MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

Building Relationships Between the Workforce Investment System and Faith-Based and Community Organizations: A Background Paper

April 2005

Sheena McConnell
Andrew Burwick
Michelle Derr
Pamela Winston
Michelle Van Noy
Jeffrey Max

CONTENTS

Chapter   **Page**

Chapter   **Page**

TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A major goal of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) is to provide universal access to the information, services, training, and other tools Americans need to enter and advance in the workforce. At the heart of the WIA program is an extensive network of One-Stop Career Centers—administered by local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs)—at which this assistance can be accessed.

Although small, grassroots faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) have traditionally collaborated infrequently with the federal and state workforce investment systems, they are potentially valuable partners to the One-Stop system for several reasons. They have a long history of providing social services in the United States and continue to serve large numbers of clients. By providing personal, flexible services and emotional support, they can assist some of the hardest-to-serve populations. Because they are integrated into the community, they can increase the accessibility of One-Stop services. Collaborating with FBCOs could enable WIBs to leverage WIB funds by accessing other financial and in-kind resources in the community. Finally, FBCOs' knowledge of the community and its needs can be useful to WIBs in planning and delivering services.

Collaborations between government agencies and FBCOs are not always easy, however. Government agencies may not know about the work of FBCOs, and FBCOs may be unaware of the ways that the public agencies could help their clients. Both the government agencies and FBCOs may perceive differences in their missions. Government agencies may be concerned about customers' rights and legal issues when services are provided by faith-based organizations. Limited administrative and service capacity of the FBCOs may also be a barrier to collaborations.

Recognizing the potential benefits of collaborations between FBCOs and public agencies, and being cognizant of the barriers to these collaborations, President Bush established Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (CFBCI) at the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and other federal agencies. The DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) has granted over $25 million to promote and sustain collaborations between FBCOs and the One-Stop system. These grants have been made to grassroots organizations (in 2002, 2003, and 2004), states (in 2002), intermediary

organizations that can work effectively with both government agencies and FBCOs (in 2002, 2003, and 2004), and WIBs (in 2004).

To evaluate the success of these efforts to promote collaborations, the DOL has asked Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) to conduct an evaluation of the grants provided to the twelve WIBs in 2004 and the grants given to the four intermediary organizations that received extensions to their grants in 2004. The main goal of the evaluation is to provide information to DOL, WIBs, FBCOs, and intermediaries on whether the grants are effective in promoting sustainable collaborations among FBCOs, WIBs, and employers in the community, and which strategies seem particularly effective, in what ways, and under what conditions they are effective.

This report provides a foundation for the evaluation by providing a review of the literature concerning partnerships between the workforce investment system and FBCOs. It draws on studies of FBCOs both in relation to the workforce investment system and in providing other services. It also draws on studies of previous collaborations between FBCOs and the workforce investment system.

The remainder of this introductory chapter defines "FBCO" and "collaboration," summarizes the federal grants to promote collaborations, and describes the objectives of the evaluation. It ends with a preview of the rest of the report.

A. WHAT IS AN FBCO?

The term "faith based and community organizations" encompasses a diverse array of religious and secular nonprofit groups. The primary goal of the DOL grants is to engage small grassroots organizations that are closely linked to the neighborhoods they serve. For this reason, DOL has established specific eligibility criteria for FBCOs to receive funding through the agency's grant programs, either directly or as a subawardee of a state, intermediary, or WIB. Under DOL's definition, eligible FBCOs must:

1. Provide social and human services as part of their mission

2. Be headquartered in the local community in which they provide the services (hence, local affiliates of national social service organizations, such as Catholic Charities, Jewish Family Services, Lutheran Social Services, and the Salvation Army cannot be grantees or subawardees)

3. Have a total social services budget less than or equal to $300,000 (for 2002 grants) or $350,000 (for 2003 and 2004 grants), or have six or fewer full-time equivalent employees

For the remainder of the report, we will use the term "FBCO" to refer to small grassroots organizations, as defined by DOL's eligibility criteria.

Faith-based organizations include sectarian or pervasively religious organizations such as churches, temples, synagogues, mosques, and congregations and secular entities created by religious organizations to provide social services. The sectarian organizations may vary in

the extent to which their religious faith infuses their programs—whether their mission statement contains religious references, whether their staff or volunteers are from a particular religious faith, and the extent to which religion is included in service provision (Scott 2003). FBCOs may also be entirely secular nonprofit organizations.

B. WHAT DO WE MEAN BY COLLABORATION?

"Collaborations" between WIBs and FBCOs can involve a range of relationships. At a minimum, a collaboration requires that at least one of the following three occurs: (1) referrals occur in at least one direction between the One-Stop system and the FBCO, (2) the FBCO acts as an access point to the One-Stop system, or (3) the FBCO provides information about community needs or services to the WIBs. At the other end of the spectrum, relationships may be formalized using Memoranda of Understanding, grants, or contracts, FBCO staff may be co-located at the One-Stop centers, FBCOs may house satellite One-Stop centers, and FBCO representatives may be included on the WIB.

C. GRANTS TO PROMOTE WIB/FBCO COLLABORATIONS

The DOL grants to build collaborations between the One-Stop system and FBCOs have had three main objectives: (1) to increase the number of FBCOs providing services within the One-Stop system; (2) to expand access to the One-Stop system to the FBCOs' clients and others who would not traditionally use the One-Stop system; and (3) to identify, document, showcase, and replicate innovative partnerships between FBCOs and the One-Stop system.

DOL has used a multi-pronged strategy to promote collaborations. In 2002, it provided grants to three types of organizations:

- *States*. $11.8 million in grants were given to state agencies. The grants were to be used to subaward to FBCOs to provide services under the One-Stop system and educate FBCOs about the workforce investment system. States were also encouraged to appoint FBCO representatives to the local WIBs.

- *FBCOs.* About $488,000 was granted to FBCOs to provide supplemental services to clients in the One-Stop system.

- *Intermediary Organizations.* About $5 million was awarded in grants to intermediaries—larger, nonprofit faith or community-based organizations that could work effectively with FBCOs and help them collaborate with the One-Stop system. The intermediaries were required to serve multiple areas and were required to develop infrastructure for the collaborations, disseminate information about both the One-Stop system and the FBCOs, administer subawards to FBCOs for service provision, and work on building FBCO capacity.

The following year (2003), the DOL awarded grants to two types of organizations: intermediary organizations (about $3.5 million) and FBCOs (about $250,000). Unlike in 2002, the intermediary organizations awarded 2003 grants were required to work in a single geographic area. The 2003 grants had similar objectives to the 2002 awards with two additional objectives: (1) the sustainability of the collaborations beyond the grant period, and (2) the documentation of outcomes from the collaborations, including the outcomes of customers receiving services from the FBCOs.

In summer 2004, DOL grants to promote collaborations were awarded to local WIBs ($5.8 million) and to FBCOs ($1.3 million). Four intermediaries granted awards in 2003 received additional funds in 2004. Although no new grants were awarded to intermediaries, WIBs could partner with intermediaries.

The overarching objectives of the 2004 WIB grants were similar to those of the earlier grants. Emphasis was again placed on capacity building, the sustainability of the collaborations, and documenting the outcomes of the grants. However, the 2004 grants differed from the earlier grants by placing emphasis on partnerships with businesses, especially those in high-growth industries. The goal was to build on President Bush's High-Growth Job Training Initiative, which aims to build partnerships to both address the employment needs of high-growth industries and provide Americans with the skills and competencies needed to access good jobs. In their grant applications, WIBs were required to identify specific census tracts within which they would concentrate their collaboration efforts and obtain commitments from up to three businesses or business sectors to work with both the One-Stop system and the FBCOs to provide jobs to those in disadvantaged neighborhoods.

The DOL has also provided technical assistance to all stakeholders involved in the collaborations under the Touching Lives and Communities project. Beginning in 2002, technical assistance was provided as part of a pilot initiative to WIBs, FBCOs, and elected officials in Memphis, Tennessee and Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Currently, under the Touching Lives and Communities project, technical assistance is provided to all WIB grantees via one-on-one phone calls and E-mail correspondence, as well as grantee conference calls, in-person conference meetings, the development of peer-to-peer learning networks, and the provision of resource materials.

D. THE EVALUATION

To determine the success of the grants to promote collaborations and to inform the WIBs and FBCOs about effective collaboration strategies, the ETA asked MPR to conduct a study of the twelve grants awarded to the WIBs. As four 2003 intermediary grantees received extensions in 2004 and so would be active during the study period, these grantees were also included in the study.

The evaluation will address three main sets of research questions:

1. **What strategies did grantees use to promote collaborations?** Did they collect and disseminate information about population needs, FBCO resources,

and the role of the WIBs? Did they conduct outreach to FBCOs? To what extent, and to what types of organizations, were the grants subawarded to FBCOs? Did grantees try to build the capacity of FBCOs in other ways? Did the grantees use strategies to improve access to One-Stop services? Were other formal or informal interagency collaborations developed? What challenges did grantees face in implementing the strategies? To what extent were these challenges overcome? How were they overcome?

2. ***To what extent were the strategies effective?*** How did relationships change among WIBs, FBCOs, and employers in the community? To what extent did the grants increase access to and use of the One-Stop system? What new services were made available to One-Stop customers? What effects did the grants have on customer outcomes? Did the grants help the One-Stop system meet employers' needs? Did the grants allow the One-Stop system to leverage additional financial and in-kind community resources? To what extent did the grants help increase FBCO input into the operation of the One-Stop centers? To what extent were the collaborations sustainable after the grant ended?

3. ***Which strategies were particularly effective?*** Which strategies were most likely to lead to sustainable collaborations? Did an intermediary or other organization play a key role? What factors determine the effectiveness of the grants? Did the characteristics of the community or grantee affect the strategies used or the success of the strategies? Under what conditions are the strategies replicable?

The evaluation will address these questions using three main sources of data. First, on-site interviews will be conducted with grantee staff as well as staff at the WIB, One-Stop centers, FBCOs, employers, and if applicable, the intermediary. Second, we will review documentation on the grant including the grant applications, progress reports, and final reports. Third, external information sources, such as published reports on state laws, will also be used.

E. PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to describe what is already known about the potential benefits of collaborations, the barriers to those collaborations, and strategies used to promote those collaborations. Chapter II provides an overview of the policy and legal context for the grants. Chapter III discusses the potential benefits of the One-Stop system partnering with FBCOs. Chapter IV describes the barriers to collaborations. Chapter V gives an overview of the strategies to promote collaborations. The 2002 and 2003 state and intermediary grants, and what we can learn from their experiences, are summarized in Chapter VI. The report ends with a description of the 2004 WIB grants—the focus of the evaluation.

CHAPTER II

EVOLVING FEDERAL POLICY CONTEXT

C oncerned that faith-based organizations (FBOs) were underutilized in providing social services and that they faced unnecessary barriers to partnering with government agencies, the federal government has moved to "level the playing field" and lower the barriers that FBOs have faced to participating in federally funded social service programs. This chapter describes how these efforts began with the 1996 welfare reform legislation, and how federal policy has continued to encourage the use of FBOs in social service provision. The chapter also details DOL administrative guidance and regulations regarding FBCO collaborations with the workforce investment system.

A. CHARITABLE CHOICE PROVISIONS IN PRWORA

Religious organizations and congregations have long been involved in the provision of social services in the United States. A series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, however, limited government support for religious institutions. Prior to 1996, statutory language and regulations covering federal social service programs explicitly prohibited any religious use of public funds (Lupu and Tuttle 2002). Hence, until 1996, lawyers generally counseled FBOs to set up separate nonreligious entities to receive and administer government funds and to exclude religious imagery or references from their government funded services (Lupu and Tuttle 2001). Nonetheless, some FBOs did receive government support to fund services that were religious in nature (Monsma 1996). However, many other FBOs established separate entities to run secular programs with government funds.

In 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PL 104-193), which allowed greater involvement of FBOs in federally funded programs. Section 104 of PRWORA contained provisions commonly known as "Charitable Choice" that allow Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program funds to be used for contracts and grants with FBOs, including organizations that were previously excluded from receipt of government funds because of their explicitly religious character. Previously, FBOs receiving government funding were required to neutralize their religious character and provide services in a secular fashion, but the Charitable Choice provisions now allow FBOs delivering federally funded services to maintain their use of

religious symbols and scripture and to retain religious standards for organizational governance and staffing. These policies cover both organizations receiving direct funding, such as contracts and grants, and indirect funding, such as TANF-supported vouchers. Finally, one major change from past law allows FBOs to discriminate on the basis of religion in their hiring decisions, hiring only co-religionists if they so choose.

FBOs receiving direct government funding under Charitable Choice are subject to a number of restrictions, however. They may not use these funds for the purposes of indoctrination or proselytizing, they may not discriminate against prospective clients on the basis of their religion or lack of religion, and they may not require clients to participate in religious activities. FBOs receiving vouchers or other indirect forms of support that provide beneficiaries a choice of providers are not subject to these restrictions. Clients who object to the religious nature of services must be guaranteed an alternative provider to which they do not object on religious grounds.

Charitable Choice provisions were also included in legislation covering three other federal programs—Welfare to Work in 1997[1] (under DOL), Community Service Block Grants (CSBG) in 1998, and certain drug treatment and prevention programs funded by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in 2000. The latter two are U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) programs. The specific requirements of Charitable Choice differ somewhat among these programs, but in all cases they share the essential provisions described above. Final regulations covering Charitable Choice for TANF, CSBG, and SAMHSA programs were issued in September 2003 (Office of the Federal Register 2003).

B. WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

Two years after PRWORA was passed, in 1998, Congress passed WIA in order "to consolidate, coordinate, and improve employment, training, literacy, and vocational rehabilitation programs in the United States…" (PL 105-220, Preamble). Implementation of WIA began in July 2000. The goals of the workforce investment system as described in WIA include:

- ***Universal Access to Services.*** An important tenet of WIA was ensuring that everyone could gain access to the programs and services offered by One-Stop centers. With WIA, any job seeker or anyone else who wants to advance his or her career should have available core employment-related services. These include information about job vacancies, career options, student financial aid, relevant employment trends, and instruction on how to conduct a job search, write a resume, or interview with an employer. Intensive services (such as career counseling and case management) and training services are available to those who need them.

---

[1] The Welfare to Work grants program has expired.

- ***Integration of Service Delivery at One-Stop Centers.*** WIA mandated the establishment of One-Stop centers, with the vision that these centers would bring together in one location public and private resources, and local, state, and federal programs to provide employment-related services and supports. Some services are provided at the centers, while for other services the One-Stop center is the point of entry and referral.

- ***Responsiveness to Community and Business Needs.*** WIA also sought to empower local leaders and organizations to implement workforce investment systems that respond to the needs of their communities and businesses. To do this, WIA required the establishment of state and local workforce investment boards (WIBs) to serve as "boards of directors" and provide strategic planning, policy development, and oversight for the local workforce investment systems.

Unlike PRWORA, the legislation was largely silent on the role of FBOs in service delivery partnerships with WIBs or One-Stop centers, although it did specifically prohibit the use of religion as a criterion for employment for WIA-funded organizations (Section 188). The final regulations governing implementation of WIA were issued in August 2000 (Office of the Federal Register 2000).

C.   WHITE HOUSE FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES

In 2001, the White House issued the first of five executive orders that would move the Bush administration's faith-based and community initiatives forward. The first, Executive Order 13199, was issued on January 29, 2001 and established the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. The second, Executive Order 13198, was issued the same day and established centers for faith-based and community initiatives (FBCI) in five cabinet-level agencies—Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Labor. It also directed all federal agencies to conduct audits of their rules and internal operations for policies and practices that had the effect of discouraging or disadvantaging participation by FCBOs. In addition, DHHS and DOL were also required to review policies and practices governing TANF and Welfare to Work funding covered by Charitable Choice, and to work to ensure compliance with its provisions.

In February 2002, the president also announced the creation of the Compassion Capital Fund (CCF) within DHHS to provide grants focused on capacity building to intermediaries and FBCOs—by August 2004, the CCF had announced or awarded $99.5 million in grants to over 1,900 grantees and subawardees (DHHS 2004, Bender 2003).

In December 2002, the White House issued Executive Order 13279 to provide guidance to federal agencies "to ensure equal protection of the laws for faith-based and community organizations, to further the national effort to expand opportunities for, and strengthen the capacity of, faith-based and other community organizations so that they may better meet social needs in America's communities…" (Executive Order 13279, 2002). It echoed many of the themes of the Charitable Choice provisions, stating that federally funded social service providers:

- Must be eligible to compete for federal funds "without impairing their independence, autonomy, expression, or religious character." In particular, they may provide services "without removing or altering religious art, icons, scriptures, or other symbols" from their facilities, and they may choose board members based on religion, have religious terms in the organization's name, and include religious references in mission statements, charters, or other governing documents.

- May not discriminate against beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries on religious grounds.

- Must engage in "inherently religious activities, such as worship, religious instruction, and proselytization…separately in time or location" from services directly funded by federal funds.

- Must ensure that any participation by a program beneficiary in inherently religious activities be voluntary.

The White House also established additional agency FBCI centers.[2] The heads of the seven agencies that now had FBCI centers were required to review their policies to assess their consistency with these goals, to amend them or implement new policies as necessary, and to collect data on the participation of FBCOs in federally funded social service programs.

Finally, in June 2004, Executive Order 13342 established FBCO centers in three more agencies—Commerce, Veterans Affairs, and the Small Business Administration—bringing the total number of agencies with faith-based and community initiatives centers to 10.

D. IMPLEMENTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The DOL has acted to implement the FBCI internally through administrative guidance to state and local agencies, regulatory changes, outreach and technical assistance, pilot projects, and grants. In April 2002, the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training issued a Training and Employment Guidance Letter (No. 17-01, 17 April 2002), addressing the cultivation of partnerships with FBCOs in the workforce investment system. In 2002, the Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives at the DOL also embarked on the Touching Lives and Communities (TLC) pilot project to encourage the cultivation of partnerships between the workforce investment system and FBCOs in two locations, Memphis and Milwaukee (Voll et al. 2004). Finally, in March 2004, the Assistant Secretary issued a Training and Employment Notice (No. 15-03, 4 March 2004), also addressing partnerships between the workforce investment system and FBCOs.

---

[2] In December 2002, the White House issued Executive Order 13280 to establish FBCO centers in the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development.

1. Training and Employment Guidance Letter

The Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL 17-01) informed members of the workforce investment system about DOL's Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (CFBCI), and requested that states make efforts to increase the number of FBCO grassroots organizations that have partnerships with the WIBs and the One-Stop centers.

Citing Executive Order 13198, and the results of DOL's audit of its policies and practices, the TEGL noted: "The Department of Labor audit discovered that both faith-based and community-based grassroots organizations are often not utilized as partners in the workforce investment system. This letter requests that states take appropriate actions to incorporate faith-based and community-based organizations into the One-Stop system and local Workforce Investment Board activities." It suggested two principal ways that these organizations can benefit state and local workforce agencies: (1) by providing "a crucial perspective" on the needs of unemployed and underemployed individuals, and (2) by acting as service providers that are "trusted and credible neighborhood and community institutions," use volunteers to "leverage" program funds, provide services with a high degree of personal attention and through strong relationships with program participants, and share common goals with local WIBs and the One-Stop system. The TEGL also alerted states to ETA's upcoming grant competitions for state agencies and intermediaries.

Noting that programs funded by WIA are not exempt from the nondiscrimination clauses of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibiting employment decisions based on religion, the TEGL described a number of actions states were requested to pursue to encourage FBCO partnerships. These included:

- Encouraging local WIBs to appoint members familiar with local grassroots FBCOs.

- Working with WIBs to develop campaigns to educate FBCOs about the workforce investment system, including grants and other opportunities for participation and partnership with One-Stop centers. In addition to providing education resources, the TEGL stressed that these efforts should cover fully FBCOs' obligations under WIA's nondiscrimination provisions, and also attempt to remedy "inaccurate perceptions" that might limit FBCO participation.

- Ensuring that state and local workforce agency information about how to apply for grants or become service providers would be "easy to find and understand."

2. Touching Lives and Communities Pilot Initiative

The DOL CFBCI established the TLC pilot initiative "to promote collaboration and integration" between the local WIB and FBCOs in two locations, Memphis and Milwaukee (Voll et al. 2004). DOL CFBCI staff and contractors specializing in technical assistance worked with the two local WIBs on planning and capacity-building activities intended to accomplish the pilot objectives. The TLC initiative had several objectives (Voll et al. 2004):

- To offer workforce development services to hard-to-reach people "by leveraging the assets (i.e., services and access)" of FBCOs located in low-income urban neighborhoods

- To connect FBCOs to the workforce investment system by including them in the decision-making and management processes of the WIB and One-Stop centers

- To create mechanisms to share resources between FBCOs and the workforce investment system by developing relationships between the staff at One-Stop centers and FBCOs, and by developing "community resource sharing tools" such as Internet sites

The TLC pilot activities described in the final report were focused largely on planning and early implementation. The TLC pilot in Memphis led to the creation of new opportunities for FBCOs to participate along with businesses in the WIB's planning process. In both locations, FBCOs saw greater access to funding as grantees, contractors, or sub-contractors. The "most dramatic outcome," according to the pilot report, was the development of new networks and relationships: "these social networks and relationships are the basis of an energy for transformation" and are "critical to having a sustained impact" (Voll et al. 2004). After the pilot phase, the workforce system and community leaders in both locations were to proceed with implementation.

3. Training and Employment Notice

The Training and Employment Notice (TEN 15-03), issued on March 4, 2004, was intended to educate state and local workforce investment officials about how to build partnerships with FBCOs, and to announce the WIB grants. It encouraged state workforce agencies and liaisons to further integrate FBCOs into the workforce system, and included three attachments to provide guidance: (1) the final report of the Memphis-Milwaukee TLC pilot project (Voll et al. 2004); (2) a report highlighting the successful models that DOL grantees used in North Dakota and Brevard County, Florida, to increase access to One-Stop services for individuals not typically served and to build One-Stop partnerships with FBCOs (DOL 2004a); and (3) a White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives document outlining legal "dos and don'ts" for government entities working with FBCOs (White House 2003).

The TEN summarized lessons learned by the TLC pilot, and encouraged states to build on this experience. The lessons highlighted included:

- WIBs can develop new funding efforts with existing WIA and other program funds (as appropriate) that can both address the needs of businesses for skilled workers, and build on the strengths of grassroots organizations and their community connections.

- Building momentum "around a vision for addressing community needs" will lead businesses, FBCOs, and community leaders to "provide their time, passion, and commitment to move the collaboration project forward."

- Workforce system and FBCO collaborations include making contracting and other direct funding opportunities available to FBCOs.

- Relationships should be built between currently funded organizations and grassroots providers—these can lead to opportunities for appropriate subcontracting and other collaboration in targeted neighborhoods.

- Developing relationships between grassroots organizations and One-Stop center staff can provide opportunities to reach hard-to-serve people by encouraging mutual referrals and the sharing of resources.

The TEN also outlined briefly the two models for increased access and collaboration found in North Dakota and Brevard County, Florida, and described in DOL (2004a). The first model—developed in Brevard County—entailed the use of FBCOs as "access points" to One-Stop center services, including the establishment of "mini-one-stop centers" located in FBCOs in high-poverty areas beyond the typical reach of the county One-Stop system. The second model—developed in North Dakota—entailed the development of a resource sharing system to help clients of FBCOs to gain access to One-Stop center services, and help One-Stop customers gain access to FBCO services.

Finally, the TEN announced the ETA competitive grants for WIBs that have already demonstrated their ability to develop partnerships with FBCOs. The grants' purpose is to cultivate long-term partnerships to develop and maintain the delivery of services to hard-to-serve groups, such as ex-offenders, welfare recipients, and youth not in school. The effectiveness of these grants will be evaluated by MPR.

E. FINAL DOL REGULATIONS

In addition to the August 2000 regulations covering WIA as a whole, regulations have been released pertaining to the FBCO initiative in particular. Final regulations issued on July 12, 2004, implement DOL's response to the White House's executive orders (Office of the Federal Register 2004b). These regulations outline an approach largely similar to that of Charitable Choice, except for the prohibition on discrimination in hiring. The regulations specify that:

1. Faith-based organizations are allowed to participate in DOL programs and compete for DOL funds on the same basis as all other organizations, without regard to their religious character or affiliation.

2. FBOs that receive direct DOL funding such as contracts or grants may not use these funds for "inherently religious activities," such as religious instruction, worship, or proselytizing. If the organization engages in these types of activities in addition to social service provision, they must be "separate in time or

location" from the social services supported by DOL funds, and client participation in religious activities must be voluntary.

3. These restrictions do not apply, however, when the FBO receives *indirect* DOL funding such as a DOL-funded voucher that a beneficiary uses to attain services. In these cases, the FBO may engage in inherently religious activities, as long as the beneficiary exercises "genuine and independent private choice." Organizations that receive indirect DOL support may integrate faith elements and social services, and may require beneficiaries to participate "in all aspects of the organizations' programs and activities, including the religious aspects."

4. FBOs that receive DOL funding retain their independence, and may continue to pursue their mission, including "the definition, development, practice, and expressions of [their] religious beliefs." They may use space for provision of DOL-funded programs while still displaying religious art or icons, scriptures, or other religious symbols. They may also retain a religious name, select board members and govern themselves "on a religious basis," and may include religious references in their governing documents.

5. DOL-funded providers may not discriminate for or against current or prospective program beneficiaries on the basis of their religion, or lack of religious belief.

6. DOL may not require that only FBOs provide assurances that they will not use agency support for inherently religious activities. All entities supported by DOL funds—including state and local governments, and social service providers—must carry out activities funded by DOL according to program requirements, including requirements prohibiting the use of direct DOL funding of inherently religious activities, and FBOs may not be singled out in this regard.

7. If a state or locality contributes its own funding to a DOL-supported program (either as a required match, or voluntarily), it may either commingle its funds with federal funding, or segregate the federal funds. If it commingles funds, however, these regulations apply to both the federal and state/local funds.

8. Except when prohibited by statute, DOL-supported religious organizations may now make hiring decisions on religious grounds. However, as the statute authorizing WIA contains specific prohibitions on employment discrimination, this affects only FBOs supported by non-WIA DOL funding.

9. Finally, the regulations simplify the process for organizations to prove that they are nonprofit organizations (in the interests of easing the burden), and allow WIA funds to finance vouchers that beneficiaries may use to participate in religious training or other religious employment programs.

F. PROPOSED WIA REAUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

WIA was scheduled to be reauthorized in 2003. The House of Representatives passed reauthorization legislation in May 2003, and the Senate did so in November 2003. However, the legislation did not receive final approval in the 108th Congress. One major difference in the 2003 House and Senate versions of reauthorization legislation was their approach to the use of religion in FBO employment decisions. The House version (consistent with the administration proposal) would have allowed religious organizations to consider religion in their hiring decisions, while the Senate version would have maintained WIA's prohibition on religious discrimination in hiring. Reauthorization legislation introduced in the House during the current session of Congress (H.R. 27) also would permit FBOs receiving WIA funds to take religious beliefs into account when hiring staff. As of early April 2005, the Senate has not yet released its version of the reauthorization legislation.

CHAPTER III

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF INVOLVING FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEM

W IA requires One-Stop centers to create relationships with other organizations in order to provide a comprehensive set of employment-related services to all Americans who need them. While many One-Stop centers have relationships with FBCOs, partnerships between the One-Stop system and FBCOs are limited (Bender 2003). In a study of five workforce investment areas, Kramer et al. (2002) found that just one to 10 percent (depending on the area) of the WIB's budget was spent on contracting with FBOs, and some of that was to the large national affiliates, such as Catholic Charities.

Yet many FBCOs provide employment-related services and could potentially partner with One-Stop centers and widen access to the One-Stop system. Chaves and Tsitsos (2001) estimate that over half of all congregations provide some support or employment services. In Florida, for example, more than 9,000 congregations provide human services (Sherman and Stanakis 2002).

Public funding comprises only a relatively small proportion of the total funding for FBCOs. In a review of studies on congregations, Montiel (2003) found that while over 50 percent of congregations provided human services, less than 6 percent (and in some studies less than 3 percent) received any public funding.

What could be gained from collaborations between One-Stop centers and grassroots FBCOs? This chapter describes the four main ways in which FBCO participation in the workforce investment system could potentially be beneficial: (1) provision of additional services in the One-Stop system, (2) access to a typically underserved population, (3) ability to leverage community resources, and (4) ability to assist WIBs better respond to community needs.

A. PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES IN THE ONE-STOP SYSTEM

FBCOs provide a wide array of services, which can complement the services provided by One-Stop centers. The services include:

- **Employment Services**. These include career assessment, job readiness skills (such as interview skills and interacting with employers and other employees), job search assistance (including resume preparation), occupational training, job placement, and retention services (including job coaching and mentoring).

- **Emergency Assistance**. Many FBCOs, especially congregations, provide assistance to families in time of dire need. This assistance may involve providing cash, temporary shelter, and food.

- **Support Services**. FBCOs may be able to provide clothes suitable for an interview (often from a clothes "bank"), child care, and transportation assistance (by private car, van, bus tokens, or by providing gas money).

- **Education**. This includes instruction in English as a Second Language, literacy, General Educational Development (GED) and Adult Basic Education (ABE) training, and computer skills. It also includes after-school programs and tutoring.

- **Soft-Skills Training**. This training focuses on familiarity with workplace norms and expectations. Topics may include communication, dressing for work, appropriate work-place behaviors, problem solving, anger management, time management, and dealing with stress. The training may also involve mentoring or counseling (which must be nonreligious if supported with government funds).

- **Substance-Abuse Treatment**. FBCOs may also run substance-abuse treatment programs.

While few FBCOs provide all these services, it is not uncommon for them to provide multiple services (Kramer et al. 2002). Urban FBCOs are more likely to provide emergency assistance, with suburban congregations being more likely to provide child care (Polis Center 2001, Stone 2000). DeVita et al. (1999) found in New Jersey that 77 percent of FBOs surveyed provided emergency assistance.

Most FBCOs specialize in providing assistance to at-risk populations, often focusing on a specific group. Bender (2003) found that FBCOs were most likely to focus on at-risk youth (including emancipated foster care youth and youth with disabilities). Other groups targeted by FBCOs include refugees and other immigrants, those with limited English language skills, ex-offenders, homeless persons, welfare recipients, substance abusers, and abused women.

Existing research on the effectiveness of faith-based services is extremely limited and inconclusive. A literature review conducted by the Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society found only 25 studies that addressed the effectiveness of faith-based social services (Johnson et al. 2002), and many of these studies examined health rather than employment outcomes. Some of these studies concluded that faith-based programs were linked with positive outcomes. However, the validity of these findings is questionable because they either lacked an adequate comparison group or used extremely small samples.

Similarly, no rigorous studies have been conducted demonstrating the *relative* effectiveness of FBOs compared to other providers (Kennedy 2003). One study of FBOs providing employment services in Indiana found, for example, that clients of faith-based providers achieved similar rates of job placement and wage rates as those served by secular organizations. However, clients of faith-based providers in the study "work[ed] substantially fewer hours per week and [were] less likely to be offered health insurance" (Deb and Jones 2003). Some observers note, however, that the aim of the policy changes is to create a "level playing field" for FBOs as government contractors, whether or not their services produce demonstrably better results than those of other providers (Sherman 2003).

The limited research base notwithstanding, observers have argued that FBCOs can be at least, if not more, effective providers of social services than other types of organizations for the following reasons:

- ***FBCO Staff Are Mission-Driven, Committed, and Passionate.*** Hence, individual staff are more likely to provide the customer personal attention, go "the extra mile" for their customer, and be committed to the client for a long time.

- ***FBCOs Provide Holistic Services***. Some FBCO providers believe it is important to pay attention to the problems of the whole family and may address issues not directly related to employment but that are a barrier to employment (such as relationship concerns). FBOs may pay attention to the customer's spiritual needs, and the infusion of faith into service provision may be particularly effective for some types of clients, such as substance abusers (Solomon et al. 2001). FBOs may make spiritual or religious counseling available to clients. Such services cannot be paid for by federal funds, however, and must be purely voluntary and separate in time and/or location from federally funded services.

- ***FBCOs Are Less Bureaucratic.*** In the absence of a large bureaucracy, workers can be more flexible about the types of services they provide and the service delivery methods. For example, while other organizations may have set hours, FBCOs are often able to be open in the evenings and on weekends.

- ***FBCOs Know the Population and Community.*** FBCOs are often extremely knowledgeable about the needs of the populations they serve and often provide more culturally appropriate services. For example, a Hmong center in Colorado

provides translations and information on Hmong culture to the One-Stop center (Otten 2004). Many FBCO staff share life experiences with their customers. Moreover, they understand the particular challenges of the community and the resources available in the community.

- ***FBCOs Are Trusted in the Community***. FBCOs' reputation in the community sometimes enables them to place customers with employers that may be reluctant to take the customers if they were not with the FBCO (Harrison and Weiss 1998). Employers trust that the FBCO will support the customer in his/her job and be available if a problem should arise.

- ***FBCOs Are Located in the Community***. Finally, FBCOs are often located in the community that they serve and hence can be easily accessed.

B. ACCESS TO POPULATIONS UNDERSERVED BY THE ONE-STOP SYSTEM

One of the goals of the One-Stop system is universal access. While One-Stop systems have improved access to the workforce investment system, access is still limited for the harder-to-serve populations such as those with limited English, persons with limited literacy, homeless persons, and seasonal and migrant workers (D'Amico et al. 2004). This may be because people are unaware of the One-Stop system or believe that they are ineligible for services. Some, especially immigrants, may not trust the One-Stop system and be concerned about interactions with government agencies. Some may not be able to access One-Stop services because of a lack of basic computer skills, literacy, or ability to speak English. Others may find it difficult or expensive to get to the One-Stop centers.

FBCOs may be able to support the goal of universal access to the One-Stop system by addressing these barriers. As trusted organizations in the community, FBCOs can provide credible information about the One-Stop system to their clientele. They can also increase access by referring customers to the One-Stop system and have staff accompany them to provide assistance with accessing the services. FBCO staff may also be co-located at the One-Stop center.

Some FBCOs also serve as additional points-of-entry into the One-Stop system. They do this by setting up satellite One-Stop centers at FBCO facilities—providing access to many of the same services as are available at the comprehensive One-Stop centers. One-Stop counseling staff may be available to assist clients at the FBCO. Other FBCOs house electronic kiosks, at which customers can access much of the information available at the One-Stop centers.

C. ABILITY TO LEVERAGE COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Collaborations with FBCOs also allow the One-Stop system to leverage additional financial and nonfinancial resources. This may make service provision at FBCOs more cost-effective.

FBCOs often provide services using a variety of nongovernmental funding, including private donations, grants from foundations, as well as other federal and state grants. Some FBCOs provide customized training to meet the specific requirements of an employer. If funding for this training comes through WIA, the cost will be shared with the employer.

Many staff at FBCOs are either volunteers or work at below-market wages. Ammerman (2001) estimates that about three-quarters of congregations provide at least some volunteers for social services. Cnaan (1998) estimates that on average volunteers provide 148 hours of work per program per month.

FBCOs also benefit from many in-kind resources. They are often able to use building space free of charge. Cnann and Boddie (2001) estimate that on average the building space used by each faith-based organization is worth about $560 per month. In addition, FBCOs receive a wide array of donated goods and services including food, used clothing, computers, tickets to entertainment events, and free or reduced-cost counseling.

D. ABILITY TO ASSIST WIBS IN RESPONDING TO COMMUNITY NEEDS

As FBCOs have a detailed knowledge of the communities and are often themselves experienced service providers, they may have a strong sense of the unmet needs of the local population and employers. This familiarity with community needs may provide important information to the One-Stop system. It may also enable FBCOs to contribute to the WIB's strategic planning process. Active involvement of the FBCO can occur by placing FBCO representatives on the WIB, creating FBCO advisory councils, or by arranging specific working meetings between members of the WIB and FBCO representatives.

CHAPTER IV

BARRIERS TO INVOLVING FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEM

A variety of barriers may impede FBCOs from working with government agencies and delivering social services with public funding. Impediments commonly cited include: (1) legal and philosophical concerns within government agencies and grassroots organizations about FBCO provision of publicly funded services, (2) a lack of awareness and interaction between government agencies and FBCOs, and (3) the limited administrative and financial capacity of some FBCOs. This chapter explores these barriers to FBCO involvement in government-funded social services, highlighting findings from research on Charitable Choice generally and the workforce investment system specifically.

A. CONCERNS REGARDING LEGAL ISSUES AND FBCO MISSIONS

Representatives of both government agencies and community-based organizations have expressed legal and philosophical reservations about involving FBCOs in social service programs. These concerns primarily relate to constitutional law regarding the nonestablishment of religion and the possibilities that collaborating with public agencies could constrain the mission of FBCOs or subject them to substantial government oversight.

1. Concerns Regarding Legal Issues

Some observers are concerned that government funding of expressively religious faith-based organizations is of uncertain legality in light of the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses in the U.S. Constitution. Courts continue to interpret the First Amendment's requirement that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." As a result, some uncertainty continues to exist about the circumstances under which government agencies may provide financial or other support to religious organizations.

The White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives has highlighted "an overriding perception by federal officials that close collaboration with religious organizations is legally suspect" as a key barrier to FBCO participation in social service programs (White

House 2001). Similarly, a U.S. Government Accountability Office (formerly the General Accounting Office, GAO) study of Charitable Choice reported some state and local officials felt that sensitivity about legal issues "might cause both FBO and government officials to be cautious about entering into contracts," even in the absence of clear legal impediments (GAO 2002).

Legal ambiguities regarding FBCO participation in government programs may reinforce state and local officials' tentative approach to collaboration with religious organizations. Scholars monitoring legal developments related to Charitable Choice note that official guidance on some important constitutional issues remains unclear. These issues include (1) standards for opening the contracting process to non-mainstream religions, (2) whether religious organizations receiving federal funding can be permitted to make employment decisions on the basis of religion (current WIA regulations do not permit such discrimination), and (3) the definition of "inherently religious activities," which may not be directly financed with federal funds (Kennedy 2003; Lupu and Tuttle 2002). Establishing trust between government agencies and FBCOs could be a challenge in places where officials fear that faith-based organizations will proselytize to people receiving services, in violation of existing laws.

In the context of these concerns and ambiguities, collaboration between government agencies and FBCOs may not occur without an explicit effort to encourage it. The White House notes in its review of barriers that "the absence of affirmative language in program rules and funding announcements listing religious organizations as eligible easily can be taken by program officials and by potential religious applicants as mandating their exclusion" (2001). FBCO leaders and members also may have political differences with government leaders, inhibiting collaboration (Sherman and Stanakis 2002). Or, they may perceive government agencies as too far removed from the level of grassroots action. It may require government agencies to make a clear statement of interest in working with FBCOs for those organizations to take steps toward collaboration.

2. Concerns Regarding Potential Influence on FBCO Missions and Activities

Leaders of FBCOs also may be disinclined to partner with government agencies out of concern about ceding control over their missions. In a study of faith-based organizations providing TANF employment services in Indiana, 57 percent of "strongly faith-influenced" groups reported that accepting government contracts did, in fact, affect their mission (Bielefeld et al. 2003). Interestingly, comments from these organizations indicate that the effects were generally considered positive, such as a broadening of services or purpose that helped energize members. However, other research suggests less sanguine perceptions among FBCOs, in particular, that they may mistrust government agencies or are circumspect about having their services monitored. A survey of religious groups in Oklahoma revealed that leaders worried that collaboration with state agencies would divert them from their religious mission and prompt government intrusion (GAO 2002). According to an Urban Institute study of FBOs providing employment assistance, even some groups offering services without religious content felt that the prospect of government supervision could deter them from participating in federal programs (Kramer et al. 2002).

B. LACK OF AWARENESS

A basic lack of familiarity between government agencies and FBCOs can hamper collaboration between the two sectors. Workforce investment agencies may not be informed of the services that FBCOs offer or have systems in place to help clients access assistance from smaller, community-based providers. Similarly, FBCOs may have no experience with One-Stop centers or other resources of the workforce investment system. Differences in culture and language could lead to misunderstandings between FBCOs and government agencies. Finally, FBCOs may be unaware of opportunities to apply for government funding.

1. Limited Outreach and Knowledge of WIB or FBCO Services

Recent studies of DOL grants to intermediaries and workforce investment boards point out the limited awareness and interaction that often exist between workforce development agencies and FBCOs. In Brevard County, Florida, where the United Way received a DOL intermediary grant, for example, the local workforce investment board previously had few links with local FBCOs that provided services to low-income people. Likewise, community-based organizations in the county did not refer clients to local One-Stop centers because they did not know about services the centers offered (DOL 2004a). A review of DOL's grant to Job Service North Dakota, the state workforce development agency, notes that relationships between that agency and local FBCOs historically had been informal and somewhat haphazard. There was no system for making referrals between One-Stop centers and community-based organizations; referrals that did occur depended on individual staff members taking steps to investigate and contact local groups (DOL 2004a).

Government agencies may encounter difficulties reaching out to FBCOs because of the diversity and dispersed leadership of grassroots organizations. Identifying key groups and making contact with their leaders—particularly influential "gatekeepers" to the FBCO community—is difficult in places where numerous, small organizations exist (Sherman and Stanakis 2002).

2. Differences in Culture and Language

Effective outreach and communication between government agencies and FBCOs may also require attention to using common language, as jargon including acronyms and program titles may be confusing or threatening for FBCOs (Voll et al. 2004). Moreover, FBCOs and government agencies often have very different missions and organizational cultures that can lead to mutual misunderstandings.

3. Lack of Information Regarding Funding Opportunities

In some cases, collaboration between government agencies and FBCOs does not occur because FBCOs simply do not know about opportunities to receive government funding. Numerous observers have identified this lack of information as a key barrier to Charitable Choice implementation. The White House, for example, notes that federal agencies typically

make grant announcements in the Federal Register or on their websites—sources that "are not everyday reading for small faith-based and community groups" (White House 2001). Under these circumstances, FBCOs must be knowledgeable about what agencies and programs are relevant to the services they deliver in order to find out about government funding opportunities. Unless they have experience with government funding, therefore, FBCOs are unlikely to be aware of new funding opportunities (GAO 2002). Organizations without experience may also misunderstand the nature of government funding. Leaders of some FBCOs in Oklahoma, for instance, were under the impression that the state's Charitable Choice initiative meant money had been set aside specifically for the use of faith-based groups. They were disappointed to discover that their groups would need to compete for government funding with other organizations (Sharp 2003).

This obstacle also exists for FBCOs that may be eligible for funding from state or local agencies. A review of Charitable Choice implementation in Michigan found that "one of the largest obstacles to the expansion of government partnerships with faith-based organizations" was that FBCOs knew little "about the availability of state contracts and how to best compete for those contracts" (Davis 2004). A similar situation existed in Texas, where officials "quickly realized that faith-based organizations are often at a disadvantage in learning about available monies" (Ebaugh 2003). The Texas Workforce Commission responded by establishing an Internet bulletin board and database with information on FBCOs so that workforce professionals would become familiar with FBCO services and announce grants and other opportunities to a wider community. Likewise, the Brevard Workforce Development Board realized that outreach targeted to FBCOs would be necessary to encourage them to respond to funding opportunities (DOL 2004a).

C. LIMITED FBCO CAPACITY

Another barrier to government collaboration with FBCOs is uncertainty around the ability of FBCOs to meet the requirements associated with government contracts and contribute toward program performance goals. By definition, FBCOs are extremely small organizations. Although FBCOs may have the potential to expand the service offerings and availability of workforce investment programs, the limited administrative, financial, and service capacity of smaller organizations could hamper their effective participation in government programs.

1. Administrative and Financial Capacity

FBCOs' limited administrative capacity can affect their ability to produce grant applications. Organizations may not have a grant writer available to respond professionally to funding opportunities when they arise. A competitive grant-making process also will tend to favor larger organizations that have a proven track record, and existing relationships with representatives of the workforce investment board (Voll et al. 2004). For these reasons, FBCOs may be at a significant disadvantage in responding to funding opportunities.

Grants from government agencies typically involve detailed budgeting, and regular audits or reporting. Although FBCOs may be capable service providers at the local level,

they do not always have systems and resources in place to handle the requirements of government grants (GAO 2002, Kramer et al. 2002). FBCOs may lack computer systems for maintaining information about clients, for example, or they may lack appropriate accounting systems. It may also be difficult for FBCOs to take steps required to protect the privacy of client information. Public officials, including those in workforce development agencies, have expressed concern about FBCOs' ability to handle such tasks as responding to audits, tracking caseloads and outcomes, and managing finances reliably (Kramer et al. 2002). Local officials interviewed in a GAO study expressed concern that "some new FBO providers may have never submitted a budget" (GAO 2002). The study also notes that FBCOs may have few staff or volunteers—sometimes only one person—to perform the administrative tasks often required of a government contractor.

FBCOs also may not have the financial means to provide services under standard government funding arrangements. The costs of launching and providing services can be substantial, and some FBCO representatives anticipate cash flow problems if payments are not timely (GAO 2002). The design of government awards to FBCOs can be especially important in this regard. Arrangements that require organizations to provide services before they receive payment—such as pay-for-performance contracts—may not be feasible for community organizations with limited financial resources (McConnell et al. 2003).

2. Service Capacity and Effectiveness

Meeting WIA performance standards is a key concern for many workforce agencies, and officials may wonder whether FBCOs will be able to support this objective. Some observers and workforce professionals are confident that FBCOs can help improve WIBs' performance through their links and familiarity with local communities and, as mission-driven organizations, by making extraordinary efforts to meet customers' needs (Bender 2003, Voll et al. 2004). Others point to the lack of knowledge about the efficacy of FBCOs compared to other types of service providers. As mission-driven organizations, FBCOs may also be more likely to target harder-to-serve populations, such as the homeless. This focus could expand the reach of WIB services but may make it more difficult for FBCOs to achieve ambitious performance goals. Questions regarding FBCO efficacy and service populations may give pause to workforce agency administrators concerned about the possible effects of collaboration on performance results. Concerns about performance results may lead administrators to prefer certain types of collaboration, such as nonfinancial partnerships with FBCOs.

CHAPTER V

OVERCOMING THE BARRIERS TO COLLABORATIONS

M any argue that FBCOs can play an important role in providing effective services and improving access to services in the One-Stop system. Yet, as described in the previous chapter, FBCOs face barriers to participating in the workforce investment system. This chapter describes some of the approaches that have been taken to promote collaborations between WIBs and FBCOs and the lessons learned from previous efforts at collaborations. It begins by outlining some of the strategies used to promote collaborations. It then describes how intermediaries can play a key role in developing the collaborations. We end the chapter by describing the lessons learned in promoting collaborations from the Touching Lives and Communities (TLC) pilot initiative.

A. STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE COLLABORATIONS

We identified six broad sets of strategies that can be used to promote collaborations. As described in the next chapter, recipients of the DOL grants to promote collaborations have used many, but not all, of these strategies.

1. Information Gathering

To determine the need for FBCO collaborations, WIBs can inventory the One-Stop customers' unmet needs and the availability of FBCOs to meet those needs. Information about One-Stop customers' needs can be collected from customer surveys and from interviews and focus groups with One-Stop and WIB staff. Collecting information about the services provided by FBCOs is more challenging. Often, lists of FBCO service providers do not exist and need to be constructed through a resource mapping process. This may involve contacting religious congregations, neighborhood associations, community action centers, intermediaries, interfaith councils, other service providers, and grassroots networks (DOL 2004b). A city's liaison for faith-based initiatives and community intermediaries may also be sources of information about local FBCOs. Useful information to gather about each organization might include the services provided, the location of the provider, and how to contact the provider. This information can be collected in either paper

or on-line directories and can be used by One-Stop staff (and other community providers) to refer customers to FBCOs.

2. Outreach

Outreach efforts can address collaboration barriers related to WIB and FBCO ignorance of each other's missions and services. Removing these barriers requires the outreach campaign to provide information to FBCOs about the One-Stop system and the services it provides as well as providing information to the One-Stop staff about FBCOs. In order to dispel common misunderstandings of the law, it also requires providing both One-Stop staff and FBCOs accurate information about the regulations regarding federal funding of FBOs (TEN 15-03). Outreach may also involve providing information to FBCOs about the availability of technical assistance and information they can share with employers.

Outreach activities can include the following:

- ***Conferences***. Several states—including Colorado, Virginia, Oklahoma, North Carolina, New Jersey, Texas, and Indiana—have held conferences in which they have invited members of the faith community and provided information about the One-Stop system and opportunities for FBCOs to partner with the government. DOL's Touching Lives and Communities project, a technical assistance initiative, has also organized virtual and live conferences for WIBs, nonprofits, and workforce professionals to provide technical assistance on collaboration.

- ***Websites***. California, Indiana, Virginia, New Jersey, Texas, Oklahoma, and the District of Columbia have websites that provide an overview of Charitable Choice laws, list grant opportunities, provide technical assistance documents, list social service providers, and have community bulletin boards (Otten 2004). Websites for DOL's Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (www.dol.gov/cfbci) and the Touching Lives and Communities project (www.dol-tlc.org) also provide a variety of resources related to collaboration with FBCOs.

- ***Presentations in the Community***. WIB or One-Stop staff can make presentations about the workforce investment system and its ability to partner with FBCOs at key community organizations (such as the FBCOs themselves and any interfaith alliance organizations) as well as at community events (such as job fairs). The DOL's Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in conjunction with the Center for Education and Research produced a presentation on CD-ROM that can be used to share information on the faith-based and community initiatives. It can be customized to provide information about the local One-Stop system.

- ***Open Houses***. One-Stop centers can host open houses and invite FBCO representatives.

- ***Informal Outreach***. One-Stop staff can go to local places of worship and talk about the services they provide and their desire to collaborate. As noted by representatives of the Cumberland County WIB (2004), "more can be accomplished over a cup of coffee than in a conference room."

3. Adding Access Points to the One-Stop System and Increasing One-Stop Referrals

For some populations, there are barriers that may prevent access to the One-Stop system. These include not knowing about the One-Stop system or the services it provides, not trusting the system, not being able to obtain transportation to the One-Stop center (especially a problem in rural areas), limited English proficiency, and limited computer literacy (D'Amico et al. 2004).

FBCOs can reduce these barriers in two main ways. First, they can house additional access points into the One-Stop system at their facilities. They can do this by housing electronic kiosks that can be used to access key labor market information or by housing satellite One-Stop centers with a resource room and counseling staff. Housing access points to the One-Stop system at FBCOs introduces customers to the system at places that customers know and trust in their local community. FBCO staff or volunteers can assist the customers with any language, literacy, or computer literacy problems faced when using the kiosks and satellite One-Stop centers. In Florida, the United Way of Brevard County provided 20 FBCOs with the hardware, software, and Internet connection required for customers to access information from the One-Stop system (DOL 2004a).

The second way in which FBCOs can expand access to the One-Stop system is to encourage clients to use services at the comprehensive One-Stop centers. They can do this by referrals. Information about the One-Stop can be provided on referral cards that can be handed out to their clients. One FBCO even puts information about the One-Stop center in baskets of food it was giving out (DOL 2004b). In addition, FBCO staff can transport clients to the One-Stop center and provide assistance to the client with the use of resources and services available at the center.

4. Providing Awards or Subawards to FBCOs

One formal way for FBCOs to participate in the workforce investment system is to provide awards or subawards to FBCOs. The award—from the federal government, state, WIB, or intermediary—can be given directly to FBCOs. Alternatively, it can be given to a larger organization and then subawarded to FBCOs. These awards can be used to cover the costs of providing services or of housing kiosks or satellite One-Stop centers. The awards may also be targeted to increase the capacity of the FBCOs to provide services, perform administrative functions, or apply for other government grants.

Previous collaboration experiences suggest that agencies making awards or subawards to FBCOs should consider addressing the following issues (DOL 2004b; Sherman and Stanakis 2002):

- *Notifying FBCOs about Award Opportunities*. Instead of just providing information about awards in the Federal Register, information should also be sent directly to all FBCOs that are known to provide services, posted on websites used by FBCOs, and advertised in local newspapers. FBCOs may need to be actively recruited to attend meetings about potential awards.

- *Simplifying the Procurement Process*. Requests for grant applications should be short and easy to understand and use acronyms and jargon sparingly. Bidders conferences can provide a forum for FBCOs to ask questions about the procurement process.

- *Structuring the Awards*. Award amounts should be commensurate with the capacity of FBCOs and not be so large that it overwhelms the FBCO. The award may provide advance payments or frequent reimbursements of costs to avoid causing FBCOs cash flow problems. Grants or contracts that base payments on performance are often risky for FBCOs that often do not have the funding base to be able to withstand large fluctuations in income (McConnell et al. 2003).

- *Monitoring the Grants*. Grants should be closely monitored and technical assistance provided when needed.

5. Capacity Building

Increasing the capacity of the FBCOs to provide services and administer federal funding effectively and efficiently is necessary to sustain collaborations within the One-Stop system. Capacity-building strategies include (1) training and technical assistance, (2) providing awards or subawards to FBCOs for service provision, and (3) providing computer hardware, software, and Internet connection to FBCOs to build their ability to apply for federal funding and provide services.

Training and technical assistance is usually provided by intermediaries—larger organizations with knowledge of both nonprofit and government organizations (see Section B below). It can, however, also be provided by other agencies, including WIBs. Training is usually provided in classes or workshops; although it can be provided over the Internet. Technical assistance is usually provided as one-on-one consultations, either in-person, by telephone, or via the Internet. DOL is currently providing an online forum for peer learning through its Touching Lives and Communities project.

Topics covered in training and technical assistance provided to FBCOs may include:

- *Nonprofit Administration*.   Topics may include mission development, strategic planning, nonprofit board development, fiscal accounting, how to apply for 501(c)(3) tax status, and systems to track performance.

- *Grant Administration*. Topics may include the procurement process, grant writing, grant management, grant closeout procedures, invoicing, and WIA performance measures.

- *WIA Services*.   Topics may include eligibility for WIA core, intensive, and training services and certification on eligible provider lists.

- *Recruiting and Managing Volunteers*.   Topics include how to recruit volunteers, sources of volunteers, and how to use volunteers effectively.

- *Service Provision*.   Technical assistance in best practices in service provision can be provided.

6.   Developing Opportunities for FBCOs to Provide Guidance to WIBs

Because of their community familiarity, FBCOs can contribute input on local needs and conditions during the WIBs' planning process, and provide feedback on whether current workforce services are meeting those needs. FBCOs can contribute to the WIB's strategic planning process most directly by having FBCO leadership serving on the board. FBCO leadership can also serve on committees advising the WIB and can be invited to strategic planning meetings.

B.   INTERMEDIARIES

Intermediaries are organizations that can assist FBCOs in providing services, increasing capacity, and partnering with government agencies. To do this effectively, they need to be familiar with FBCOs in the community, nonprofit administration, and government contracting. Intermediaries are usually larger nonprofit organizations and often operate nationally. Some are faith-based (such as the Salvation Army); others are secular (such as Seedco[3]).

Intermediaries can assist FBCOs in developing partnerships in at least four ways:

1. *"Bridge Building."* Trusted by both government agencies and the FBCOs, they can assist in developing relationships. Intermediaries may know the key stakeholders in both the faith community and the WIB. Knowledge of the terms and acronyms used by WIBs enables intermediaries to be "translators" for the FBCOs (Voll et al. 2004).

---

[3] Structured Employment Economic Development Corporation.

2. ***Providing Training and Technical Assistance***.   Experience in nonprofit administration allows the intermediaries to provide training and technical assistance to smaller FBCOs as described above.

3. ***Mentoring the FBCOs***.   Often intermediaries act as mentors to the FBCOs providing support and assistance on a long-term basis as needed. In a study of faith-based intermediaries, Sherman (2002) found that some FBCOs viewed mentoring as the most valuable service provided by the intermediary.

4. ***Acting as the Fiscal Agent for FBCOs***. Some intermediaries serve as the fiscal agent for the FBCOs, managing the contracting relationship with the government and acting as liaison between the FBCOs and the government. (This was required under the DOL Intermediary grants.) This involves the intermediary writing the application for funds, subawarding the funds to FBCOs, and, in some cases, collecting performance measurement data.

One of the main challenges facing intermediaries is the reluctance of foundations to provide funds for intermediary activities rather than for direct service delivery. Some intermediaries—usually the secular ones—require payment for services such as training and technical assistance.

C.   THE TLC PILOT PROJECT: LESSONS LEARNED[4]

In 2002, the TLC initiative launched pilot projects in Memphis, Tennessee, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The goal of these projects was to promote collaborations between the workforce investment system and FBCOs. The TLC project team—contractors to the DOL's Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives—worked to facilitate these collaborations. The team included nationally known experts as well as people from the pilot cities who were well known to local stakeholders.

In Memphis, an action group was developed with members of the Mayor's Office of Faith-Based Initiatives, FBCO leadership, and workforce system leaders. The goal of this group was to formulate strategies for collaboration. The four main strategies adopted were:

1. ***Develop Neighborhood Resource Centers***. Neighborhood resource centers were to be located at FBCOs in the neighborhoods with the highest unemployment. The centers would have kiosks with Internet connections so that the clients could access the services available at the One-Stop system. The centers would be staffed by WIB-trained FBCO volunteers or paid staff.

2. ***Use FBCOs to Provide Employability Skills***. Many of the FBCOs in the area could provide employability or life skills training to job seekers.

---

[4] This section is drawn from Voll et al. (2004).

3. **Use FBCOs to Provide Customized Training**. A FBCO developed a relationship with the Memphis Marriott Downtown to provide customized hospitality training to disadvantaged job seekers. As this was customized training, the cost of the training was split equally between the WIB and the Memphis Marriott.

4. *Contract with Intermediaries*. The WIB created a request for proposals for intermediaries to promote collaborations between FBCOs and the WIB. The intermediaries would: conduct outreach to FBCOs in the community, keep the FBCOs in the community aware of workforce development programs and activities, provide technical assistance to FBCOs, and help develop the neighborhood resource centers.

In Milwaukee, the WIB contracts out to private organizations to administer the One-Stop centers and provide intensive and training services. Although these private contractors include large faith-based organizations, such as the YWCA, few small FBCOs participate in the workforce investment system. One of the major barriers to participation of FBCOs is that it is difficult for them to compete effectively in bidding for service provision against larger organizations that have proven track records.

The Milwaukee WIB and the TLC project team focused on four main approaches to increasing the participation of FBCOs in the workforce investment system:

1. **Provide Welfare-to-Work Grants to Organizations that Subcontract to FBCOs.** The WIB selected a non-profit organization, The New Hope Project, with a reputation for working with other community organizations to provide employment services for the Welfare-to-Work program. The New Hope Project subcontracted to two grassroots FBCOs to provide services to ex-offenders.

2. **Include FBCOs on Lists of Eligible Intensive Service Providers.** The Milwaukee WIB approves providers to provide intensive services to WIA Title I "adults." Intensive services include case management, counseling, basic skills, GED services, and supportive services. FBCOs could become eligible providers of intensive services.

3. **Build FBCO Capacity Using Intermediaries**. To make sure that the FBCOs on the eligible intensive service provider list are able to provide intensive services, the WIB contracted with intermediaries to provide technical assistance and other capacity-building services.

4. **Educate Caseworkers**. To encourage caseworkers at One-Stop centers to refer to FBCOs, the intermediaries also were tasked with increasing caseworkers' awareness of FBCOs and their value to certain populations.

The TLC pilot projects provide examples of how collaborations can be developed in two quite different WIB environments. Of the lessons learned, three cross-cutting findings are most relevant to this study. First, intermediaries can play important roles in developing partnerships and building FBCO capacity. Second, the sustainability of the partnerships

requires that the FBCO seek sources of funding other than WIA. Third, it takes time to form collaborations and expectations for progress should reflect this.

CHAPTER VI

STATE AND INTERMEDIARY GRANTS: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

P artnerships between FBCOs and One-Stop systems may expand the amount and types of resources available to help customers get and keep jobs. However, the initial investment required in cultivating new partnerships can discourage relationships from forming. Recognizing the need to jumpstart these relationships, beginning in 2002, the DOL Employment and Training Administration provided grants for states and intermediary organizations to develop these relationships. In this chapter, we use information obtained from grant applications, progress reports, and final reports[5] to describe the grantees, grant objectives, structure of the grants, types of services provided, collaborative strategies, and strengths and challenges grantees faced in carrying out grant activities.

A. THE GRANTEES

In 2002, funding totaled $11.9 million for 12 state grants and $5 million for nine intermediary grants. In 2003, funding totaled about $3.5 million for eight new intermediaries. In addition, about two-thirds of the 2002 intermediary grants were extended (at a lower level of funding). For state and intermediary grantees, the grant period was 12 months. Extensions were six months beyond the end of the grant period. Table VI.1 lists state and intermediary grantees in each year.

State grantees are typically state workforce development agencies—the state Department of Labor, state WIB, or Job Service. In Indiana, the grant was given to FaithWorks, an initiative formed by the state's Family and Social Services Administration to promote FBCO service provision and assist organizations in accessing government support.

---

[5] DOL (2004a) describes the United Way of Brevard County, Florida 2002 intermediary grant and the Job Service North Dakota 2002 state grant. Otten (2004) describes the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment 2002 state grant.

Table VI.1. 2002 State, and 2002 and 2003 Intermediary Grantees

2002 State Grantees (12 Grantees)	2002 Intermediaries (9 Grantees)	2003 Intermediaries (8 Grantees)
Agency for Workforce Innovation (Florida)	Cobb Community Collaborative (Georgia)	**Appalachian Center for Economic Networks (Ohio)
Arizona Department of Economic Security	**Concurrent Technologies Corporation (Pennsylvania)	**Capitol Region Education Council (Connecticut)
District of Columbia	**Hope Network West Michigan (Michigan)	**East Harlem Employment Services (New York)
FaithWorks, Indiana		
Colorado Department of Labor and Employment	Richmond County Community Support Center (North Carolina)	Experience Works (Louisiana)
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Team PA Workforce Investment Board	**Seedco (New York)	**Good Samaritan Ministries (Michigan)
	**SER—Jobs for Progress (Texas)	HOPE Community Development Corporation (West Virginia)
Connecticut Department of Labor		
Job Service North Dakota	South Coast Business Employment Corporation (Oregon)	Labor's Community Service Agency (California)
Massachusetts Commonwealth Corporation	**United Way of Brevard County (Florida)	Youth Policy Institute (California)
Ohio		
Virginia Employment Commission	**University of Massachusetts Boston; Institute for Community Inclusion (Massachusetts)	
Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development		

** Indicates a grant that was extended.

Intermediary grantees, as defined by the DOL in its request for grant applications, are "non-profit, community, and/or faith-based organizations with connections to grassroots faith-based and community organizations with the ability to connect those organizations to the nation's workforce investment system in more than one service area" (Office of the Federal Register 2002). They are a diverse group of nonprofit organizations that provide a range of community services to disadvantaged populations.

The majority of intermediary grantees were either employer-focused or educational organizations. For example, Appalachian Center for Economic Networks (ACEnet) in Ohio is a microenterprise program created to help job seekers create small businesses. Capitol Region Education Council, in Hartford, Connecticut, links disadvantaged workers to public education and training opportunities within the community.

About half of the intermediary grantees are locally based organizations. For example, Cobb Community Collaborative is a consortium of local agencies, businesses, and county leaders creating jobs within four counties in Georgia. The remaining grantees are local affiliates of national organizations. SER-Jobs for Progress is a national organization that addresses the economic concerns of Hispanics in 18 different states and serves about

600,000 individuals nationwide. Two of the intermediary grantees—Hope Network and Good Samaritan Ministries—are faith-based organizations; the other grantees were secular.

B. GRANT OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the grants, as defined by the DOL in its solicitation for grant applications, is to: (1) increase the number of FBCOs serving as committed and active partners in the One-Stop delivery system, (2) expand access of FBCOs and customers to the services offered by One-Stop centers, and (3) identify and highlight successful and innovative practices in involving FBCOs in One-Stop systems (Office of the Federal Register 2002).

The individual state and intermediary grants differed somewhat in their focus. The main focus of the state grants was information collection and dissemination, and encouraging communities to bring together the primary decision makers from the local WIBs, One-Stop centers, and FBCOs to create new relationships and cultivate existing ones. The intermediary grants, while also focusing on information collection and dissemination, placed greater emphasis on providing direct services through FBCOs, FBCO capacity building, and developing One-Stop system access points at FBCOs.

Based on the progress reports, state grantees carried out several activities, alone or in combination. First, grantees identified existing resources within communities using systematic information gathering techniques (e.g., surveys of local FBCOs, resource mapping, environmental scanning, and focus groups). Second, grantees provided information to FBCOs via conferences and presentations so that they could understand the basic operations of the One-Stop systems. Third, grantees introduced administrators from FBCOs, local One-Stop systems, and WIBs. Some states also used the grants to increase access to the One-Stop system (by placing computer kiosks at FBCOs, for example). Colorado also used its grant to subaward to FBCOs for direct service delivery.

C. STRUCTURE OF THE GRANTS

The state grants were typically larger than the intermediary grants (Table VI.2). The size of the state grants ranged from about $450,000 in the District of Columbia to $1.5 million in Wisconsin. The average amount of the state grants was around approximately $1 million. Nearly two-thirds of the state grants provided more than $1 million in funding. In contrast, intermediary grants ranged from roughly $270,000 to just under $655,000. The average grant amount for 2002 intermediary grantees was about $560,000, and the average amount of the 2003 intermediary grants was about $460,000.

Reflecting this difference in size, state grants tended to subaward to multiple workforce investment boards while intermediary grants generally targeted one workforce investment area, which sometimes included multiple counties. SER—Jobs for Progress, a 2002

Table VI.2. Structure of the 2002 State and 2002 and 2003 Intermediary Grantees

Characteristics	2002 State Grantees (12 grantees)*	2002 Intermediaries (9 grantees)	2003 Intermediaries (8 grantees)
Grant Amount			
Less than $500,000	2	1	5
500,000 to 1 million	3	8	3
1 million +	7	0	0
Average	$989,512	$555,556	$460,418
Number of Partner Agencies*			
None	4	7	7
1	3	0	0
2	0	0	0
3+	2	2	0
Number of Grantees that Targeted Specific Populations	3	2	5

Source: Grantee progress reports and the U.S. Department of Labor, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

*We do not have this information for three state grantees: the District of Columbia, Faithworks, and Ohio.

intermediary grantee, and Seedco were the only intermediary grantees to operate in multiple states. SER—Jobs for Progress operated in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma (one community in each state) and Seedco operated in New York City, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Florida, and Alabama.

Applying for grants with partner organizations adds resources and support for the grant and brings existing partners to assist with collaborative efforts. About half of the state grantees partnered with at least one agency or community organization to apply for funding (Table VI.2). For example the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment aimed to expand resources and support for the grant by partnering with three other organizations: the Colorado Department of Human Services, Colorado Foundation for Families and Children, and Policy Studies, Inc. We know of only two intermediary organizations that opted to partner with other organizations.

Seven intermediaries and three states used funding from the grant to expand resources and services for target populations that may require specialized services to move into jobs and are frequently underserved in the One-Stop system. Targeted populations included customers with personal and family challenges, various racial or ethnic groups, and limited English speakers. For example, the University of Massachusetts at Boston and the Institute for Community Inclusion targeted "diverse cultures and communities." They used grant funding to provide in-house translation and interpreter services and English as a Second Language classes for non- and limited-English speaking customers.

D. USE OF SUBAWARDS

All the intermediary grantees and nearly all the state grantees subawarded to other organizations (Table VI.3). State grantees, targeting the system level, tended to contract with workforce investment systems and local WIBs to identify agency partners and carry out activities to promote collaboration rather than subawarding to FBCOs. Colorado is an exception—it subawarded to 35 FBCOs as well as to 14 WIBs. All intermediary grantees provide funding (typically less than $100,000 in total) to FBCOs to provide WIA core services and supportive services to job seekers and/or to serve as access points within the community for One-Stop centers. Some subawards were used to fund collaborative activities. For example, in Pennsylvania, Team Pennsylvania Workforce Investment Board provided subawards to four local WIBs to hold local regional summits with FBCOs to share information about local workforce investment systems.

E. STRATEGIES USED BY GRANTEES

We identified six key activities that grantees included in their reports as activities that they completed as part of their grant. Table VI.4 lists these activities and the frequency of their reported use by grantees.

Information Gathering. Information gathering activities were used to identify the existing community resources that may benefit customers served within the One-Stop system. State grantees were much more likely to fund these information-gathering activities than the intermediary grantees. Some grantees used resource mapping, which involves identifying organizational needs and existing community resources to address those needs. Others developed surveys to distribute to FBCOs to gather information about the type of services available, how to access services, and hours of operation, among other information. For example, Job Service in North Dakota surveyed 723 FBCOs to develop an on-line referral system for One-Stop staff. In Massachusetts, funding supported use of surveys, interviews, and on-line data collection within local communities to identify FBCO partners. Grantees used the collected information to develop websites, resource guides, and automated referral systems.

Outreach. Outreach activities are designed to inform agency staff and job seekers about services available through One-Stop systems and FBCOs and how to access them. All the grants for which we have reports covered outreach activities, although the scope and scale of outreach varied considerably. Connecticut Department of Labor and Good Samaritan Ministries in Michigan implemented some of the most aggressive outreach strategies. In Connecticut, the state Department of Labor contracted with two public television stations to show "best practices" in collaborations of FBCOs and One-Stop centers as part of a 13 episode Connecticut WorkNet series on employment and training services. The grantee reported that they distributed 80,000 flyers promoting the television effort and created 40,000 posters to distribute to One-Stop centers, WIBs, and FBCOs. Good Samaritan, an intermediary grantee in Michigan, distributed 10,000 flyers to agencies throughout the workforce development area to inform them about the One-Stop system.

Table VI.3. Number of Subawards, Funding Amount, and Types of Services Provided

	2002 State Grantees (12 grantees)	2002 Intermediaries (9 grantees)	2003 Intermediaries (8 grantees)
Number of Subawards*			
None	3	0	0
1-5	1	1	4
6-10	3	3	2
More than 10	4	5	1
Average Amount of Subawards*			
Less than $50,000	0	4	3
$50,000-$100,000	0	0	3
More than $100,000	2	1	0
Key Services Provided			
Direct Services	5	6	6
Remote One-Stop	1	5	2
Referrals to One-Stops	7	3	6
Collaborative Activities	5	1	0

Source: Grantee progress reports and the U.S. Department of Labor, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

* Some of the state and intermediary grantees did not include the number or amount of the subawards in written reports.

Improving Access to the One-Stop System. FBCOs can expand access to the One-Stop system in at least two ways: (1) by housing computer kiosks or satellite One-Stop centers at their locations to provide additional access points into the One-Stop system, and (2) by encouraging the use of the comprehensive One-Stop centers by, for example, referring clients to the One-Stop centers, providing transportation, or co-locating FBCO staff at the comprehensive One-Stop centers.

Five state grantees and eight intermediary grantees increased the number of access points into the One-Stop system (see box on next page). In Pennsylvania, the Team Pennsylvania Workforce Investment Board purchased computers and Internet access for 27 FBCOs to expand access to One-Stop services. Capitol Region Education Council provided six FBCOs with computer kiosks to become "portals" to the One-Stop system, especially for job seekers with limited English proficiency. Virginia Employment Commission provided 43 FBCOs with new Internet computer systems for linking clients to One-Stop centers.

Several of the intermediary grantees conducted activities to encourage the use of the comprehensive One-Stop centers. Bay Area First Step in Oregon received funding to provide their clients with a bus service to the local One-Stop center once a week. Job Service in North Dakota created referral cards to be used by FBCOs in referring clients to the One-Stop centers. Only one grantee, Richmond County Community Support Center, co-located FBCO staff within One-Stop centers.

Chapter VI: State and Intermediary Grants: What Have We Learned?

Table VI.4. Grantee Activities Categorized by Collaborative Strategies

	State 2002 (12 grantees)	Intermediary 2002 (9 grantees)	Intermediary 2003 (8 grantees)
Information Gathering	7	4	4
Resource Mapping	3	1	3
Directories/Resource Catalog/Web	7	2	0
Surveys	7	2	3
Outreach	12	9	8
Conferences	6	4	2
Recruiting/Social Marketing/Linking	11	9	8
Improving Access	5	5	3
Satellite One-Stop Centers	5	1	1
Co-location of Agencies or Staff	0	1	0
Computer Access	3	4	3
Direct Services	4	7	8
Provided by Grantees	0	0	0
Provided by Subawardees	4	7	8
Capacity Building	10	9	8
Training and Technical Assistance	10	9	8
Structural Resources (e.g., computer hardware, kiosks)	4	3	4
Interagency Collaborations	9	9	6
Interagency Workgroups	5	0	2
Board Involvement	5	2	1
Collaborative Strategic Planning	5	4	3
Formal Agreements (e.g., MOUs)	5	4	1

Source: Grantee progress reports and the U.S. Department of Labor, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

Building Access Points in Brevard County

Funding awarded to the United Way of Brevard (UWB), an intermediary grantee, was used to create Mini-Career Centers in 20 FBCOs in Brevard County, Florida. FBCO subawardees were provided with a small resource library, a work station, and computers with connections to the Brevard Job Link system. In addition, UWB maintained the computer equipment, paid for high-speed Internet at each site, and provided a monthly stipend to the FBCO. Training and technical support provided to subawardees included areas such as computer usage, One-Stop collaboration, how to talk with job-seekers, and using Job Link resources.   UWB reported that in one year, 2,487 customers received core job search services at the Mini-Career Centers (DOL 2004a).

Direct Services. Intermediary grantees, more so than state grantees, provide subawards to FBCOs for direct services. Nearly all of the intermediary grantees and about one third of the state grantees provided subawards to FBCOs to provide direct services. Direct services provided by subawardees included employment services, emergency assistance programs, supportive services, education and training, soft-skills training, and substance abuse treatment. For example, Outreach for Jesus received $25,000 to provide work experience, job readiness, and supportive services to homeless individuals in Hamlet, North Carolina under the Richmond City Community Support Center grant. In New York, Zion Baptist Church received $80,000 to provide basic job readiness skills and continuing education classes for Hispanic job seekers.

Capacity Building. Capacity building is used primarily to improve the sustainability of the services and partnerships developed as a result of the grants. All the grantees reported that they used funding for services to strengthen FBCOs. These activities include mostly training and technical assistance to help FBCOs serve One-Stop customers more effectively or to increase the number of customers they are able to serve. For example, Seedco assigned subawardees a "coach" for one-on-one technical assistance in marketing, cultivating relationships with large retail employers, and analyzing the FBCOs facility needs. SER—Jobs for Progress provided a two-day training for subawardees on One-Stop centers and the workforce investment system. In San Diego, Labor's Community Service Agency (an intermediary grantee) held nine community workshops at the local One-Stop centers to improve services provided by FBCOs. Cobb Community Collaborative in Georgia links FBCOs with an organization that can provide individualized and ongoing support and technical assistance to FBCO administrators and staff. Some grant funds were also used to pay for computer hardware, software, and Internet connections at the FBCOs.

Interagency Collaborations. Formal interagency collaborative arrangements implemented by the grantees included multi-agency workgroups, WIB board involvement by FBCOs, and interagency service agreements such as memoranda of understanding (MOUs). For example, the state of Florida developed a new consortium of 120 FBCOs to discuss strategic planning, capacity building, and sustainability strategies. Colorado uses Learning Circles where community partners meet regularly to network, share information, and respond to community needs (see box). Nearly all of the grantees implement some form of formal collaborative arrangements.

Learning Circles: Encouraging Interagency Collaboration in Colorado

Colorado created the concept of "Learning Circles" where workforce centers, FBCOs, and other public agencies and community stakeholders meet to network, share agency information, and respond to community needs. A state grant supported regional Learning Circles in four service areas. Learning Circle conferences led to the development of community collaboration action teams (interagency workgroups) to address local issues. Funding also paid for technical assistance and facilitation for community action teams. Learning Circles and community collaboration action teams planned job development fairs; developed a transportation system to help low income families get to work, daycare, and school; collaborated with employers; developed a mentoring program; and developed a community response plan for homeless families with local FBCOs (Otten 2004).

F.   GRANTEE REPORTED OUTCOMES

Positive outcomes reported by the grantees reflect the beginning efforts of the collaborative process. Mostly, grantees reported the introduction of new partners to the One-Stop system and new customers accessing services through either the satellite One-Stop centers or referrals.   Other outcomes include completing efforts to expand the organizational capacities of FBCOs through training and technical assistance. Finally, grantees reported positive feedback from partner agencies, staff, and customers garnered through surveys and anecdotes.

1.   Increase in One-Stop Partners

Identifying and recruiting partners is the first step in building a collaborative One-Stop system.   Grantees report that activities increased awareness about potential community partners, the types of services they provide, and how to access them. State grantees, in particular, actively recruited new partners to the One-Stop system. In North Dakota, 370 FBCOs signed partnership agreements with the One-Stop centers. Virginia reportedly created 114 new partnerships. Concurrent Technologies Corporation, an intermediary grantee, also reported success with engaging new partners; 100 agencies were introduced to the One-Stop system through its efforts. Several of the grantees were successful with entering formal partnerships with agencies. One grantee reported that grant activities "increased awareness" of existing services available through FBCOs.

2.   New Customers Introduced to the One-Stop System

Collaboration as a result of the state and 2002/2003 intermediary grants reportedly increased the use of WIA core services in some areas. A few grantees reported increases in the number of new clients referred to the One-Stop or satellite One-Stop centers. United Way of Brevard reported that in May 2004, almost 3,000 customers were served from satellite One-Stop centers created through the grants and that 224 of these customers found jobs. SER—Progress for Jobs reported that 76 individuals were referred from subawardees to One-Stop systems within the grant period. In North Dakota, under a state grant, 2,201 referrals were reportedly made between FBCOs and One-Stop centers within the grant period. One grantee reported an increase in the number of hits on the agency website since the implementation of the grant.   Some grantees reported that customers who had not used One-Stop centers in the past chose to use services at the satellite One-Stop centers located at the FBCOs.

3.   Expanding the Capacity of FBCOs

Grant activities were used to build FBCOs' capacity to serve WIA customers either directly and/or as an access point. Training workshops, organizational planning, provision of structural resources, and individualized mentoring support are examples of activities used by the grantees to build the capacities of FBCOs. While the influence of training and technical activities and other capacity building activities can only be measured over time,

according to grantees, administrators and staff from some FBCOs reported that they benefited from these activities.

4. Sustainability of Collaborations

At the end of the grants, most state and intermediary grantees were in the introductory phases of cultivating relationships. Through these grants, agencies carried out activities that reflect basic forms of collaboration: identifying agency partners, information sharing, training and technical assistance, and organizational capacity building.

The long-term sustainability of these relationships remains unclear, but some grantees have made efforts to continue promoting collaboration between workforce agencies and FBCOs. The Brevard Workforce Development Board, for example, is using WIA funding to maintain support for FBCO access points to the workforce investment system. Collaborative activities and direct services provide a foundation for active partners to further build these relationships. Additional forms of collaboration such as collaborative workgroups, co-location of staff, and WIB board involvement were planned but remain as future steps for some grantees.

G. KEY CHALLENGES

In their progress reports, grantees described many challenges associated with implementing grant activities and cultivating active partnerships. Challenges as reported by the grantees include:

1. ***"Selling" the Collaborative Concept.*** Grantees found that partners—WIBs, One-Stop centers, and FBCOs—often need to be sold on the value added by collaboration before they are willing to participate. According to grantees, the time and energy required to cultivate these relationships and limited amount of trust among partners sometimes interfered with "buy in" and participation in collaborative activities. Active community outreach through the grants was used to gain support and trust from different partners.

2. ***Lack of Leadership.*** Lack of leadership among different agencies in some sites limited the effectiveness of carrying out grant activities. According to reports in one of the sites, personal problems experienced by the FBCOs' directors prevented grant activities from being completed. Another grantee reported that roles were not clearly defined as a result of lack of leadership. Grant activities were either not implemented or implemented on a limited basis in these sites.

3. ***Staff Turnover.*** Turnover in staff in One-Stop centers and FBCOs reportedly limited the amount of referrals between organizations. Sustaining collaboration required agencies with high turnover to frequently retrain staff since new staff were unaware of the resources available through One-Stop centers or FBCOs.

4. ***Lack of Information.*** Grantees reported that in some cases there was limited or unclear information distributed to One-Stop and FBCO staff. Some FBCOs

did not fully understand One-Stop systems or WIBs. According to grantee reports, FBCOs indicated that lack of information limited the number of referrals since staff was not aware of available services or how to access them.

5. **_Logistical Problems in Capacity Building._** Grantees reported logistical constraints associated with providing training and technical assistance to FBCOs. For example, travel between agencies was reported to be a drain on agency staff. In addition, some grantees indicated that there was limited time and resources to meet all the technical assistance needs of subawardees.

6. **_Limited Organizational Capacity of FBCOs._** Limited organizational capacities of FBCOs jeopardize the sustainability of the grants. Grantee reports indicate that FBCOs may struggle to carry out and sustain grant activities for several reasons. First, as described above, they sometimes lack information about the One-Stop system. Second, FBCOs had difficulty maintaining the computer and kiosk equipment provided to them through the subawards. According to grantees, agencies, especially smaller FBCOs, lacked computer staff to maintain the systems implemented through the grants. Third, grantees reported that some subawardees did not have the staff to write successful grants to continue the collaborative activities.

7. **_Completing Activities Within the Grant Timeframe_**. According to grantees, short grant periods do not allow enough time to carry out grant activities and cultivate collaborative relationships. Time-consuming grant activities included engaging stakeholders, navigating state bureaucratic procedures, and evaluating proposals for subawards.

CHAPTER VII

THE 2004 GRANTS TO WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS

_____

I n 2004, the DOL, Employment and Training Administration and the Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives focused their efforts to promote collaborations in the workforce investment system on the two main stakeholders: the WIBs and the FBCOs. In addition to awarding grants to grassroots FBCOs, the DOL awarded grants to 12 WIBs. This chapter summarizes the plans of the 2004 WIB grantees based on information from their grant applications.

A. THE GRANTS AND GRANTEES

The DOL awarded a total of $5.8 million in grants to 12 WIBs to promote collaborations with FBCOs. These grants cover the 18-month period between July 2004 and December 2005. Table VII.1 summarizes some characteristics of these grants and the WIBs that received them.

Ten of the twelve WIB grant awards were either exactly $500,000 or within $10,000 of that amount. The other two grants were $350,000 and $439,140. On average these grant awards were about $481,000—slightly smaller than the average amount of the grants to 2002 and 2003 intermediary grantees.

Six WIBs planned to partner with intermediary organizations to provide assistance to FBCOs. The WIBs sought intermediaries that could provide connections and experience in working with the FBCOs targeted by the grants. For example, the San Diego Workforce Partnership sought to overcome FBCOs apprehension about collaborating with the workforce system by working with an intermediary that is a well-known and trusted organization in the community—All Congregations Together. As the New Hampshire WIB, New Hampshire Community Technical College System planned to use its grant to serve youth (ages 16 to 24), it subawarded to Odyssey Youth Rebuild, a local organization with an established network and experience working with youth and organizations serving youth.

Table VII.1. Description of 2004 WIB Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount	Populations Targeted	Employer Industry Partnerships	Plan to Use Intermediary
San Diego Workforce Partnerships, Inc. (CA)	$500,000	Refugees with LEP Low-income minorities	FBCO subawardees required to identify business partners	Yes
City and County of Denver (CO)	$500,000	Immigrants Refugees Ex-offenders Youth offenders Homeless persons People with disabilities	Health care Hospitality/tourism Manufacturing Transportation	Yes
Capital Workforce Partners (CT)	$500,000	Low-income people	ShopRite of Manchester Hartford Convention Connecticut Retail Merchants Association	Yes
District of Columbia Government, Dept. of Employment Services (DC)	$494,308	Low-income persons	CVS Pharmacy Construction Lead testing companies	No
WorkNet Pinellas, Inc. (FL)	$439,140	People with LEP Ex-offenders Low-income persons	Healthcare Construction trade Manufacturing Utilities	Yes
LaFourche, Assumption, Terrebonne WIB, Inc. (LA)	$500,000	Low income persons Recent welfare recipients Persons with disabilities Ex-offenders	Bollinger Ship Yards Inc. Shaw Coastal Inc. Houma Auto Sales	Not reported
Anne Arundel Workforce Development Corporation (MD)	$490,803	Residents of detention centers Residents of low-income housing	Health care Hospitality Manufacturing Transportation	No
Metro North Regional Employment Board (MA)	$500,000	Underemployed and unemployed Persons with low literacy Persons with LEP	Banking Hospitality Health care	No
Ottawa County (MI)	$500,000	Low-income people Unemployed or underemployed Welfare recipients Ex-offenders People with LEP Female single parents	Boar's Head Provisions Manpower Gentex Corporation Bradford Company	Yes
Capital Area Michigan Works! (MI)	$350,000	People with disabilities Ex-offenders Welfare-to-work clients	Broadcast Group	Not reported
NH Community Technical College System (NH)	$500,000	Youth 16-24	Healthcare Construction Hospitality/tourism	Yes
County of Cumberland (NJ)	$499,562	Underemployed Unemployed At-risk youth People with LEP	Hospitality/tourism Construction Health care	Not reported

Source: Grantee applications

Chapter VII: The 2004 Grants to Workforce Investment Boards

All WIB grantees planned to serve disadvantaged populations (Table VII.1). Several grantees defined their target population broadly, including, for example, all low-income persons. Other grantees, however, plan to serve only one or two specific target populations, which often face multiple barriers to employment. Other populations targeted include ex-offenders, people with limited English proficiency (LEP), people with low literacy levels, homeless persons, refugees, persons with disabilities, single parents, welfare recipients, and persons transitioning from welfare. Several grantees reported that they focused on particular geographic areas with a high density of poverty associated with underemployment or unemployment.

The applicants for the 2004 WIB grants were required to discuss partnerships with employers. Five applicants named specific employers who would consider hiring persons who received services from the FBCOs under this grant (Table VII.1). One applicant plans to require the FBCO subawardees to partner with employers and has collaborated with an intermediary to help them do so. The other grantees named specific high-growth industries that they would target with their placement efforts. The most frequently named industries were healthcare, hospitality/tourism, and construction. Other industries named include manufacturing, transportation, and utilities.

B. PLANNED COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIES

Nearly all grantees planned to undertake information gathering efforts to get a better understanding of their community needs and resources (Table VII.2). This was often proposed as a first step in the project so that the grantees could get a better understanding of the kinds of resources available in their service delivery areas relative to the needs of the target population. The ten grantees that include information gathering in their plans intended to use strategies such as resource mapping, developing resource guides, and conducting surveys. Specific planned approaches to gathering information include attending meetings of local FBCOs, conducting surveys of local FBCOs, and inviting FBCO staff to informational sessions at One-Stop centers.

Conducting outreach efforts to FBCOs is a priority for WIB grantees. All 12 WIB grantees intend for their relationships with the FBCOs to help to bring in new clients to the One-Stop system. Most expected that the FBCOs were already serving a population that previously had not been utilizing the One-Stop system and could be better reached through these efforts. One grantee reported that they are also planning to bolster the existing outreach efforts of FBCOs by conducting training on grassroots outreach.

All WIB grantees plan to provide technical assistance to FBCOs. Some plan to provide assistance to FBCOs that they do not subaward to as well as subawardees. Since observers have identified the grant application process as a barrier to FBCO participation in the One-Stop system, many WIB grantees intend to provide guidance and assistance on the grant application process. Several of the WIB grantees planned to hold workshops or seminars on topics such as grant writing or the procurement process.

Table VII.2. Planned Grantee Collaborative Strategies

Grantee	Information Gathering	Outreach	Capacity Building			Adding Access Points/Increasing Referrals	
			Training and Technical Assistance	Structural Resources	Subawards for Direct Services	Satellite One-Stop Centers	Co-location
San Diego Workforce Partnerships, Inc.	X	X	X		X		
City and County of Denver		X	X		X	X	
Capital Workforce Partners	X	X	X		X	X	
District of Columbia Government, Dept. of Employment Services		X	X		X	X	
WorkNet Pinellas, Inc.	X	X	X		X	X	
LaFourche, Assumption, Terrebonne WIB, Inc.	X	X	X		X		
Anne Arundel Workforce Development Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Metro North Regional Employment Board	X	X	X		X		X
Ottawa County		X	X		X		
Capital Area Michigan Works!		X	X	X	X		X
NH Community Technical College System	X	X	X		X		
County of Cumberland		X	X	X	X	X	

Source: Grantee applications

Chapter VII: The 2004 Grants to Workforce Investment Boards

All the WIBs that received grants plan to make subawards to FBCOs to provide direct services, as required by DOL (Office of the Federal Register 2004). WIBs commonly intend for these subawards to cover services such as employment counseling and placement for specific target populations. Subawards may also fund services that may not be available at the One-Stop, such as English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction, and life skills training. For example, the Ottawa County WIB planned to provide classes in ESL, life skills training, and adult literacy training. Similarly, the City and County of Denver planned to offer ESL classes, cultural assimilation assistance, and assistance for disabled workers to be successful at work.

Other grantees seek to build strategies that improve access and build organizational linkages between the One-Stop and the FBCOs. Four grantees plan to establish satellite One-Stop centers located at the FBCOs. For example, the Anne Arundel Workforce Development Corporation plans to open satellite One-Stop centers in local detention facilities and subsidized public housing communities. Another grantee plans to use a mobile One-Stop van to regularly travel to the FBCOs. Two grantees arranged to co-locate FBCO staff at the One-Stop centers to provide information about their services. These arrangements are sometimes viewed as a first step to making the FBCO a more permanent member of the One-Stop system.

Interagency collaborations, such as interagency workgroups, board involvement, collaborative strategic planning, and formal agreements, were not common elements of the WIB grantees' plans.

All 12 WIBs plan to subaward to FBCO for direct services to clients and to cultivate partnerships that may generate referrals to One-Stop centers. Grantees vary in their planned approaches to working with subawardees (Table VII.3). Some planned to include as few as five subawardees; others plan to include as many as 40 subawardees. Six WIBs plan to determine the number of subawards after they receive proposals. Six grantees had not determined the amount of the FBCO grants at application. Of those that reported the amount of the subaward, it was typically less than $50,000 per FBCO.

C. NEXT STEPS: THE EVALUATION

To inform the DOL, WIBs, FBCOs, and intermediary organizations about effective strategies to promote collaborations between FBCOs and the workforce investment system, the DOL asked Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) to evaluate the WIB grants. The data for this evaluation will be collected from three main sources:

1. **Site Visits.** Most of the information for the evaluation will be collected during unstructured interviews with staff at the local WIB, One-Stop centers, and FBCOs. MPR will conduct two rounds of site visits. The first round of site visits occurred in early 2004; the second round will occur in late 2004.

2. **Documents.** MPR will review grant proposals, monthly reports, and any memoranda of understanding or agreements that the local WIB has with the FBCOs.

Table VII.3. Planned Number of Subawards, Funding Amount, and Types of Services Provided

Grantee	Type/Number of Subawardees	Amount of Subawards	Key Services Provided By Subawardees		
			Direct Services	Remote Access Points to One-Stop Centers	Referrals to One-Stop Centers
San Diego Workforce Partnerships, Inc.	1 intermediary No. of FBCOs not reported	$350,000 in total	X		X
City and County of Denver	2 intermediaries No. of FBCOs not reported	$5,000 per FBCO	X		X
Capital Workforce Partners	1 intermediary 6 FBCOs	$45,000 per FBCO	X	X	X
District of Columbia Government, Dept. of Employment Services	20 FBCOs	$257,000 in total	X	X	X
WorkNet Pinellas, Inc.	1 Intermediary 4 FBCOs	$60,832 per FBCO	X	X	X
LaFourche, Assumption, Terrebonne WIB, Inc.	Not reported	$282,987 in total	X		X
Anne Arundel Workforce Development Corporation	5 FBCOs	$300,000 in total	X	X	X
Metro North Regional Employment Board	4–6 FBCOs 3 grants to technical assistance providers	$255,000 to FBCOs, $195,000 to technical assistance providers	X		X
Ottawa County	1 intermediary, No. of FBCOs not reported	$300,000 in total	X		X
Capital Area Michigan Works!	Not reported	$300,000 in total	X		X
NH Community Technical College System	1 intermediary 1 organization for resource mapping 9–12 FBCOs	Between $20,000 and $30,000 for each FBCO	X		X
County of Cumberland	Not reported	Not reported	X		X

Source: Grantee applications

Chapter VII: The 2004 Grants to Workforce Investment Boards

3. **Administrative Records.** The grantees are required to report regularly on the use of the funds, including the number of customers served, the receipt of services, and the employment outcomes of the customers. These data will supplement the more qualitative data.

A mid-project report, due to the DOL in summer 2005, will describe the goals of the grantees, the FBCOs involved, and the approaches used to promote collaborations between the FBCOs and the workforce investment system. It will also suggest some initial lessons learned from the experiences of the grantees. The final report, due to the DOL in summer 2006, will describe the extent to which the grantees met their goals, including customer outcomes, building the capacity of FBCOs, and sustainability. It will also describe which strategies were most effective and under what circumstances they were effective, and summarize the lessons learned from the grants.

References

Ammerman, Nancy. "Still Gathering After All These Years: Congregations in U.S. Cities." In *Charitable Choice Work? Covering Religion's Impact on Urban Affairs and Social Services*, edited by Andrew Walsh. Hartford, CT: Leonard Greenberg Center, Trinity College, 2001.

Bender, April M. "The Relationship Between the Workforce Investment Act and the Charitable Choice Initiative." Hannawa Falls, NY: State University of New York, University Center for Academic and Workforce Development, June 2003.

Bielefeld, Wolfgang, Laura Littlepage, and Rachel Thelin. "Organizational Analysis: The Influence of Faith on Impact Service Providers." In *Charitable Choice: First Results from Three States*, edited by Sheila Suess Kennedy and Wolfgang Bielefeld. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, 2003.

Executive Order No. 13279, Federal Register 67, No. 241, pp. 77141-44, December 16, 2002.

Chaves, Mark, and William Tsitsos. "Congregations and Social Services: What They Do, How They Do It, and With Whom." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2001.

Cnaan, Ram. "Social and Community Involvement of Religious Congregations Housed in Historic Religious Properties: Findings from a Six-City Study." Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1998.

Cnaan, Ram, and Stephanie Boddie. "Philadelphia Census of Congregations and Their Involvement in Social Service Delivery." *Social Service Review*, vol. 75, no. 4, 2001.

D'Amico, Ronald, Kate Dunham, Jennifer Henderson-Frakes, Deborah Kogan, Vinz Koller, Melissa Mack, Micheline Magnotta, Jeffrey Salzman, Andrew Wiegand, Dan Weissbein, and Gardner Carrick. "The Workforce Investment Act After Five Years: Results from

the National Evaluation of the Implementation of WIA: A Report Prepared as Part of the National Evaluation of the Implementation of WIA." Oakland, CA: Social Policy Research Associates, June 2004

Davis, Belinda Creel. "Faith-Based Organizations and the Delivery of Social Services in Michigan: A Case Study." Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government, May 2004.

Deb, Partha, and Dana Jones. "Does Faith Work: A Preliminary Comparison of Labor Market Outcomes of Job Training Programs." In *Charitable Choice: First Results from Three States*, edited by Sheila Suess Kennedy and Wolfgang Bielefeld. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, 2003.

DeVita, Carol, Tobi Jennifer Printz, and Eric Twombly. "Report to The Human Services Faith-Based Organizations Task Force: Findings from The Survey of Community Services of Faith-Based Organizations in New Jersey." Washington, DC: Urban Institute, April 1999.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose. "The Faith-Based Initiative in Texas: A Case Study." Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government, October 2003.

Harrison, Bennett, and Marcus Weiss. *Workforce Development Networks: Community-Based Organizations and Regional Alliances.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

Johnson, Byron R., Ralph Brett Tompkins, and Derek Webb. "Objective Hope: Assessing the Effectiveness of Faith-Based Organizations: A Review of the Literature." Philadelphia, PA: Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, 2002.

Kennedy, Sheila Suess. "Privatization and Prayer: The Challenge of Charitable Choice." *American Review of Public Administration*, vol. 33, no. 1, March 2003.

Kramer, Frederica, Demetra Smith Nightingale, John Trutko, Shayne Spaulding, and Burt S. Barnow. "Employment and Training Services Provided by Faith-Based Organizations: An Exploratory Study and Issues for Consideration in the Use of Public Funds." Presented at the Annual Research Conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Dallas, TX, November 2002.

Lupu, Ira, and Robert Tuttle. "The State of the Law 2003: Developments in the Law Concerning Government Partnerships With Religious Organizations." Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government, Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy, December 2002.

Lupu, Ira C. and Robert Tuttle. "The Distinctive Place of Religious Entities in Our Constitutional Order." *Villanova Law Review*, vol. 46, no. 5, 2001.

McConnell, Sheena, Andrew Burwick, Irma Perez-Johnson, and Pamela Winston. "Privatization in Practice: Case Studies of Contracting for TANF Case Management." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 2003.

References

Montiel, Lisa. "The Use of Public Funds for Delivery of Faith-Based Human Services: A Review of the Research Literature Focusing on the Public Funding of Faith-Based Organizations in the Delivery of Social Services." Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government, The Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy, June 2003.

Monsma, Stephen V. *When Sacred and Secular Mix: Religious Nonprofit Organizations and Public Money.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996.

Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. "Workforce Investment Act." Federal Register 65, no. 156, pp. 49293-49342, Washington, DC. OFR, August 11, 2000.

Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. "Grants for Intermediaries." Federal Register 67, no. 74, pp. 18946-49, Washington, DC. OFR, April 17, 2002.

Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. "Charitable Choice Regulations Applicable to States Receiving Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grants, Projects for Assistance in Transition From Homelessness Formula Grants, and to Public and Private Providers Receiving Discretionary Grant Funding From SAMHSA for the Provision of Substance Abuse Services Providing for Equal Treatment of SAMHSA Program Participants." *Federal Register* 68, no. 189, pp. 56430-56470. Washington, DC: OFR, September 30, 2003.

Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. "Grants for Workforce Investment Boards." *Federal Register* 69, no. 66, pp. 18126-18139, Washington, DC. OFR, April 6, 2004a.

Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. "Equal Treatment in Department of Labor Programs for Faith-Based and Community Organizations; Protection of Religious Liberty of Department of Labor Social Service Providers and Beneficiaries." *Federal Register* 69, no. 132, pp 41882-41894, Washington, DC. OFR, July 12, 2004b.

Otten, Kathryn. "Colorado Partnerships: Workforce, Faith and Community Works Initiative." Denver, CO: Colorado Department of Labor and Employment, February 2004.

Polis Center. "Indiana Congregations' Human Services Programs: A Report of a Statewide Survey." Indianapolis, IN: FaithWorks, March 2001.

Scott, Jason. "The Scope and Scale of Faith-Based Social Services: A Review of the Research Literature Focusing on the Activities of Faith-Based Organizations in the Delivery of Social Services." Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government, The Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy, June 2003.

Sharp, Brett S. "Great Expectations and Recent Frustrations: Oklahoma's Continuing Quest to Partner with Faith-Based Organizations." Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government, October 2003.

Sherman, Amy. "Charitable Choice: It's Still About Ending Discrimination." *Christianity Today,* June 9, 2003.

Sherman, Amy. "Empowering Compassion: The Strategic Role of Intermediary Organizations in Building the Capacity Among and Enhancing the Impact of Community Transformers." Indianapolis, IN: The Hudson Institute, 2002.

Sherman, Amy, and Marc Stanakis. "Building Fruitful Collaboration Between Florida's Faith Communities and One Stop Career Centers." Indianapolis, IN: The Hudson Institute, 2002.

Solomon, Amy, Caterina Gouvis Roman, and Michelle Waul. "Summary of Focus Group with Ex-Prisoners: Ingredients for Successful Reintegration." Washington, DC: Urban Institute, December 2001.

Stone, Melissa. "Scope and Scale: An Assessment of Human Service Delivery by Congregations in Minnesota." Paper presented at ARNOVA conference, New Orleans, LA, November 2000.

United States Department of Labor (DOL), Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. "Bridging the Gap: Meeting the Challenge of Universal Access Through Faith-Based and Community Partnerships." Washington, DC: DOL, February 2004a.

United States Department of Labor, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. "Empowering New Partnerships in Your Community: Faith-Based and Community Initiatives." Washington, DC: DOL, 2004b.

United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). "President Announces $43 Million in Grants from Compassion Capital Fund." News release. Washington, DC: U.S. DHHS, August 3, 2004.

United States General Accounting Office (GAO). "Charitable Choice: Federal Guidance on Statutory Provisions Could Improve Consistency of Implementation." Report No. GAO-02-887. Washington, DC: September 2002.

Voll, Michelle, Lindan Johnson, and William Wubbenhorst. "Experiences from the Field: Fostering Workforce Development Partnerships with Faith-Based and Community Organizations." Calverton, MD: ORC MACRO, Submitted to U.S. Department of Labor, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, February 2004.

White House. "Unlevel Playing Field: Barriers to Participation by Faith-Based and Community Organizations in Federal Social Service Programs." Washington, DC: White House, August 2001.

White House. "Guidance to Faith-Based and Community Organizations on Partnering with the Federal Government." Washington, DC: White House, November 2003.