiency.

San Bernardino County recently implemented a pilot program with the primary focus of re-engaging sanctioned participants. The pilot program included inviting the participant to the office to pick-up his/her monthly check. Case managers discussed with the individual the reason why he/she chose a sanction. Of more than 500 individuals contacted, approximately 20 percent cured the sanction and have stayed compliant since that time. In the same pilot, some clients chose to terminate their case, rather than supply the information necessary to impose vendor pay.

Orange County uses a specialized social worker to bring sanctioned individuals back into the WTW program. The social worker contacts the client, discusses the value of participation and offers services to overcome barriers that may exist for the client and his or her family.

Stanislaus County also utilizes the skills of social workers to re-engage sanctioned individuals. Case managers refer sanction cases to the Building Successful Tomorrows (BST) team. The team consists of three social workers, one alcohol and drug specialist and a public health nurse. The case manager, BST team and client work together to develop a plan of re-engagement.

Kern County's case managers send letters to sanctioned individuals inviting them to participate and listing the steps needed to cure the sanction. In addition, Kern County has dedicated three staff positions to perform outreach activities with the sanctioned population, including making home calls, calling and sending letters.

Riverside County has case managers specifically assigned to stay in contact with sanctioned participants and offer assistance for curing the sanction. Kings County, like Kern County, also conducts periodic reviews on sanctioned individuals (at least every six months). The periodic reviews consist of follow-up contact by phone, mail and home visits.

Customer/Client Choice - Broad Range of Activities

The design of the CalWORKs program gives counties a considerable amount of discretion and flexibility in the development of WTW services. Section 11322.6 of the Welfare and Institutions Code identifies 19 separate kinds of activities allowable under state law. Federal law defines only 12 allowable work activities. As noted earlier, this variance can artificially lower the WPR each county reports to the state. However, because state law provides

broader flexibility to meet client needs, CalWORKs clients may have a better chance of attaining self-sufficiency.

As of February 2004, 130,284 individuals statewide were participating in WTW activities. Of these, approximately 67,466 individuals (52 percent) were participating in some form of actual employment (unsubsidized employment, self-employment, subsidized private/public sector employment and supported work or transitional employment. An additional 25,201 (19 percent) were enrolled in some type of education/training and 13,213 (10 percent) were enrolled in mental health, substance abuse or domestic abuse services. The remaining individuals 24,404 (19 percent) were enrolled in appraisal, assessment, reappraisal, job search/job readiness, Self-Initiated Programs or other activity allowable under state law.

Per the 2000 Census 33.2 percent of California residents over the age of 18 have less than a high school diploma/GED. Based on county records the percentage of clients currently enrolled in the Welfare to Work program that do not have a high school diploma/GED ranges from a low of 29 percent to a high of 73 percent (Table 10 and Table 11).

**TABLE 10: EDUCATION LEVEL AND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
WTW ENROLLEES (Invited Counties)**

COUNTY	EDUCATION LEVEL (NO HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED)	PRIMARY ETHNIC ORIGIN	NOT PROFICIENT IN ENGLISH	PRIMARY LANGUAGES (EXCLUDING ENGLISH)
Imperial	43%	White, Hispanic, Black	33%	Spanish, American Sign, Filipino
Kern	48.4%	Hispanic, White, Black	10%	Spanish, Tagalog, Cambodian
Kings	45%	White, Hispanic, Black	15%	Spanish, Portuguese, Hmong
Orange	45%	Hispanic, White, Vietnamese	28%	Spanish, Vietnamese, Farsi
San Bernardino	50.7%	Hispanic, Black, White	8.3%	Spanish, Vietnamese, Cambodian
San Diego	42%	White, Hispanic, Black	30%	Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic
Santa Clara	54%	Hispanic, White, Vietnamese	31%	Spanish, Vietnamese
Stanislaus	49%	White, Hispanic, Cambodian	10%	Spanish, Cambodian, Assyrian
Yuba	29%	White, Hispanic, Laotian	7%	Spanish, Cambodian, Hmong
California	33.2%*		9.1%**	Spanish, Cambodian, Hmong

*Overall population (2000 Census)

** Overall population: Language other than English Spoken (2000 Census)

**TABLE 11: EDUCATION LEVEL AND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
WTW ENROLLEES (Volunteer Counties)**

COUNTY	EDUCATION LEVEL (NO HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED)	PRIMARY ETHNIC ORIGIN	NOT PROFICIENT IN ENGLISH	PRIMARY LANGUAGES (EXCLUDING ENGLISH)
Alameda	32.8%	Black, Hispanic, White	11.8%	Spanish, Cantonese, Vietnamese
Calaveras	35%	White, Hispanic, American Indian	0%	none
El Dorado	Not available	White, Hispanic, Black	1%	Spanish, Farsi
Fresno	56.5%	White, Hispanic, Black	10.9%	Spanish, Hmong
Lake	50%	White, Hispanic	5%	Spanish
Riverside	34.8%	Hispanic, White, Black	9.2%	Spanish, Vietnamese
San Luis Obispo	Not available	White, Hispanic, Black	Not available	Spanish
Santa Cruz	73%	White, Hispanic, Vietnamese	10%	Spanish, Vietnamese
Solano	Not available	White, Black, Hispanic	Not available	Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese
California	33.2%*		9.1%**	Spanish, Cambodian, Hmong

*Overall population (2000 Census)

** Overall population: Language other than English Spoken (2000 Census)

Counties participating in the study have developed a broad range of activities for customers participating in their counties. The activities are designed to meet clients' unique needs, including education, while increasing participation and employment. The design of the CalWORKs program gives counties considerable discretion to develop vocational training; on-the job training; education; and substance treatment, domestic violence and mental health services. Because there are too many unique programs to name individually in this report, the programs are outlined by county in a separate attachment. (Attachment 2), with a few programs highlighted below in order to demonstrate the diverse offerings.

- San Diego County has incorporated mini-workshops during Network Center/Job Search. The workshops provide information on legal services, criminal record expungement, motor vehicle violations, court processes, budgeting, credit repair, partnering, health relationships, self-esteem, employment background screening and Section 8 Housing.
- Kern County has developed weeklong workshops that help participants build life and coping skills. These workshops are utilized as short-term activities, when participants are awaiting the start of a longer-term activity. Kern County utilizes this approach to increase participation while also offering instruction in necessary life skills.
- Like Kern County, Santa Clara County also identified the need to develop short activities while clients wait for entry into their next scheduled activity. The county's response is entitled The Bridge, a program using the nationally recognized motivational life skill curriculum of Women in Community Service. Participation can be as short as one week or up to eight weeks. Santa Clara has also implemented the CalCAP program, which works with part-time employed clients to identify strategies to locate full-time employment while also developing appropriated activities to complete their hourly participation requirements.
- Stanislaus County has implemented multiple vocational training programs for clients. These programs are designed in partnership with local colleges, other county departments, community collaborates, and schools. In addition, the programs have been designed to meet challenges in education levels and language skills. Available programs include Certified Nursing Assistant, Office Assistant, Welding Certification, Construction Technology, Manufacturing Operator, Maintenance Welding, Print Press Processes, Flexographic Printing, Automotive Brakes and Suspension and Automotive Transmissions and Transaxles. In addition, in partnership with Modesto City Schools, Center for Senior Services, and the county's Adult Services Division, monolingual Spanish clients and English-speaking clients are trained in Home Health Care. Clients graduating the program are certified and placed with elderly individuals and persons with disabilities needing In-Home Supportive Services.
- Yuba County designed a specialized program to serve the unique requirements of its customer base. The county's CanWORKs program provides specialized work activities for participants who live in the county's most remote areas. The county also developed a contractor apprentice program called Youth Build. The program enables clients to obtain a high school diploma while learning job skills building houses for low-income families to purchase. The program provides educational opportunities and employment opportunities while giving valuable assets to the community at large.

- Solano County has developed a program for parents that become employed during Job Club, but are determined to be “underemployed.” The program provides activities and workshops designed at increasing wages and responsibility. PRIDE workshops include topics on reducing the stress of parenting, moving beyond the past, managing money, exploring careers, test taking, typing, math skills, and job advancement.
- Fresno County has implemented two programs, JOBS First and JOBS 2000. Through JOBS First and JOBS 2000, clients not only receive job search and assessment they also receive child support and legal services through interagency agreements. Each month a class of participating clients goes to court with the assistance of a Public Defender and District Attorney to settle misdemeanor legal issues that have impaired their ability to become employed and self-sufficient.

Language-Related Services

It is much more difficult to access and provide federally allowable WTW activities when clients are not proficient in the English language. A county with a larger percentage of WTW clients who have diverse language needs may have a harder time increasing its WPR. In the 2000 Census, 39.5 percent of California residents reported that a language other than English was the primary language spoken at home and 9.1 percent of California residents do not speak English. Based on county records, the percentage of clients enrolled in the WTW who are not proficient in the English language can be as high as 33 percent (Table 10 and Table 11).

A person who is enrolled in a basic education course, English as a Second Language course and other educational programs must also be participating in 20/30 hours in at least one of nine core activities. This means that a client must be participating in more than one activity during the week to meet federal work participation requirements. Customers participating in vocational training may only participate for up to 12 months in order to have their participation considered a countable activity when calculating federal work participation rates. In addition, counties are limited in the number of clients who can be considered meeting work participation requirements through participation in educational activities. Only 30 percent or less of all cases included in the WPR numerator may be deemed as meeting federal requirements through participation in specified educational activities (ACL 99-85).

A number of significant barriers, including a lack of resources, can limit a county’s ability to ensure sufficient opportunities for enrollment into countable WTW activities, including work experience, on the job training and community service sites for monolingual clients. Counties participating in the study indicated that relatively few training options are available for clients who are not proficient in English.

In order to address language barriers, Imperial County developed a partnership between Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program and local adult schools to create a six-month English immersion program. Graduates of the program can continue in pre-GED and GED classes.

Orange County has developed employment opportunities in multiple employment sectors for participants who speak limited English. In addition, vocational training and basic education classes are available in Spanish and Vietnamese.

Stanislaus County, in partnership with Modesto Junior College, Department of Employment and Training, City of Modesto, Stanislaus County Planning and Community Development

and Habitat for Humanity, developed a preconstruction training program for Spanish-speaking WTW participants. The 20-week program focuses on helping students prepare for a career in the construction industry. The program provides English as a Second Language courses, as well as courses in occupational math, basic English, construction safety and training, life skills and job development.

Post-Employment/Job Retention Services

Counties responding to the survey identified that post-employment/job retention services help individuals and families who have transitioned to self-sufficiency remain self-reliant. However, survey responses indicate that reductions in CalWORKs funding at the county level have limited the resources that can be dedicated to these services.

Solano County implemented the “Career Success Program” to assist participants who have been discontinued from aid due to earned income for a period of up to twelve months. The program provided family mentoring services, referrals and linkages to local and community resources, employment and career promotion workshops, and assistance and reimbursement for supportive services. During a 12-month period, 437 families were referred to the program. Of the 437 families, 302 received services. The goal of the program is to assist participants with job retention services thereby reducing recidivism. In addition to “Career Success Program”, Solano County has implemented the “READY” program. This program serves customer who become employed in through Job Club but are considered to be underemployed.

El Dorado County provides transportation assistance and distributes a monthly newsletter to individuals and families that have transitioned off of aid. The monthly newsletter provides information about job retention and job advancement opportunities. Riverside County provide mentoring, case management, employment counseling, job coaching, job leads, resume assistance, substance abuse counseling, mental health counseling, domestic violence intervention and other services that assist customers in remaining employed. Kern County, Orange County, and Yuba County provide assistance with transportation and case management services.

San Diego County, Santa Clara County and Stanislaus County indicated that, while there are services available to customers, cuts to the program have occurred during the past year due to reduced allocations.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE: STAFFING, FUNDING IMPACTS, TRAINING, AND PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Performance Standards and Reports

Several of the counties surveyed indicated that they have implemented performance standards for individual case managers, units, and/or local offices. By measuring performance, counties report that they are promoting accountability and motivating managers, supervisors, and case workers to work closely with clients in order to increase work participation and employment. (Attachment 1)

Although the performance standards vary between counties, individual counties have established specific targets and measures that are to be attained by employees. Counties attribute increased client participation to their performance measures. Some counties that have established performance standards utilize the set performance standards in employee evaluations/reviews; however, some counties report that their ability to implement

performance standards at the case manager level is impacted by the need for the standards to be negotiated with collective bargaining units.

Most county Social Service Agencies provide presentations to their Board of Supervisors regarding the WTW program. The Directors provide annual reports that articulate the goals, accomplishments and success of the program.

Orange County has established a Work Participation Rate Workgroup whose purpose is to promote and strive to improve the county's work participation rate. The Workgroup, comprised of program, operations, administrative, district, and contractor staff, developed and conducted a worker survey to determine workers' perceptions regarding work participation and their methods for encouraging clients' participation. Action items were developed addressing strategies to improve the participation rate. The Work Participation Rate is also a standing agenda item discussed at all Divisional Management meetings and Program meetings. The information discussed at these monthly meetings is disseminated to the Supervisors and line staff in the district offices. By continuously mentioning the participation rate, all line staff, Eligibility, Welfare to Work, and Ancillary, Child Care and Transportation workers, will understand how all of their roles contribute to it and to a clients' effort at becoming self-sufficient.

Classification of Employees

Classifications include Social Worker, Employment and Eligibility Specialists, Employment Services Technicians, Family Services Specialists, Staff Service Analysts and their respective supervisory positions. Seven of the nine counties utilize Social Workers when providing Welfare to Work services to enrollees.

San Diego and Orange County have specific regions within the county in which employment services for mandatory WTW enrollees are provided through the utilization of contracts. A little over half (54 percent) of Orange County's current WTW client population is served by a contract agency. San Diego County has divided its current WTW client population into six regions, four of which are served by a contract agency.

Function: Generic vs. Specialized

The majority of counties participating in the study reported that specialized case managers are designated to provide case management for WTW enrollees. Their primary responsibility is providing employment services. Caseload assignments vary greatly among counties. The average monthly caseload for a specialized case manager ranges from a low of 67 enrolled clients to a high of 130 enrolled clients.

Five counties – Lake, San Luis Obispo, Solano, Stanislaus and Yuba – have elected to utilize case managers for generic services. Case managers that provide employment services to mandatory enrollees also perform the continuing eligibility determination for several other public assistance programs, including CalWORKs, Food Stamps and Medi-Cal. Caseloads for these workers also vary by county, from an average of 49 families to 130 families.

Employee Recognition

Counties have identified that employee recognition is important. Some counties reported that they have formal recognition programs in place that reward staff for meeting and exceeding performance expectations in the WTW program. Other counties report that there are informal avenues utilized for staff recognition.

In counties where formal recognition programs exist, employee recognition may consist of time off, acknowledgement in evaluations, certificates of appreciation and/or opportunities to earn credits that can be exchanged for gift cards to local restaurants or movie theaters. For example, San Diego County has devised a monthly recognition program for employees that meet or exceed performance goals and outcomes. In addition, yearly “Quality First” bonuses may be received by employees for high achievement in designated outcome areas.

Employee Training

Each county responding to the survey identified an ongoing commitment to expanding the talents and knowledge of the case managers responsible for providing employment services through extensive training programs. Counties focused their training curriculum in areas that would be most beneficial in engaging clients in work participation.

The most common training topics included early identification of barriers such as domestic violence, mental health, and substance abuse, interviewing techniques including an emphasis on Family Focused Strength Based Decision Making, and program updates on items such as regulation changes.

Employee Training Programs Offered by Survey Counties

- | | |
|---|--|
| ➤ Behavioral Health Services Overview | ➤ Interviewing Techniques |
| ➤ Child Care Program Overview | ➤ Leadership |
| ➤ Chronic Neglect and Intervention | ➤ Learning Disabilities |
| ➤ Civil Rights/Diversity Training | ➤ Linkages Training (Child Welfare and TANF) |
| ➤ Community Collaboration and Marketing | ➤ Managing Workplace Stress |
| ➤ Compliance and Sanction | ➤ Quarterly Reporting |
| ➤ Critical Incident Training | ➤ Service Provider Fairs |
| ➤ Crime Prevention and Personal Safety | ➤ Serving the Hard to Serve |
| ➤ Customer Service | ➤ Success Signals |
| ➤ Domestic Violence | ➤ (Communication Styles) |
| ➤ Electronic Benefit Transfer Training | ➤ Time Management |
| ➤ Empowering Participants/Empowering Ourselves | |
| ➤ Family focused Strength Based Decision Making | |

BUDGET IMPACTS

During the past year, the majority of counties participating in the study indicated that funding issues have impacted their ability to fill positions that are essential to administering the Welfare to Work program. In addition, the reductions have resulted in the reduction of services available for clients required to participate in WTW.⁶

For example, Santa Clara County indicated that they have been understaffed by 20 percent during the past year and have just begun to fill vacant positions. San Diego County identified a decrease of 37 position within the two county-managed regions as a result of decreased State allocations. Alameda, El Dorado, Kern, Kings, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San

⁶ For further detail on budget impacts to the CalWORKs program, see the California Budget Project’s “Stretched Thin: State Budget Cuts Threaten California’s Health and Human Services Programs,” available on the Internet at <http://www.cbp.org/2004/0405stretchedthin.pdf>.

Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Solano and Stanislaus counties all indicted that hiring restrictions have been put in place due to budget shortfalls.

Counties reported that budget shortfalls had not only impacted staffing, but had also had a significant impact on the types of programs and activities available to clients. For example, Santa Clara County terminated its Sanctioned Client Project due to insufficient funding. The project was an outreach program designed to encourage sanctioned individuals to cure the sanction and participate in the WTW program. Individuals were provided with information on how he/she could correct the sanction as well as information on the many program activities offered through WTW. Imperial County eliminated funding for its economic development coordinator and transportation coordinator. Kern County was required to reduce the frequency and availability of job search workshops and eliminated paid work experience.

In order to operate within its allocation, San Bernardino County eliminated some vocational training contracts, limiting choices for clients. Kings County eliminated relocation services and some of its contracts with educational providers. Solano County also reduced the amount of funds available to clients for car repairs – a vital service especially when public transportation is not available to help clients get to their jobs on time – and reduced the amount of contracted vocational and education services by 25 percent during the past two years.

IV. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

The findings and recommendations in this report present a blueprint for a number of next steps. Counties, CDSS and the Legislature have an opportunity to work in partnership to continue the work begun in 1997 with the enactment of federal welfare reform legislation and in 1998 when California's version of welfare reform began. As last year's SB 1104 shows, the job is not yet complete, and opportunities to build on existing programs and enhance participation continue to present themselves.

The CWDA workgroup identified the following specific next steps.

- Engage in a joint CWDA-CDSS workgroup to clarify specific policies related to the calculation of the Work Participation Rate (WPR). Clarification in the following areas will lead to increased accuracy and continuity in the calculation of the WPR.
- Disseminate the findings of the report through the convening of a one-day symposium sponsored by CWDA. The symposium will provide a collaborative learning environment to facilitate the distribution of the key findings of the report, to share innovative approaches, and to identify strategies to increase work participation rates throughout the state.
- On an ongoing basis, encourage collective learning opportunities through the development of conference sessions on customer engagement strategies at upcoming CWDA and CalWORKs conferences.

These steps are just the beginning. Additional recommendations may arise as the findings of the surveys, described in detail in this report, are considered and discussed more broadly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CWDA would like to thank and acknowledge the following individuals for their contribution to the study:

CWDA Work Participation Rate Workgroup

Phil Ansell – Los Angeles County
Kathy Harwell – Stanislaus County
Julie Hornback – Fresno County
Cynthia Hinckley – Riverside County
Alette Lundeberg – Santa Clara County
Cathy Senderling – County Welfare Directors Association of California

County Participants

Alameda County

Chet P. Hewitt
Marietta Jubert
Richard Read
Dorthy Hicks

Charles Schwab

Calaveras County

Terri Beaudreau
Mary Antus

El Dorado County

John Litwinovich
Mike Petee
Jenny Wilson

Fresno County

Don Pierce
Julie Hornback
Judy Lemos
Deborah Martinez
Roselinda Torres

Imperial County

James Semmes
Carla E. Moore

Kern County

Beverly Beasley
Stephen Peiz
Christopher Cushner

Kings County

Peggy Montgomery
John Semas

Lake County

Carol J. Huchingson
Kathy Harrison
Patricia Shuman

Mono County

Ed Zylman
Phil Hurtz

Orange County

Angelo Doti
Ann Myers

Riverside County

Dennis Boyle
Cynthia Hinckley
Robert C. Hughes
Jennifer De La Ossa-Ramirez
Planning and Evaluation Section

Sacramento County

Penelope Clarke
Kathy Beeler

San Bernardino County

Carol L. Anselmi
Daryl Rhoden
Linda Haugan

San Diego County

Joan Zinser
Dennis Mirabelli
Karen Clabeaux

San Luis Obispo County

Leland W. Collins
Natalie Walter

Santa Clara County

Will Lighbourne
Alette Lundeberg
Raul Aldana

Santa Cruz County

Cecilia Espinola
Carol Walberg
Jan Picolorich

Solano County

Patrick O. Duterte
Sheri Toy

Stanislaus County

Ken Patterson
Lydia Toledo
Virginia Wilson
Rob Biesemeier

Yuba County

Kathy Harwell
Suzanne Nobles
Diana Clavel

ATTACHMENT 1: COUNTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

ATTACHMENT 1: COUNTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

COUNTY	PERFORMANCE MEASURE/TARGET	EMPLOYEE CLASSIFICATION
Calaveras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollment of all participants within 30 days of cash aid approval 	Case Manager
Fresno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% of all customers must be engaged in an activity each month 	Case Manager
Imperial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 direct job referrals monthly 	Case Manager
Kern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceed federal participation requirement of 50% Minimum 70% of cases participating in full time WTW activity Minimum 85% of cases reflect timely case management Monthly contact on 100% cases 	Program Case Manager Case Manager Case Manager
Orange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of mandatory WTW clients are engaged in approved activities Overall participation rate for both one and two parent assistance units equal to 65%. Note: Contractor is paid an incentive payment for each quarter that the participation rate is met. 	Case Manager Contractor
Riverside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance standards are set for customer participation, employment, education, and training. 	Case Manager Supervisor Managers
San Bernardino	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5% of the office total monthly caseload transitions into employment (includes active, sanction and exempt clients) 50% Work Participation Rate monthly 	Case Manager Each Regional Office
San Diego	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% of the Region's active CalWORKs participants in one-parent cases shall be participating in approved work activities for 128 hours per month (an average of 32 hours per week). 75% of the Region's active CalWORKs two-parent cases shall have a parent or parents participating in approved work activities for a total of 140 hours per month (an average of 35 hours per week). 50% of the Region's active CalWORKs participants shall be engaged in employment. 70% of the Region's active CalWORKs participants who became employed shall remain continuously employed for 30 consecutive calendar days. 65% of the Region's active CalWORKs participants who enter employment shall remain continuously employed for at least 90 consecutive calendar days. 	Applied to each Region

San Diego (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5% of the Region's number of active participants monthly shall reach the goal of having retained continuous employment for at least 180 consecutive calendar days or longer. • The average hourly wage of the Region's active employed CalWORKs participants shall increase by 2% per year. The baseline measurement is taken July 1st of each year and compared to the average wages on June 30th of the following year. • 90% of the Region's former CalWORKs participants who exit CalWORKs cash assistance because of employment shall remain independent of CalWORKs cash assistance for at least 6 calendar months. • 3.5% of the Region's number of active Welfare-to-Work participants shall exit CalWORKs each month due to employment and remain independent of CalWORKs cash assistance for one (1) full calendar month. • 5% of the number of the Region's active Welfare-to-Work participants shall obtain employment and retain that employment for at least 180 days. Both active participants who continue to receive CalWORKs and those who exit CalWORKs while employed shall be counted as actuals. • The percentage increase in participants by region earning \$10.00 per hour or more compared to the established baseline. • The percentage decrease of Welfare-to-Work participants in each Region's participant pool who have been on TANF/CalWORKs 30 months or longer as compared to the established baseline. 	
San Luis Obispo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Participation Rates 	Region
Santa Clara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% Work Participation 	Management
Stanislaus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase enrollment in WTW activities by 3% for the period of July 2004 through June 2005 • Increase the number of WTW customers transitioning to employment by 5% • Increase the number of WTW customers who remain employed six months beyond attaining self-sufficiency • Increase the number of personal responsibility plans by 5% <p>Note: The above performance standards were established in July 2004 and are to be implemented in January 2005.</p>	Case Manager and Management

ATTACHMENT 2: COUNTY ACTIVITIES AND SPECIALIZED PRACTICES

ATTACHMENT 2: COUNTY ACTIVITIES AND SPECIALIZED PRACTICES

County	Innovative Activities and Specialized Practices to Address Barriers reported in WTW Survey
Alameda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic Violence Specialists and Behavioral Health Care Services workers are located at each office.
Calaveras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created Supporting Success Groups facilitated by Psychiatric Social Worker- this program offers help in many areas including Self-Esteem, Assertiveness Skills, Communication Skills, Relationship Issues, Setting Boundaries, and Social Skills. The groups help people gain success in seeking and maintaining employment. Group sessions and meetings are scheduled around bus schedules. Bus passes are provided to participants
El Dorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County was given an award for best practices regarding integrated employment services offered by their Rehab unit in Employment Services. The services offered are Alcohol and Drug (AOD), Mental Health, Domestic Abuse (DA) and other services. WTW clients participate in employment activities while receiving personalized support services. To assist clients the WTW program will pay mileage as well provide car repairs, assistance with DMV registration (one time only) and car insurance (one time only). County has a Family Loan program available (for clients who qualify) that can assist WTW clients purchase a car. Established Linkages committee. On a monthly basis a Linkages meeting is scheduled to discuss difficult clients in order to avoid sanctions. With the clients permission DHS staff along with other agency staff who have been serving the client meet to discuss the client and try to develop a more effective approach for serving the client. El Dorado County was awarded a Certificate of Commendation by the California Institute for Mental Health for best practices in providing integrated employment-focused services in the areas of mental health, addiction, domestic violence and physical barriers.
Fresno	<p>Programs that encourage client participation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tattoo Removal Service, Money Management instruction Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) filing assistance JOBS First and JOBS 2000 through which clients receive not only job search and assessment services but also Child Support and legal services provided through Inter-Department agreements. Each month a class of participating clients is taken to Court with the assistance of a Public Defender and District Attorney to settle many misdemeanor legal issues that have hampered their ability to become employed and self-sufficient. Contract many specialized needs including the provision of domestic violence services, transportation services (including during non-traditional work hours), interpretation/translation services. Contract with Community Providers for full case management of Refugee clients. Contractors provide the full spectrum of employment services with the added benefit to the client of caseworkers who speak their native language and understand their culture.
Imperial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed and partnered with Regional Occupational Program and local school districts to have 32 hours/week English Immersion classes, Adult Basic Education, GED and Job Readiness classes of monolingual participants. Co-location of Behavioral Health Unit has increased communication between partners. This allows for immediate outcomes in cause determination.
Kern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed weeklong workshops that help build life and coping skills while also serving the purpose of providing a short-term activity between longer activities. Full range of WTW activities are offered in the smaller and geographically dispersed communities in the county to address the transportation difficulties many participants have in getting to the larger community of Bakersfield. In partnership with the Mental Health Department, developed a weeklong workshop facilitated by Mental Health staff. The workshop provides a support group setting for identifying Mental Health/Substance Abuse/Domestic Violence issues. Employed an in-house DV counselor to address DV issues. This improved the coordination of services, likely resulting in improved participation rates for individuals with these barriers. In addition to providing services and workshops in their primary language, some offices in Kern County have provided orientation sessions specific to seasonal farm workers to help incorporate them back into WTW activities when the season ends.
Kings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed a "Life Skills" program which has been extremely successful in identifying barriers and finding the means to overcome barriers to personal success Spanish language services and staff with those language skills work together to overcome barriers to participation. Vanpools and AITS (ag worker transport) efforts have targeted certain employees to assist in transportation services

Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A video handbook has been developed to explain the WTW program and activities. •
Orange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-the-Job Training and Work Experience for the WTW participants through the Workforce Investment Boards located at the One-Stop Centers. • Multi-Disciplinary Team meetings involving various workers associated with a case addressing client barriers in a positive setting to develop a case action plan to optimize the client's involvement in Welfare to Work activities. Individuals attending an MDT meeting include WTW Case Manager, Public Health Nurse, Behavior Health Services staff, Ongoing Services Worker for the CalWORKs eligibility case, Ancillary, Child Care and Transportation worker, Domestic Abuse services worker, and Children and Family Services Social Worker. This is in conjunction with specialized WTW activities to address participants' barriers dealing with Domestic Abuse, Behavior Health, and Substance Abuse issues. All of these activities assist clients in achieving self-sufficiency and meet the CalWORKs regulations but do not fulfill the federal Welfare to Work regulations • Addition of a Public Health Nurse utilized to meet with the client, determine barriers to participation, and participate in the Multi-Disciplinary Team meetings. SSA contracts with the Health Care Agency for Public Health Nurses. These individuals are collocated in CalWORKs offices and perform a variety of services for CalWORKs and non-CalWORKs clients, including attending MDT meetings, conducting home visits to determine individual and family health needs, and liaisons with doctors and other health care providers. • Domestic Abuse units are specialized in working with this vulnerable population to ensure that clients are receiving the support and assistance needed with priority focused on self-sufficiency and work participation. The Domestic Abuse Services activity and the Domestic Abuse Waiver component were created so that participants who have current or past domestic abuse issues that impact the ability to participate in regular WTW activities could participate in activities directly related to domestic abuse. Examples of these activities include Community Based Services, individual or group counseling for parents and children, Mental Health or Substance Abuse services, medical services, Immigration Services, parenting skills training, independent living and financial planning, and court related activities. • Occupational Therapy through the Health Care Agency's Behavioral Health program assists clients who are not able to enter unsubsidized employment at the present time. • Mutual Client program allows participants to work on the Children and Family Services (CFS) case plan if the participant has an active CFS case. The CFS case plan activities are integrated into the WTW plan allowing the participant's hours to count toward WTW participation • Language need - Many of the activities are available in Spanish and Vietnamese which are impact languages in Orange County, including vocational training, job search, one stop services, assessments, case management and basic education. Employment opportunities are developed in multiple employment sectors, and as many as possible are available to those who speak limited English. Additional activities are available through collaboration with local refugee providers and community organizations for unique language needs. • Specialized Job Search – A specialized job search function has been developed for certain marginalized populations and English language learners - vocational assessment is available for the same population. Through current and past memoranda with agencies such as Goodwill Industries and the Department of Rehabilitation and Regional Center, services are offered to disabled clients. • Learning Disabilities - Learning disabilities screening and evaluations are offered to all English-speaking participants. Learning disabilities that are suspected from school and work history can be evaluated by Spanish-speaking professional, pending the finalization of other screening tools. • Support Services - Contracted support services that address multiple needs, and are available in all impact languages. These services include emergency childcare and transportation, professionalism, basic needs (housing, clothing, food), domestic abuse and transitional shelter. • Supportive Services - Supportive services including child care, transportation and ancillary services are available to all participants, and are case managed by bi-lingual staff, including Stage 2 and 3 through the Alternative Payment Program. • Prevention Services – The Prevention Services activity was created to allow the participant to work on the activities that have been identified as part of a risk assessment. This allows the participant to work on a prevention services plan and have the hours counted toward WTW participation. Activities which fall into this component are Community Based Services, individual or group counseling for parents and children, Mental Health or Substance Abuse services, medical services or immunizations for children, attendance at school counseling appointments, parenting skills training, independent living and financial planning, and court related activities. • Refugee Services - The program designed to serve non-English speaking participants was enhanced to meet the needs of refugees by providing language-specific services. Refugees are also eligible to receive other services such as transportation, which is available to all other WTW participants.

Riverside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulltime employment is the goal that is stressed in Riverside County. For clients working towards that goal, use of combined job club, job search and motivational workshops plus individual job counseling is used. Job Developers are involved in developing job leads to fit individuals. • Contracts have been initiated with schools throughout the county to provide remedial Education, ESL and computer skills. Transportation funds are available for everyone participating in WTW.
San Bernardino	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed specialized classes in Spanish and Vietnamese • MOU with County Mental Health. The County Mental Health staff is co-located in some of the WTW offices, which improves the show rate for participants that are referred for services. Contract with agencies that provide substance abuse and domestic violence counseling. These agencies attend office staff meetings at times so that they can continue to provide accurate information to their CalWORKs clients. Currently have a contract with a company that provides assessment services to help identify customers who may have Learning Disabilities. • Recently signed an MOU with Public Health to provide services to the exempt population. Public Health nurses review CA 61's. They visit clients who have short-term disabilities to see whether they can intervene and get them needed services quicker. For long term disabilities, they refer them to apply for SSI. • Established contracts with schools and community based organizations to provide ESL classes. Provide Job Services activities in Spanish and Vietnamese
San Diego	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regions have incorporated mini-workshops during Network Center/Job Search. Staff and community partners provide information on: Legal Assistance, Criminal Expungement, DMV, Court Process, Budgeting, Credit Repair, Domestic Violence, Drug and Alcohol Information, Mental Health, Parenting, Healthy Relationships, Self-Esteem, Employment Background screening, Section 8 Housing, and Resume writing. • Have access to additional resources that allow the client the ability to resolve barriers that could interfere with participation. Participants can also work on resumes, practice their typing skills, and work with Job Developers, job search via the Internet, and/or brainstorm with their peers. • Drug and Alcohol and Mental Health services available that can be incorporated in a participant's WTW plan. • For participants with Learning Disabilities, accommodations must be included in their plan to facilitate success. • Spanish Orientation and Job Clubs and provide interpreters for other languages. • Assign hard to place participants at County WEX sites and continually develop additional WEX training sites in remote areas and those that will utilize limited English speaking employees. • Work with participants to develop basic transportation planning skills, teaching them about web sites like Yahoo Driving Directions, Map Quest and how to access public transportation telephone numbers. • Mandatory screening for AOD, voluntary screening for MH, and the opportunity to self-declare DV at CalWORKs Intake and again at WTW orientation/appraisal. All participants are offered an LD screening. In addition to the screening and referral process, the AOD and MH providers hold workshops during Job Search/Network Center to provide our participants with ways to address their barriers and function in society with work and family. • Conduct specialized English-proficiency testing ,conduct specialized Job Clubs, Assign to ESL or basic education training, Assign to Bilingual staff who understand the language and culture, Provide access to a Multilingual Mental Health Provider • Have extended office hours including being open one Saturday a month in a couple regions. • Welcoming walk-ins. • Plan to implement SSI Advocacy for unemployable clients • Plan to implement pilot project using county-contracted doctor to assess client employability • Designated participation as "Pay Point" for new contracts effective July 2005. Contractors will be paid ONLY if they meet required participation rate. • Plan on implementing remote learning sites at libraries for clients who live far from the office. • Evaluating plan to pay "work support" allowance to working clients to motivate job retention
San Luis Obispo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with Goodwill through the Goodwill Works OJT program. Goodwill case managers provide feedback and in depth client assessments.
Santa Clara	<p>Have developed two programs to increase participation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bridge is a special program for clients as they wait entry into their next scheduled activity. This program utilizes the nationally recognized motivational life skill curriculum of "Women in Community Service". Clients can participate in the program one to eight weeks. The program is able to work with clients as they wait for a new activity or when their service provider has a scheduled break in service. • CalCAP, works with the part-time employed clients identifying strategies to locate full-time employment while also developing appropriate "back-fill" hours for the WtW.

<p>Santa Clara (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Guaranteed Ride Program arranges one to forty rides for CalWORKs participants. Once enrolled in the program, clients may receive rides to/from work or to job interviews whenever their regular mode of transportation is unavailable. This service is provided by a local paratransit provider and includes stops at childcare or elementary school as needed and delivery to the workplace/scheduled activity. • Local refugee programs have been supplemented by CalWORKs Incentive funding. As a result, specialized VESL programs have been developed for clients with language barriers. These programs are time limited (less than 6 months) and include employment goals. • Established specialized support services such as onsite social workers, onsite DV counselor, LD services, and an intensive case management model, referred to as Pathways. Referrals are also made for services in these areas for clients who have more than one need to a team of professionals that are contracted to deal with these multiple issues. <p>CWES has bilingual workers who meet the needs of the major groups of LEP clients. The partnership between Adult School Districts and Community Colleges, and Refugee Providers has also created 22 program sites that serve LEP clients. Almost all the sites have school liaisons who work closely with CalWORKs clients</p> <p>Specifics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SCC provides CalWORKs orientation in English, Spanish and Vietnamese in group setting. Individual orientations are provided by bilingual workers as necessary to meet non-English proficient clients' needs. 2. Clients answer "self appraisal" questionnaire about their English level at Intake. 3. Clients identified as needing ESL and not successful at job club are referred to Adult Education providers who further develop a service plan for up to 12 months (can be concurrent with Vocational Training). 4. Non-English proficient clients also can receive ESL in the Community Colleges, concurrent with other college activities. 5. Non-English proficient clients who have refugee background and have 6 years or less of educational in their homeland are often referred to Central Intake Unit for refugee specific services (see more details in the next question for refugee specific services).
<p>Santa Cruz</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented the Pathways Program to increase client participation. • Special vocationally focused ESL Classes on site, Literacy Services (Tutoring), Self-Employment Classes, Social Work Assessments, On- site mental health counseling, SSI advocacy, On- site substance abuse assessment and referral, Emergency ride home program (tax vouchers) for bus riders, Families in Transition Housing, Scholarships, Microenterprise Training, Women's Ventures (non-traditional apprentice training for women), Financial Literacy classes and Pathways case management model.
<p>Solano</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented procedures for Clerical Assistants to contact clients prior to scheduled appointment for Orientation. Call script includes date and time of Orientation appointment, explanation of Orientation, explanation of Job Club, questions about Doctor appointments, childcare needs and transportation. • Implemented SMART team to address domestic violence, substance abuse, and mental health issues • Provide post aid retention activities
<p>Stanislaus</p>	<p>The following programs have been implemented to meet the unique needs of clients participating in WTW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right Start Program – Utilizing an outcome based performance contract, clients are referred to Kelly Services to obtain employment. The contractor is reimbursed based on the number of clients employed and the duration of employment. • ARBOR – Utilizing an outcome based performance contract, clients are referred to Arbor for an intensive four-week Job Services program with an emphasis on self-directed job search. ARBOR receives payment only for those clients who are placed in unsubsidized employment. Services provided by ARBOR include: vocation/career assessment, interview techniques, resume preparation, placement opportunities, job retention strategies, basic computer skills, self-esteem and motivation training. • Pre-Construction – This vocational training program is administered in partnership with Modesto Junior College, City of Modesto, American GI Forum, and the Habitat for Humanity. Pre-Construction training is a specially designed course that lasts 16 weeks and equips participants with the knowledge and skill required for success in the Construction Industry. • CVOC – Spanish speaking customers participate in a contracted Job Club/Job Search program through the Central Valley Opportunity Center. CVOC conducts extensive assessments and develops an employability plan for each participant. • Stanislaus Co Literacy Program – This contracted service provides testing, assessment, case management, reading classes, English as a Second Language Classes, spelling classes, math tutoring, and pre-GED counseling. Often Literacy Services are coupled with Vocational Training and Community Service placement activities.

Stanislaus (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welding certification program and Accelerated Skills in Industry Program. Accelerated Skills Industry Program (which is a collaborative effort between CSA and MJC to provide TANF recipients training in manufacturing, construction, automotive repair and printing, while they earn college credits. Intensive case management services are provided on-site by MJC and by a Family Services Specialist outstationed at MJC on a part time basis), • IHSS (a partnership with Modesto City Schools and the IHSS Program to fill an unmet need within Stanislaus Co for trained providers to provide in-home care for the elderly/disabled residents of our County), • On-site Behavioral Health Services for customers (that include AOD, MH and Domestic Abuse Services) and • Intense services from the Building Successful Tomorrow's Team (BST) to address barriers to family self-sufficiency and help the customer become engaged and successful in the WTW Program. • A Learning Disability Orientation has been created specifically for those customers who have identified Learning Disabilities, • English as a Second Language classes are available for our mono-lingual customers, • Literacy classes are available for customers with limited literacy skills, • a limited number of training classes are available for mono-lingual Spanish participants • Assistance with SSI for those customers who are not able to participate in WTW due to a permanent medical/ psychological/ psychiatric condition • The partnerships established with Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, the Haven Women's Center (Domestic Abuse Services), Modesto Junior College (Learning Disabilities) play an integral role in providing customers with services that address barriers to self-sufficiency and assists them in being successful in obtaining and maintaining a safe and healthy living arrangement for themselves and their children and obtaining skills that will enable them to become financially self-sufficient. These services when provided collaboratively with the customer have increased the likelihood that the customer will be successful in whatever activity they are assigned to or participating in
Yuba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented a program called CanWORKs that provides work activities for participants who live in the remote hill areas of the county. • Offer job skills training and education directly related to employment activities as well as Regional Occupational Program (ROP) classes such as Certified Nurses Assistant and Office Technology classes on-site. • Offer a contractor apprentice program called Youth Build that enables participants to obtain a high school diploma while learning job skills as they build houses for low-income families to purchase • English-as-a-Second-Language classes through local Office of Education and are developing non-English speaking work experience sites. • Established a multi-disciplinary team approach that helps to coordinate the efforts of all parties involved in resolving an individual's barriers to participation. The team may consist of staff from Employment Services, Child Welfare Services, Prevention Services, and any community agency staff that is involved. Co-located with mental health counselors, substance abuse counselors, staff from the local domestic abuse shelter, Children's Home Society, Yuba College, and the Family Support division. Children's Home Society is contracted to provide assistance with all childcare needs and Yuba College staff administer the Learning Disability testing and evaluation. This One-Stop concept has helped to facilitate coordination of services. It also helps to provide individuals with prompt service and enables case managers to respond immediately to urgent situations that may arise.

ATTACHMENT 3: COUNTY DEMOGRAPHICS - FEBRUARY 2004

Invited Counties: IMPERIAL WPR: 50.26%
 Unemployment Rate: 19%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	2223
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	516
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	219
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	859
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	222
Total:	4039

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	556
Exemptions (number)	90
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	17.4%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	13
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	2%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	1835
Exemptions (number)	188
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	8.5%
Good Cause	2
WTW Sanctions (number)	11
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	.05%
Total Enrollees	2391
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	304
Percentage not enrolled	12.7%

Invited Counties: Kern WPR 53%
 Unemployment Rate: 10.7%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	7214
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	1438
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	811
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	6371
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	1393
Total:	17,227

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	2330
Exemptions (number)	119
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	8.3%
Good Cause	287
WTW Sanctions (number)	486
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	17.3%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	5664
Exemptions (number)	1316
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	18.2%
Good Cause	506
WTW Sanctions (number)	1884
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	25%
Total Enrollees	7994
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	4598
Percentage not enrolled	57.5%

Invited Counties: Kings WPR 34.2%
 Unemployment Rate: 11%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	1214
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	229
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	166
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	898
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	124
Total:	2631

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	314
Exemptions (number)	76
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	33.2%
Good Cause	48
WTW Sanctions (number)	486
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	13.3%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	835
Exemptions (number)	257
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	21.2%
Good Cause	13
WTW Sanctions (number)	305
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	26.8%
Total Enrollees	1149
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	625
Percentage not enrolled	35.2%

Invited Counties: Mono WPR 46%
 Unemployment Rate.: 5.6%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	28
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	4
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	0
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	23
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	0
Total:	55

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	2
Exemptions (number)	3
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	75%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	3
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	60%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	19
Exemptions (number)	5
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	17.9%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	4
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	17.4%
Total Enrollees	21
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	15
Percentage not enrolled	41.7%

Invited Counties: Orange WPR 50%
 Unemployment Rate: 3.2%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	6867
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	1665
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	1161
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	7792
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	1056
Total:	18,541

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	2300
Exemptions (number)	216
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	12.9%
Good Cause	16
WTW Sanctions (number)	167
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	6.8%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	4426
Exemptions (number)	976
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	14.2%
Good Cause	122
WTW Sanctions (number)	1015
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	18.7%
Total Enrollees	6726
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	2512
Percentage not enrolled	27.2%

Invited Counties: San Bernardino WPR 51.6%
 Unemployment Rate: 5.2%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	18355
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	2456
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	1387
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	10951
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	2507
Total:	35,656

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25
 (February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	4581
Exemptions (number)	1095
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	44.6%
Good Cause	870
WTW Sanctions (number)	782
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	14.6%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	14212
Exemptions (number)	4936
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	26.9%
Good Cause	1237
WTW Sanctions (number)	2986
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	17.4%
Total Enrollees	18793
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	11906
Percentage not enrolled	38.8%

Invited Counties: San Diego WPR 52%
 Unemployment Rate: 3.6%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	10,361
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	1544
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	1071
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	9853
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	1892
Total:	24721

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	1504
Exemptions (number)	279
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	18%
Good Cause	n/a
WTW Sanctions (number)	238
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	15.8%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	4050
Exemptions (number)	2121
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	20.47%
Good Cause	n/a
WTW Sanctions (number)	1766
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	30.4%
Total Enrollees	5554
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	4404
Percentage not enrolled	44.2%

Invited Counties: Santa Clara WPR – 50%
 Unemployment Rate: 5.5%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	6757
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	1577
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	776
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	4468
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	873
Total:	14451

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	2193
Exemptions (number)	285
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	18%
Good Cause	477
WTW Sanctions (number)	175
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	7.4%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	4553
Exemptions (number)	1200
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	17.8%
Good Cause	168
WTW Sanctions (number)	664
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	12.7%
Total Enrollees	6746
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	2969
Percentage not enrolled	30.6%

Invited Counties: Stanislaus - WPR – 36.45%
 Unemployment Rate: 10.1%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	4048
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	995
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	472
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	2925
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	470
Total:	8480

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	1335
Exemptions (number)	109
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	11%
Good Cause	34
WTW Sanctions (number)	131
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	8.9%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	3194
Exemptions (number)	478
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	11.8%
Good Cause	79
WTW Sanctions (number)	422
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	11.7%
Total Enrollees	4529
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	1253
Percentage not enrolled	21.7%

Invited Counties: Yuba WPR 50%
 Unemployment Rate: 13%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	901
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	231
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	146
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	560
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	108
Total:	1946

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25
 (February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	245
Exemptions (number)	46
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	19.9%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	13
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	5%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	593
Exemptions (number)	177
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	19.6%
Good Cause	8
WTW Sanctions (number)	66
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	10%
Total Enrollees	838
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	310
Percentage not enrolled	27%

Volunteer Counties: Alameda WPR – 36.7%
 Unemployment rate : 5.4%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

f. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	9783
g. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	1480
h. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	1471
i. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	3300
j. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	2096
Total:	18130

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	1852
Exemptions (number)	292
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	19.7%
Good Cause	21
WTW Sanctions (number)	416
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	18.3%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	7089
Exemptions (number)	970
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	10%
Good Cause	188
WTW Sanctions (number)	1786
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	20%
Total Enrollees	8941
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	3673
Percentage not enrolled	29.1%

Volunteer Counties: Calaveras – WPR 34.02%
 Unemployment rate : 6.1%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	220
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	37
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	5
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	114
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	396
Total:	792

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	34
Exemptions (number)	16
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	43%
Good Cause	4
WTW Sanctions (number)	13
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	27.7%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	131
Exemptions (number)	67
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	33.8%
Good Cause	6
WTW Sanctions (number)	32
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	19.6%
Total Enrollees	165
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	138
Percentage not enrolled	45.5%

Volunteer Counties: El Dorado WPR 28.8%
 Unemployment Rate: 4.2%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	524
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	106
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	21
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	333
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	66
Total:	1050

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25
 (February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	116
Exemptions (number)	31
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	29.2%
Good Cause	12
WTW Sanctions (number)	7
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	6%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	332
Exemptions (number)	132
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	25%
Good Cause	30
WTW Sanctions (number)	44
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	13.3%
Total Enrollees	448
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	256
Percentage not enrolled	36.36%

Volunteer Counties: Fresno WPR 21%
 Unemployment Rate: 12%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	9942
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	2954
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	2198
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	6970
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	1760
Total:	23824

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	3679
Exemptions (number)	687
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	23.3%
Good Cause	37
WTW Sanctions (number)	2381
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	39.2%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	7660
Exemptions (number)	1289
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	13%
Good Cause	69
WTW Sanctions (number)	4605
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	37.5%
Total Enrollees	11339
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	9068
Percentage not enrolled	44.4%

Volunteer Counties: Lake WPR 29.91%
 Unemployment Rate: 5.7%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	652
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	138
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	59
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	469
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	118
Total:	1436

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25
 (February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	164
Exemptions (number)	63
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	45.6%
Good Cause	2
WTW Sanctions (number)	43
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	20.8%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	382
Exemptions (number)	257
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	39.5%
Good Cause	14
WTW Sanctions (number)	161
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	29.7%
Total Enrollees	546
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	540
Percentage not enrolled	49.7%

Vounteer Counties: Riverside WPR 41.7%
 Unemployment Rate: 6.1%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	9789
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	1156
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	708
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	7107
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	1571
Total:	20,331

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25
 (February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	1257
Exemptions (number)	274
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	23.7%
Good Cause	182
WTW Sanctions (number)	443
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	26.3%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	6952
Exemptions (number)	2227
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	22.7%
Good Cause	1029
WTW Sanctions (number)	1887
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	21.3%
Total Enrollees	8209
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	6047
Percentage not enrolled	42.4%

Volunteer Counties: San Luis Obispo - WPR 20%
 Unemployment Rate : 3%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	886
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	143
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	21
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	561
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	119
Total:	1730

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	228
Exemptions (number)	38
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	26.6%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	28
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	10.9%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	675
Exemptions (number)	164
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	18.5%
Good Cause	2
WTW Sanctions (number)	167
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	19.4%
Total Enrollees	903
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	394
Percentage not enrolled	30.3%

Volunteer Counties: Santa Cruz WPR 29%
 Unemployment Rate : 5.7%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	894
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	128
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	49
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	646
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	185
Total:	1902

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	191
Exemptions (number)	45
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	35%
Good Cause	1
WTW Sanctions (number)	24
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	11.1%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	830
Exemptions (number)	249
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	27.9%
Good Cause	11
WTW Sanctions (number)	135
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	14%
Total Enrollees	1021
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	465
Percentage not enrolled	31.3%

Volunteer Counties: Solano WPR 11.2%
 Unemployment Rate: 5.2%
 CalWORKs Demographics:

Overall CalWORKs Active: (February 2004 – Active During the Month)

a. CalWORKs All other families:	
Number of cases:	1345
b. CalWORKs 2 parent families:	
Number of cases:	269
c. Safety Net: 2 parent families/All families	
Number of cases:	32
d. CalWORKs Zero Parent families:	
Number of cases:	1083
e. TANF Timed out families:	
Number of cases:	171
Total:	2900

CalWORKs Mandatory WTW – WTW 25

(February 2004-Active During the Month)

a. Two Parent (Separate State Program)	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	480
Exemptions (number)	24
Exemptions	
(% of total active Two Parent	
CalWORKs)	9%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	35
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	6.7%
b. All (other) Families	
CalWORKs WTW Enrollees (number)	2049
Exemptions (number)	186
Exemptions (% of total active	
All families CalWORKs)	13.8%
Good Cause	0
WTW Sanctions (number)	93
WTW Sanctions	
(% of total mandatory enrollees)	4.3%
Total Enrollees	2529
Total Exempt/Sanction/Good Cause	338
Percentage not enrolled	11.8%