

TO: Cynthia
Julie

1/7

FROM: Andrea

While these ^{may not work too well as} welfare to work success stories,
they might come in handy for ESL/civics initiative!
Even if not, they show how people are
combining ESL w/ skills training in the workplace.
(all 3 from SeaFirst Bank in Seattle, provided
thru the W2W partnerships).

Anna and Yuriy Kulibaba

Both Anna and Yuriy lived in the small Republic of Moldova, once a part of the Soviet Union. After the break up of the Soviet Union, civil war broke out in Moldova so Anna and Yuriy fled to Warsaw, Poland. For two years they tried very hard to find and keep jobs in Poland, but it was clear they were not going to be successful. In 1995 they moved to Moscow and they both found jobs in the clothing industry.

They made a good living, had a car, and even owned a home in Moscow. When their daughter Yana was born in 1996, they began to think about the rampant crime, and feared losing all of their money and their lives. So, in 1997 they decided to move to Seattle in hope of a new and safe life for their family.

When they first moved to Seattle, Yuriy was only able to secure short term jobs at very low wages, not enough to support his family and they were forced to go on welfare. When they heard about the Welfare to Work Training Program offered at Seattle Goodwill in partnership with Seafirst Bank/Bank of America, they both applied in order to get jobs at the bank together. Anna was limited to working near their home, or commuting with Yuriy since she did not drive.

They attended four weeks of training in work basics, English as a Second Language, ten-key by touch and bank terminology. Both demonstrated rapid improvement in their English skills, as well as improving in their ten key skills. Upon graduation, Yuriy was selected for a position in the ATM Deposit Processing Unit, and Anna in the Proof Department. They were given similar start times so that they could commute together to work in downtown Seattle.

Anna and Yuriy took advantage of Seafirst's inaugural quarter of English as a Second Language in order to continue to improve in their English skills.

Their goals for the future are to save money, improve in their job levels, buy a house, and to ensure a good education for their three year old daughter, Yana.

Anna started at \$7.62 an hour, but is now earning an additional \$2.05 an hour incentive pay plus full benefits. Yuriy is making \$7.70 per hour plus full benefits.

Polina Stepanskaya and Leonid Baram

Now working as Cash Handlers in the Cash Vault at Bank of America, married couple Polina Stepanskaya and Leonid Baram fled the Soviet Union in 1997 with the assistance of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society which aids Jewish people under persecution in their native countries seeking to emigrate to the United States. Polina and Leonid emigrated to the U.S. in August of 1997 with their two daughters who are now 15 and 23. They received Temporary Aid for Needy Families upon their arrival; their income is now sufficient that they no longer receive welfare payments.

Leonid had been an aerospace engineer in Moscow, Polina an office worker in the same firm as her husband. They did not speak English when they arrived. Polina enrolled in the training program at Jewish Vocational Service where she participated in a Clerical training program. She and her husband were recruited for jobs at Bank of America in September of 1998 with the assistance of her trainer at JVS and Bank of America's welfare to work department.

Both had to struggle with language and age barriers to employment. They accepted entry level positions with Bank of America, and are working on career enhancement – Leonid is taking classes now at City College in English and computer science, Polina in accounting. Their Bank of America mentors have been talking with them about career advancement, and Polina and Leonid hope to advance to other positions within Bank of America before the end of 1999.

Valentina Sad

In 1995, Valentina, her husband, and two of their five daughters left their home in Rovno, Ukraine to travel to Seattle to find the freedom to practice their Christian religion. Valentina had worked in a bank in Rovno for 25 years, after attending financial college. She loved her job, and she eventually advanced to the position of accountant and lead check processor. Her husband was unable to find work in Rovno because of their religion, and Valentina lived in constant fear that someone would find out that she was a Christian and she would be fired.

They borrowed the money to come to America, but had to accept welfare while they looked for work. For three years, Valentina was unable to get a job because of her limited English proficiency. She worked as a volunteer in a food bank in order to gain English skills, but was still unable to find a job.

In early 1998, she signed up for the Welfare to Work Training Program offered at Seattle Goodwill in partnership with Seafirst Bank/Bank of America. She quickly learned that she would be performing a very similar function at Seafirst as the job she had left in the Ukraine, a job that she loved!

After completing the interview process and being chosen to fill one of the training positions, Valentina studied English as a Second Language, ten-key by touch and bank terminology. The four-week training program gave her the knowledge, tools, skills and self-confidence she needed to re-enter the workforce. After graduation from the Seafirst Bank/Seattle Goodwill training program, Valentina was delighted to accept a position in the Proof Department at the Bank in July of 1998. With all of the excitement and joy of returning to a job she had loved for 25 years in her homeland, she came into her new job with a strong foundation to succeed. Valentina is a valued employee and is doing very well in her new position. In fact, she has already received a raise. She started at \$7.00 an hour and was recently promoted to \$9.62 an hour plus full benefits.

After hiring 28 trainees from the Seafirst Bank/Seattle Goodwill training program, Seafirst Managers began to realize that in order to retain these staff and ensure their career advancement, more training in English as a Second Language was needed. The Seafirst Management decided to contract with the Seattle Goodwill to present ESL classes on-site during working hours in order to make it as accessible to participants as possible. Valentina completed the inaugural 12 weeks of class, and is soon to attend her second quarter of ESL.

Her goals for the future? On February 1st of this year, the family she left behind in the Ukraine (three daughters, their husbands and two grandchildren) will be joining her family in Seattle. They too will be free to practice any religion that they desire. As far as her career, Valentina is in the job that she loves, and will continue to work with all of her new friends at Seafirst.

(IRS) David Rosenberg
(Comm. staff)

10/22/98

<Adult Literacy>

Edu: what do we currently do?
current funding

→ Book of Stats (from Nat. Inst. for Literacy)
that breaks down by county (literacy)

National Adult Literacy Survey

Significant

→ (25% of those in level 1 are immigrants)
(43% of those in level 1 are Black/H)

Adult Educ Act program (@ Edu.)

ESL

Adult basic skills

GED preparate

No income test ; test is whether you lack skills or credentials.

Serve 4 million students a year in Adult Educ.

Providers

- ① School districts
- ② Community groups
- ③ CBOs

Formula to states; w/in state,
competes for \$

New Adult Educ. Act (w/workforce bill)
w/new emphasis on accountability.

\$385 million (= fed investment)

(44 million people in U.S. @ Level 1) 25 million (< 65 yrs old)
44 " " @ Level 2 "

Do of Ed: biggest demand in urban areas
long waiting lines for ESL (2 yr. wait in MA)

Other growth area: those w/out a H.S. diploma
Average cost to serve a student = \$300/year (being pushed out of regular school b/c of standards)

Immigrants w/ lower level of literacy than in the past

26% of people w/ Level 1 skills ~~are~~ have learning disabilities

① Barriers ?

TIME
CHILD CARE COSTS
(TRANSPORTATION COSTS)

Program is difficult to complete in one setting.

② Access (convenience)

③ Efficiency (new ways to increase quality of programs — get more efficiency out of them.)

Do Ed: got \$7 million for ESL

propose \$20 million ~~for~~ in FY2000



→ Workplace literacy:

Ran a \$12m program in 1980s re: workplace literacy

Hard to justify an increase in base funds (b/c a formula)

BUT - New law:

lots of emphasis on standards (standards for
accountability program quality)

In Jan.

Second video series: On Common Ground

(w/ INS)

program on citizenship and what it means
used in all adult ~~center~~ centers
(part of life skills instructional
package)

Nat. Instit. for Literacy

(trying to identify the skills one would
need for citizenship and achievement)

When people come to a literacy program want:

- ① a job
- ② leads to do better in school
- ③ citizenship.

Is there a role for the private sector (?)

technology

getting employers involved

→ State models of local collaboration re: adult literacy -

(Evaluations of adult educ. programs)

- ⊗ Links to a job
 - ⊗ Family literacy
 - literate family greatly benefits kids (0-3)
- (link literacy to EZ/ECs and to a job) "job ready" employers

DoL

Q: can adult learners access scholarship \$ and get literacy educati @ colleges ~~and~~ (including community colleges).

Dpt. of Defense does a lot of adult edu. and has lots of \$.

Next Steps (?)

- ① info from agencies to ensure that we have all info re: programs and \$

① who @ INS working on video
② what is HHS doing w/ refugees

Nov. 3rd
next mtg.

\$7 million in FY 1999

\$20 million in budget for ESL (FY 2000) ←

discretionary grants) demonstration
rich curriculum

Part of general life long learning

~~Damon~~

\$70 million

OUA#

Run out of the Adult Education:
National Programs

Discretionary grant out of
Nat. Leadership

6-12 states
Require proposals from each State

DoEd prefers

states investment in this
state-wide initiative

No problem w/ open to all

- CBOs
- LEAs
- States
- Comm. Colleges

no floor on CBOs

\$70 million

How many
grants (?)

~~40-60~~

40-60
grants

Expect applicant to
have quality controls
to assess impact

(ask to identify for us
how hope to determine
impact)

\$150 → \$1.5
250 million

Set parameters
around what you

Almost 40% of \$361 million grant goes to ~~ESL~~ providers

ELP

English Literacy Programs

(State administered)

~~Current demo~~

FY99 — \$7 million for demonstration programs

Match?

option

DoEd would support 25-30% match

In-Kind or cash

National workplace literacy prog

Party invested in this.

we should be cautious.
Dealing w/ CBOS (some small)

we are trying to enhance capability.

Fee or tuition can't be used as a match

for basic skills/ESL training

Under WIA,
Up to States

*Cyrtina
Heli
USCIS
S/L
Per Capita*

OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

AN OVERVIEW

FOR

**DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL
WHITE HOUSE**

ANDREA KANE

(Tel: 456-5573)



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

SEP - 9 1998

MEMORANDUM TO: State Refugee Coordinators

FROM: Lavinia Limon
Director
Office of Refugee Resettlement

SUBJECT: Adjusted Fourth Quarter Social Service
Formula Awards to States with TANF Agreements

This memorandum announces the award of supplemental social services funding to the 31 States that have written agreements with their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) agencies to serve refugee TANF recipients through the State refugee service system.

We have approved funding to each of the 31 States that submitted copies of agreements to the Office of Refugee Resettlement. Adjusted fourth quarter social service formula awards will be issued to States this week.

The attached allocations table indicates the amount of funding to each of the 31 States, based on each State's share of the total estimated refugee TANF caseload projected to be served in FY 1999. We calculated each State's estimated refugee TANF caseload as a percentage of the sum of the 31 States' estimated TANF caseload (33,366) and on the basis of those percentages, we determined each State's proportionate share of the \$10 million available in supplemental funding. In the case of the State of California, we determined the proportionate share of the 9 counties in the State that have agreements with their TANF agencies.

I am very pleased that so many State Refugee Coordinators succeeded in making agreements with their State TANF agencies to ensure that refugee TANF recipients are served by refugee providers. These agreements will result in a greater likelihood that refugees will receive appropriately designed services that will enable them to become employed and self-sufficient more quickly than would occur through the mainstream system. I applaud each of you on your efforts to help TANF refugees.

Attachment

Supplemental Social Service Funds for TANF Refugees

State	Estimated Refugee TANF Caseload To Be Served	Allocation
Arizona	250	\$74,927
California	10,906	\$3,268,596
Alameda	327	\$98,004
Contra Costa	104	\$31,169
Los Angeles	3,616	\$1,083,738
Orange	558	\$167,236
Sacramento	2,305	\$690,823
San Diego	1,963	\$588,323
San Francisco	425	\$127,375
San Joaquin	392	\$117,485
Santa Clara	1,216	\$364,443
Colorado	213	\$63,837
Connecticut	146	\$43,757
Florida	3,224	\$966,253
Georgia	450	\$134,868
Illinois	2,854	\$855,362
Iowa	800	\$239,765
Kansas	254	\$76,125
Louisiana	40	\$11,988
Maine	100	\$29,971
Massachusetts	1,150	\$344,662
Michigan	1,826	\$547,264
Minnesota	1,043	\$312,594
Missouri	150	\$44,956
Montana	13	\$3,896
New Hampshire	150	\$44,956
New Jersey	600	\$179,824
New Mexico	100	\$29,971
New York	1,065	\$319,187
North Carolina	300	\$89,912
North Dakota	204	\$61,140
Oregon	536	\$160,643
Pennsylvania	1,000	\$299,706
Rhode Island	110	\$32,968
South Dakota	155	\$46,454
Texas	750	\$224,780
Vermont	200	\$59,941
Virginia	225	\$67,434
Washington	4,138	\$1,240,185
Wisconsin	414	\$124,078
Total	33,366	\$10,000,000



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FA
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

ORR State Letter

#

98 - 13

Date:

MAY 05, 1998

TO: STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

FROM: Lavinia Limon
Director
Office of Refugee Resettlement

SUBJECT: Referring Refugee TANF Recipients to Refugee
Program Services and the Availability of
Supplemental Social Service Funds for This
Purpose

Issue

We fully support the philosophy of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program regarding time-limited assistance and required participation in work activities, and view the goals of TANF as being closely aligned with the goals of early employment and self-sufficiency in the refugee program. However, since State TANF programs are designed for the mainstream recipient population, they may not be well-suited to a specialized population such as refugees, particularly newly-arrived refugees who do not speak English and have not yet acculturated.

In order to attain timely employment and self-sufficiency, it is essential that refugees engage in services and work activities that are designed appropriately to address the special language and cultural barriers that refugees face as newcomers to the U.S. We are concerned that refugees participating in TANF may not receive the linguistically and culturally adapted services and work preparation they need to obtain employment quickly and move off welfare.

For example, most State TANF programs provide TANF recipients with a short orientation on TANF, its work requirements, and the responsibilities of TANF participants before participating in job club/job search for a period of time. Our experience in the refugee program has shown that refugees new to the U.S. require extensive and sometimes repeated orientation in the American work

culture and the expectations of American employers to properly prepare them for placement in a job in the U.S. Orientation for non-English speaking refugees, by necessity, must be conducted in the native language of the refugees. State TANF programs usually are not designed to provide such specialized orientation.

We also know that refugees who are limited English-speaking are able to successfully obtain employment through assisted job search and job placement in which refugees are aided by bilingual employment counselors, both in making employer contact and in the job interview. However, in most State TANF programs, participants are required to engage in intensive unassisted job search for a period of time, in some cases as long as 12 weeks. While this method may be appropriate for mainstream TANF recipients, unassisted job search is not an effective method of finding employment for newly-arrived refugees who do not speak English and are not familiar with American culture. As a result, time spent in TANF job search is often wasted time that does not bring a refugee any closer to employment.

We believe it is in the best interests of States as well as refugee TANF recipients to use the existing system of refugee service agencies in a State to provide TANF work activities to refugee TANF recipients, instead of trying to develop a bilingual/bicultural capacity within TANF mainstream agencies and their contract agencies where none may have existed before. Refugee service agencies already have a well-developed system in place to provide linguistically and culturally appropriate employment services and job training to refugees and have a proven track record of helping refugees to become employed and self-sufficient as quickly as possible.

When serving refugee TANF recipients, we understand that refugee service agencies would be required to follow the same TANF work requirements and State definitions of TANF work activities as other TANF agencies. However, we believe that these activities, when provided in a linguistically and culturally appropriate manner by agencies experienced in placing refugees in employment, will result in refugees becoming employed and terminating TANF assistance faster than is likely to occur if they were served by a mainstream TANF agency. Faster self-sufficiency results will benefit refugees by using less of their TANF lifetime limit and will benefit States by reducing their TANF caseload.

Several State Refugee Coordinators have been successful in developing agreements with State TANF agencies to have refugee TANF recipients referred to refugee service agencies for TANF work activities immediately after intake. A few State Refugee Coordinators have also had success in obtaining some State funds to serve refugee TANF recipients.

We believe it should be the priority of every State refugee program to ensure that refugee TANF recipients are served by the refugee service system. We, therefore, strongly encourage every State Refugee Coordinator to develop similar agreements in their States as their colleagues have done.

Availability of Additional Funding to Enhance Services to TANF Refugees

To emphasize ORR's commitment to this issue, we are making available up to \$10 million in social services funds to supplement the social services allocations of States that are able to develop an agreement with their State TANF agency to have refugee TANF recipients referred to refugee service agencies for participation in TANF work activities.

These funds are to be used for the purpose of enhancing services and work activities to refugee TANF recipients in order to better ensure stable employment and to accelerate refugee movement off TANF. We encourage you to consider using these funds to provide services, such as short-term skills training or on-the-job training (OJT), that will help refugees to obtain jobs at higher than entry level wages.

Eligibility Requirements

1. We intend to allocate these funds only to State refugee programs or to California counties that have established an agreement with the State or county TANF agency to provide the full range of TANF work activities, as needed, and not to States or counties with agreements that are limited to providing only one TANF work activity, such as job search or community work experience.
2. Our purpose is to provide extra support to the refugee service system in a State or in California counties. Therefore, allocations will be limited to States/California counties that have an agreement to have refugee TANF recipients referred to refugee service agencies for TANF activities. Supplemental refugee social service funds will not be made available for bilingual TANF services/work activities provided to TANF refugees through mainstream TANF agencies because TANF funds are already available for these mainstream services.
3. Allocations will not be made to any State or California county that is not planning to provide linguistically and culturally appropriate services to TANF refugees through refugee service providers. For example, if a State or a California county refugee program plans to provide job

search to refugee TANF participants, it must be assisted job search appropriate to refugee needs (e.g., assisted by bilingual employment counselors employed by refugee service providers), not independent job search through the mainstream TANF program.

4. Although preferable, referral agreements with the State TANF agency need not be Statewide for a State to be allocated a social service supplement. States that have an agreement to serve TANF refugees in selected counties or only a portion of the State will be considered for funding.

Letter Content

States that are interested in receiving a social service supplement must submit to the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), a letter which includes:

1. A description of the agreement that has been made with the State or county TANF agency, including:
 - a. A description and listing of the services that refugee service agencies will be providing to refugee TANF participants,
 - b. A description of the point at which referral will be made to the refugee service system (e.g., after intake) and the anticipated length of participation in refugee-specific services; and
 - c. The number of refugee TANF participants who have been in the U.S. less than 5 years that the State/county refugee program expects to serve through its agreement with the TANF agency, and a description of the type of TANF refugee to be served (e.g., first year arrivals, all TANF refugees in city X, etc.).
2. A copy of the formal referral agreement between the State/county refugee office and the State/county TANF agency, or a letter from the State/county TANF Director or his/her designee, attesting to the arrangement agreed to. The referral agreement or letter must corroborate the information provided in (a), (b), and (c) above.

Deadline

Letters must be received by ORR no later than COB July 28, 1998, to be considered for funding.

Method of Allocation

Funds will be allocated by formula to all States that meet the requirements described above, on the basis of the number of 5-year time-eligible refugee TANF recipients each State expects to serve in FY 1999.

States approved for these funds will receive an adjusted fourth quarter FY 1998 social services formula award before the end of the fiscal year.

Outcome Goals

States that receive a supplemental social services allocation will be expected to reflect the increased funding through increased employment and self-sufficiency outcome goals in their Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) FY 1999 goal plan.

We look forward to receiving your letters of application. Your ORR State Analyst will be contacting you within the next month to determine whether you plan to apply for a supplemental allocation.

If you have any questions, please contact Toyo Biddle, Director, Division of Refugee Self-Sufficiency, at (202) 401-9253.

FLORIDA INITIATIVE

[The following is one of 17 identified issues in the Florida report, but it is the only one pertaining to employment and ESL.]

Issue:

Low wages and no benefits are resulting in a growing vulnerable refugee/entrant population in Miami;

job lay-offs are increasing;

a labor surplus exists in Miami;

employers are hiring part-time and temporary workers rather than offering full-time jobs;

more employers are requiring English language ability as a requirement of hiring and advancement.

Proposed solutions:

Increase short-term skills training to upgrade refugees to higher paying jobs.

Use different approaches to encourage ESL participation:

- * Evening ESL
- * ESL at refugee agencies
- * tutoring
- * Job site ESL
- * ESL at easily accessible locations

Excerpts from “Reform, Results and Best Practices”

Proceedings of the 1997 National Conference

Office of Refugee Resettlement

Reform

Seldom has a program been confronted with such broad and far-reaching requirements for reform.

New refugee populations, greater diversity in those populations, and smaller numbers of arrivals provide an unprecedented chance to reexamine long-standing ideas, methods, and practices.

At the same time, welfare and immigration reform confront us with new challenges and opportunities to help refugees become productive members of our society without falling victim to prolonged public assistance.

This section of the Conference Report deals with the many changes that are having such a profound impact on our profession.

Welfare Reform Plenary Session

November 13, 1997

Panelists: Edwin Silverman, Illinois State Refugee Coordinator
Laurie Bagan, Colorado State Refugee Coordinator
Everett Gill, Georgia State Refugee Coordinator
Sheri Steisel, National Conference of State Legislators, Washington, DC

Moderator: Toyo Biddle

Ms. Biddle – Federal guidelines allow for a lifetime limit of five years for TANF funding. A number of states have chosen to limit that to less. It is vital for us to develop a strategy so that TANF refugees will be able to receive the services they need.

In a number of states, TANF refugees are required to participate in work activities which are not satisfactory or helpful (such as unsupervised job searches) and there is no guarantee that refugees in TANF will be referred to our refugee service providers. Instead, they get referred to mainstream TANF agencies where they are not appropriately served because those agencies and services are designed for the mainstream which may not be familiar with the special needs of refugees.

Ms. Steisel – There is so much change at the state level that it is very easy for refugees to be ignored. Thirty-five states had already enacted major comprehensive legislation. Similarly, the Federal Government had not been idle. The balanced budget bill has a whole new welfare program, Welfare to Work, which potentially may be one of our options. It contains a possible option for employment and training for the population at large, which of course includes refugees. You may want to talk to your Departments of Labor which will have funds for employment and training of welfare recipients.

Also setting the stage is the massive decline in the welfare caseload, down by some 200,000 people per month, the lowest levels since 1971. According to a Council of Economic Advisors report, 40% of this can be attributed to the economy. What that means is that refugees are only part of a smaller caseload which is mostly comprised of harder-to-serve recipients.

In a sense, states will become victims of their own success. As the welfare caseload declines, states still have to put an increasingly larger number of welfare recipients to work for larger and larger numbers of hours. They risk financial penalties for failure to meet these goals.

Thus the issue facing the states is that even if they have success in welfare reform, they must put more and more people to work for a longer number of hours. That also means that the refugee service providers have an opportunity to tell the states. "We can get you those numbers of hours." Remember, that is how the Federal government will assess how states are doing. In addition, there is also the five year lifetime limit for welfare, although some states have set it higher or lower. The states have more exemptions than the Federal guidelines.

What are other options that states have with TANF? First, TANF is far more flexible than the old law. States can set the rules, eliminating old rules that do not make sense or did not serve the recipients' needs or that proved to be a barrier to work. Second, for a lot of states, they had no idea how many refugees the communities had until the federal government said they were cutting off the Medicaid benefits. Then they noticed their invisible populations. Part of our job is to make our state legislators understand the special needs of this relatively small community and their willingness to go to work.

Let me talk a little more about some innovations of the states.

Maryland lets each county decide how to best implement the work requirements. Colorado sends their block grants to the localities allowing great flexibility. In North Carolina, 15% of their population, whether in one county or several combined, can determine eligibility levels for TANF and create their own programs.

There is also a lot of experimentation among service providers. Wisconsin has a county-by-county performance level, and if a county fails to meet that level there is a bidding process. Florida is rewarding community colleges if they exceed goals in tying their employment to what they are teaching in the colleges. Washington is giving \$500 bonuses to welfare recipient who stay in their job beyond a certain period of time, and tax credits to the employers for the same situations, encouraging truly successful placements.

Oversight functions are becoming more critical. In Iowa, new studies are tracking ineligible refugees. A lot of states are preparing for economic downturns. They are creating their own ready-made loan funds because they are in a block grant situation, and if there is a downturn, they will have additional responsibilities.

Lastly, special funds are available for unique populations. An interesting part of the TANF law is that state and federal funds, if used separately, have different rules. Some states are segregating money for special populations who need special services such as victims of domestic violence and refugees, but others are dedicating funds, for instance, to full-time students to allow them to finish their education without meeting work requirements.

Jr. Gill - Georgia received 2,400 newly arrived refugees last year, and 98% of them settled in the Atlanta area. There are six volags; cooperation among all agencies is high and they are well informed. This makes for strong coalitions and shared information and resources. We also have a good job situation there. It is fairly easy to place refugees and agencies have built good relationships with employers who sponsor job fairs and other activities. Our typical refugee gets a job 3-4 months after arrival.

A second factor in Georgia is that welfare payments are very low. For a single parent and one child - \$235 per month maximum. You can hold *any* job and get more money than you can on welfare. That's both good and bad. We have to be very careful that this does not mean that refugees end up in dead-end jobs.

The third factor (and a lot of you will identify with this) is where the refugee program is placed in state government, well down in the hierarchy. So when we have a concern, we depend a lot on personal relationships, people that we have come to know over the years and work with in state government. Some of these relationships were built during the TANF planning effort. The other state people were having to write TANF policy. We made ourselves very useful to them as a resource. We helped them make the distinction between a refugee and an immigrant.

Ms. Biddle: In trying to make a link between refugee programs and TANF programs, what kinds of barriers have you faced?

Jr. Gill: The biggest problem is their taking people out of a successful program (RCA) and putting them into one where they seem sure to fail. This is one of the things that is not working and we have

to ask: "Is this what welfare reform had in mind?" Agencies say "give us a three-month exemption from TANF for refugees and we will get them jobs." But the law will not allow this. We have to find a way to work within that situation. The frustration is obvious.

Ms. Biddle: Community service is a useful approach and service providers can set the protocols. Community service is defined as unsalaried work providing a service to the community, but only when the participant cannot find other work activities. It can be out or inside the home; it can even be providing child care for a person who is providing community service. The criteria for a designated community service site is up to each state. Providers should look at their activities and see what they can come up with for a primary community service activity - youth programs, soup kitchens, habitat environmental improvements to the community.

Dr. Silverman: Each state is accountable for its TANF success or failure. The action has shifted and we can no longer blame the federal government. There is a trap here. There are really three types of clients: 1) those who receive TANF and who also participate in federal, and countable, work activities; 2) others who receive benefits and are not in work activities; and 3) those who will be funded simply by the state or locality but do not count in the client base nor the federal performance records of the state. Bear in mind, there is a difference between non-participation and non-compliance (which results in sanctions).

The mandate implemented by Illinois includes: orientation, assessment, comprehensive planning, and service referral to countable work activities. Service providers are either the state, volunteers, community colleges, or the Department of Labor.

Ms. Biddle: What got you concerned about refugees?

Dr. Silverman: Refugees are very small percentage of the overall group. In Illinois only 0.2% of the AFDC caseload statewide are refugees; in Cook County only 0.4% are refugees. However, if you look at Cook County, 50% of the two parent TANF people are refugees. They need to be given a top priority. There is a danger that refugees will get lost in the mainstream.

Another issue is language. The mainstream does not yet have the answer to the language problem. Due to state mandates, especially under federal regulations, two parent families get referred into community work programs and they are under pressure because their families had not been established. Employers often cannot communicate with the new employees and therefore they had safety concerns as well. The agreement we struck to resolve it was similar to the one we had 20 years ago. When a refugee applied for public assistance, as a condition for receiving that assistance he or she was referred to a refugee specific service provider. Part of what had broken down, is that with TANF and the advent of state waivers for welfare support we found refugees were being served by two systems (refugee social services and the public aid system), often at odds with each other. We drafted an agreement. (Getting the private sector service providers involved is a way of gaining the attention of the administrators who are distracted by the larger caseloads.) We trained the public aid district office managers; next week we will be training line staff. Then what has been working informally will be formal. The referral into refugee specific services, the case management, assessment, orientation, comprehensive planning, all of that will be done by refugee specific services.

Question: You say that refugees when applying for TANF are referred to refugee specific service providers. How was the money allocated?

Dr. Silverman: What was attractive to the mainstream training/employment people was that we already had money through ORR. Part of the argument was: Why set up a secondary system when there is already a satisfactory one in place? The other part of the argument was our job placement record, which is far superior to the state's mainstream programs.

Comment: The refugee population in Kansas is distributed throughout three geographic areas. We have the old income maintenance workers and the jobs workers. In the past, our jobs workers did referrals to the social service provider, and now we have one worker that handles all issues related to the case. It is primarily the income maintenance worker, that has no experience dealing with the refugee population, and we see refugees getting "parked" because a caseworker says, "You do not speak English; you obviously have a major barrier to employment." Because the caseworker is not trained properly, the refugees do not get direct access to the services they need.

Ms. Bagan - In addition to the 918 new refugees Colorado received last year, add 220 Kurds. Colorado has block grants to the county social services agencies. Counties can waive any requirement except basic eligibility and termination guidelines. The cash benefit is \$350 cash per month for a single parent with two children.

The good news is that only six counties in Colorado have refugees, so we do not have to deal with pulling together the programs of all 63 counties across the state. However, 95% of the refugees are in a five-county Denver metropolitan area, and each has its own TANF agency. We also have four voluntary agencies. We realized early on how things were going to develop about the impact of the two-parent households and TANF, so we took an active position in our largest county, Denver County, which has half the refugees and a third of the TANF population.

One of our early meetings on welfare reform in Denver dealt with collaboration. Our numbers are so small that they do not make us important in the eyes of the state TANF agency, nor could we make ourselves heard by simply going to the top of that agency. So those informal contacts that Dr. Gill was talking about are really important to our work.

Ms. Biddle: How did you go about working out an agreement with the state since your arrangement in Colorado is different than Dr. Silverman's, in that every county is going to be different.

Ms. Bagan: We did not work out an agreement with the state, but rather with counties. Like Kansas, previously in the jobs programs, single parent refugees were routinely placed in holding categories due to what was labeled language insufficiency, which sometimes was simply accented English, and lack of skills necessary for employment. Given how small that caseload was, it was just easier not to bother with them. So when the trend became apparent, we were worried about it from both sides; the one side that said they are going to be ignored and turn into long term welfare dependent people, and the other side that said they are going to get mainstreamed into something that is totally inappropriate for them and they will not understand. What is going to happen to a welfare case manager caught in the middle? They will find themselves either trying to solve the resulting confusion or dealing with client neglect.

We were very concerned about losing over a third of our RCA caseload to TANF and possibly all of the matching grants. We considered many possibilities, but it came down to this: our service design is refugee centered and our purpose is effective resettlement. We normally resettle around 1,000 refugees a year and we really need a critical mass of service providers to be able to provide the multiplicity of culturally and linguistically appropriate services that the refugees need.

The RCA technicians in these metropolitan counties have been a part of the whole scene here a long time and know that our providers do a good job in placing refugees. Having decided what our transition plan was, we contacted the line supervisor and each of the eligibility technicians in all six counties. They liked our idea. It was obvious to them they were unable to work with refugees, so they had nothing to lose by letting us try our plan. We have a written non-financial agreement with De Kalb County for first year refugees, and unwritten arrangements with the other five counties.

Comment: In Florida, we resettled 17,000 refugees and immigrants and our services are all over the state so our service network is distributed. All two parent families were on refugee cash assistance and most ended up in TANF and away from their provider network. Hot spots developed in areas with the greatest density of refugees. Also our employment program does not just serve public assistance recipients, either refugees or immigrants or the general TANF population.

Jacksonville was a hot spot. To deal with the problem, we started negotiating with the workfare grant for TANF in Florida. They have clients for the first eight weeks and if the client is not employed at that time, he/she is referred to a local coalition with a big service provider network and that is done on a county by county basis. So one of our problems was that if we made an agreement, what would happen after eight weeks? Did that mean that we had to link our network with every one of the coalition employment providers? Our Department of Labor backed us in this, and from our negotiations, we now get a direct referral out of the public assistance offices to our employment service network. We are going to link with the Florida statewide welfare computer system, so that we will be current on participation rates and demographics. Thus basically our employment provider network will encompass the state and local situation and we will have the client from start to finish. In addition to that, we are developing linkages for the hard-to-place client.

Comment: We feel our MAA responsibility. We may be slow and too ambitious, but we want to challenge you to pay attention to our people who might otherwise be forgotten.

Ms. Biddle: Good point. We don't want refugees banked in the TANF. It is incumbent on all of us to show a good track record in refugee job placement in order to get TANF refugees referred to you.

Question: Currently, individuals who are receiving RCA are referred to our employment services, and individuals who receive TANF are referred to the state. Dr. Gill, did you encounter a lot of barriers trying to bridge state, county and localities – in getting all government agencies to come together?

Dr. Gill: No, they were ready to come together; they needed us. We must acknowledge how much support is needed in this process – not the least of which is translation services! Sometimes only the refugee service providers can provide translators and so they need us.

Ms. Biddle: Some techniques to sell the idea:

- Focus on improving outcomes for new arrivals.
- Emphasize our ability to serve special populations.
- Have a single point of contact who has links to the TANF providers.
- Stay focussed on the big picture – the issue of outcomes vs. project goals.

It is easy to get bogged down on what is countable and permissible; learn the TANF rules and how to work or can work in your situation.

Ms. Steisel: Provide advice to states in making state level deals to work in TANF and also to service providers on how to play the game. Many of you are familiar with the Immigrant Policy Project of NCSL – that works with state officials from the legislature down to the county level. Some of our complications arose when states started getting requests from mainstream TANF agencies for more information about some of the refugee programs because they had such successful placement rates. The mainstream system also has something to learn from all of you.

Show your successes and tie those successes back to the needs of the TANF program. You can offer slots in your own agencies as community service slots. They can be refugee TANF or mainstream TANF. You have volunteer labor possibilities that are attractive to the state agency or local agency, or both. *Use the media* to let people know what you do to employ refugees – human interest stories are very useful. Let the methods you use and the results be publicized. It also brings notice from elected officials – invite them in to see your program to correct misconceptions. No long report to very busy officials. Here's what we're doing, and here are the results! *Develop relationships with private industry councils* who will be deciding where the funding will go – they might even serve on your boards. After 20 hours of work, vocational education counts. You can work in literacy – be creative – workplace literacy. The education task – *educate the mainstream about what you do*. As you accomplish this, you can develop more clout. Leverage your talents and your positive results. Check out the NCSL web site – www.ncsl.org. There are links about how mainstream welfare programs work, and also immigration information.

Look at training your on-line staff; this is vital – it is critical to be able to deal with all levels of society.

Our legislators – when we were adopting our policy – discovered they hear very little from voluntary agencies or MAAs. The elected official is often the last to know that a new population is coming; they feel like there is not enough communication. They say this is what they want, so I encourage you to step up the communication.

Technical Assistance with English Language Training and Welfare Reform

November 13, 1997

Presenters: Shirley Brod and Barbara Sample, Spring Institute for International Studies, Denver, CO
Margaret Silver, International Institute, St. Louis, MO
Miriam Burt, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC

Moderator: Kathy Do

Reporter: Elizabeth Brenden

English language training programs are facing new challenges due to the increasingly stringent welfare laws. In order to obtain funding, ELT programs are now required to demonstrate their students' progress and develop tools and tests to assess their improvement. Employability rather than mastery of grammar is the priority dictated by funding sources.

Another change for these programs is that the philosophy for how best to teach English as a second language is changing. From grammar drills and learned phrases, the discipline is evolving into a competency based method, where the focus is on providing language skills relevant to the students' needs. The focus in this method is on what students can do concretely with the language, not on what they know abstractly. For instance, rather than know how to conjugate verbs, students should be taught how to fill out job applications. In addition to teaching students more practical skills, this method also facilitates the assessment of progress as required by funders.

In response to these changes in the ELT field, the Mainstream English Language Training Project or MELT has been developed with funds from ORR. The first MELT initiative in 1983-84 involved seven ELT programs nationwide who field tested the MELT and developed the ORR Competency Based MELT Resource Package. This document has had a large impact on the ELT field and helped standardize English training for refugees as well as encouraging ELT providers to focus on the skills required for refugees to survive and prosper. An updated MELT was developed in 1997 to synthesize the knowledge gained in the last 15 years of the MELT initiative.

This new document states that:

- Language is most effectively learned through a curriculum reflecting authentic contexts;
- Communication is a process, with comprehension preceding production;
- A low anxiety level in the classroom is one of the keys to student participation;
- Assessment is part of teaching; and
- Programs need to be accountable to funding sources.

The presenters described two programs that have been developed to fulfill the needs of special groups within the refugee population. The first is the WorkStyles Program. This program was developed for low-level learners who need early employment. It is an intensive sixty-hour, two-week program focused on getting and keeping a job. The most important aspect of this program is that it raises the self-esteem and confidence levels of the participants, enabling them to better deal with the challenges of the job market. The program has been effective and the presenters attributed this success to several factors.

- WorkStyles is team-taught. Having several teachers in the room provides maximum individual help.
- Multi-level classes help foster cooperation among students.

- Concepts are demonstrated, not explained. Students help to generate the content, and the activities are hands-on.
- The intensive curriculum provides maximum bonding.
- Videos of student interviews simulate life and provide invaluable feedback.
- Active listening and clarification skills are taught. Students learn to repeat what they have heard rather than simply responding, "Yes, I understand."

Games and activities have been developed to hone in on all the skills that are taught, so the participants have experience in performing the skills they learn.

Another project is the Special Target Assistance to Refugees (STAR), developed to help educated professional refugees to re-enter their field of expertise. One of the challenges for this project's staff has been determining the credential requirements for different fields such as engineering. A critical step in this program is obtaining the academic and professional credentials from the refugee's home country and having them translated into English. This often takes time, and it is important that the refugees in the program realize that the procedures can be slow. Refugee professionals can achieve recredentialing with commitment to self-study, an acceptance of US workplace attitudes, and a willingness to start again on the professional advancement ladder.

In summary, the trend in refugee language training is toward self-sufficiency and employment. ELT programs must focus their energies on survival skills and methods of meeting the accountability requirements of funding sources.

California Initiative:

In FY 1995, ORR began a cooperative effort with the California Department of Social Services and interested counties to improve refugee program results in selected counties in California.

Since its inception in FY 1995, the Federal/State/County team has recommended ways to improve employment and self-sufficiency outcomes for refugees residing in three California counties with large refugee populations: Merced, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. The team conducted in-depth, on-site assessments of the existing service delivery system in each county to determine how to improve the system to achieve better client outcomes. The approach was similar but in each county the existing structure, the identified problems, and team recommendations were unique.

The redesign of English as a Second Language was a significant component of initiative recommendations, especially in Merced.

The following represents the types of types of recommendations made for ESL redesign:

[SEE ATTACHED ESL DESCRIPTION]

In Merced, in response to the team's recommendations, Merced County made almost 30 program changes to its GAIN program. As a result, Merced County increased the number of TANF refugees who entered employment by 24 percent, and cash assistance terminations increased by 79 percent.

As a result of the Initiative in Orange County, there was a shift of TANF refugees from the GAIN system to the county's refugee-specific service system, and the system was expanded to include a broader range of services needed for self-sufficiency. As a result, in 1997 the County placed 2,352 long-term welfare-dependent refugees into jobs -- approximately the same number as the year before, however, there had been a 47 percent decline in caseload. In addition, the number of job placements with health benefits increased by 48 percent ,

and cash assistance reductions increased by 59 percent over the previous year.

Los Angeles County joined the California Initiative in FY 1997. The team's focus was on moving refugees to self-sufficiency because, even though refugees were becoming employed, they were not becoming self-sufficient. The team's recommendations included :

- 1) expanding services: skills training, ESL, OJTs;
- 2) developing job placements above entry-level wages, and focusing on placements for older refugees;
- 3) developing second wage-earner placements;
- 4) restructuring contracts to encourage self-sufficiency outcomes ;
- 5) providing incentives to refugees to move to self-sufficiency quickly.

The County has begun to implement these revisions in their 1998 service contracts, and we look forward to learning the results of these changes in 1999.

employment plan that leads to employment and self-sufficiency as soon as possible.

E

This change would apply to all GAIN clients, not just refugees, and would require a waiver from the State.

4. Provide ESL and basic education concurrent with employment or other employment-related services. This would eliminate the provision of these activities as a prerequisite to participating in employment-related activities and would accelerate the movement of refugees into activities needed to gain employment.

E

ESL

1. Provide more interactive ESL including:

E

- o Exercises at the board.
- o Oral work in class.
- o Conversational curriculum that is work-related.

2. Design an ESL curriculum aimed at employment, which:

E

- o Provides job-related ESL as early as possible after a refugee's arrival in the U.S.
- o Teaches American work culture principles such as the value of work; getting to work on time; giving timely notice of illness and resignation; safety.
- o Teaches the vocabulary needed to fill out a job application.
- o Is targeted to specific employer needs.
- o Includes basic math and civics.
- o Includes a VESL component.
- o Includes a health-related component which teaches refugees the importance of good health practices such as the need to make medical appointments.

3. Initiate smaller ESL classes. Students will be able to get more individual attention if class size is reduced.

4. Increase the utilization of and accessibility to existing computer ESL training by:

E

- o Augmenting ESL instruction at all sites with expanded

Technology?

More
Counseling

hours in mandatory computer lab.

- o Augmenting the hours of VESL instruction at all sites.

- o Expanding the variety of ESL/VESL software at all sites.

5. Consider the expanded use of the computer literacy center to teach ESL. NE
6. Consider developing a learning disabled diagnostic test for limited-English speaking students. NE
7. Consider increasing the use of volunteer tutors to augment ESL classes. NE
8. Expand the utilization of evening ESL classes. NE
9. Consider increasing the use of out-of-class English conversation using volunteers. NE
10. Consider the expanded use of mentor programs to help refugees learn English. NE
11. Provide additional training to assist prospective Mien bilingual teacher aides to pass the proficiency test. NE
12. Consider the need for flexibility in evaluating the progress of slow learners in ESL. NE

Assessment

1. Train and involve the bilingual case managers in the development of employment plans for refugees. E
2. Consider changing the length of time and type of assessment for refugees including: E
 - o Evaluating the appropriateness of the current assessment for refugees.
 - o Eliminating the use of current inventory and interest tests for refugees.
 - o Identifying and using more appropriate assessment tools for refugees.
 - o Reducing the length of assessment from the current 4 days. E
3. Upon entry into the system, develop family self-sufficiency

THE WASHINGTON INITIATIVE
FEDERAL TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS on
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

2. Culture Change - A Consistent Message

1. The team suggests joint training for MSC and CSO refugee social workers and eligibility workers on effectively serving clients in common by emphasizing early employment and self-sufficiency at every client contact.
2. The team also suggests that service provider and CSO staff communicate a consistent urgent message from all aspects of the Washington refugee assistance and services delivery system that welfare reform is real. Getting a job as quickly as possible is the best way to survive welfare reform and save the lifetime TANF limit on receipt of transitional assistance by "banking" it for the future.

3. ESL

The team also recommends that to ensure coordination between the MSC staff and the CSO staff regarding shared clients, procedures should be set up for joint staffings at review points before major decisions are made to transfer a client from one provider to another. The team also recommends that uniform guidelines be distributed to and followed by all CSO refugee social workers for initial assessment of English proficiency and transfer of participants from one provider to another.

This issue could be addressed in other ways as well, such as restructuring of the service delivery system in a Wilson/Fish alternative program model in which all refugees would be served, irrespective of English proficiency level and category of assistance by the refugee providers. The Federal team is ready to provide technical assistance as ORIA explores the various options.

2. The team strongly recommends moving the site of ESL instruction from the community colleges to the MSCs as soon as possible to facilitate concurrent provision of ESL and employment services. This change would allow ORIA to control the content of the ESL curriculum and ensure that it is employment-focused. With ESL on-site at the MSCs, ORIA could also set the length of instructional components and ensure that refugees are attending classes. Until this occurs, ESL will remain disconnected from the provision of employment services. The current physical separation of ESL from employment services results in sequential rather than concurrent employment services provision that is inconsistent with ORR regulations and does not support the philosophy or practice of early employment.

If the shift to an emphasis on early employment is to take hold and succeed in Washington, ESL enrollment must be controlled by the service providers so

that ESL attendance is tied to the family self-sufficiency plan. To achieve maximum effect, ESL instruction must be time-limited, concurrent with employment services and co-located with employment services to support the concept of early employment.

3. We recommend that the MSCs schedule alternative hours of ESL on-site to facilitate refugee concurrent participation in ESL and employment services, and to provide post-placement ESL for employed refugees who need to improve their English to advance in employment.
4. We also recommend that ORIA and the MSCs continue to develop workplace literacy initiatives with large employers of refugees to facilitate continued English language acquisition for employed refugees.

4 Early Employment Incentives

1. To combat the fact that many AFDC refugees are unwilling to take a job, the State should consider methods to involve the MSCs in Track II referrals and use of Track II as a motivator to encourage refugees to accept early employment. When the State re-examines its funding priorities, it should consider funding the MSCs for Track II referrals, since Track II provides valuable post-employment reimbursements for work-related expenses. This is one more tool that should be used more effectively in a combination of strategies to move refugees into the labor market.

● Work Supplementation

1. The State should consider the use of an expanded state-wide grant diversion/work supplementation as a funding mechanism to support employer incentives designed to hire refugee/welfare recipients who would not be hired without a subsidy. Grant diversion/work supplementation should be used to ensure the availability of effective employer-based training that leads to unsubsidized employment. This option should be considered as one component within the mix of other employment options offered to refugees/welfare recipients. Grant diversion/work supplementation should be used as an employment or marketing tool but not as a separate program.

The team would be happy to supply basic descriptive materials and the necessary technical assistance regarding program design issues, target populations, work incentive structure, pre-employment and on-going support services, etc.

OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

AN OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND OF U.S. GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

Refugees may apply for resettlement to the U.S. through several entities overseas, such as non-governmental organizations (NGO's) working under governmental contracts in collaboration with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, international voluntary agencies, and U.S. consulates. Once their applications are adjudicated positively by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), they are admitted for resettlement in the U.S. through a process managed by the Department of State. Each year the President, in consultation with Congress, sets a ceiling for the number of refugee admissions.

When refugees arrive in the U.S., the Federal government provides support through the following key programs:

1. **Reception and Placement (R&P) program.** Administered by the Department of State through national voluntary agencies, this program provides initial reception and placement services in the community, e.g., basic support for 30 days (housing, food, clothing) and services for up to 90 days (orientation, school enrollment, social security card application, etc.).
2. **Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA).** Administered by ORR through States, needy refugees who do not qualify for cash assistance under the TANF or SSI programs may receive this special cash assistance for refugees. RCA is currently available during the first 8 months after a refugee arrives in the U.S. Typically, RCA and RMA beneficiaries are single adults, childless couples, and families with adult children.
3. **Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA).** Administered by ORR through States, needy refugees who do not qualify for Medicaid receive this assistance in the same manner as Medicaid, but all funds are provided by ORR. RMA is also available during the first 8 months after a refugee's arrival.
4. **Matching Grant (MG) program.** Administered by ORR through national voluntary agencies, this program is designed to help refugees become self-sufficient within 4 months after arrival. For each refugee resettled through the program, voluntary agencies may receive up to \$1,400 in Federal funds and must provide match of up to \$1,000 in cash or in-kind support.
5. **Social Services (SS).** Administered by ORR through States, funding for this program is provided to States based upon a statutory formula. ORR also provides funding for a broad range of social services to refugees through competitive, discretionary grants to States and nonprofit organizations.

6. **Targeted Assistance Program (TAP).** Administered by ORR through States and counties, the TAP program funds employment and other services for refugees who reside in local areas of high need.
7. **Unaccompanied Minors.** Administered by ORR through States, unaccompanied minor refugees are identified in countries of first asylum as requiring foster care upon their arrival in the U.S. These children are sponsored by one of two voluntary agencies and placed in licensed child welfare programs. ORR reimburses 100 per cent of costs to States until the month after the unaccompanied minor's eighteenth birthday or such higher age as permitted under an individual State's policy.
8. **Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).** Administered by States through a Federal block grant, TANF provides assistance to refugees on the same basis as citizens during the first five years after arrival, or longer at State discretion. Typically, TANF beneficiaries are single-parent and two-parent families with minor children.
9. **Medicaid.** Administered by the States, refugees are eligible for Medicaid on the same basis as citizens during the first seven years after arrival, or longer at State discretion.
10. **Supplemental Security Income (SSI).** Administered by the Federal Social Security Administration, aged, blind, and disabled refugees are eligible for SSI on the same basis as citizens during the first seven years after arrival.

OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

Budgets: FY 98 and FY99

	FY 98 Appropriation	FY 99 Appropriation
Cash, Medical, Admin	230,698,000	220,698,000
Social Services	129,990,000	139,990,000
Preventive Health	4,835,000	4,835,000
Targeted Assistance	49,477,000	49,477,000
 TOTAL	 415,000,000	 415,000,000



Bureau of Populations, Refugees, and Migration

FACT SHEET

U.S. REFUGEE ADMISSIONS AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

The U.S. considers for refugee admission persons of special humanitarian concern who can establish persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The legal basis of the refugee admissions program is the Refugee Act of 1980 which embodies the American tradition of granting refuge to diverse groups suffering or fearing persecution.

Each year, following an extensive consultative process during which representatives of the Administration and Congress, state and local governments, public interest groups, private voluntary organizations, mutual assistance associations and other organizations concerned with refugees focus on refugee resettlement needs worldwide and the domestic and international implications of U.S. refugee policy, the President proposes refugee admissions levels and regional allocations. A worldwide processing priority system sets the guidelines for the orderly management of refugee applications for admission to the U.S. within the regional ceilings established annually by the President.

Eligibility for refugee status is decided on a case-by-case basis. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officers conduct personal interviews of all applicants. Those found eligible for refugee status and their immediate family members then have medical examinations, attend cultural orientation sessions and otherwise prepare for departure for the U.S. Each refugee case is assigned to an American private voluntary agency that, working under cooperative agreement with the Department of State, provides sponsorship and initial resettlement assistance, including housing, essential furnishings, food and other basic necessities, clothing, and additional cultural and community orientation.

Transportation arrangements to the U.S. are usually made through the International Organization for Migration (IOM.) Refugees are expected to repay the cost of their transportation. At the U.S. port of entry, INS admits the refugee officially to the U.S. and authorizes employment.

The U.S. Government priority is to promote economic self-sufficiency as quickly as possible, limiting the need for public assistance and encouraging refugees to contribute to the diversity and enrichment of our country as previous newcomers have done. Programs funded by the Department of Health and Human Services and administered by each State provide cash and medical assistance, training programs and employment and other support services to assist refugees to make the adjustment to life in the U.S. After five years of residency, refugees are eligible to apply for U.S. citizenship.

OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

English Language Training (ELT), and Vocational ELT (VELT) Employment Projects

Proficiency in the English language remains of critical importance to a refugee's chances of obtaining and maintaining self-sufficiency, however, with welfare reform and the need to place refugees into jobs soon after arrival, it is no longer enough for refugee service providers to concentrate on this challenge alone.

Some examples of the projects which ORR is funding are:

* California: Employment projects in Alameda, Fresno, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Jose, and Stockton work with both literate and non-literate refugees through the provision of language training, employment and support services, and job upgrades. Those who are non-literate are placed in jobs which do not require English language proficiency. Extensive support services such as transportation (bus tokens), child care, work tools, job coach services, English at the job site, and job upgrading are provided. The providers work closely with the employers to identify job site problems and then work with refugees to resolve these problems. English language literate refugees are placed in jobs and provided with ongoing job coaching, VELT, and job upgrades. TANF refugee clients are provided VELT and employment services, and assisted in job search activities.

* Idaho: Service providers work with multiple family members providing employment placement for those who are job ready, and prepare other family members to become employed through English language training and pre-employment training. Ongoing employment and language support services are available to the refugee families to assist them in maintaining their jobs.

* Illinois: Older Russian refugees (55+) are provided with skills training, VELT and internships through OJTs and eventual job placements. These refugees have very limited English and many are TANF clients. The training modules are for English literate and non-literate clients. Those with no English are placed in jobs that do not require English, and extensive language support services are provided to help them retain their jobs.

* North Dakota: Refugees in Fargo and Bismarck are provided with job skills training, language training, and job upgrade services, as well as extensive support services such as transportation, assisted job search, interpreter services, worksite ESL classes, child care and job-related tools, all of which assist the refugee in retaining their jobs.



In addition, ORR has two nationwide technical assistance grantees to assist these providers when necessary in the areas of English language training, vocational ELT, and employment services. Technical assistance is provided to service providers in the areas of incorporating employment readiness competencies for low level or non-literate learners, and integrating necessary skills for the workplace competencies in language and employment curriculum.

Bill Summary & Status for the 100th Congress

Item 1 of 3

PREVIOUS BILL | NEXT BILL
PREVIOUS BILL:ALL | NEXT BILL:ALL
NEW SEARCH | HOME | HELP

S.629SPONSOR: Sen Bingaman (introduced 03/03/87)

Jump to: Titles, Status, Abstracts, Committees, Amendments, Cosponsors, Summary

TITLE(S):

- SHORT TITLE(S) AS INTRODUCED:
English Proficiency Act
- OFFICIAL TITLE AS INTRODUCED:
A bill to establish literacy programs for individuals of limited **English** proficiency.

STATUS: Floor Actions

NONE

STATUS: Detailed Legislative Status**Senate Actions****Mar 3, 87:**

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

Mar 9, 87:

Referred to Subcommittee on Education, Arts, Humanities.

Mar 9, 87:

Committee on Labor and Human Resources requested executive comment from Education Department, OMB.

ABSTRACT(S):

- ABSTRACT AS INTRODUCED:

Directs the Secretary of Education to establish within the Office of Adult Education a program of grants for **English** literacy programs for individuals of limited **English** proficiency.

COMMITTEE(S):

- COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERRAL:
Senate Labor and Human Resources
- SUBCOMMITTEE(S):
Ssc Education, Arts, and Humanities

AMENDMENT(S):

NONE

20 COSPONSORS:

<u>Sen Simon</u> - 03/03/87	<u>Sen Dixon</u> - 03/03/87
<u>Sen Moynihan</u> - 03/03/87	<u>Sen Bentsen</u> - 03/03/87
<u>Sen Matsunaga</u> - 03/03/87	<u>Sen Inouye</u> - 03/03/87
<u>Sen McCain</u> - 03/03/87	<u>Sen Cranston</u> - 03/03/87
<u>Sen Bradley</u> - 03/03/87	<u>Sen DeConcini</u> - 03/03/87
<u>Sen Lautenberg</u> - 03/23/87	<u>Sen Graham</u> - 03/27/87
<u>Sen Grassley</u> - 04/01/87	<u>Sen Mikulski</u> - 04/08/87
<u>Sen Kennedy</u> - 08/07/87	<u>Sen Melcher</u> - 09/25/87
<u>Sen Sarbanes</u> - 09/25/87	<u>Sen Kerry</u> - 09/25/87
<u>Sen Cochran</u> - 10/29/87	<u>Sen Riegle</u> - 12/01/87

SUMMARY:

(AS INTRODUCED)

Jump to Search Words

English Proficiency Act - Directs the Secretary of Education to establish within the Office of Adult Education a program of grants for **English** literacy programs for individuals of limited **English** proficiency.

Allows such grants to provide for the training of personnel to provide **English language** instruction and for support services including child care and transportation costs for program participants.

Provides that such grants may be made to community-based organizations, local education agencies, tribally-controlled schools, institutions of higher education (including community colleges), public libraries, and prisons.

Sets forth grant application requirements.

Limits grants to not more than three years' duration.

Requires that at least 50 percent of grant funds go to community-based organizations with the demonstrated capability to administer **English** proficiency programs.

Requires grant recipients to report annually to the Secretary.

Directs the Secretary, through the Office of Adult Education, directly and through grants and contracts, to carry out demonstration programs to: (1) develop innovative approaches and methods of literacy education for individuals of limited **English** proficiency; and (2) establish a nationwide clearinghouse on literacy education for individuals of limited **English** proficiency.

Requires the Secretary, directly and through grants and contracts, to evaluate and annually audit programs funded under this Act.

Authorizes the Secretary to accept grants, gifts, or bequests of money for the purposes of this Act.

Authorizes appropriations for FY 1988 through 1990.

Limits to five percent the portion of funds available under this Act which may be used for demonstration programs.

RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD GRANTS

Goal/Purpose

- Strengthen families by helping fathers to be more effective and involved parents and responsible members of their community through:
 - 1) Increasing the employment and earnings of low income fathers so they can better support their children either through child support or more take-home pay.
 - 2) Promoting and supporting fathers' personal responsibility including paternity establishment, child support, community involvement, and marriage (when appropriate).

Rationale [needs to be refined and beefed up with statistics]

Most children on welfare live with a single (custodial) parent and depend on child support payments from their non-custodial parent (usually father) for additional financial support. As these families move from welfare to work and face time-limited welfare assistance, increasing the child support paid by non-custodial parents is critical. Many of these fathers work, but their employment tends to be unstable and confined to entry level jobs. A recent study found that 70 percent of poor non-custodial fathers had some involvement with the criminal justice system. These same fathers express strong interest in being involved with their children, by providing both financial and emotional support and serving as a positive force in their children's lives. Evidence shows that active, meaningful involvement in the lives of their children serves as a strong motivation for low income fathers to make a sustained commitment to work. There is growing, broad-based support for responsible fatherhood initiatives.

Current Initiatives

The **Welfare-to-Work grants** administered by the Department of Labor can be used to provide employment-related services to certain non-custodial parents of children on welfare. Several states have focused their entire formula grant funds on non-custodial parents, others intend to serve a significant number of non-custodial parents along with custodial parents. In addition, 54 Welfare-to-Work competitive grants include non-custodial parents, with several of these grants focused exclusively on this population. However, these WTW services do not address the needs of a broader group of low-income fathers who do not themselves meet the WTW criteria or whose children are not currently on welfare.

The Office of Child Support Enforcement is funding eight **Responsible Fatherhood demonstrations projects** to help low-income, unmarried fathers who have established paternity become involved in the lives of their children and become financially responsible parents. Funding for projects in CA, CO, MD, MA, MO, NH, WA, and WI, along with a multi-site evaluation, totals \$1.5 million.

Partners for Fragile Families demonstration is a \$10 million initiative announced on December 1st to promote responsible fatherhood and increase child support among poor, single fathers in 10 cities. The project, managed by the National Center for Strategic Nonprofit Planning and Community Leadership, receives support from the Ford Foundation and other private foundations, as well as HHS and DOL. Each site represents a partnership between community based organizations and child support agencies.

Eligible population

Generally, low income fathers who are committed to playing by the rules in terms of employment, paternity, child support, and active, responsible involvement with their children.

Depending on how the eligible population is defined, there are between 2 million and 5 million low income fathers, the majority of whom live with their children. The number of poor non-custodial fathers conservatively ranges from 300,000 to 700,000. Data from the 1990 SIPP indicates there are about 2 million fathers living in households with income below the poverty level, of which: 1.5 million fathers live with their children (resident dads), 300,000 do not live with any of their children (non-custodial dads), and 200,000 live with some of their children but not do not live with others (dual dads). An additional 2.7 million fathers live in households with income between 100% and 150% of the poverty level, including: 2 million resident dads, 400,000 non-custodial dads, and 275,000 dual dads. Looking at personal income, which is the basis for child support payments, about 3.8 million fathers have annual income below \$10,000, including: 2.3 million resident dads, 1 million non-custodial dads, and 450,000 dual dads. These figures considerably understate the number of low-income fathers because they do not include men in prison [approximately 1 million of whom are fathers?] nor those living on military bases, plus they reflect the census undercount of poor, young minority men.

Options:

- (1) **Preferred Option:** Low-income parents. Could define income eligibility as 150% of poverty, 185% of poverty, eligibility for Medicaid and/or Food Stamps, EITC eligibility, or below state or local average income of male earners (Fathers Count bill targets 80% of funds to the latter group). Consider allowing a limited number of higher income fathers.
- (2) Non-custodial parent of a child eligible for or receiving TANF, formerly received TANF, or at risk of receiving TANF. Could also non-custodial parents receiving Food Stamps -- provides link with population, by including fathers who are ABAWDs and Food Stamp E&T program.
- (3) 'Hard to Serve' non-custodial parents (current WTW definition). 70% criteria: either the child or the custodial parent has received TANF for at least 30 months or will become ineligible for assistance within 12 months due to a time limit *and* the non-custodial parent has two of the three barriers related to low education skills, substance abuse or poor work history. 30% criteria: noncustodial parent has characteristics associated with long-term welfare dependence.

All of the above income levels include fathers living with their children if they need help with employment and parenting (whether or not the parents are married). This could be open-ended, or limited to a certain percentage of the total grant funds. Also consider allowing localities to serve a limited percentage of non-poor fathers. Limiting eligibility to non-custodial parents is disincentive to marriage and/or father living with children. Also, non-custodial mothers would be served in the same way as non-custodial fathers. Custodial parents on welfare are likely to be served under TANF or WTW.

NOTE: Options 2 and 3 are considered too narrow, administratively burdensome, and too tightly linked to welfare status of custodial parent.

Allowable activities

- Employment activities -- same as WTW activities, including job placement, post-placement services, retention, re-employment, and job advancement services. Include education and training tied to employment (allowing stand-alone education and training raises equity issue with custodial parents). Also include entrepreneurship (build in link with IDAs).
- Employment-related supportive services if not otherwise available -- transportation, child care, work-related expenses such as clothes and tools. Consider including one-time/short-term health care and housing expenses needed to help someone get or keep a job. Whether to include ongoing health or housing assistance, i.e. monthly insurance premiums, needs further discussion. Encourage private sector involvement, including partnerships with health care providers (e.g. Kaiser Permanente provides insurance coverage for participants, including fathers, in Baltimore Healthy Start programs for a minimal monthly premium).
- Other activities to promote responsible fatherhood including: outreach, peer support groups, parenting classes, violence reduction, conflict resolution, team parenting courses, legal assistance, mediation, counseling, treatment, and other items related to the purpose of the program.
- Allow reasonable administrative expenses (15% to be consistent with WTW funds).
- Encourage employment of low-income non-custodial fathers to help collect child support from other non-custodial parents and reinforce the importance of responsible fatherhood. [being done in MD Responsible Fatherhood project?]

Total funding level

- Up to \$200 million, within overall WTW reauthorization.

Match

Options

- (1) Current WTW match: \$1 non-federal for every \$2 federal. Up to 50% can be

met in-kind.

- (2) \$1 non-federal for every \$2 federal. Up to 75% in-kind.
- (3) No match (Fathers Count). (Not recommended due to equity with other WTW funds)

Existing foundation-funding for Fatherhood demos could count toward match. Also consider broad definition of in-kind match and flexibility on timing -- not all required in 1st year. Consider allowing a small percent of Federal TANF \$ to be transferred out as match (requires further discussion).

Funding flow and Service delivery system

Federal to State

- Allocate majority of funds on a formula basis to states who submit Responsible Fatherhood plans. Include a floor for small states (Assuming Fathers grants at 20% of WTW formula grants, smallest states would get approximately \$700,000). [DOL doing runs with \$200M allocated based on population and WTW formula; HHS doing runs based on low-income men and modified version of A&V formula].
- Formula factors:
Options [DOL/HHS: need to do runs]
 - Population (Fathers Count)
 - Low income men (data on fathers not available at sub-state level)
 - Poverty + number of children not living with both parents (similar to Access and Visitation grants)
 - WTW formula (poverty and welfare receipt)
- Reserve 15% at national level for Secretary to provide research and evaluation, Technical Assistance, and discretionary grants to test national models. Assuming \$200 M, 15% = \$30 M. (Fathers Count earmarked \$10 M/year for research & evaluation, and \$10 M for TA.)

Tribes

- Set aside for formula grants directly to federally-recognize tribes who submit plan.

Substate Allocation:

Options

- 1) Same as WTW: 85% of funds to local PICs/workforce boards, 15% reserved for Governor's discretionary activities. Require local PICs to coordinate with public agencies responsible for TANF and child support, with community and faith based organizations involved in fatherhood issues, and with EZ/ECs. Encourage PICs to subcontract with private organizations where appropriate. Could provide waiver authority for Governor to designate alternate service

delivery entity. Establish minimum grant size similar to WTW funds.

- 2) Allow Governor to allocate funds within state to entities that best meet state and local needs and circumstances. This could be done on a formula or competitive basis. Grant recipients would need to demonstrate coordination with local workforce, welfare, and child support systems, at a minimum.

NOTE: Assuming charitable choice provision in TANF applies to WTW, states can contract with religious organizations.

Federal Administrative responsibility

- Regardless of which federal agency administers the funds, there should be a strong mechanism for ongoing interagency involvement in reviewing state plans, providing technical assistance, sharing information among various constituencies, and coordinating with existing programs. Both HHS and DOL should be involved in reviewing state plans. A broader group of agencies including DOL, HHS/OCSE and ACF; HUD; Justice; and Education should collaborate on technical assistance and to ensure linkages with ongoing fatherhood initiatives.

Plan Requirements

- Governor submits plan with mandatory sign-off from workforce, TANF, and child support agencies. Designates lead agency at state level and identifies mechanism for ongoing coordination among key agencies, such as Interagency Memorandum of Agreement. For example, state might have existing Fatherhood Task Force. Could require state to get sign-off from, or demonstrate coordination with, at least one other relevant agency such as Criminal Justice, Education, Housing or Health. Plan should document how coordination will occur at service delivery level, including referral process.

Evaluation

- Require cooperation with evaluation as condition of receiving grant funds.

Technical Assistance

- Provide authority and funding for federal agency(s) to provide or contract for technical assistance for state and local grantees.

Performance Measures

- Identify several core measures in legislation, such as increased employment and earnings of fathers; increased payment of child support; increased involvement with children; reduction in criminal activity/recidivism(?).
- Require Governors to identify additional measures by which they'll hold programs accountable. Suggest additional measures of parental involvement such

as: presence during the neonatal period; active involvement with child's education; involvement in child's health care through nutrition or vaccinations.

Waivers

- Allow states to propose waivers necessary to put together a package of services that make sense at the community level (similar to EZ/EC).
- Explore discussion of special language to permit retroactive modification of child support order, for fathers participating in this program where appropriate. This is potentially controversial, but may be less so when targeted on low-income fathers. (Needs further discussion with ACF and OCSE).
- Consider deferral of arrearages for fathers participating in employment-related activities including education and training combined with work, community service, and certain parenting activities as incentive for low-skilled fathers to build skills and increase earning potential. (Do states have this authority now? Issue is federal share of collections.)

Other Issues

- Build in protections for victims of domestic violence and allow batterers intervention services. Also recognize fathers who were themselves victims.
- Encourage fathers to get involved before child is born--prenatal and link with in-hospital paternity programs.
- Sort out how this relates to other WTW funds spent on non-custodial parents -- for example, would MI and MO use this to expand population served by their regular WTW formula grants? Would DOL still award regular WTW competitive grants for non-custodial fathers, or focus those funds on other populations?
- Encourage links with criminal justice system and incarcerated fathers about to be released.
- Consider link with child support financing process, including issue of child support disregard or pass through. Also explore link with possible child support assurance demonstrations(?).
- Be mindful that some fathers have children with more than one women and in more than one household.