

Proceedings

Bridging the Gap: Higher Education and Career-Centered Welfare Reform

**A conference convened by
Metropolitan College of New York
the National Urban League
Medgar Evers College
The College Board and
the National Black Caucus of State Legislators**



On November 18, 2002, Metropolitan College of New York (MCNY), the National Urban League (NUL), Medgar Evers College (CUNY), the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, and The College Board hosted a one-day conference at MCNY.

Bridging the Gap: Higher Education and Career-Centered Welfare Reform, examined the current welfare policy and considered the use of higher education as a tool for moving low-income persons into self-supporting careers.

Bridging the Gap panelists and speakers included academics, experts in the area of welfare reform, and policymakers. Panelists assessed the problems of current welfare policy as it relates to work, education, and parenting. Students affected by public assistance policies also were present and testified. The conference attendees discussed several models already in use for moving welfare recipients and low-income workers into meaningful and sustained careers.

These proceedings have been published in hopes that legislators considering further reform of welfare policy will consider the importance of education in breaking inter-generational poverty and producing self-reliant citizens.

The proceedings were edited by Prof. Kevin R. Kosar (MCNY) with assistance from Kevin Curley, Assistant Director for Governmental and Public Affairs (MCNY). This document was copyedited by Stephen McCluskey (MCNY). The cover of the proceedings was designed by Michael Thompson (MCNY). The publication and conference were made possible by the generous assistance of Metropolitan College of New York and the National Urban League (NUL) and the efforts of MCNY, NUL, The College Board, Medgar Evers College (CUNY), and the National Black Caucus of State Legislators. We also thank the Joyce Foundation for their support.

The opinions expressed herein are those of the panelists and should not be attributed to the sponsoring institutions.

Metropolitan College of New York
75 Varick Street
New York, NY 10013-1919
212-343-1234

National Urban League
120 Wall Street
New York, NY 10005-3901
212-558-5300

National Black Caucus of State Legislators
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 622
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5457

Medgar Evers College (CUNY)
1150 Carroll Street, Rm CP28
Brooklyn, NY 11225
718-270-6471

The College Board
1233 20th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036-2304
202-822-5900

CONTENTS

Welcoming Remarks: Stephen Greenwald	1
Keynote Address: William Spriggs, National Urban League	3
Keynote Address: Danny Simmons	12
Questions and Answers	14
Panel I: Federal Law and State Policy Barriers to Higher Education as Work	20
<i>Hector R. Cordero-Guzman, Baruch College (CUNY)</i>	
<i>Aurora Jackson, University of Pittsburgh</i>	
<i>Gwendolynne Moore, Wisconsin State Senator</i>	
<i>Linda Gordon, New York University</i>	
<i>Lawrence Mead, New York University</i>	
<i>Judy Williams, Maine Bureau of Family Independence</i>	
<i>Cristina DiMeo, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies</i>	
Questions and Answers	57
Lunch Address: Rae Alexander-Minter Interviews Yvonne Rhem-Tittle	72
Panel II: Welfare Mothers, Non-Traditional Students and College	78
<i>Kenya Cox, National Urban League</i>	
<i>Susan Gooden, Virginia Tech</i>	
<i>Lisa Grossman, National Governors Association</i>	
<i>Florence Washington, Medgar Evers College (CUNY)</i>	
<i>Vanessa Ratliff, Metropolitan College of New York</i>	
Questions and Answers	100
Panel III: Programs and Models That Work	107
<i>Esmeralda Simmons, Medgar Evers College (CUNY)</i>	
<i>Rae Mack, Metropolitan College of New York</i>	
<i>Vivyan Adair, Hamilton College</i>	
<i>Henry Buhl, Association of Community Employment Programs for the Homeless</i>	
<i>Kathryn K. Johnson, Stay in School Project</i>	
Questions and Answers	122
Remarks by Patricia White, New York Community Trust	132
Closing Remarks by William Spriggs, National Urban League	136
Afterward: <i>Welfare Reform: What Is Happening in Congress?</i> by Kevin R. Kosar	137
Brief Bibliography	140

WELCOMING REMARKS: STEPHEN GREENWALD

Stephen R. Greenwald has served, since 1999, as the third president of Metropolitan College of New York. President Greenwald has committed the College to create an institutionalized forum for policy debate and analysis designed specifically to include the participation of New Yorkers who live with the consequences of public policy. He earned his L.L.M. and L.L.B. degrees from New York University Law School.

Thank you. Good morning. Welcome everyone. Welcome to Metropolitan College of New York (MCNY). To those of you who came from out of town and around the country, welcome to New York. I can tell you that this is the first ray of sunshine that we have seen in about 72 hours--so, hopefully, you brought some better weather to us. We are very happy to have you here today.

Let me just speak for a moment about Metropolitan College of New York. The College was founded in 1964 by Audrey Cohen. She was an educational pioneer. Since our founding, the College has been offering students the opportunity to apply their classroom learning to the workplace as part of our unique Purpose-Centered System of Education and our model of experiential education. This system prepares students for the challenges of the global information and service-centered economy, which employs more than 80% of the American workforce. Over a three-semester calendar year, the College enrolls approximately 4,700 students and offers both baccalaureate and master's degrees in the fields of business and human services at four locations here in New York City.

Metropolitan College of New York takes a special interest in the subject of this conference. Historically, the College has been dedicated to creating a more egalitarian society. Traditionally, a large number of our students work in or go into careers in human service agencies, non-profit organizations, government, and so forth. They work in positions that enable them to help those in need. Metropolitan College of New York

has a long history of educating persons on public assistance. Indeed, the College began as the Women's Talent Corps, a federally funded program started in 1964 by Audrey Cohen to move women (who were on welfare) into the workforce and on to economic self-sufficiency and dignity for themselves and for their families. We at Metropolitan College, along with our partners, Medgar Evers College and Pace University, continue to pioneer in this critical area with a program you will hear more about today (Welfare to Careers).

Accordingly, we are interested in the possibilities for higher education for those who receive public assistance. As the title of the conference indicates, we want to learn more about how education can bridge the gap between public assistance and occupations that create self-sufficiency. We have assembled today a remarkable group: scholars, researchers, public servants, and individuals who are notable for their expertise in this subject area. I want to thank them all for coming here to Metropolitan College. I welcome all of our panelists and members of the audience. I look forward to today's presentations and conversations and to learning along with you. Thank you very much for being here.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: DR. WILLIAM SPRIGGS

Dr. William Spriggs is the Executive Director of the National Urban League Institute for Opportunity and Equality. Previously, Dr. Spriggs served as Senior Economist for the Democratic staff of the Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress and led the staff of the National Commission for Employment Policy in the Clinton Administration. He received his doctorate from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

My initial charge is to set out the substance of the conference. First, it is necessary to acknowledge the great partnership between the National Urban League and Metropolitan College of New York. The League and the College worked very hard to increase access to higher education for women receiving public assistance from the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. This collaboration began with hosting a press conference in Washington D.C. with the late Senator Wellstone (D-MN), and representatives from the National Organization for Women, the Center for Community Change, and the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Today, we will hear more from researchers, state and local officials who administer TANF, college officials who have programs giving TANF recipients needed access to higher education, and most importantly, from women who have received public assistance and found their way to self-sufficiency through obtaining a college education.

Part of my keynote address is to explain the evolution of TANF. Many of you know the history of our nation's current welfare program. Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) began as part of the Social Security Act of 1935. It is important to remember that the initial charge in the Social Security Act, created during the Great Depression, was to give the nation an economic base, a safety net, not just for individuals but for society as a whole. The program was seen as good for the economy. America learned it couldn't rely on the marketplace to solve economic depressions. When you

have a lot of poor people, that means a lot of people can't buy things, and if people don't buy things then the economy stagnates. The Social Security Act (SSA) contained a section that created ADC--Aid to Dependent Children. This program supported widows, orphans, and abandoned children. SSA aided the elderly, the blind, and needy children by creating an entitlement to protect families from the loss of income because of the loss of a breadwinner.

Within that original framework, the loss of a breadwinner could be the result of death, disability, abandonment, or divorce. When Social Security added survivors benefits and disability for all workers, the result was to separate women with children who were widows from women with children who were divorced or separated from the children's father. And, what had been an entitlement under the umbrella of social insurance, became an entitlement that was "means tested," that is, the families had to demonstrate they were eligible for benefits by proving their poverty status.

In the early 1960s, ADC was changed to AFDC or Aid to Families with Dependent Children and became federalized, to help insure more nationally uniform treatment of poor children within the family unit. The late 1960s brought the notion of a work-oriented approach to the AFDC program when Congress enacted a work incentive program (WIN) to provide training and employment. In the 1970s and 1980s, additional efforts to "reform" welfare continued the move toward the work approach with variations on program benefits and supports to achieve this goal, all the while maintaining the notion of entitlement to AFDC benefits.

“Ending welfare as we know it” became the reform cry of the early 1990s, and the looming congressional elections of 1994 fed a political climate that favored the politics of welfare stereotyping. In this view, “welfare” was portrayed as creating a class of women who lacked the individual motivation to lift themselves out of poverty. With this view, the program took on greater notions of prescribing specific actions the families needed to take to be eligible. Congressional proposals for welfare reform ran the gamut of political perspectives: from extremely punitive approaches espoused by far right conservatives, to a centrist approach that introduced the notion of two-year “time-limited” welfare coupled with subsidized jobs and increased funds for education, training and job placement, to more liberal proposals that rejected any time limits and instead advocated increased federal aid for the education and training of welfare recipients.

The firing shots towards the extreme goal of unraveling the AFDC safety net occurred after the November 1994 elections when the “Contract With America” was put forth calling for the unprecedented punitive proposals on social welfare policy that included dismantling the AFDC cash benefit entitlement and imposing a five-year lifetime limit on public assistance with a state option to end benefits after two years. Ultimately, these proposals, coupled with the “work-first” philosophy, became part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) that ended the entitlement for poor children in 1996.

Faced with the reauthorization of the PRWORA, we should ask the question, “Did the 1996 law work?” A lot of people are quite convinced that this new act, which created the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, worked because the number of people who were receiving public assistance went down dramatically after

1996. It also happened to have been a period when the economy was generating millions of jobs a year.

In 1997, the first year of the new law, the welfare caseload stood at 2,679,716 adults. By 1999, the caseload had fallen more than 500,000 to 2,068,024 adults. In August 1996, employment in the private non-farm sector stood at just over 100 million. By December of that year, employment in that sector had risen to nearly 101.5 million, a rate of about 280,000 new jobs a month. Three years later, in 1999, private sector, non-farm employment was growing at the still enviable rate of 211,000 a month. So, the TANF program was launched during a period of rapid job growth, allowing the work participation rate for all families on TANF to reach 34 percent by 2000.

But, after the Federal Reserve Board of Governors took a series of steps in 1999 and 2000 to slow the economy, employment started to fall after peaking in February 2001. In a little over a year, employers dropped 1.8 million paychecks from their payrolls, a rate of almost 153,000 a month. In this new environment, TANF is being reauthorized.

What this conference presents to you is research that tells what actually happened when America made the transition from AFDC to TANF, and one of those things that happened was the denial of the opportunity for women to pursue college as a way out of poverty. What do we know? We know that the correlation between education and increased earnings is straightforward. The U.S. Census Bureau tells us that in 2000, a woman without a high school degree earned \$9,996; a woman with a high school degree earned an average of \$15,119; and one possessing an associate's degree earned \$23,269.

In contrast, a woman with a bachelor's degree received \$30,487; and a master's degree earned her \$40,249. In short, the more education one has, the easier is the path out of poverty. So, one would think that our national policies would reflect this basic reality. Instead, policies moved in the other direction.

The League's contribution to this conference developed out of research that the National Urban League Institute for Opportunity and Equality did, documenting the size of the impact of changes in policies from the old AFDC to the TANF program on college attendance for women receiving public assistance, which will be presented later during this conference. It has been well documented; for example, enrollment of welfare recipients at the City University of New York decreased from 27,000 in 1995 to 5,000 in 2000, indicating a drop of about 81.5 percent.

Data used for the National Urban League Institute for Opportunity and Equality study came from the 1997 and 1999 waves of the Urban Institute's National Survey of America's Families and it affirms the trend seen at CUNY. Nationally, welfare recipients are attending college less after the passage of PRWORA; there has been approximately a 20 percentage point drop in the college enrollment of all welfare recipients, relative to other poor women who were not recipients, and a 16 point drop for African American recipients, over the first two years of TANF.

Clearly what was at work was not simply the passage of time, but a change in a set of policy variables that affected welfare recipients. We modeled those state policy variables that directly affected college attendance by running logistic regression models and using college attendance as the dependent dichotomous variable. The focus was on

those states that did not allow post-secondary education as a work activity and those states that allowed limited work activity credit for post-secondary education. Many of the state TANF programs discourage college enrollment by refusing to count hours spent taking college courses as a work activity. In 1998, 25 states did not allow welfare recipients to count any time taking college courses toward their work requirement.

The result of our estimation indicates that on average, state policies account for 13 percent of the drop in the probability that welfare recipients would enroll in college relative to other poor women (who were not on welfare) after implementation of TANF. Overall, there is a substantial and statistically significant lowering of the odds that TANF recipients attend college after the implementation of TANF compared to pre TANF. Moreover, the decline in the probability of college attendance for TANF recipients occurred while there was, otherwise, an increase in college attendance among poor women. The most disturbing part of our finding was that African American welfare recipients, who reside in states with strict “work first “ TANF programs, are most affected.

The data in the National Urban League Institute for Opportunity and Equality report covers a short period, only two years after welfare reform. Yet, it is able to show a dramatic decline in the probability of welfare recipients pursuing college. Given the current shortage of teachers, nurses and computer technicians in America, this is an unintended consequence we all lose from.

This tension between the lower earnings of women, and the need to help female-headed households avoid the indignities of the resulting poverty is not a new problem.

And relating a story as ancient as the Bible, the story of two poor women—Ruth and her mother-in-law, Naomi, I think, helps this debate. It is the story of two poor women, Ruth and her mother-in-law named Naomi. Naomi and her husband, who lived in Israel, were very knowledgeable and very faithful. Naomi, her husband and her sons left Israel to go to Moab because they wanted greater economic opportunity. They got to Moab and the two sons married two women from Moab, one was named Orpah and the other woman was called Ruth.

Naomi's husband died and her sons died and the result is that the Bible gives us one of our earliest welfare stories. It is instructive because it includes all the elements of the current debate, including the complication that Naomi and then Ruth were immigrants. And, as today, the low earnings of women made them vulnerable. Fortunately, we have come a little way, because then the only way for women to be protected was to have the protection of a man. So, the recent debate in Congress about solving welfare through marriage is no new solution. No doubt some in Congress who think that marriage is the only solution will quote to you from Naomi and Ruth's story and say “See, you have to get married.”

Left without the protection of her husband or sons, Naomi returned to Israel, and Ruth accompanied her, which made Ruth the immigrant. Ruth and Naomi arrived in Israel during the harvest. To care for her mother-in-law, Naomi, Ruth got work as a gleaner. Gleaners gather up grain left by the reapers or harvesters, who were male. That part of the story sounds familiar to us today: men get jobs that pay, women get what's left. But, this is the problem with work first; it does not resolve the problems of being a gleaner forever.

Speaking of present day problems, the story covers sexual harassment too. Ruth goes to the field of one of her kinfolk, Boaz. Boaz tells her that he would tell his men not to touch her. Later he tells her, "Don't go to another field because harm may come to you." It shows the dangers in the workplace facing Ruth. It was dangerous for a woman to be out alone. It's simple; people who are in a vulnerable position are vulnerable to abuse. They are also vulnerable to not being able to find enough to eat because they are gleaned. Work first wasn't the answer for Ruth or Naomi and they didn't get out of their predicament because of work first.

As the story shows, the real solution isn't either marriage-first or work-first. Naomi has been faithful and is learned in Jewish law and knows that she is entitled to the land of her husband. But the land has to come through one of her kinfolk redeemers. So Naomi tells Ruth, "Boaz is one of our kinfolk redeemers, if he marries you he can take claim to my husband's land."

The story clearly states the problem with encouraging women to pursue a policy of thinking marriage will be their ticket out of poverty. Boaz praises Ruth when she comes to him. "You are known as a virtuous woman because you didn't chase after men, not the rich, not the young." This is a very strong reminder that marriage needs to be pursued for the right reasons, not to chase after money. Ruth got out of her predicament by knowing the law, by being educated. Thereafter Boaz marries Ruth, takes claims to Naomi's husband's land. Now, those of you who do not know this story may assume that this is another Bible story that was only meant to be a story about faith. The Bible is full of stories about people, lifted up by faith, who appear to be of little or no significance. So, you may assume that Ruth really wasn't important, and assume, as some

policymakers do, that no one on welfare will ever amount to anything, nor will their children.

Well, Ruth's son was named Obed. And Obed had a son named Jesse. And Jesse's son was named... David. Now you know the rest of the story. So this is not an insignificant story, this is not an insignificant person; this is not a new problem. It still has the same solution: education.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: DANNY SIMMONS

Danny Simmons is an artist, collector and philanthropist whose paintings have been shown nationally and are included in the collection of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, Montclair State University, the United Nations, and Chase Manhattan Bank. Mr. Simmons is the Founder and Vice President of the Rush Philanthropic Arts Foundation, a non-profit organization with a focus in arts education for children.

Hello, everyone. My name is Danny Simmons. Thank you, Dr. Spriggs. I don't know what kind of a charge I can come up with after that. I am not a legislator or an educator. So, when I pondered what I might say I thought, "Well, I did go to school and I did learn how to become a social worker." I went to New York University and Long Island University and got my MSW and my MPA. I worked at that for a number of years as a social worker because of my father. He told me, "Danny you are privileged and you have to give something back to your community."

However, being a social worker didn't quite fulfill me. I didn't see anything changing. I couldn't really help the people that I wanted to help. I couldn't affect their lives. I saw them as being in sort of a wheel and I was one of the persons pushing this wheel around and around and around. Nothing was really changing. I decided that I would stop doing that and be an artist. Maybe I would be able to express some of the things that were going on through my art. I started doing that and that wasn't quite enough either. I am still an artist and I still enjoy expressing myself through it. But that wasn't enough. I had to give back to the community in a more substantial way.

I looked at the educational system and I wanted to stay in the arts so it occurred to me that maybe I should start an art foundation. Since the government was cutting back on arts funding for the schools, a foundation could help them. So, I started laying the

groundwork for what would become the Rush Philanthropic Arts Foundation (RPAF). I went to my brother, Russell, the businessman, and I said, “Russell, we really have to do something to help the kids and educate them in our culture and in the arts.” We soon began the task of raising money and then giving the money away. For the past eight years now, we have given away several million dollars to arts education programs.

As Dr. Spriggs said, it is important to be educated. Being an artist and an art entrepreneur is one thing, but I wouldn't have had the concepts and the organizational skills to put together RPAF, develop the structure, get a board of directors and the right people, and produce results unless I had gone to school. I don't think that working for someone else is always a solution, but I do think education is always a solution. If you want to do your own thing, it is vital that you have the skills you need to do it. Many things that people try to do fail because they don't take the time to do the research and get the education they need in order to get it right. Part of what I'm here to do is to show you, particularly the students, that you can look upon your education as not only a way to help you get a job, but it can also help you go out and create something on your own. You can go out and create something that might be substantial and something that might work for your community.

You know I'm a kid from Hollis, Queens, a middle-class kid. My father went to college, but I'm from a common background. But you know what? This past weekend something great happened. I have a play--because of my entrepreneurial background--I have a play on Broadway. It's called Def Poetry Jam On Broadway. This happened because of my arts initiative education work. The idea I had was that poetry was a way to help our children, to get them to start writing, reading and expressing themselves. We

first sold it to HBO and now it is on Broadway. We are doing all that we can. Russell serves on the Board of the National Urban League. I serve on the Board of the Brooklyn Academy of Music and the New York Foundation for the Arts. I am going to be serving on the Board of the Poetry Society of America.

I don't know if this was the kind of charge that Dr. Spriggs was talking about, but what I'm saying is that with an education you can create something that might make a change not only in your life, but in the lives of other people. Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Dr. Paul Lerman:¹ Okay, do we have any questions for Dr. Spriggs and Mr. Simmons?

Audience: I have a bit of a comment and a question. I just recently went to a professional career management meeting that reported on an international meeting of career managers. They stated that jobs in the future will last about 1 to 6 months. It is very interesting because the job world is going more in the direction of what Mr. Simmons was talking about... people who have to work have to be creative and create their own opportunities. So, my question is “How can you educate people to be that type of person, to have that self-esteem to know their strengths, their core strengths, so that they can continually move their abilities and their strengths from one job to another frequently?”

¹ Dr. Lerman is the Executive Vice President and Provost of Metropolitan College of New York.

Dr. Spriggs: The solution is a good liberal education, which includes acquiring the higher critical skills that one needs. These are cognitive skills and transferable skills that can be applied in all different contexts and situations. I think that one of the dangers in higher education today is the growing trend toward vocational-types of education--an education that is very narrow. There are some dangers in distance learning, which also can be very vocational. Liberal education is what most of the leaders of our business communities and countries have. Thus, these narrowly focused programs that are often pushed as helpful to people at the lower end of the economic spectrum may not be so helpful. I think there is a risk in them because the skills that you need to become a leader are the skills that a broad based liberal education provides. I think that is what Danny was talking about and I think liberal education is a solution to the problem.

Audience: I have a question, sort of to follow up on that. One of the things that concerns me is this idea that if everybody gets higher education, that will solve the problem. No, I don't think this is a bad idea... But, you spoke about structural problems in labor markets and in certain kinds of jobs and in certain cities even. The pool for very low skill jobs is not actually decreasing, it is expanding. They just happen to be very rapid-turnover, low paying jobs. Do you see different games of musical chairs going on, so that if even a small portion of people who don't have higher education obtain it, they may still not have any place to go because there is a hollowing out in the middle of the labor market? New York is a perfect example of that.

Dr. Spriggs: Well, clearly, I think there are other solutions. We cannot solve the problem without taking on these other issues. Until we can close the equality or fairness

gap, that is, until women can earn what men earn for the same amount of education, doing similar jobs, we are going to be stuck with this problem. Until we can figure out that you really do have to have a meaningful minimum wage, that we cannot continue this long experiment we started in the early 1980s that essentially did away with the minimum wage, we are going to have problems. So, those other things have to be key components. There really is no reason why someone who has been trained for a job can't make a living, but we have done away with wage policies to insure that that is the case.

So yes, the issues you raise have to be solved, but even in the face of all of that it seems so cruel to have this other set of policies which emphasize taking away someone's opportunity by cutting off college attendance and denying them the chance to solve it on their own.

Audience: To go back to Danny Simmons' point about taking chances and thinking out of the box: he came from a family that encouraged that. But when you have to struggle to find work, to put food on the table and have many, many children and really don't have the time to have your children think out of the box or encourage it... It is very, very difficult. I think it is incumbent on us as educators and those who work with very young children to begin to train children to think out of the box and be creative. We need to teach them that you can be rewarded for these things. If we do this I think then we will have more Danny Simmons and Russell Simmons.

Dr. Lerman: We have time for one or two more questions or comments.

Audience: I am also in line with this young man in terms of his concern for others, for those who don't go into higher education. I think that there are opportunities

to be created in the arts, not only in painting, sculpting and music, but in constructing furniture and other creative things. There are so many ways to unleash human creativity. You know, it seems to me that these opportunities are not made or it is only the professional or the university person that is talked about with dignity. I think workers have dignity, whatever work they do. I think that we should open more opportunities for different abilities to be channeled.

Audience: I want to come back to Dr. Spriggs' comment and others' comments on creativity. What we do need to address is this: those who are charged with the responsibility for children and raising children, whether it is teachers, caregivers, nursery school teachers, these professions are low paying and get little respect. Most frequently women occupy them. This raises the questions, "How do we create equity? How do we raise the level of respect for these kinds of positions that have such a huge impact on the future?"

Dr. Spriggs: This is very important and the concerns that others have about the dignity of work in general. The problem is that in 1996 when policymakers looked at welfare reform, no one bothered to look at the numbers. The median income for women with a high school education in this country is roughly \$15,000 per year, which is about the same as the poverty line. When you say median, you mean half the women make less and these aren't necessarily women on welfare. These are all women, White women, Black women. This is all women in the United States with a high school education. Half of them cannot make enough money to live above poverty.

So, on one hand, we have this debate in Congress and on the other we had the reality over here. When this welfare reform took place, over half of the women in the United States with a high school education could not make enough to live above the poverty level. This is a recent phenomenon that at least half the women can earn enough to lift a family out of poverty.

The reason we are talking about education is because women with a college degree make a median of \$31,000. They are well above the poverty line. There is an existing clear path out of poverty and we have this mean policy that says you can't trust that path. The problem is the policymakers who aren't paying attention to the reality of women's earnings. So we are not dealing at all with the bigger picture of what does the economy look like which the welfare labor force is entering. But, the reality of the labor market is very important, it must be part of the context whenever we talk about welfare reform. My biggest focus is if you know how to train someone with a high school diploma to make \$30,000, well, then, train the other half of the women in the United States.

So yes, we must have common sense policy that starts with what is really doable and what isn't doable. We have to make policies that address wages and pay equity and all of those things that make it so that there is dignity in work no matter what someone does--so they are not getting a wage that puts them at poverty level. If you make the minimum wage today, you are guaranteed to be poor because you cannot make enough to keep above the poverty line. It is impossible.

It is important that we remind our policymakers who aren't paying attention to what real unemployment rates are or what real wages are for real women. It is important to remind them of reality and it is important that we stop them from being mean. Beyond being stupid let's also stop them from being mean. Unfortunately, if you put stupid and mean together then you are really in trouble.

PANEL I: Federal Law and State Policy Barriers to Higher Education as Work

Prof. Hector Cordero-Guzman:² Thanks to President Greenwald and Dr. Spriggs, my old colleague from the Urban League. I'm very delighted to introduce the panelists and get out of the way because they are a remarkable, dynamic group of practitioners and policymakers who are going to address some very important questions about state and federal law policy barriers to higher education as work.

We will follow the order on the program. We will begin with Aurora Jackson from the University of Pittsburgh. Following Dr. Jackson, we will hear from Gwendolynne Moore, Wisconsin State Senator. Next we'll hear from Dr. Linda Gordon, who is a Professor of History at New York University (NYU). After Dr. Gordon, her colleague from NYU's Department of Politics, Dr. Lawrence Mead, will speak to us. Then we'll hear from Judy Williams, Director of the Maine Bureau of Family Independence, which administers the state's TANF, food stamps, and medical assistance programs as well as others. Christina DiMeo comes next. She is from the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, an umbrella organization of more than 240 human services organizations across New York City. Finally, we have Seth Diamond, the Executive Deputy Commissioner for the Family Independence Administration at New York City's Human Resources Administration (HRA).

² Hector Cordero-Guzmán is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Black and Hispanic Studies Department at Baruch College and a member of the Ph.D. faculty in Sociology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He is the co-editor of the book *Migration, Transnationalization and Race in Changing New York* (Temple University Press, 2001). He holds a Ph.D. from The University of Chicago.

Dr. Aurora Jackson

Dr. Aurora P. Jackson is an Associate Professor of Social Work at the University of Pittsburgh. Her scholarship examines the interrelationships among work, welfare, maternal psychological functioning, and child outcomes in families headed by low-income, single-parent mothers with young children. She received her doctorate from The Ohio State University.

Well, it took me a while to decide what I wanted to say today because I knew the audience wouldn't be composed of researchers alone. I am going to talk about a study, a longitudinal study carried out in New York City. The 1996 federal welfare law (PRWORA) sought to reduce the number of children growing up in poor single-parent families by requiring mothers to move from welfare to work and by promoting marriage. The question is *"how well are programs implemented under the 1996 law accomplishing these goals and how are they affecting children's well-being and development?"* Whether the law is having positive effects on children is important. Untoward effects on child development can translate into educational failure, increased crime and violence, and reduced productivity among adults.

Available evidence suggests that, as of the fall of 2001, low-income children have been fairing fairly well. Poverty rates were down and fewer children were living in families headed by single mothers. Yet, despite the extraordinary economic growth that occurred in the 1990s, at the end of the century, almost a fifth of all children in the United States were poor. For children under six years of age, this figure was 22%. While 68% of all families headed by unemployed single mothers were poor, fully 24% of those headed by employed single mothers also were poor. Just over a fourth of all Black children were poor; among those in families headed by single-parent mothers, this figure

was 47%, or almost half. Single Black mothers are disproportionately represented among the very poor and the welfare dependent.

Surprisingly little research has examined the relationships between and among low-wage employment, parenting, and child outcomes in families headed by single Black mothers with young children, the population most affected by the 1996 law. The research on maternal employment that helped to bring this law into existence typically focused on middle-class, married, White mothers. Employment may have different consequences for poor and near-poor single Black mothers than for their middle-class, married, mostly White counterparts because single Black mothers are less affluent and the earnings of Black mothers make up a greater share of total family income than those of White mothers. Single Black mothers also are more likely than married White mothers to experience stressful events that put them at risk for psychological distress. High levels of psychological distress may lead to inadequate parenting and adverse child outcomes. This is an important issue because a large number of young Black children are being raised by a single mother.

This brings me to my recent work and some of the findings from this work.³ At the outset, given that the focus of this conference is on the role that higher education plays in welfare reform, let me say that in my study of single mothers in New York City-- and it is very nice to know that Seth Diamond is on this panel, because my sample came from the HRA--were current and former, employed and non-employed welfare recipients

³ See, for example, Aurora P. Jackson et al., "Single Mothers in Low-Wage Jobs: Financial Strain, Parenting, and Preschoolers' Outcomes," *Child Development*, vol. 71, 2000, pp. 1409-1423; and Aurora P. Jackson, "Maternal Self-Efficacy and Children's Influence on Stress and Parenting Among Single Black Mothers in Poverty," *Journal of Family Issues*, vol. 21, 2000, pp. 3-16.

in 1995, just before the 1996 welfare law was passed. We found that mothers with some education beyond high school were more likely to be employed, earned higher wages, scored lower on our measures of depressive symptoms and parenting stress, and scored higher on our measure of self-efficacy. They also had children as pre-schoolers who had fewer behavior problems and better cognitive abilities and behavior problems among pre-school children are an important issue because studies have shown that such behavior problems in the pre-school years predict later school adjustment and advancement educationally throughout life.

Mothers with some education beyond high school also scored higher on our measure of warm, supportive, and cognitively stimulating parenting in the home environment. My work suggests as well that employment can have beneficial effects both for poor and near-poor single Black mothers, and you notice that I focus primarily on single Black mothers. I study single Black mothers like most people study White mothers. I compare them to each other rather than comparing them to White mothers, because there are individual differences among poor people, and among poor Black people, and certainly among single Black mothers. So, to start again, my work suggests that employment can have beneficial effects both for poor and near-poor single Black women and their children. In several papers, I report significant differences between employed and non-employed mothers on many of the variables just mentioned. That is, employed mothers were lower in depressive symptoms and parenting stress. Most people think that if people with young children go to work they will experience a great amount of parenting stress. In my study, mothers with young children who were working experienced less parenting stress than those who stayed at home to take care of those

children. Mothers who were employed also were higher in self-efficacy than mothers who were not employed and receiving welfare. Employed mothers also had more income. Contrary to what some people think, people who work do earn more and do have more income than people who receive welfare benefits. However, in my sample, employed mothers experienced no less financial strain than their non-employed counterparts. In short, even though mothers who were working in low paying jobs seemed to be better off, they still were not earning enough to make a significant difference in terms of financial strain.

Before discussing other findings I will give you a brief description now of the study design and the sample so that you will have a context within which to place my work. With funding from the William T. Grant Foundation, the National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH), and a visiting scholarship at the Russell Sage Foundation, I examined concurrently and over time, the interrelations among work, welfare, maternal psychological functioning, parenting, and child outcomes. The subjects of the study were from New York City. They were single-mothers, employed and non-employed, current and former welfare recipients, and their young children. The timeline of the study spanned five years, beginning in 1995, just before the 1996 welfare law. The study had two phases:

- 1) a baseline phase in which 188 mothers and their preschoolers were interviewed in their homes between February 1996 and January 1997; and
- 2) a longitudinal phase in which 178 of these mothers and their by now school-age children were re-interviewed between July 1998 and December 1999.

The mothers lived in zip codes representing Central Harlem in Manhattan, Bedford Stuyvesant in Brooklyn, and Jamaica in Queens. These are areas with large

numbers of low-income Black families. A random sample was generated through the New York City Human Resources Administration. At the baseline, it consisted of 266 mothers with a three- or four-year old child. We achieved a response rate of 71% at baseline (i.e., the first interview) and we carried 95% of those mothers over three years (for the longitudinal interview). For these interviews, the mothers completed a number of scales measuring important characteristics and objective assessments of the children's pre-school readiness at Time 1 and the children's reading and math abilities at Time 2.

Now, in addition to the findings already discussed with respect to the differences between employed and non-employed mothers, we were also interested in for whom employment was most beneficial. In addressing this issue, we ran some analyses on the employed mothers only. In so doing, we examined whether and how maternal education, financial strain, and the availability of instrumental support influence mothers' psychological functioning, parenting adequacy, and the children's behavior problems and school readiness. We found that maternal educational attainment beyond high school was associated with higher earnings, which, together with greater access to instrumental support, were associated with less financial strain. Financial strain, in turn, predicted greater depressive symptoms, which were negatively implicated in parenting quality. The quality of parenting was associated with fewer behavior problems and with better school readiness. In short, our preliminary findings suggest that lower wages and financial strain take a toll on mothers like those in our study *via* depressive symptoms and the level of involved and supportive parenting that can be expected of them. Overall, it is likely that the effects of maternal employment on children in low-income families probably depends on whether family resources increase, the characteristics of the child

(such as the age, sex and temperament), the characteristics of the mother (such as her psychological well-being, her education attainment), and the availability of support, as well as characteristics of the job itself.

With respect to current welfare programs, states need to develop better approaches to helping single-mothers keep their jobs and increase their earnings, since others have also found that welfare reforms can have positive effects if both employment and income are increased. In particular, a greater emphasis on education and training beyond high school seems to make sense. Many families currently receiving welfare could benefit from such education and/or training.

Prior to reform, welfare programs had education components that focused on helping recipients enhance their basic skills. This approach, they found, demonstrated little success. Perhaps, for some mothers, support for education beyond basic skills and beyond high school is more appropriate. In addition to improving a family's future earning potential, maternal educational progress appears to be linked to positive child outcomes. Indeed, some have found that increased maternal educational attainment is more consistently associated with positive childhood outcomes than are increased family employment and income. Thank you very much.

Honorable Gwendolynne Moore

Gwendolynne Moore is a two-term senator [D] from the State of Wisconsin. Reared in Milwaukee, she entered Marquette University as an expectant mother who needed to apply for welfare to complete her education. Before being elected to the Senate she was twice elected to the Wisconsin State Assembly. Her chief legislative concerns are welfare, education, and criminal justice issues.

It is so good to be here. I feel a bit challenged. Over the weekend I contracted a terrible ear infection, so I am a little less effervescent than usual, but just bear with me, for I am no less enthusiastic about this subject than I ordinarily am. I am Gwen Moore, State Senator and I am the only African American woman who has ever been elected to the Wisconsin State Senate, the only woman of color. That presents a tremendous challenge to me. While I represent the northern part of the City of Milwaukee, my constituency really is statewide, as not only women of color, but poor women rely on me to carry on the work of protecting their interests.

Our program is called W-2 or Wisconsin Works. The majority of the caseload for Welfare Reform in Wisconsin, 76.5%, is in the City of Milwaukee, which I represent. Wisconsin Works operates on a biennial budget and for the past two sessions I have been the chief Democratic negotiator of the billion-dollar TANF package. I have also been very proud to be the chair of Wisconsin's Legislative Black and Hispanic Caucus, and I also served as the chair of the Human Services Committee of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators. I want to thank Chuck Bremer of NBCSL for securing my participation in today's conference.

The next Congress, the 108th, will have to finish the task left uncompleted by the 107th Congress: reauthorizing the expiring TANF block grant statute. With the recent tragic losses of both Congresswoman Patsy Mink (D-HI) and Senator Paul Wellstone (D-MN), I fear for the underrepresented, the underserved, the underprivileged, the

downtrodden, and the disenfranchised. We have lost true champions of civil and economic justice, and I hope that someone will take up the baton and protect these constituents.

It is becoming increasingly evident to me that the Republican--I am a partisan Democrat--control of the House and the Senate might actually enhance the passage of TANF legislation. As originally proposed by George W. Bush, it was very prescriptive and limited the states' flexibility in administering TANF. It proposed

- a 40 hour work week for women, leaving no time for parenting;
- earmarking marriage initiatives that ignore both limited funding and domestic violence concerns;
- no increase in TANF money despite overwhelming evidence of increased need given the nosedive of the economy.

It is fairly obvious who is behind the legislation being pushed by the President. President Bush's architect is the Department of Health and Human Services Secretary, Tommy G. Thompson. He also was the architect of welfare reform in Wisconsin. He was helped by Andrew Bush, now the Director of the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) in D.C.⁴ He also got help from Jason Turner, who left Wisconsin for New York.⁵ I know you all know Mr. Turner. I can't tell you how many phone calls I got from New Yorkers saying "Why did you Wisconsin folks send him here? Can you take him back?" All kidding aside, I just want to give you a little background, so you'll understand.

When Tommy Thompson was the governor of Wisconsin in the early 1990s, he was very ambitious. He was testing the waters for a presidential run, or of being on the

⁴ OFA is part of the Administration for Children and Families, of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

⁵ Jason Turner was the Commissioner of the Human Resources Administration from February 1998 through the end of 2001.

Republican ticket as vice-president. So, he wanted to be first to eliminate welfare as we know it. And you guys know the story--old Slick Bill Clinton sort of pre-empted him and ended it first before the Republicans were able to make this a campaign issue. And ending welfare in Wisconsin was sort of ending it at all costs. Wisconsin Works helped make the reputation of Tommy Thompson as a welfare reformer. When President Bush first unveiled his national TANF proposal, based on the Wisconsin model, there was a resounding outcry of opposition from the states and from the governors. Interestingly, Tommy Thompson was the chair, the head of the National Governors Association at that time of the original passage of TANF. He aggressively advocated for the adoption of these proposals. Even the National Conference of State Legislatures, an original proponent of the 1996 law creating TANF, opposed the Bush-Thompson version of TANF legislation.

Dr. Lawrence Mead, who you are going to hear from soon, wrote a paper on the politics of welfare reform in Wisconsin and noted how ineffective Black politicians like me were in convincing the public not to totally end welfare, not to totally shred the safety net. Mead said that Black politicians were ineffective, even though we had played the race card. That's true. And I should have played the gender card too. I just want to report to you, to those of you who play cards, that 80% of the people who are now still on this program are women of color, 96% are women. But, of course the race card and the gender card are always trumped by the money card! In our community, Hispanics and Blacks, were give contracts to administer our welfare program and they got \$160 million dollars in profit from doing it. So, the race card is always trumped by the money card. That is society.

Wisconsin's TANF program has routinely been touted for its innovative ways of kicking people off cash benefits by employing a drastic work-at-all-costs philosophy. When W-2 was first implemented, the Milwaukee Area Technical College estimated that nearly 6,000 mothers were kicked out of school, forced into the workforce. They were unable to complete their course work. A 2001 evaluation of the W-2 program by the non-partisan Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau (WLAB), found only seven of the agencies out of more than 70 provided any opportunity for technical or post-secondary educational programs in 2000. WLAB also recommended that the Department of Workforce Development and the legislature consider "whether the current focus of W-2 agencies on assisting participants in finding jobs based on their existing skills rather than providing more vocational or other training that may assist them in obtaining higher paying jobs is the most appropriate approach, or whether with more training, fewer participants would return to the program."⁶ Our program was so aggressive, we were kicking teen mothers out, forcing them to work, I mean 15-16-17-18 year olds who should have been in high school. We were kicking them out, telling them, "You all got to go down to wipe tables at Wendy's. You can't go to school." Fortunately, I was able to get Republican women to work with me to pressure our governor to lower child-care co-payments for teen parents. However, Assembly Republicans have refused to adopt legislation mandating that W-2 agencies allow teen parents to complete high school or GED's (General Educational Development) in lieu of work.

However, at the same time and over the course of the past five years, other states have been truly innovative, utilizing the financial flexibility provided under the current

⁶ *Administration of the Wisconsin Works Program by Maximus, Inc.* (July 2000), retrieved at <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/lab/>

TANF law to develop and create smart TANF law programs. What comes to mind is Parents as Scholars in Maine. That is a program that is a better model than what we have in Wisconsin. During the 2001 Department of Health and Human Services listening tour on TANF Authorization, I made some comments that I think are worth repeating here. This is what I said: “The discrimination of the future is going to be based on educational attainment and not a race or anything like that. Eighty percent of the workforce is currently unfit to go to work because they need to upgrade their skills. They need education and training.” So, while it may be good to connect people to work, there is not a single person around this table who is telling their 18-year old kids, “Go to work first before you go to college.”

I think we have to apply the same standard to, maybe not to college, but to technical schools, because people who have two-year technical school degrees are creating a lot of the new jobs. I mean that is the reality of the 21st century, and I don't want to see the TANF recipients left behind. Yet, we continue to debate whether they ought to have education and training. Additionally, we have a double standard where we are telling our kids, “You have to go and become this nurse or RN, you have to become computer literate,” while we are telling TANF recipients that “No, you just need to go flip hamburgers for a while before you get an education and training.” I urge all policymakers to really evaluate W-2 participant's outcomes before blindly adopting the Wisconsin work first model at the national level. It should be noted that Tommy Thompson, as governor of Wisconsin, twice vetoed bi-partisan agreements from the legislature that expanded educational opportunities for W-2 recipients. Dr. Spriggs was kind when he called it mean. I call it racial, gender and class warfare! People need

educational opportunity! You know the only way the United States is going to be competitive in a global market is when we educate our people and not leave this class behind. Slavery is over with. Women, and women of color in particular, ought not be re-enslaved in the name of welfare reform.

Dr. Linda Gordon

Dr. Linda Gordon is a Professor of History at New York University and the award-winning author of several books including Pitied But Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare. As a domestic violence expert, she serves on the Departments of Justice/Health and Human Services Advisory Council on Violence Against Women. She earned her doctorate "With Distinction" from Yale University.

Thank you all for coming and thanks to those who invited me. It's an honor to be here and to speak on the same platform as Gwen Moore. We did that a lot in my seventeen years in Wisconsin. I have become a New Yorker and unfortunately I have less influence than Jason Turner. I have the same Wisconsin cold that Gwen has, so I am going to lean close to the microphone. Wave your hand back there if you can't hear me.

I want to talk a little about the history of the kind of pickle we are in. In part, the history of the past couple of decades is one in which the Democratic Party has tried to act more and more like a Republican Party. The irony of this is that welfare, or Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) as it was called at the time of its repeal, was a part of the Social Security Act of 1935. Furthermore, when it was passed, it was the most uniformly acclaimed, least controversial part of that act. It is a very interesting fluke that the program we today call Social Security, was really only one of the eleven titles of the Social Security Act, in other words, the Program of Old Age Pensions. AFDC was welcomed by all because in the kind of simplistic thinking of the age, who could oppose

a little bit of help for very poor children and their poor guardians? The real origins of that program called welfare lay in the orphanages and the scandals therein at the beginning of the 20th century. There were thousands and thousands of children in orphanages back then and the great majority of them were not orphans. That is, the great majority of them had a living single parent, almost always a mother who could not find any way both to earn money for her children and to raise her children. The origins of the thought behind this program that came to be known as welfare was, “Why should we pay strangers in orphanages to raise children when we could give money to their own parents?” And it would be less money because it is always cheaper to support people in their own homes than it is to support people in institutions. Essentially, we could pay their mothers less money and end up with a much more both practical and constructive program.

Now, the main reason that welfare was repealed in 1996 has to do actually with a long orchestrated campaign against welfare that had in it components of racism, components of sexism, and also, quite separately, components of a uniquely American hysteria about taxes. We have politicians who are always afraid to say anything except that they support tax cuts, even though they know perfectly well that the tax cuts that are being talked about usually benefit only those at the top (who do pay very high rates of taxation). But there are also some other internal reasons why welfare was very vulnerable and weak from the very beginning. So, I would like to just take a moment to point out to you how welfare and Social Security Old Age pensions were constructed so differently. In the first place, to get aid for raising a child you had to not only be poor, but you had to prove that you were poor. Remember that you can get a Social Security

old age pension even if you are very wealthy. It has nothing to do with how much money you have. Furthermore, to get AFDC, you not only have to prove yourself poor, but first you have to make yourself poor. In other words, for a very long time, people were required to get rid of any resources that might have been useful in helping them get back on their feet.

Yet another point, and this is where sexism comes into it: AFDC was tremendously, what some of us have come to call, morals tested. There was a complete double standard. Women who were the recipients of AFDC were required to open their lives to investigation into their housewifery habits, into their social life, their sexual habits. At the beginning of the program, women who even touched liquor were labeled as inadequate, inferior mothers. Do I need to point out to you that the men for whom unemployment compensation and old age pensions were targeted never had that kind of investigation of their private lives? I have had many discussions with social workers old enough to remember the days when they were encouraged to drop in unannounced at 10 to 11 P.M. and when they were requested to do things like look in the dirty clothes hamper to see if it contained any men's clothing. Furthermore, AFDC was always much less well funded than any other program of the Social Security Act. There was never a time at which the stipends were enough to bring a person with only two children up to the poverty line. Built into it was this very odd and very complex double standard in which theoretically you weren't supposed to work, but any decent parent seeing that they didn't have enough from this welfare grant to raise their child, any decent parent was actually scrounging for ways to work on the side. In fact, it has been argued by many social workers that mothers who followed the rules were actually not being good mothers

because they were depriving their children by not seeking out better opportunities for their kids.

Finally, there was a whole mythology constructed that people who were receiving Social Security Old Age pensions were receiving money that they had earned while people who received welfare were receiving other peoples' money. This distinction is completely nonsense. I hope that you all know by now that there is not a separate piggy bank for Social Security Old Age pensions, that, in fact, our government has been taking money from those pensions for a very long time and are threatening now to eliminate it altogether. On the other hand, people now who receive Social Security Old Age pension are actually getting more of other people's money than are people who receive a small welfare grant to help raise children. There was a short period of time when this changed and that was in the late 1960s with the development of the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO). It was actually an extraordinary success story that within a fairly small amount of time, an organization like this, won such very significant battles. NWRO organized lawyers to contest some basic principles. They got the Supreme Court to rule on some very fundamental constitutional issues: to rule that these secret searches were illegal, that people, just because they received welfare, did not have to sacrifice their constitutional right to privacy, that rules about waiting periods when you move to another state were illegal, that you had a constitutional right to travel freely throughout this country, that you had a constitutional right to a hearing before they cut off your welfare grant, etc.

I think there is a very important lesson here and it is not only a lesson about welfare, but also about life. A lot of us learned about life from our parents, possibly,

from our churches and, I hope, from education. In life, we have two things to do. One is we have to build as good a life as we can for the people close to us. The other thing is we have to think about is the future. We have to leave the world a better place for our children. What I would like to say about the welfare issue is that I think that education, and I'm talking about serious college education, has been shown in study after study to be the only thing that will reliably enable people to get a living wage job for the rest of their lives. On the other hand, I really want to underscore the statements of Dr. Spriggs earlier. I very much liked his metaphor about the musical chairs. We have a government that on the one hand is telling people who have been on welfare, "Go out and earn a living, we don't care if there are just these minimum wage jobs available." On the other hand, there is also another arm of the government, seeing to it that the unemployment rate remains at least at 5%. Now there is a contradiction here. There are not enough chairs. It does seem to me that it is very important for people to think not only about how they are going to prepare themselves to cope, but also how *we* are going to work to change the basic rules of the game.

Let me just close with one specific political criticism that I think probably applies to me and probably some other people in this room. When you think about the welfare program and about who the constituency is, there have been three large national political lobbying and pressure organizations that represent the people who are involved. One is the National Organization for Women (NOW). Then there are the various civil rights organizations representing people of color. Third, are the trade unions, which surely should know that the forcing of welfare people into the labor force at incredibly low-wages is going to have the effect of pushing wages down and forcing out unions for all

working people. So you have three groups, that when they are together, represent very powerful forces in the United States and yet, not one of those three sectors, made it a priority to fight the repeal of welfare in 1996. That is the kind of coalition that we are going to need if we are going to do something about this in the future. Thank you very much.

Professor Lawrence Mead

Dr. Lawrence M. Mead is a Professor of Politics at New York University and an expert on the problems of poverty and welfare in the United States. He is widely published and has written several books including The New Politics of Poverty and From Welfare to Work: Lessons from America. Professor Mead testifies regularly before Congress on poverty, welfare, and social policy. He received his doctorate from Harvard University.

I have a handout here.⁷ Will someone help me distribute this? Thank you. It is a real pleasure to be here and it is particular pleasure to see Senator Moore from Wisconsin. I just finished writing a book on welfare reform in Wisconsin and Senator Moore plays a major role in it (*Welfare Reform: The Wisconsin Story*, forthcoming, Princeton University Press).

Senator Moore: "Am I In It?"

⁷ Text on the handout: Studies supporting work-oriented welfare reform programs over education and training: James Riccio, Daniel Friedlander, and Stephen Freedman, *GAIN: Benefits, Costs, and Three-Year Impacts of a Welfare-to-Work Program* (New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, September 1994); and Gayle Hamilton et al., *National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: How Effective Are Different Welfare-to-Work Approaches? Five-Year Adult and Child Impacts for Eleven Programs* (New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, November 2001). Studies favoring short-term training closely tied to specific jobs: John Burghardt et al., *Evaluation of the Minority Female Single Parent Demonstration: Summary Report* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, October 1992); and Susan Scrivener et al., *National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Implementation, Participation Patterns, Costs, and Two-Year Impacts of the Portland (Oregon) Welfare-to-Work Program* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education, May 1998).

Prof. Mead: Oh, you're in it, several times, and you haven't read all of it. In the rest of it I make several quite flattering references to your role. Senator Moore is a force; you have heard it and I have heard it.

This conference addresses a very important question, the role of higher education in welfare reform. I am a Republican and I basically support welfare reform. In spite of that, I think that the education issue has not been fully discussed at the national level and it is very useful to discuss it now.

I am going to advocate what Bill Spriggs has called “the mean policy” and try to convince you that it not a mean policy. It is an effective policy and a fair policy. There are basically two arguments I want to make for the policy of requiring work in advance of education. First of all, evaluations of welfare work programs show that those that emphasize actual work in available jobs perform better in evaluations than those that stress education and training for better positions. That is, clients who go through work-oriented programs show larger gains of employment and earnings and reductions in dependency relative to control groups that don't partake in the program. The gap between the program group and the control group is larger if the program emphasizes work than if it emphasizes education and training. This doesn't mean that the education and training don't also have some good effects. They often do if they are well run, but impacts are often smaller than for the work-oriented programs. And on the handout I show you some important studies that have established this. These are very prominent, very well known experimental evaluations of welfare reform programs.

It used to be thought that the superiority of the work-oriented program was a short-term thing, because you put people to work quickly, they will inevitably make more money in the short-term than people who are in education and training programs. But, so the thinking goes, eventually the people in the education program would get out and get better jobs and they would eventually outperform the people in the work-oriented program. But that has not happened. Even over five years, it turns out that the work-oriented programs are superior.

It is true that some people on welfare do well going to school. There is no question. There are some cases of this. You can find many success stories of people who went to college on welfare and then they got well paying-jobs at the other end. Those who advocate this approach focus on these cases. But what we don't hear about are the much larger number of people who drop out of these programs, do not finish and do not go to work. So that on average, these programs are much less effective than they may seem. It is true that a person who goes to college may well get a good job, but you haven't established by that fact alone that going to college was the reason they got the good job. It might be that they went to college because this was a person of initiative and ability and that caused them both to go to college and to get the good job. So you have the problem with what the economists call "selection effects" and you have to deal with that in your evaluation. Experimental studies compare those who go through a program to an equivalent group of people who do not go through the program. Then you allow for all those differences in motivation and then you find out that the education program does not do as well on average as the program that stresses immediate work.

The reason for this, and it is not very surprising, is that for most welfare recipients, the best way to get ahead usually isn't to go back to school. Audiences like this are good at school. That is why we are all here. People in this room like school, they succeed at it. That is how we got the positions that we have and we are inclined to think that that must be true for everyone, that all people on welfare are like us and should also go to school. But in fact, about half of welfare recipients are school dropouts. Many actually resist going back to school. It has not been a good experience for them. It doesn't mean there is no hope for them. The way forward, in fact, is to establish a job history, to start to work and to work steadily, and on the basis of that to move up to better positions. We also know from talking to employers, that they are unimpressed by paper educational credentials. What they want to see is a steady job history. That is the person that they are prepared to hire and that is the person that they will themselves train for higher skilled jobs.

I don't go all the way with work first. I am not saying work only. I am not saying that a program should have no element of training in it. In fact, the very best programs such as the one in Portland, Oregon, combine a work first emphasis with an element of training that is targeted at particular types of jobs. The Portland Welfare-to-Work Program, was probably the most successful that has ever been evaluated. One program that I looked at in Wisconsin, in Kenosha County, was known for a similar approach. They put people to work, often in part-time jobs. Then after that they would train them for better jobs, as well, so they would work and train too. There is also a good evaluation by the Center of Employment Training (CET) in San Jose, California, which found a similar approach to be effective.

So, you don't just aim to go to school and get through college, that doesn't work in general. But if you key training to particular positions with heavy input from employers, which is what they do at CET, then you can achieve some real effects. The key is to go to work first. Once you work at least part-time, you can then train for a better position. Once you have a work history then things change. It is at that point that a client may well qualify for something more in the way of education.

The second reason to favor the work first policy is simply fairness. There are many low-skilled workers in the economy who are working at unpleasant jobs, flipping hamburgers, whatever. They don't have the chance to go to college without working as well. Yet, that is what some individuals are proposing for welfare recipients. Public opinion polls are very clear; Americans regard this as unfair. Americans are prepared to help families in need, but they also want the parents in those families to work alongside the taxpayers, and education is not equivalent to working. They want recipients to work. Then they feel much better about supporting families. So, there are questions of fairness that require people to work first, but, again, not necessarily work only. There is no objection here to the general idea of people who are low-skilled going to college, but work has to come first. If you want adults to study without working, you should extend the privilege to the entire low-skilled working population and not only people coming off welfare. That is what you have to do. Only if you do that is it fair.

Current policy in New York and in the nation mostly supports the priorities that I just defended. We stress work first here in the City with the emphasis of putting people to work when they first go on welfare. If they don't get a private job, then they go into the Work Experience Program (WEP). That is about half-time, but there is also training,

which is the key to getting a better job. So, work first, but not work only. That's also the approach I think we should follow at the national level. I think some of the administration's proposals for reauthorizing TANF are constructive and some of them are extreme. They advocate too many hours of work. They require as well, a participation rate of about 70%. That is higher than we are likely to achieve. I would rather focus on achieving at least 50% participation for most people involved in welfare. Have the focus on work, but then also allow for training aimed for a better job. Work is not the end, work is the beginning. Once you are employed, even better if you can get off welfare, then you can take advantage of all the other opportunities to get through college. Thank you.

Judy Williams

Judy H. M. Williams is the Director of the Maine Bureau of Family Independence, which administers the state's TANF, Food Stamps, and Medical Assistance programs as well as special programs to assist low-income families, such as Parents as Scholars, which offers a monthly benefit to parents working toward two- and four-year college degrees.

It's a real pleasure to be here with you today. You are probably wondering why someone from a large rural state is here in the City talking about post-secondary education. I'd like to think it is because Maine took a unique approach to welfare reform in 1996. We offer a two- and four-year post-secondary education program parallel to our TANF program and I would like to thank the Honorable State Senator Moore for her kind comments regarding our Parents as Scholars program (PaS).

I am here to tell you that states, counties, and cities can do what we did. It just takes the initiative and creativity to do it. To understand where we are in Maine now, we have to go back prior to welfare reform. We always had a long commitment to post-

secondary education, both two- and four-year degrees. We have a very high percentage of high school graduates in the state, but less than 25% go on to post-secondary education. We needed to insure that we provided opportunity through post-secondary education because our labor market was changing at that time. We were a manufacturing economy--shoes, textiles, paper--and we were headed into a highly technical labor market that needed higher skill levels. So, we needed to provide higher opportunities. In fact, of our TANF participants at that time, 70% of them had graduated from high school, which, compared to the rest of the nation, is phenomenal. The population in Maine also does not mirror the national population. We have very few teen parents. We have an older population with older children.

Then along came welfare reform in 1996 and it put the State of Maine into a quandary, because it was clearly a work first model. So, we had to figure out how we were going to approach the work first model and keep our strong commitment to post-secondary education, especially in light of the language in the law that said that state programs couldn't circumvent the work first approach. We needed to develop the skills of our participants so that they could become as self-supporting as they possibly could and still meet the needs of our employers.

We decided that the best way to do that was to offer different opportunities: a work first approach, as well as post-secondary education. Within six months of the passage of the federal welfare reform, the Maine legislature, the advocates, the institutes of higher education, and the administration came together to create the Parents as Scholars (PaS) Program. It is a separate 100% state-funded program. Here, I should note that there is a provision in the federal welfare law that allows separate state programs to

meet the maintenance of effort requirement. The maintenance of effort requirement, for those of you who may not know, mandates that states have to spend the same amount of money on welfare as they did before welfare reform; but, they may use separate state-funded programs to meet that level. We decided to do that. Now, our legislature can be a little conservative at times and they decided that they were concerned that if we offered post-secondary education, it may open the floodgates. They put a cap on it so no more than 2,000 participants could be in PaS at any given time. I want to tell you that their fear didn't come true. We have never reached the cap of 2,000 at one time. The highest level we ever achieved was 1500. We average somewhere between 900 and 1200 participants at any given time in this program. Though we have not reached the 2,000 cap, the percentage of participants is near the highest level ever because the overall caseload for TANF, including PaS, has declined.

We run two parallel programs, our TANF Program and our Parents as Scholars program. Cash benefits are the same, eligibility is the same, and the support, primarily child-care and transportation, are the same for the both. Now, you would probably say this is a very expensive program in light of tuition. No it isn't, because most of participants are eligible for Pell grants. So, it is a rare occasion that we have to pay the tuition. We pay cash, we pay the support services. I have to say that Parents as Scholars program is tough. It is not for everyone. PaS participants are highly motivated. There are very stringent participation requirements and they work hard at this program and I am sure you will hear later how hard it is to obtain a post-secondary education while you are trying to care for a family. Our participants are primarily female, single heads of

households. We do have some males in our program, but the program participants are primarily female heads of households.

What does Parents as Scholars look like? First of all, participants have to be matriculated in college. They have to be in education full-time (as defined by the college), that is, either 12 or 15 credit hours. It is not part-time. They have to maintain a C average. They have to increase their earning potential and as you have heard, post-secondary education will increase earning potential. They have to complete their education within a normal time frame, two or four years, depending on the degree. We do provide extensions for some good cause, primarily medical reasons, but never more than one and a half-times, which means a maximum of three for a two-year degree, a maximum of six for a four-year degree. The first 24 months of enrollment in post-secondary education is full-time education: 12 or 15 credit hours. After the 24 months, then there are two options that an individual can take. They can participate for 40 hours a week, which is basically 12 hours in class--we allow one and a half-times for study--and 10 hours of work. Or, they can do 15 hours of what we call Work Activity Education (WAE). What is WAE? Internships, practicums, field work, work-study of any variety.

This is where the universities became real partners in the program. They went beyond the normal post-secondary education delivery to contend with non-traditional students. They developed course curricula. They developed more internships so that people could take the 15-hour option. They also expanded their delivery system, meaning that they did more evening classes, more weekend classes. Because Maine is a large rural state, colleges began utilizing the Internet and IT long distance learning. We went from potentially 15 campuses to any high school within the state as a delivery

center. The universities also provided additional support services. Many of our campuses now provide, on-site child-care, on-site housing for women with children, support groups, not only general educational support groups, but support groups for Parents as Scholars that provide advice on how to balance education while trying to raise a family. Certainly they offer tutoring and remedial education and other campus support services.

What are the outcomes of the Parents as Scholars Program? Well, first of all, let me talk about the total caseload, TANF and PaS. Even though we offered post-secondary education, we still were able to achieve the caseload reductions that all the other states saw. We reduced our caseload from over 23,000 to 10,200 a month. What we see from our PaS is that they have a higher level of self-esteem, commitment, self-assurance, and their ability to continue their employment regardless of the change in economic environment. We have a 95% graduation rate. That means that less than 5% drop out of Parents as Scholars. In spring graduations, we have somewhere between 250-300 graduates, every spring semester. I asked one of our sister agencies (the colleges and universities) to give us an example of what that means to your general student population--they said that normally they lose 25% of their freshman class. So PAS has a higher completion rate.

When we look at both TANF and Parents as Scholars with regard to the rate of recidivism, we have less than 6% that come back to our welfare rolls within 6 months. This is because we provide opportunities and options, whatever fits, to the individual. Certainly, we have higher employment. The highest placement for our TANF placement is \$7.00 an hour; for our Parents as Scholars, it is over \$11.00 an hour. I will give you an

example of one individual who within one week of graduating landed a job at \$64,500. Certainly PaS graduates are offered higher paying jobs with benefits. Last, but not least, is the impact on the children. PaS parents are role models to their children. Studying beside their child has increased the grades of the children themselves and education is no longer a thought, it is an expectation.

We have an expression in the State of Maine, I think it was an old political expression: “As Maine goes, so goes the nation.” I give you all that challenge.

Cristina DiMeo

Cristina DiMeo is a Senior Policy Analyst for Income Security at the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies (FPWA), an umbrella organization for more than 240 human service agencies across New York City. She engages in policy, advocacy and research around welfare, poverty and economic security issues. Ms. DiMeo holds a master's degree in social work from Hunter College School of Social Work (CUNY).

It's a pleasure to be here today and I wanted to bring a local advocacy perspective to these issues. I'd like to talk about some of the success we've had in New York around access to education. First, I'm going to give you some background.

As you know, under the Giuliani administration, we saw a tremendous drop in the number of people receiving welfare who were enrolled in education and training programs. The only place we have hard data is from the City University of New York (CUNY) system, so I'm going to cite those statistics and they are really startling. Back in the fall of 1995, there were 28,000 students in the CUNY system who were on public assistance. By the fall of 2001, the number had dropped to less than 5,000 students. We don't have hard data on students at other universities and educational institutions, but

anecdotally we know that students in literacy, English as a second language (ESL), GED, and vocational training were also forced out of these programs. I know the focus today here is on higher education, but we can't talk about higher education without talking about access to other forms of education so that people have opportunities to go to college.

So what was happening to these students? Well, under the former Giuliani administration they were forced to enter the Work Experience Program (WEP). People were forced to work for City agencies like the Human Resources Administration, the Parks Department... Sanitation to work off their welfare checks. They were not provided with any form of education or training. Instead, they were forced to work off their checks and these placements didn't lead to any jobs. So, you are taking students out of a program that works and forcing them into a dead-end workfare slot. Recipients in college or any type of education training were told they had to leave those programs. And for people who were interested in attending those programs, they were told that education was not an option, that WEP was the only option, or their case would be closed. Despite the fact that research showed that 88% of students who received welfare and obtained a four-year degree left welfare permanently, students were being forced out of these programs.

So, what happened? The welfare organizing groups in New York City got together and decided that we wanted to do something on a small scale to alter these policies. Students at the Welfare Rights Initiative at Hunter College, which is an organization that tries to increase access to higher education, came up with an idea to do something on a small scale, but that we would try to build upon. We wanted to enact a

State law to help students stay in school, one that would override what the Mayor was doing in the City. Thus, one of the first things that we did was reach out to our State elected officials. State Senator Tom Duane (D-Manhattan) and former Assemblyman Roberto Ramirez (D-Bronx), who was then Chair of the Assembly Social Services Committee, encouraged Senator Ray Meier (R-Utica) of upstate New York, who is the Chair of the New York Senate's Social Service Committee, to visit New York City. We targeted this Committee because that is where the legislation on welfare comes from. We targeted Ray Meier because he is a Republican and we thought that if we got him on board basically it would mean that the bill would go through.

In February of 2000, we toured three CUNY campuses, the Borough of Manhattan Community College, Bronx Community College, and Hunter College, where the Welfare Rights Initiative is based. At each campus, Senator Meier heard from students who told their stories of how they were trying to juggle college, homework, their children and their families, internships and work at the same time, and meet the welfare requirement of the Work Experience Program. He also heard how students were in internships that would lead to real jobs and were being forced out of school and in to these dead-end workfare assignments. Meier heard the students say they desperately wanted to stay in school so that they could have a better future for themselves and their children. The students had an amazing impact on him. He had to leave to go back to Utica but he stayed later than he planned because he was enthralled by the students. It wasn't just research, it wasn't statistics; it was talking to people face to face and hearing what they had to say.

To make a long story short, after much negotiation and work by a lot of different organizations all over the State, a bill was agreed on. The bill would allow time spent in federal work-study and internships to count as a work activity. The bill also said that social service districts around the state could not interfere with a person's class schedule. So, in New York City, that meant that the welfare agency would have to make a reasonable accommodation for students to attend school. The bill wasn't everything we wanted. Ultimately, what we would like is for all forms of education and training to count as work. Yet, it was a step towards building a relationship with the state legislature around the issue of access to education training for people receiving welfare.

I am pleased to say that the bill passed both houses of New York's state legislature and Governor Pataki signed the bill into law in October of 2000. The law was a two-year demonstration project. It expired this past June. Because of the work that had been done to show how this program was beneficial to students, the Governor signed a law extending it for two more years.

I want to mention two other efforts that are going on. One is a bill that the State Assembly and the Senate passed this summer that would allow basic education, ESL, literacy, and GED studies to count as a work activity. It is another way of trying to help students stay in school. I want to note what is happening now, under the Bloomberg administration: there isn't as much focus on workfare as before, but students are still being pulled out of school every day to do workfare. Second, on the local level, a broad-based coalition is working on a City bill that would count all forms of education and training, from literacy, GED, ESL two- and four-year college and vocational training to count as work. I'll close by saying while we have had some success in New York State

and that we are working on improving the situation in New York City, we also need policies at the federal level that make it less difficult for states and cities to do the kind of work that we want to do, to increase access to education and training. We still have an opportunity with TANF reauthorization to make access to education training for all welfare recipients a reality. Thanks.

Seth Diamond

Seth Diamond is the Executive Deputy Commissioner for the Family Independence Administration (FIA) at the Human Resources Administration of New York City. FIA provides short-term cash assistance and Food Stamps to eligible individuals and helps these individuals achieve self-sufficiency. FIA also oversees a variety of work, education and training programs. Mr. Diamond is a graduate of New York University School of Law.

Good morning everybody, it is a pleasure to be here. I want to talk about our policies on higher education and college, but I thought it might be best to put it in the context of the administration's policies on education and training generally, because, as you have heard, and as we have said before, they are very closely linked. Mayor Bloomberg has laid out a very clear agenda on where he feels education and training should go in terms of welfare reform. In his May speech on his vision for welfare, the Mayor described the very strong role that he believes education and training must play in the future of welfare reform. He is particularly interested in education as a preventative strategy and in working with the schools to make sure that people who are in the school system are able to move right into a career and don't have a need for public assistance.

He also believes in education and training as part of a larger retention strategy. We have been, in the City, very successful in placing people in jobs. Over the past two

years alone, we have moved nearly 300,000 people, not counting this year--if you count this year, it is over 350,000 people--into employment.

Employment is a good first step, but we recognize that it is not the final step. The Mayor believes that education and training can be a very big part of the continual progress to self-sufficiency. So, he wants to use education and targeted training to both keep people in the job market and to help them upgrade their skills so they can move into better paying jobs. It is part of a larger strategy that we have of emphasizing work and continuing to work with people to help them move up the economic ladder. The proposals the Mayor made are contained in his broader TANF legislation proposal that we sent to Washington and is available on HRA's website (<http://www.nyc.gov/html/hra>) for anyone who is interested. It contains things like not having a 60-month time limit for people who are in paid employment and who are pursuing education and training. Also, increasing the number of people who can pursue education and training as a sole activity from 30%, in current law, to 40%.

So, we have tried to advocate for things in Washington that we believe will help with the broader agenda of including education and training in the mix of services and strategies to help people off welfare. We all know that things take time in Washington and while we are hopeful that Congress will act on Mayor Bloomberg's suggestions, we have to wait. But we haven't waited in New York; we've tried to implement some things that we believe incorporate a sound strategy for moving from welfare to employment.

We strongly believe that the choice that is sometimes laid out between education or work as the best way to move to employment is really a false choice. Just as work

alone is not a sufficient strategy to move people to employment, education alone is, in most cases, not a sufficient strategy. What is successful and what I believe the research has shown is this: together education and training, with work, is the best approach. Accordingly, we have tried to move the debate from an either/or situation, which we too often get bogged down in, to the matter of how we can best combine work and education. In short: *how can you offer both work services and education and training?* That is the operative question for us.

Sometimes this point gets drowned out in the debate and people try to label us as work first, or denying education. It is really neither. We're not work first in the sense that we don't believe in work exclusively, and we're not against education. We believe in combining the two and we believe we have been successful in doing that.

The City has made tremendous progress in moving away from a system that relies only on work experience to one that relies on a combination of activities. Only a few years ago, in 1999, of the people in work experience, under 15% of them were doing something else, so that 85% of the people in work experience were only in work experience, and 15% of the people were in work experience and some other activities. Now the numbers are reversed, 90% of the people in work experience are also involved in education and training and only 10% are in work experience alone. In the City today, you actually have more people in education and training alone than you do in work experience alone. So the City has made almost a complete change from where it had been and really is on the path to designing programs that emphasize work with education and training. The idea being that people, again, learn certain kinds of skills that they will need to succeed in the workplace--how to work with colleagues, the discipline of work,

how to take direction from supervisors, those kinds of things--and you can learn specific skills in the classroom targeted around your particular needs or interests. Ideally, things you learn in the classroom are reinforced in the workplace and again, the two feed off each other, so that teachers could even communicate with workplace supervisors on specific skills that have been learned in the classroom to make sure they are practiced in the workplace and visa versa.

That is the kind of program we have tried to put together and I think we have been very successful. To give you some examples of the programs we offer, we have the Begin program which emphasizes English as a second language (ESL) and lower level literacy programs for people who need these skills. People who need education services work three days a week in a work experience assignment and then spend two days a week in the classroom. The programs have been tremendously successful, both in terms of work and in terms of educational outcomes. The GED program that the Begin program runs has the highest pass rate in New York State, higher than full-time GED programs, higher than any other program in the State, and that is in a concurrent model. We also offer other kinds of concurrent programs, always with the idea that people spend, again, three days a week working and the other two days should be targeted at the particular services and skills they need. We have programs that offer job searches on those other two days. We, in cooperation with the City University, have a Poise program that offers special kinds of parenting and other skills to pregnant women who need those kinds of services. So, again, they spend three days a week, if they are able, working in some kind of work environment and then they spend two days a week in parenting skills and learning things around raising young children and in employment related skills. We have

programs targeted at homeless individuals, where homeless people spend time both working and in non-work activities.

So, we have been able to design models that work together to combine the kind of work and non-work services that people need in a concurrent, comprehensive model to help move them to employment. Clearly, we have more to do; there are not enough targeted services. There are certain populations that, as we move further in welfare reform, maybe we either couldn't pay attention to in the past or didn't realize that they existed. So, maybe we need more services in a particular area to address a particular need that is now an urgent one in the public assistance population and we are committed to doing that. But we are committed to doing it in the model that combines work and non-work services. We think it has been very successful in the City and in other places that have done it.

Let me spend a minute addressing that concept and how we have applied that to the college context, because we have also worked very closely, primarily with the City University of New York, but with other colleges in implementing programs to assist college students who are also on public assistance. The City has a very large program with the City University, called the COPE program, and I know there are some people here from the COPE program. We have supported COPE for many years, and it is a primary vehicle that we use to assist college students who are on welfare. Through that program we fund academic advisors, job searches, tutoring assistance, and other kinds of aid that will help the City University students. It also helps City University administrators work with us to educate college students about welfare reform requirements, provide assistance to them, and help them find employment, whether it is

on a part-time or full-time basis. COPE also provides academic advisement to help students make the right course selection and tutoring assistance to help them stay in college. Under that program, which we pay for on a performance basis with CUNY, CUNY receives money based on the people they place in jobs. It has been tremendously successful and we have been able to continue that for many years. I think if you talk to people at City University, they will say, as we say, that it is a very much a success.

We also have introduced, in the past several years, a Work Experience Program at City University. In it, people who have a work requirement can do their work requirement either at, or near, their college campus. This makes it easier for people who do have a work experience assignment, on top of college, to be able to do the work in their off hours, so that, hopefully, they can fulfill their requirement and still have time for other things that they need to attend to, like their families.

We also have implemented, as was discussed right before me, the law governing internships and work-study, so that the situation now, as I understand it in my conversations with people from the City University, is that because work-study and internships count towards people's work requirements, most college students, when you add internships, work-study and college attendance, do not have additional work requirements. In most cases, work-study and internships, often require a significant number of hours, and combined with class hours usually add up to about 35 hours, thereby limiting, to a great extent, the additional work requirements that most college students have.

So we have moved a long way in the discussion about education and training and the way it fits in welfare reform and the path to employment. I would like to continue the progress and I think, again, that we should think about it not in terms of an either/or, but a combination of activities, and how the two can best fit together. I think we, on the government side, have tried to be flexible in terms of recognizing that people should not be in work only and we should accommodate non-work activities. Sometimes providers and other educational people have also been flexible in terms of offering classes at evening hours and looking at how best to alter schedules so that they can accommodate work. Sometimes it has been less successful; but if the two of us can work better together on how to combine schedules, we can make a real comprehensive model that emphasizes both work and non-work services, and I think everyone will benefit. That is really the best approach and one that we hope will be embodied in the legislation in Washington and that we hope that we can implement in the next round of welfare reform. Thank you very much.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: So we managed to be able to have at least twenty-five minutes, or so, for questions. So, any questions, comments, suggestions, from members of the audience? If you would be so kind, there is a microphone, please use it so that both the panelists and the audience and people that are in other rooms trying to hear this conversation can also hear you.

Audience: My name is Dr. Jillyn Stevens, and I am a former welfare recipient. I have a few comments. First of all, I want to remind everyone in the room that raising children is work. It is an honor, but it is work, okay?

Second, Dr. Mead, your numbers are really confusing to me. You say that on average, women who graduate from college and those who drop out make less than women who go to work. I have to tell you that you are also not adding in the women who drop out of work. I mean, it is fuzzy math, it really is. In terms of life-long earnings, I can tell you that I will be paying well over \$300,000 in my lifetime in federal taxes alone, and I can also tell you that women who work at the minimum wage are going to be paying maybe, maybe \$50,000, at most, in their lifetime in federal taxes. This is a long-term investment and I cannot believe that you are sitting here telling this audience of smart, competent people that in the long run education does not pay. I don't get it. I am standing here as proof. I come from a small, rural town in Utah, and here I am in New York. I have a great job as a director in a non-profit and I make good income, it doesn't make any sense to me and I just want to put that out there.

Third, to pit the working poor against welfare recipients in terms of access to college, I mean, college should be open and available to everyone.

My final statement, in terms of Dr. Gordon talking about getting a legal kind of process moving against the upcoming welfare issues, I wonder about how Title IX⁸ plays into this and I think some work needs to be done to find out how come institutions of

⁸ Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 mandates "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."

higher education and the federal government can violate civil rights in terms of racism, sexism, classism and access to college. It just doesn't seem right. There is an obvious disconnection between the whole theory of discrimination and what is happening with women on welfare.

Prof. Mead: What I said was that the evaluations do not support a welfare reform policy based heavily or predominately on education in advance of work. That is what is clear from the evaluations. No expert seriously disputes that. To contend otherwise is to simply fly in the face of the facts. Now, I'm not saying that this argument applies to the people in this room. I'm not saying that it applies to people who are good at school. To us it doesn't apply. But we are not typical of people on welfare and to contend that we are is frankly false. This simply isn't plausible. I'm not saying education plays no role, I'm saying that it plays a role for most welfare recipients after they are working at least part-time.

Now, you say that I'm pitting the welfare poor against the working poor. Yes, I am. According to polls done right here in New York, 90% of the voters and 90% of the recipients support unpaid work for people on welfare who do not work in the private sector. To say, therefore, the public in New York supports the policy of people going to college on welfare is simply false. Other people in New York who are working at low paying jobs do not have the opportunity to go to college on the public dollar and it seems to me that those who argue for this must take this fairness question seriously. Now I'm not saying that everyone with a low paying job shouldn't have a scholarship to go to

college. Maybe they should, but that is what you have to argue for, and not for a privilege specific to welfare people.

Dr. Jillyn Stevens: I just want to make one final statement, and that is that when you speak of people on welfare, you are speaking from a very privileged position, and you are speaking about people, like myself, who did have some privilege. You have a whole group of people who have been beaten down by a system and going to school first helps build their self-esteem so that they can get a job.

Prof. Mead: I'm just saying that on average for the welfare population, as far as we know from the research, that is simply false.

Dr. Spriggs: Well, I'm taking a little privilege to put myself at the mike, but I need to speak to Dr. Mead's point about the Manpower Research Development Corporation (MDRC) study.⁹ That study was comparing work first to a job-training and education program, all built on a model that you had someone with very low educational attainment. There are a large number of women, who, in fact, could go onto college who are on welfare. So, to characterize the MDRC study as showing what happens if we send folks to college is misleading.

Remember the selection problem works both ways. When you take what happened here in New York City and what happened nationwide, when you take women who were in college and tell them they have to go to work, of course they are going to do

⁹ Gayle Hamilton et al., *National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: How Effective Are Different Welfare-to-Work Approaches?*

well in the labor market because, as Dr. Mead pointed out, the ones who were in college are over-qualified for the low-wage jobs pushed by work first programs.

The meanness comes by saying one-size fits all, and assuming that all welfare recipients are low skilled people who can't achieve. Instead of programs that are from the top down, I think what we need to do, as researchers, and those of us in the research community need to contribute, is to believe that women are rational. Go back and look at what women on welfare were doing to create pathways out of poverty. What the data clearly show, is that a large segment of women on Aid to Families with Dependent Families (AFDC) figured it out and were going to college. So, instead of having a program that says, "We know; you do," we need to have a program that says, "You did," and asks, "What did work, what didn't work, and how can we make it work better?" So, I think we need, as scholars, to be a lot more accurate.

Prof. Mead: I just want to reply briefly. It is true, as Bill says, that these studies were not, *per se*, about college, but they did include many assignments to post-secondary education. They weren't, *per se*, college. That is correct. But if those programs underperformed work first programs, which is the case for these general welfare populations, it is highly implausible that a college emphasis is going to perform better for the general welfare population. Now, I also admit there is some element of the welfare population that would benefit from going to college. I'm saying we don't have studies showing those programs are generally effective, but even if I were to concede that, the fairness question is serious. You have a lot of other single mothers and other low-skilled workers who are not on welfare, who are paying the bills of the people who are on welfare and they do not have the same opportunity to go to college. Now that, it seems to me, is

inequitable. You can say the society ought to provide low-income women the chance to go to college, but that should be for all of them, and not simply for people on welfare.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Just for clarification, when you say under-perform, you mean what variable, what criteria? Are you using wages, employment?

Prof. Mead: Various things, well, three main impacts: impacts on employment, earnings, and reductions in dependency of AFDC payments. By those criteria, the work first programs outperform programs oriented to education, where education was defined to include various training programs and some post-secondary education. So we don't have findings that bear directly on college as a strategy. But it is implausible, in light of the other findings we have, that a college emphasis would, in general, be a good idea for people on welfare.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: And is this six months, or two years after they finish?

Prof. Mead: Usually the follow up is two years, three years in the case of the Gains Study, which is on the list I handed out.

Audience: I'm from California, and I represent an institution, which I'll talk about later, that does focus on four-year BA programs and support for that 10 to 15% of the population that experiences the 1996 welfare reform legislation as a deprivation and an unfairness and a taking away in the way that's described. I would like to address my comment to you, Mr. Diamond of the HRA, and to urge that when you think about the college option, do not generalize. I don't know how your children were raised, but I want to support the comment that raising children is work and when you talk about 40 hours a

week, not only are you talking about an impossible workload, in terms of a requirement when you look at the practicalities of college expectations, which in California are 3 to 6 hours of homework for every hour of class, with 15 units, you've got a more than 24 hour workload, not saying what it's got to do with your children, and I want to point out the class bias in this kind of ruling, as well, because there is an expectation from middle-class children that they might work, but work-study, in California, is 10 to 20 hours and maybe 15. It is not 25, or whatever the work requirement is, so there is a class and a gender issue that has to be taken into account!

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Please...Easy, now. Next question?

Audience: My name is Cora. I'm the former president of the New York Coalition of 100 Black Women and I am employed in the education department for the Bronx Borough President. As a matter of fact, I'm the Deputy Director of Education for him. My comments, and a question are directed to Dr. Mead. It becomes a learning experience if I get a response. What term is applied to those farmers who receive payouts and are told not to farm, number one? Which means they wouldn't be working, but would be receiving federal handouts. What term is applied to the monies that have been given, since World War I, II, and the Korean War to European nations? The handouts? What term, is it a political term other than welfare, that I am not familiar with? What term is given to the bargaining with the corporate leaders for tax abatement? Is there some specific term other than welfare that is applied to those three?

Prof. Mead: Well, my reading of the politics of welfare is that the public wants recipients to be involved in the economy and to contribute something. It does not require

self-sufficiency in the sense that you have to be supporting yourself, no matter how little your income. The public does not expect people to be self-sufficient. It does expect them to work, if they are dependent on the public. The cases you mention are cases of corporate subsidies which are frequently questionable from every point of view, but they are consistent with this idea. The people who are getting the subsidies have some function in the economy. They have a work history, they have something they are contributing, and then they also get a subsidy. Now, that is the politics of the American economy. Roughly, if you are working you have more claims, rather than fewer claims, and the more you are involved in the economy, the more you get help from government. And, in fact, people who go to work off welfare enter into a much broader set of subsidies than they had before, including wage subsidies, unemployment benefits, child-care, etc.

Cora: What about the handouts to the Europeans? What about the other handouts that I mentioned, coming from World War I to the Korean War and all the billions, billions.

Prof. Mead: That I'm not going to try to explain.

Cora: All right, thank you.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Dr. Gordon?

Cora: Oh, okay.

Dr. Gordon: Well, actually...

Cora: What is it called, that's all I ask?

Dr. Gordon: It's called foreign aid.

Cora: Okay, not welfare, thank you.

Dr. Gordon: I just want to respond to a number of points that have come up in these exchanges, first of all about public opinion. It is extremely important that people begin to understand, and I trust you will, Larry (Mead), that public opinion isn't a given; public opinion is constructed. The very polls that ask people what they prefer are already framing issues in certain ways so that they only have certain responses. Let me give you one famous example from a few years back. A *New York Times* poll asked people if they wanted to cut welfare they got a proportion of about 65% of people who wanted to cut it. When they were asked if they wanted to cut aid for poor children and their caretakers they got a response of about 30% of people who wanted to cut. They are talking about the same thing in different ways. Second, public opinion is not only constructed by the polling, but huge fortunes have been spent in mobilizing and constructing and shaping public opinion around these issues. The issue of work... one way to think about this is: would we solve the welfare problem if all parents of children who are poor and need help exchanged places with other parents of children? Could they then be sent to work if they are taking care of your children rather than my children? Well, that is obviously absurd, isn't it, and yet that is the policy. It would count as work if you are taking care of someone else's children; it would not count as work if you are taking care of your own children. There is a gendering here that is so basic that it is really hard for people to see. We live in a culture in which for generations, for centuries, it has been women's

responsibility to take care of children. Now, in the United States, that position was based on a myth, the myth of the male breadwinner. We have an ideal that a very small proportion of people in the very upper middle-class and upper class are able to achieve, which is that one male breadwinner can earn enough money to support a whole family. Now, I want to tell you, I'm sure you know this, that that is true of less than 10% of American families. Now, here is something that not many people do know: never once, not once in American history, was this true of the majority of American families. It is a complete myth and it is a very class biased myth, and yet we have social policies that are based on that myth. I think we need to start once more, even though it is out of fashion right now, making the case that raising children is a major contribution towards our society and that it deserves support.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Unemployment insurance is an example of what you are taking about. Yes...

Dr. Susan Gooden: My question is actually directed to Judy Williams. I am intrigued by the Maine program and the results that you achieved. You say about 10-15% of recipients are in PaS and there is a cap of about 2,000 participants. If you wanted to ramp that up, you know, extend it to say 50% or 85%, or even 100%, what would be some key ingredients to expand it and to raise the number beyond the 15%?

Judy Williams: As I said, the Parents as Scholars, as it is currently designed, is very tough, it is full-time. Perhaps, if the focus were to enroll more in it part-time, then we would have a higher enrollment allowance.

Let me note a few things: PaS runs statewide. A program should be consistent statewide, so there are no geographical barriers to participation. Another factor is... when our caseworkers talk with individuals, though we had 70% who actually graduated high school, recipients tell us that high school wasn't necessarily a good experience. Many are concerned about going back to school. Normally, they start in TANF, and as they work with their caseworker, they see education as a potential, so they'll move from TANF to Parents as Scholars. Remember, encouragement might make a big difference, because PaS participants really have to be motivated to move into the post-secondary area. I believe that, because it is their option, that we have the success rate that we have, the 95%. The participants have the desire to go there versus us kind of pushing along, when they are ready, they move to Parents as Scholars.

Audience: Hello, my name is Simica and I am a student at MCNY and I am just in my second semester and I have a question for Professor Mead. I am a single-parent with two children and I am trying to go to school and I have a part-time job and I did go to welfare and asked for help and they told me that I had to leave school and leave my part-time job and be a part of their program which was not beneficial to me or my children's future. So, my question to you is how is it unfair for people who are trying to stay in school to ask for help and not receive it?

Prof. Mead: Because there are many other women, like you, who are working, not on welfare. They do not have the opportunity to go to college, paid for by the public. It seems to me the question should be raised whether it is fair for people on welfare to have that opportunity if other people don't. That is all I'm saying.

Simica: Well, wait a minute, wait a minute, because I would like to comment...

Prof. Mead: And I'm not saying that everyone shouldn't have that opportunity. I only say that if welfare recipients have a distinct privilege and others do not it raises an issue of fairness. And I want to reiterate what Judy said right now: For many people on welfare, I would say the majority, going back to school is not what they want to do, and we shouldn't make this our basic policy. That is simply not the way forward for most of them. Again, there is a minority for whom it may well be the way forward, but then you have this fairness question which is serious, and you just can't ignore it.

Simica: Well, I would like to say, because you mentioned a couple of times about paying, like about people who are paying their tax dollars, if welfare was eliminated, we still would have to pay taxes. So, it is not a matter of my tax dollars, because I am not on welfare, but I did go try to apply. I do want to go to school, and for most people, they get stuck in jobs, because they have to earn money, so now they're stuck. I'm in a minimum wage job. I'm kind of stuck because I can't go to school. I'm not getting the proper help, the funding for babysitting, or financial aid. I still would have to pay tax dollars if welfare was eliminated.

Prof. Mead: You say you are not on welfare now.

Simica: I'm not now because I'm not going to sacrifice, I'm not going to quit school and...

Prof. Mead: Well, this makes a very considerable difference. See if you are simply using the subsidies available to the general population, and many people do,

including child-care and income tax credit, various forms of tuition assistance, these things are entirely legitimate. That changes the game completely. You're exactly right that going to college is a good idea to get ahead.

Simica: It's the same thing. I'm getting the same thing; I'm receiving financial aid that is a handout. I'm receiving child-care that is still a handout, so I'm still receiving.

Prof. Mead: But you are also paying taxes. You are also working and paying taxes, that makes a huge difference.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Any other questions before we have to close the panel?

Senator Moore: Hector, can I just respond to some of these questions? I want to defend Dr. Mead here for a moment. I want to defend him, because he has made this point several times, and I want to hear it. Eighty percent of the workforce is unfit for the 21st century. The rest of us don't have Ph.D.'s, and there is some logic in people who are promoting these policies to try to look at educational opportunity for the general public that is not means tested. There are women and men in our economy who, you know... My daddy had a third-grade education, worked in a factory in Wisconsin, and he made more money than I have ever made, pouring steel. But those jobs don't exist anymore. There is not going to be a second coming of these manufacturing jobs and so, therefore, it is a fact that we need education, but we don't need to deselect women, especially women of color, for educational opportunities, because one of the things that you have not defended very well is why, like the young woman who just came up here before indicated, why there ought not be an option to go to school and to go to college? And,

just in defense of Dr. Mead, we do need broader educational opportunity, publicly funded education, for at least two years beyond high school. High school used to be the ceiling, but now with a high school diploma, even if you are the valedictorian of your school, when you walk out the door, you are unfit for the 21st century.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Now I'm going to let the members of the panel make any closing remarks.

Prof. Jackson: Okay, in response to those who argue that taking care of children (at home) is work: well, yes, it is and so are being a wife and taking care of a house. All of this is work. Nevertheless, the fact is, research shows that women who stay at home and do that kind of work only are more depressed than the women who go out and do some other kind of work for which they are paid.

With regard to education, what my research seems to show is that women with some education beyond high school are simply better parents to their children. I think this is a very important issue. Furthermore, I think policymakers need to try to help women to be the best parents that they can be, to get a job that they can hold, and to get the preparation they need to get the kind of job they want. I think these are policy implications that flow from my research and that of some of my colleagues.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: Do you have a quick comment, because I don't want to leave you standing?

Audience: I just have a comment, I'm Mamina. I'm from the Poise Program at Medgar Evers College. I want to know, are you just setting us up for failure, because by

us working and going to school and maintaining a household, that's a failure? I was a student, I had three years of college under my belt and when this new act went into effect, I had to leave school because I had to go to work. I only had a year left to finish my nursing degree, a year left to go for a nursing degree, for a job that would have me set, secure for my children and for myself. I had to leave because the new law went into effect, it was mandatory, they didn't tell me to go to college, that was their remark to me. "Nobody told you to go to college; you went on your own."

Prof. Mead: And you should continue on your own.

Mamina: Listen, okay, I'm sorry... I'm a mother of four children. I started having children when I was sixteen-years old; there was no parental guidance. I have two daughters of my own, I plan on being there for them, not to walk in my shoes, so for me to do it for myself is pretty hard when I just have circumstances in my life that are not helping me. You are hindering me. I need help from you. You are telling me that you are there to help me, then help me, show me, don't just dictate and tell me what to do.

Prof. Cordero-Guzman: I want to thank all of you, all of the very distinguished panelists for showing up and defending their positions admirably. I want to thank the audience for maintaining their cool and their calm and not storming the stage, which would have put me in a very difficult position of having to physically defend Dr. Mead. Please stay for the rest of the proceedings. Thanks so much.

INTERVIEW OF YVONNE RHEM-TITTLE
BY DR. RAE ALEXANDER-MINTER

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle is the retired Principal of St. Augustine's School in the Bronx. She started volunteering at the school as a single mother on public assistance so her children could attend for free. Over the next four decades she worked her way up from paraprofessional to teacher to principal while raising seven children and going to school. Ms. Rhem-Tittle holds a master's degree from Bank Street College of Education.

Dr. Rae Alexander-Minter is Vice President for Governmental and Public Affairs at Metropolitan College of New York, where she plays a strategic role in the presentation of and support for the College's programs and initiatives to governmental, educational and civic leaders. Previously, Dr. Alexander-Minter was Director of the Paul Robeson Cultural Center at Rutgers University. She received her doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: We've had a change in our schedule and so I want to present our luncheon speaker at this time; you will hear from an extraordinary woman. Mrs. Yvonne Rhem-Tittle has been on welfare, had seven children and her husband left her, and she moved on and became a principal of a Pre-K to 8th grade parochial school. She is an extraordinary role model for all of us and I think you will enjoy hearing her speak.

Mrs. Rhem-Tittle, I read about you in a wonderful article this summer in the *New York Post*. I wrote you, and when I didn't hear from you, I called you, I found you, and you said to me, "I don't think I have anything to say." So I said, "Look, I'm coming up to see you." So I came up to your house, and I rang your bell, and you and your husband greeted me and I came in and I sat down for several hours and talked to you, and so I want you to relay some of that riveting story you told me. My first question to you is--I was so moved by your story and I wanted to ask you--can you tell me a little about your background, where you grew up, and a little about your early adult years, what were they like?

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Well, I grew up in Harlem. I was born in Harlem Hospital and raised on 124th Street and 7th Avenue. I went to public school, then I married very young, and I started having children and I never finished high school. It is a story that you can figure that can happen throughout the entire country, maybe throughout the entire world, and I found myself in a situation where I had to ask for public assistance. My husband left me because he was on drugs and he just disappeared from the planet, literally, which left me out there. I moved to the Bronx, became involved at St. Augustine's Church, and at that time I started volunteering, just working within the area of the Rectory and helping out in the school until my oldest daughter was ready for school. Immediately after that, well, at that time tuition was only like \$5-\$10 a month, not what it is today, but ...

Dr. Alexander-Minter: But you had seven children...

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Yes, a total of seven children.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: And we should tell them that St. Augustine is located in the Morrisania section of the Bronx.

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Which is considered one of the poorest in the nation in terms of what is going on there: devastation, poor neighborhoods, drugs, anything you can possibly think of, it happens in the Morrisania section of the Bronx. But there are also some wonderful things happening in the Morrisania section of the Bronx. At any rate, I continued to volunteer and as a result of that, the pastor and principal of the school said, "Yvonne, you're doing all of this stuff, it's okay, you don't have to worry about tuition." The custodian of the school got very sick and that's when I decided I would ask

if I could help clean the bathrooms, wash down the stairs, anything I could do to make sure I could pay the tuition. By this time now, my second oldest daughter was in school, so I continued with this. As time went on, I was asked if I wanted to become a part of the paraprofessional program, and I said yes, and that was the beginning of the actual being paid. At that time, it was less than \$5,000 per year in pay.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: But there was someone who was working in St. Augustine's, was it one of the nuns, or was it a paraprofessional, who said to you "Yvonne, there is more that you can do with your life."

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: His name is Brother Edward Phelan. He is a DeLaSalle Christian Brother, along with Sister Marietta Joseph, S.C. They met with me and they said, "Yvonne, you know you have so much potential. How about going back to school?" Well, I always wanted to do that, I was in the classrooms, working with the students, I taught creative dance in the evening to students and parents, because I was a student for a while with Katherine Dunham, many years ago when she had her studios on 125th Street, so what happened for me was that I started to do things that would fulfill my need that I was doing something in the community and helping my school and it just meshed together. As I told Dr. Minter, if you know the hymn, *On the Wings of an Eagle*, that's when it all started. It was like I was out of breath, I had no control of what was taking place in my life, it was the Creator, it was the Almighty who brought me to where I am today.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: You applied and were accepted to Antioch College's extension here in New York.

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Yes.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: And, then you moved on from there, you finished.

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: I got my bachelor of science degree in education in 1976 from Antioch. I started teaching full-time at St. Augustine's School, 5th to 8th grade and it was all of the subject areas. Then, I decided that I had to move and make some additional changes. I started looking at various schools and I decided on Bank Street College of Education, and I went for my interviews. I was accepted and I started school immediately. I went summer, spring and fall, I just kept on keeping on because I knew it was important. We had some very young people in there and they used to tease me and they would say, "Yvonne, you know you have six years," I'd say, "No, baby, I don't have six years, I have five minutes."

Dr. Alexander-Minter: Mrs. Rhem-Tittle, what motivated you to do this? As I recall, in my early talk in speaking with you, when I came to your home, your spiritual values catapulted you, propelled you. Is that correct?

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Yes, I looked at my children and I said, you know what, there must be something better for you. The struggles and the changes and the obstacles and the setbacks I put aside, because the most important thing to me was raising my seven children and to do the best job that I could do. Sitting down with them, going to work in the morning--because I was volunteering at St. Augustine's School, then started working as a custodian--we would all drag up the hill together, and in the evenings we would sit down and do homework together. It was important that they understood why education was important and they would be prepared for the future.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: You were a role model, then for your children.

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Everyone says that to me. I just said I was a Mom, so I had to do what I had to do.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: Well, let's talk about your children. They all have graduated, all, at least six from college.

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: It's four, I have four college graduates, and I have an MBA, I have a teacher, I have a health analyst/administrator. They run the gamut. It's wonderful.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: You're wonderful.

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: It's a good feeling when you can sit back and say to yourself, "Thank God." Often, many times in the struggle, and people can't believe when they hear it, even to the parents. Ironically, what I would do when we would have the open house for the parents, and I would stand up in front of them or walk through the audience and they would say "I can't do this" or "I can't do that," and I would say to them, "Excuse me, stop the madness, you can do it all," and then I would tell them my story, and then they would realize that with faith anything is possible.

Dr. Alexander-Minter: If you had the opportunity to talk to President Bush regarding the welfare legislation that is being considered for reauthorization, and knowing that he believes in the importance of work and his restrictive requirements would limit education... Given your history, and what you have told us, what would you say to President Bush, if you had the opportunity?

Yvonne Rhem-Tittle: Basically, I would ask him, “If you’ve never walked in my shoes, then you can’t criticize and abuse. Education is the key to success.”

Dr. Alexander-Minter: Thank you very much.

PANEL II: WELFARE MOTHERS, NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS AND COLLEGE

Kenya Cox:¹⁰ Good afternoon, do we need to stretch after lunch? It is my pleasure to participate on this panel as moderator, and to share with you findings from a recent study Dr. Spriggs and I completed. Today is a very exciting day for me because the topic of higher education and career-centered welfare reform is an important and necessary discussion, especially given the imminent reauthorization of TANF. Metropolitan College of New York should be applauded for hosting such an event.

Let me provide some background on the study that Bill Spriggs and I completed, which examines the impact of state policies on college enrollment for welfare recipients. Six years later after the passage of PRWORA, we all should ask, “How effective has the policy been?” Let’s keep in mind that there are several levels of policy. At the federal level, the entitlement status was ended and the cash benefit was time limited to a maximum of 60 months, and most of the responsibility to implement TANF was devolved to states. Given the federal guidelines, states can implement whatever social policies they choose.

Our study, *The Negative Effects of TANF on the College Enrollment (SRR01-2002)*, examines the effects of state policies (which do not allow welfare recipients to count college as a work activity) on recipients’ college enrollment. The Joyce Foundation supported this research. This question is important, because according to the

¹⁰ *Kenya Cox is a research analyst with the National Urban League’s Institute for Opportunity and Equality in Washington, DC. Ms. Cox expects to receive her doctorate from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County in May.*

Administration for Children and Families, in 1998, nearly 50% of recipients were high school graduates. Moreover, college education, without a doubt, boosts self-sufficiency. A bachelor's degree boosts women's median earnings to more than three times that of a high school dropout and twice that of a high school graduate. With a high school education, a woman with two children makes an income only slightly above poverty.

Evidence, as was stated earlier from CUNY, suggests that welfare reform has negatively affected the college enrollment of recipients. Between 1995 and 2000, we saw over an 80% decline in the college enrollment of welfare recipients at CUNY. And this decline occurred when overall college attendance had increased, for women, to 70%. For this study, we used the 1997 and 1999 waves of the Urban Institute's National Survey of America's Families (NSAF). We compared recipients to other poor women 18 to 35 years old, all of whom were high school graduates. The dependent variable is college enrollment--this is the variable we try to explain. The variable of interest is an interaction that captures the effect of state policy that doesn't allow the recipients to count college as a work activity, which we compare to other poor, non-recipient women who also reside in these states. We also control for various individual characteristics such as the number of children, size of family, pre- and post-TANF period, and community college cost. What we find is that between 1996 and 1998 there was a 20-point swing in recipients' enrollment in college, compared to poor women's enrollment. Between 1996 and 1999, recipients' college enrollment dropped by 6%, and poor women's college enrollment increased by 14%.

Our empirical results suggest that these differences can be attributed to state policy. Between 1996 and 1998, 22 states changed their policies toward counting college

as a legitimate work activity. Nineteen states went from yes to no, and three states went from no to yes. So, as we move from AFDC to TANF, states aggressively pushed women to take any job as opposed to encouraging them to attend college. Using the weighted data, there is a 20% decline in welfare recipients attending college in states that don't count college as compared to other poor women in the same states. In short, the conclusion is that state policies matter. If we are truly dedicated to making welfare mothers economically independent, these policies have to be revisited to make college a more accessible alternative to recipients. Currently, the policy makes recipients choose any job over developing their human capital, and that is unacceptable. Thank you.

Lisa Grossman

Lisa Grossman is a senior policy analyst for the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices where she conducts research and policy analysis on state social service issues, including TANF reauthorization issues. Her publications have addressed aspects of welfare reform and educational opportunities for low-income workers. Ms. Grossman holds a MPA from the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service at New York University.

I just want to thank you for having me here today. I am currently with the NGA Center for Best Practices, but I'm going to present research that I did for my previous employer, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC). I want to present findings from a qualitative study that both Susan Gooden and I worked on for MDRC, the "Opening Doors, Earning Credentials" study, where we looked at community college access, and retention issues for low-wage working parents. Copies of this study are available here at the conference, and there are also copies available on MDRC's

website.¹¹ The title of the report is, *Opening Doors: Students' Perspectives on Juggling Work, Family and College*.

Susan and I and the rest of our team conducted eighteen focus groups with 131 low-wage working parents at six different community colleges around the country. There were three distinct groups of low-wage workers we spoke with: current community college students who were also working at the time, former students who had been low-wage workers and enrolled in similar programs (but were not able to complete their programs and did not earn a credential), and potential students (low-wage workers in the community who had never attended a post-secondary granting program). We set out to find out what was involved in terms of balancing work and family life and college, what supports or services made it possible for current students to attend, what might have made a difference for former students or could help to attract them back, and what would it take to get potential students into the college classroom. We wanted to know these things to help colleges and policymakers design strategies to help low-wage workers access career-advancement opportunities through post-secondary education.

Who were these low-wage working parents? About a third were welfare recipients, particularly among potential students. Many were not; 86% were women and 47% were single parents. There were a few interesting differences between the groups that I am going to share with you, but they probably had a lot to do with how we recruited the participants more than anything else. We recruited current and former students directly from the six colleges we were working with, and the potential students we

¹¹ Retrieval at http://www.mdrc.org/project_publications_14_2.html.

recruited from public welfare or work-force agencies. Only 50% of the potential students had a high-school diploma or GED. Almost all participants in the other two groups did. That was one potential barrier for those students in accessing some community college programs. The current students tended to work the least number of hours compared to the other groups, as you might suspect, and they tended to have fewer children on the average. The current students we saw as placing the greatest priority on education, and also as having the most access to support in their personal lives, compared to participants in the other two groups. The former students fell somewhere in the middle on these dimensions, and the potential students really had the most barriers to attending college. They have very severe personal issues, and the least job stability of the participants in our focus group. Most of the rest of the time, I'm going to talk across these three groups, because we saw them as a continuum. This was one snapshot taken at one point in time. It is very possible that the potential students may become current students, and so on.

So the way Susan and I decided to split things up, I'm going to present findings from the study around the participants' experiences with college and looking at their financial, personal and academic support needs at the college. And then I'm going to turn things over to Susan to talk about some of the personal issues in their lives that they are experiencing, and the relationships with employers and government agencies.

I think one really important thing that came out of the focus groups is the role of personal motivation. This was key in participants' college decisions. As one former student told us, the biggest factor in her decision to go back to college "is really me." That is what she said. And that priorities and choices made by the participants are just as big a factor as many of the other issues that we are going to discuss today. Once the

current and former students got to college, and the potential students when they are thinking sort of hypothetically about what would they need when they were at college, they all talked about needing direction: what courses to take, how to navigate through program requirements, help with all the forms and applications, identifying resources and services that were available at the colleges, and then coordinating between all those different services and programs, which often overlapped. It suggested to us a need for counseling that probably goes beyond what most colleges typically provide. It is very common to have very large student to counselor ratios. So, a lot of the participants talked about really needing more time with a point person, somebody to help them navigate through the college maze.

Another key element of the college experience for the current and former students was the faculty. They were the front line of college for participants; they were the staff they dealt with most often, and their classroom policies played the biggest role in shaping that experience for students. Their policies around attendance, making up exams, course load, and the degree to which they were seen as either supportive or not supportive of the balancing act that these students were dealing with; as well as how understanding they were about conflicts between work and family responsibilities. These were the sorts of things that participants talked a lot about with us. Another important theme from the groups was that it can take a really long time to graduate. It takes a lot more than two years to get an associate's degree. Because the participants are working, because they are going to school part-time in some cases, because they have had to take time off, because they have dropped out and had to come back, it is not inconceivable, that a lot of our participants take about five or six years to get an associate's degree. So I think that is

another consideration for policymakers, when we look at trying to design programs for working students.

Turning to supports, financial aid was obviously a major factor in students' enrollment decision. Not just the direct college costs, like courses and books, but concerns about losing income if you have to reduce work hours to add college into the mix. Most of our current students were eligible for federal financial aid, but not all were, and many of the former and potential students did not believe they would be eligible. Some of the reasons they gave us for why they were not eligible included: their incomes exceeded the federal financial aid income guidelines, even though they considered themselves to be low-income, they thought they were probably making too much as workers to qualify; that they were going to school less than part-time; that they had defaulted on past student loans or grants in their previous attempts at college; or that they were on academic probation from past attempts at college. Basic skills were another big issue for some of our participants, particularly among the potential student group that we talked with. Again, half of them needed a GED or high school diploma. A lot of participants talked about difficulty with particular subjects. Language issues were another factor, including the need for ESL services. These all had ramifications, obviously, for student's ability to qualify for financial aid, as well as complete their programs. Sometimes, colleges did not have the services that students said they needed; child-care might be one example. Other times, the colleges did have services and students were not aware of them. We found there was a considerable information gap in terms of what students were aware of being available for them at the college. So, it was not always that it was not there; students just didn't know about it. They did learn a lot

during the focus groups from each other. We were really impressed with the amount of information exchange going on, and it suggests the value of peer networks as a way of getting some of this information out.

Finally, the focus groups suggested college strategies to us, and Susan is going to discuss these a little bit more in her presentation as well. But one-stop support service centers on campus, where students could access a lot of the supports they are talking about would help in navigating that system. Some thinking needs to be done on non-traditional course formats and financial aid options geared towards working parents. MDRC is trying to develop demonstrations around many of these ideas to test them and build knowledge on what some solutions may be.

But I think in the meantime the take-home message for us was that there really is not a single solution to help low-income workers to access college and complete their programs. It is really going to take a comprehensive strategy, a combination of supports and services. With that I'm going to turn things over to Susan so she can share some more findings.

Dr. Susan Gooden

Dr. Susan Gooden is an Associate Professor in the Center for Public Administration and Policy (CPAP) and Director of the Race and Social Policy Research Center at Virginia Tech. She conducts research in the area of welfare policy with an emphasis on race and welfare, private and non-profit service delivery, and rural welfare policy. She received her Ph.D. from the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.

Thanks, Lisa. I also would like to extend thanks to both Chuck Bremer and Bill Spriggs for including me in this wonderful symposium. I am pleased to be a part of it.

As Lisa mentioned, our study includes the voices of low-income workers. I think this is a particular strength of our research approach.

In terms of the personal situational factors, the aspects of their personal lives, four items were heavily discussed. One was balancing the demands of life. All the students, whether they were current, potential, or former students, spoke of the difficulties they had trying to balance work, family obligations, college, on-going financial concerns, pending evictions, personal crises, and issues dealing with other family members. It was a juggling act--trying to keep all of these balls in the air at one time was very, very difficult. College was not the only thing in their life, although they were very interested in pursuing a college education and clearly saw the benefit of it. Child-care was another big issue. Affordable, high quality child-care that was available during class hours was a very big need. All six of the community colleges had some sort of child-care on campus, but often it did not meet the needs of the students. For example, very few campus child-care centers accept children under the age of two. So, child-care for children under two was a major problem. Sometimes child-care services were at full capacity or had long waiting lists. Another problem was class time not being concurrent with the hours of child-care operation. Often, child-care would end at 5:00 or 6:00 o'clock in the evening and class would not end until 8:30 or 9:00 o'clock.

Beyond that, some participants were very reluctant to use child-care in the evening. They had been away from their child all day and when they thought of putting their child in child-care during the evening, it made them question whether they were being an effective parent. That was a big thing: they were really concerned about the effects on their children. And there was the matter of instructor understanding. To

follow-up on Lisa's point: instructors are the arbiters in terms of classroom policies such as making up tests and exams. If a child gets sick, it is very difficult for students to handle child-care arrangements and also to fulfill their school obligations.

Family and peer relationships--that was clearly an important theme. There was a very wide array of experience here. We had some students who had very supportive families. They told students, "You can do it. Stick with it, we're behind you 100%." Then there are students who have very unsupportive family environments, where family members were actually more of a constant source of frustration than they were enablers of the student completing college.

Financial issues--that was a major theme, and not just the financial implications of attending school, but the lack of income from not being able to work as many hours. Even if school expenses were covered, not having enough financial support to keep the household afloat was clearly an impediment.

Four moderately discussed items included discrimination that participants experienced in the community colleges. These spanned race, gender, age, and discrimination in parenting status. Female students who were in non-traditional environments, for example, if they were in welding, they talked about the gloves only being in the sizes that would fit men. There were things that the community colleges could have done to be more supportive. Also, a lot of single mothers talked about how they were discouraged to participate in certain programs: "This program is too hard for you," and "You can't do this while you have a child."

A second, moderately discussed item was housing. This came up primarily in Santa Cruz, California: pending evictions, living in unsafe housing conditions, lacking access to affordable housing. Transportation was another item, and that was usually a matter of car repairs that were needed and inconvenient bus connections.

Needing assistance was also a major issue, both in terms of personal help and help with family issues. Having to care for children who had disabilities, mental and physical health problems, and the lack of health insurance while attending college is taxing. Infrequently discussed, but also very important, were two issues. One was domestic violence. For women who were in a domestic violence situation, these were very serious barriers. For example, one woman described being thrown down on an asphalt highway. The second issue was legal and immigration issues. Immigrants needed green cards to access services.

In terms of their jobs, most of the participants said they needed more flexible employers, although some students felt that they had a really good relationship with their employers who were very flexible during exam times when students need to study more. Part-time work seemed to be a good fit. And this gets back to the balancing act. It seemed a little bit unrealistic to expect that somebody could work full-time, go to school full-time, and be an involved parent. There are only so many hours in the day. The students who seemed to be doing the best at staying in school and receiving the benefits of an education were able to combine part-time work and part-time education. But, again, this raises financial concerns because if they are working part-time, they earn less.

Tuition-reimbursement programs from employers received a mixed review. Often, they were only available for full-time students. Some people thought they were really good. Others felt their employers really scrutinized the classes they took and they had to make sure their courses were job related, and there is a commitment expected back to that employer, either explicitly defined in contract, or informally expected. In terms of government agencies, the news isn't all bad here. WIC (Women Infants, and Children) benefits, Food Stamps, and Section 8 housing were identified as very positive supports in enabling the participants to stay in college.

TANF, however, received very different reviews, very mixed reviews. Many students felt it was very difficult to combine work and school, and on this point I am going to deviate from the MDRC research and reference my own research on the relationship between TANF and race. One of the things that I think we have to really be clear on is that there is an expectation that people who receive TANF services are all receiving similar services. But we have seen that this varies a lot by racial group.¹² We need to further examine the types of education and training clients receive. Some people may sort chips; other people are getting computer-skills training. So there are really appreciable differences, and we really need to unpack and understand what it means when we say someone is receiving “education and training,” because clearly the sort of education and training one receives is going to influence their future wages and employment outcomes.

¹² Susan T. Gooden, “All Things Not Being Equal: Differences in Caseworker Support Toward Black and White Welfare Clients,” *Harvard Journal of African-American Public Policy*, vol. 4, 1998, pp. 32-33.

Labor market discrimination also is a very important matter. Harry Holzer, William Julius Wilson and others have reported on it.¹³ There are documented differences between employers' willingness to hire minority welfare recipients. So, as we think about education and training, we must recognize that all education and training is not the same and we need to understand which groups get which training. It is also interesting to look at majority/minority counties and how they provide education and training, versus majority/majority counties. The excellent example we received earlier from Maine was very interesting. I think we would be hard-pressed to find a state or county that has a heavy minority population that is as supportive of education.

Jumping back now to *Opening Doors* research, we learned that flexible scheduling, self-paced classes, open entry and exit were all viewed as very positive. Financial aid is a key consideration. We should consider ways to expand eligibility for federal work-study, perhaps even having federal work-study extend to private employers. Student support services were critical. They were key variables in terms of whether someone continued with college. Expanding child-care would be helpful. As Lisa mentioned, it is not just one single solution; it is a balancing act. So, as we think through policy solutions, we need to recognize that our policy solutions need to be as complex as the families we are serving. Thank you.

¹³ Harry Holzer, "Forgotten Men: The Continuing Crisis in Black Male Unemployment, and How to Remedy It," *The American Prospect*, July 15, 2002; William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1996).

Florence Washington

Florence Washington is a single-parent currently attending Medgar Evers College (CUNY). She is pursuing her degree in public administration while working for the National Urban League as a Publications Representative. A former public assistance recipient, Ms. Washington has been self-sufficient for two years.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm a single mom of three, currently enrolled in Medgar Evers College, where I'm pursuing a bachelor's degree in public administration. I came to Medgar Evers to better my life and my children's. When I started at Medgar Evers, I was dependent on welfare; I had no other income. After two years of hard work, I finally received my associate's degree in public administration. And I also realized that my time on welfare had run out, I had to go to work.

My transition from welfare to work was a difficult struggle. As the two panelists before me discussed, with child-care, working, taking care of the house--it's a lot of balls to juggle. The Welfare to Careers Project has really helped me a lot. It helped me with my struggle through counseling, tuition aid, books... you see, as I got closer to attaining my B.A. I learned that my financial aid was running out. That left me having to pay for my books and some of my tuition. And Welfare to Careers really, really helped. It supplied tutoring services, counseling services, and provided referrals to other places where I could get help. I am the mother of two children, ages eight and thirteen, and I have a 25-year old daughter. My girl was no problem, but the boys, oh my God, they are very active. Plus, I'm not as young as I used to be.

Welfare to Careers not only gave me academic support, it also gave me moral support. They are there for me when I really, really need them. I'm going to start crying, I'm getting choked up. I realize that me being here is through the grace of God, and a lot

of hard work and a lot of support. I don't have the family support that is needed to get through all this. Most of my family is deceased or moved away, so it is just me and my children.

So, thanks to the people in the student support services at Medgar Evers, the work-study, the counseling--oh, I don't know where I might be without these programs. But I just want to say, thank God, and thanks to the staff, really, for having good people, not just people that do their job but people who go beyond the call of duty and say, "I'm going to reach out a little further to help this person."

I went into public administration because I also want to help people. I want to help the community, because if it wasn't for people from the Welfare to Careers Program, I often wonder where I might be. I was in the shelter system, I was in the drug thing, I was... I was really, really down, and to see where I've come from to where I am now... I am currently working in the publications department at the National Urban League. Like I said, it is only by the grace of God and by these programs that I have kept my head above water. I hope that we keep supporting these programs. I hope that we get more funding for these programs because they are really well needed for single parents like me and others who stumbled in their walk through life. I just want to say thank you.

Vanessa Ratliff

Vanessa Ratliff is a first year student at Metropolitan College of New York majoring in Human Services. She was recently laid off from her full-time job, and is now interning at Project Contact Educational Alliance while she seeks permanent employment.

My name is Vanessa Ratliff, I'm Afro-American, I'm 41. I'm never ashamed to say my age, because it is God who keeps me alive and I am happy to be here. Any day that He keeps me alive, I shout my age all over the place. I have three children, I'm currently going to Metropolitan College, here on the main campus. I'm in my second semester and I am going for my bachelor's degree in human services.

I just want to say I love Welfare to Careers. It is a blessing to me. It has helped me fulfill one of my lifetime goals and that is going back to college. And I feel so blessed to be a part of this program. I can recall a time in my life when I had just graduated from high school and I enrolled in college for court reporting. I wanted to be a stenographer. And I applied for a student loan. And I did that for about a year and a half. It was good, it went well. And then my mother took sick. She had a severe stroke, so I had to take a leave of absence.

Then one thing led to another and another and another and I found myself pregnant. So, I decided to have some children and that led me to be on welfare for the first time in my life. What I didn't know then... I didn't anticipate on being on welfare for so long. I was on welfare for 15 years or so. During that time on welfare it was a struggle, it was a real struggle, but after a while you just get tired.

You know in the middle of being on welfare for such a long period of time like that, you think, "Oh, Oh, Oh, this is good." But after so many years, I just felt life was

going past and I needed to do something. I snapped out of it and said to myself, “Listen, I have to get a job, this is standstill.” So, I got a job, any job that would pay the bills. Keep in mind that when I first got the job, I still had a student loan from very long ago. I had to pay on it now that I was working. It had grown over all those years because I wasn’t paying on it, from \$2,000 to around \$7,000. It took me three years to pay that student loan back, and I finally did, and I am glad.

I had a job, but I kept thinking, “This is not going to work. I need a degree, I need to do something with my life, this job is just not good enough.” But I was reluctant to go back to school because I didn’t want to deal with the student loans and things like that. It was just a hardship for me. I didn’t want to deal with that, and that’s why, for me personally, Welfare to Careers is such a blessing, because now I don’t have to concern myself with that. I can just go ahead to school and receive grants and whatever the grants don’t pay, Welfare to Careers is right there to back me up with whatever financial problems I am having. I am so grateful. So now when I graduate, get my degree and get a job, I don’t have to worry about paying student loans back. I can start doing things that benefit me, like establishing good credit, or starting a bank account, things that I needed to do back then that I didn’t do because I was paying the student loans and bills. I can get my life back on track once I get a good job. So, I am so grateful for that part.

Welfare to Careers, it’s a cheerful place and I love them. They are all so happy, they are happy people. When I have an appointment with them it’s never a stressful thing. It’s a happy thing, and I can talk to the director on down. There are so many people in the program that you could go to. If you can’t find one, you could talk to another. There is a job director who will help you find a job. If you are having a

problem in school, academics, whatever, you can go to workshops, there are people that will help you get ahead, or study with you, particularly the counselors. People that come to Welfare to Careers didn't have a perfect life. We have barriers and things that are holding us down. So, if you need to talk to those counselors, they are there to help you. It's a real beautiful program.

In conclusion, I just want to say that I have three children and I hope that they see me as a role model. They were with me during the times when I was on welfare for such a very long time, and I know they remember the time that I was in the shelter system. We were sitting in there waiting to be placed and there were times... it was really not an attractive place. Welfare to Careers... it's a blessing and I hope when my children see me doing this every day, you know, they can forget about the past and see what I'm doing now. I'm 41 and it's not easy to go to work. Recently I was laid off, and it wasn't easy to go to work and go to school. But I didn't miss a day. I study and I do research and I hope that my kids see me doing this. My lifetime goal is to get my bachelor's degree and to go on and get a master's in social work and then maybe a CASAC (Credentialed Alcohol and Substance Abuse Counselor) degree will also help, of course. I have an interest in teenage girls with issues and elderly people, so I just hope to complete my goal. Thank you for having me here today.

Dr. Edmund W. Gordon

Dr. Edmund Gordon is a Visiting Scholar in Residence at The College Board where he studies the development of academic ability and intellectual competence within and across diverse groups of students.¹⁴ Dr. Gordon has devoted more than 50 years to improving educational opportunity, particularly for ethnic and cultural minorities. He received his doctorate from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Thank you, colleagues, for an interesting discussion. I have four children, two sons and two daughters. My youngest daughter says of her father that he is pretty good at the theory, but he is not very good at the practical stuff, and as I listen to my colleagues talking about both how you do it and the experience of doing it, I am fearful that what I have to say may be a bit theoretical and not very practical, but I'll try to bridge the two.

In one part of my research, I study the lives of successful Black men, that is Black men who have started out with odds stacked against them, but who have gone on to higher achievement. I have been doing this for almost fifteen years now, and I am beginning to feel some sense of futility in the pursuit of this work because as I see these successful Black men, for each one that I can find, I see tens of thousands of others who didn't make it. I was listening to these young people who are showing us that we can do it, and some showing us how to do it, I had that same sense and want you to remember that while we have to continue this kind of work and we certainly ought to be doing more of it, the real problem in this society is that it produces too many people who are trying but failing to overcome poverty, who are trying but failing to overcome disadvantage,

¹⁴ Intellectual competence is an ability to adapt to and appreciate knowing and understand the phenomena of human experience. It reflects the capacity to handle a wide range of human learning achievements and problem solving tasks. It is the developed ability and disposition to adaptively and efficiently use knowledge, techniques and values to engage and solve both common and unique problems.

because the system is designed to produce more losers than winners, and it is particularly important that we remember that.

Two weeks after the most recent election, we saw a party that once defended the rights and opportunities of the masses of people identify with the privileges of individuals and the highly placed individuals at that. That party was defeated, as it should be. I am talking about the Democrats. Democrats ought to be embarrassed at the kind of campaign that we--I'm a Democrat--ran. This is a world that needs us to step out front and say that people's lives count, that opportunities for people are important, that education and health are human rights and we've got to protect them.

Now, back at The College Board and up at Columbia, where I am a faculty person, we've been studying recently something that we call the "affirmative development of academic ability." It grows out of some work of a French political philosopher, I guess, Bourdieu, who some years ago reminded us that education and upward mobility in modern societies occur because people have capital to invest in it.¹⁵ He writes of a variety of capitals, things as simple as health and nutrition, and intact family, knowledgeable adults, and social networks that one can draw upon.

He has one category that's very interesting. It is the concept of "polity" capital. Polity simply refers to a sense of membership, your sense that I am a member and my sense that I am a member. If I feel that I am a member of the group, then I identify with what the group is about and pursue its goals and respect its standards. If I don't feel that I

¹⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital" in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing, 1986).

am a member, I say “The hell with it.” More important, if you feel that I am a member, then you are concerned about me, and you are concerned about increasing my opportunities. You are concerned about extending a hand to help me. If you don’t think I’m a member, you don’t give a damn about what happens to me. Now, there are too many people in our society who lack polity capital. Too many of us who feel like outsiders, or to use James Baldwin’s little term, “strangers in the village.” We are not a part of this thing, so we don’t identify with your goals. And you don’t identify with us, as members, you don’t want to help us. By the way, Bourdieu argues that all of the interventions that are primarily directed at doing things to and for people, like education, health and social services, should be essential functions of the society. But, we also have to do something about ensuring their equal access to these resources, since, as Bourdieu argues, it is the interaction of access to his varieties of capital (human, social, polity, etc.) and access to the resources of the society that account for much of the development of the person.

In our program of Affirmative Development of Academic Ability, we say that a primary foundation is meaningful membership in the social group. Its second foundation is a more equal distribution of the resources of the society. One of those resources is education. There was a time in this country when education was a lot cheaper than it is now and in New York when it was absolutely free. We have used the term “affirmative development” as a kind of play on “affirmative action.” Affirmative action tied to race has come to have some negative connotations. Some people reject it as a special privilege for ethnic minorities or women. I remind you that one of the largest affirmative action programs in the history of this country is the Veterans Preference Act. It gave

veterans privileges in their economic, educational, health, and political development. Another example is the affirmative action that enabled industries to get started in this country. We don't tend to think of the aviation industry, for instance, as a beneficiary of affirmative action, but the United States, through its military training of young men, supplied the technical folk, the human capital for that industry. We wouldn't have the aviation industry that we have today if we had not trained all of these young men, farm boys and unskilled laborers, to fly planes for the military, which the aviation industry took over. But let's go back to the Veterans Preference Act for a minute. Somebody had the good sense--I suspect it was more a repayment for a service to the country--somebody had the good sense to recognize that if the United States was going to move into the position that it was headed for in the latter part of the 20th century, it needed millions of highly educated folk. At the end of World War II, we had millions of White and Black uneducated farm and city boys who had nothing to do. We gave them free tuition, we gave them healthcare, we gave them low cost loans. We even gave them a political advantage. If you were a veteran, you had a foot up. Prior military service gave one an advantage in politics and in business. What we were saying for that underdeveloped segment of the population was, "This nation needs these people and we will exercise affirmative action and affirmative development, to better prepare them to meet the future needs of the nation."

Today, I am contending that in the current period, academic development is not only a civil right but that it also is essential for meaningful participation in a modern technologically advanced society. The nation needs to embark on a national effort at the affirmative development of academic ability in that broad range of folk whose natural life

circumstances have not predisposed them to the development of academic ability. Our welfare group is one category of such people. Poor people, in general, are an example. Some of our minority folk qualify for such treatment.

As we think about where the nation will be in the next ten, twenty, thirty years, it appears that we are going to need the ability of all the folk that we have. Most of the people who study the future, say that the currency of the future will be what I've been calling Intellectual Competence, the ability to use your mind to do things. The liberal arts and sciences curriculum of college enables the development of intellectual competence. People ought not have to pay for it. If they're on welfare, it ought to be their privilege; if they are wealthy, it ought to be their privilege; if they are sick, if they are crippled, if they are blind, it ought to be their privilege because society needs it. So, what we are doing now is struggling to make access to college certain for these folks who are moving from positions of economic dependency to independence. We're helping a few of them. But we must universalize it. As a society we must say, "We are in the human development business. Academic and personal development is the right of all of us." Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Ms. Cox: That concludes our panelists' presentations. At this time we will have questions and answers.

Audience: My name is Annie. This is to Vanessa Ratliff. You said you were 41-- I thought I was the oldest person in here, I'm 40. If your kids don't see you as a role

model... Well, I'm pretty sure they do. Either way, I just adopted you as a role model. I always tell my self "I think I can," but after hearing your story, I *know* I can.

Audience: Hi, my name is Evelyn and this is to the single moms. I just want to know about the fathers of these children because I'm trying to help young men out here be more responsible. I'm interested in knowing what has happened with the fathers of your children, if they are supporting their children while you're struggling.

Ms. Washington: Well, my kids' dad, he's in rehab now, getting his life together, and I think we can make an impact on the men to get them to do what they need to do, which is to step up to the plate at an early age. I have two boys and I hope to God that if they ever get married, or when they get married and they have children that they do the right thing. But, it starts at an early age a lot of the time, so you have to teach your boys how to be responsible men and people in society. So, sometimes we fall off the wagon, sometimes the men just, just...I don't know what it's going to take, I just know it's going to take some time, some work, some talking, some programs, for the men. We have a lot of programs for the women, we need some programs for these men to tell them that they need to step up to the plate.

Ms. Ratliff: Actually, I broke up with the children's father so long ago, that I have really a vague memory... but he is still in their life, it's just financially, he just wasn't fit, and I allowed welfare to take his place. He was a headache; he was a real big headache. So, I just let the children deal with him, but as far as me trying to make him be supportive of the children, it was just too overwhelming. So, as you see me now, doing well, you know, I hope it motivates him, because I believe he is on welfare himself. I

don't know. He was really a good man; it was just that financially, he just wasn't supportive.

Prof. Gordon: I hope we won't put the burden of rehabilitating these men on these women. William Julius Wilson writes about the way in which our society has contributed to the downfall of men of color, and I simply want to take you back to my earlier remarks. I think the society has to assume some of this burden. It's got to provide better employment for these men, it's got to provide better education for them, it's got to provide better models for them. Let's not ask these women who have enough to struggle with, let's not ask them to solve the problem of these Black men. I hope they'll worry about it, I hope they'll continue to love us and help where they can, but it's a bigger problem than they can solve and they didn't cause it. It's not Black women who've sent Black men to jail.

Ms. Cox: Are there any more questions? Yes?

Audience: I would like to take the opportunity to ask you, since I see you are identified with The College Board, what's happening with racially biased testing because The College Board is at the front line, in part, of this movement for standards to re-segregate our society.

Prof. Gordon: That's a complicated one, because even though I've been associated with The Board for a number of years, I'm one of its most severe critics. But I don't criticize The Board for its position on education standards. I stand with the most vigorous of them in arguing that it is not the standard that is the problem, and it may not even be the tests. We've made some efforts at improving the tests and we are continuing

to do it. There is another revision of the famous SAT, but where I have placed the blame is on opportunities to learn.¹⁶ I referred a few minutes ago to my four children who are now young adults. People have been bragging about their 40 years, I've got twice that many, I'm 81.

But, the problem is that we have not solved the problem of universalizing high quality and differentiated education for folk. What I've said to my youngsters is that I don't want a special test for you because you are Black or because you are female. Whatever the test is, I want you to be able to pass it, and we ought to be saying that to all of our kids, and we ought to be providing the resources that they need in order to enable them to do it.

Ms. Cox: O.K., let me try to pose my own question. This is for Lisa Grossman and Susan Gooden. The work you all are doing is needed, absolutely. Around the office we speak about what was missing in the 1996 welfare reform. The voices of welfare recipients were definitely missing from the discussion. So how do you--Lisa I know that you have the connection with the National Governors Association--but how do you two propose to push this forward, in terms of turning what you all have found into some real policy outcomes.

Ms. Grossman: I can speak for the NGA's Center for Best Practices. We use research like the *Opening Doors* study in the technical assistance that we provide the states. We work with all the governors and when a state is trying to design its welfare program, they may come to us and look for advice on what research has found, what

¹⁶ Opportunities to learn refer the resources that enable students to learn the subject matter taught.

other states have done. So, one of the things that I try to do is catalog what is going on in other states so that they can learn from each other. That's a way some of this research gets filtered down into policy and practice.

As organizations like MDRC continue to create tests of these community college programs, I think they are looking at evaluating programs like the program here at Metropolitan College of New York, Welfare to Careers, those sorts of efforts, so we can have some rigorous evidence on what works best. We know a lot about what college can do for somebody in terms of their income and what those outcomes are, but we know a lot less about what it is going to take to help low-wage workers access college and graduate and about the issues around college-going for this population in general. For the community colleges, where I've focused most of my research, "non-traditional" students actually account for a larger percentage of the whole student body than "traditional" students (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics). But, we don't know a whole lot, we don't have a lot of sort of rigorous evidence on what policies, program designs, curriculum innovation, support services, and so forth can improve graduation rates for low-wage working students.

Prof. Gooden: I agree with what Lisa said. The only thing that I would add to that, I guess, is that once these best practices have been identified, there needs to be some acceptance on the part of the institutions. That is where the rubber really meets the road. If an organization is not willing to use what we are showing, not much will change.

Audience: I'm Chuck Bremer with the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL). To what extent, and this is principally for Lisa, to what extent does the

National Governors Association have a policy on career/higher education for TANF recipients and if it does, is it regional, southern, western, etc.? And the other part of this question--it's more a statement--it would probably behoove us to leave this session with a particular group of people proposing a resolution that can be distributed to the National Governors Association, the National Conference, and the broader group of state legislators. It's principally these two bodies of politics that have oversight and responsibility for program implementation and administration. So, perhaps Kevin Curley and others that I've worked with here, and the Vice President, Rae Alexander-Minter, perhaps we can fashion some resolutions. I certainly would take it to my group and maybe we could share it with the National Governors Association and the National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL).

Ms. Grossman: The National Governors Association has two sides, there is a lobbying side and that is the side that would answer that question. I work for the Center for Best Practices, we provide technical assistance to the states. I can tell you what I know about the NGA's position this past year, but I don't know if their position will stay the same. I know that around the education issue, in particular, I think the NGA's position has been--don't quote me exactly on this because this is not my area--but I think that it has been that Governors want maximum flexibility to define appropriate work activities.

Mr. Bremer: How vigorous is that, or is that just a modern politics statement? Do you have any champion governors on this issue?

Ms. Grossman: I think we really don't know what it's going to look like this coming year because we just had such a huge turnover of governors. Last weekend, all the new governors just met, so hopefully we should know more about where we will be going with that issue. We are an organization that serves the governors and we just had a turnover of, I believe, 24 of them, so, it is really hard at this particular moment to tell you what our position is going to be.

Ms. Cox: I would like to thank all of our wonderful panelists. It wasn't as fiery as the previous panel, but it was informative. Thank you.

PANEL III: PROGRAMS AND MODELS THAT WORK

Esmeralda Simmons:¹⁷ Good afternoon colleagues, my name is Esmeralda Simmons and I have the honor and privilege of moderating this final panel. I ask folks to not leave after this panel is over, you will not want to miss the remarks of Patricia White, who will speak right after us.

This panel is titled “Programs and Models That Work.” We are going to hear today from four panelists who will discuss models, and I do ask you at this point to clear your mind so you can start comparing one model to the next. That way, when we get to the Question and Answer period, you will be ready to talk about how the models discussed are different from the models that you are acquainted with.

In introduction, I will say that in preparing for this panel, I did a little bit of reading up. In an August paper of the Center for Urban Policy, which was devoted entirely to the TANF and the work issue, there was a whole section titled, “Education Pays.” It notes, “If the old tradition of training is dead, education is taking its place.” At the bottom of the article it says, “College can no longer be part of a mix, it must be the end goal, the point on the pyramid.” So we’re no longer talking about college education as a maybe-yes-maybe-no proposition. We’re talking, now, about college education as a critical part of human development. I’m a proponent of killing the word training. We’re talking about human development so we can better serve the potential of all of our

¹⁷ Esmeralda Simmons is a civil rights and human rights attorney specializing in education, voting rights, cultural rights, and racial discrimination cases. She is the founder and executive director of the Center for Law and Social Justice, a successful community-based legal advocacy and research institution at Medgar Evers College (CUNY). Ms. Simmons received her J.D. from Brooklyn Law School

citizens and the potential of this nation that is made up of thousands of individual communities.

Before we go on, I'd like to point out that there have been several recent studies on the new TANF bill and the role of work and how discrimination has taken its toll. We have already heard about the National Urban League study. I would also direct you to the 2002 study that has been produced by the Applied Research Center (ARC) of Oakland, California, *From Poverty to Punishment: How Welfare Reform Punishes the Poor*. I serve on that board of ARC and I've been a proponent of their contention that TANF as it has been practiced is a direct violation of the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, particularly Title VI.

Rae Mack

Rae D. Mack is the Program Director of the Welfare to Careers Project, a collaboration of Metropolitan College of New York, Medgar Evers College (CUNY), and Pace University. The Project's mission is to provide low-income people with a college education and career training, and the supportive services necessary to insure their academic success.

Good afternoon. My name is Rae Mack and I am the Program Director of the Welfare to Careers Project. Our mission is to provide low-income people with a college education and career training and the supportive services necessary to insure their academic success so they can attain a fulfilling and economically sustaining career.

Now, everything that you have heard today--our program is actually a culmination of all of those points. Our population is low-income, working people, 100% of our people are TANF eligible, 100% of them are not collecting cash public assistance. Many

of them are former welfare recipients and they all are working low-income jobs that are not paying them enough to have a great quality of life. Welfare to Careers is a collaboration of Medgar Evers College (CUNY), Metropolitan College of New York, and Pace University, who make up the Education and Work Consortium. The Education and Work Consortium developed into Welfare to Careers, so that is how we came to be. Pace University will conduct the research component. Pace will undertake a longitudinal study of our graduates. Basically what we provide is a college education. Students go to Metropolitan College of New York or Medgar Evers and they receive a bachelor's degree. We push our students to get a bachelor's degree, but some do receive an associate's degree.

Just to give you a little more about what we do: not only do we provide college education, but we have the support services necessary to keep non-traditional students in school so they can graduate. As you heard before from Ms. Washington and Ms. Ratliff, what we do is help them. We provide referrals to the support services they need. Some people have housing problems, some people have domestic violence issues. Our Student Service Coordinators are there to help them and care for them and insure that they stay in school. Child-care is another issue. So, we've set up linkages with child-care providers. We also have--besides the Student Service Coordinators, who do assessment on the students and assess their needs--we also have the Academic Specialists who assess participants' academic needs and help students become adjusted to college life. They also help students to adjust to their outside life and their work life. They teach them time management and provide tutorial services as needed. We also have a Job Developer at each of the sites. They do two things. They help the students maintain employment

during the program, which is one of the program eligibility requirements, and they help students get better jobs and promotions. They give career coaching straight through the student's entire time in college.

So, that is my team and I actually am very lucky to have such a great team. I've never seen people so dedicated. They don't leave their desks to go to lunch, I have to make them leave. It has been a pleasure because I don't receive any complaints from any of the students about not getting serviced. I don't even have to really manage them because they know exactly what they are doing and they are professionals in their area and at the end of the day, they know that the student is what matters.

Just to give you a little bit more information about our goals and some of the demographics of our students, currently we have 175 students enrolled in the Welfare to Careers Program. By December 31st of 2002, we will have 180 students. The average age of our students is 32 years old, 169 of the students are women and six are men. All live 200% below the poverty level. So, they are in dead-end jobs or they are in jobs where they earn so little that they can't sustain a livelihood and constantly have to worry about bills. Again, we want to get them out of this situation by providing them with a college degree and a better job. We don't want them just to have a job, we want them to have a self-supporting career.

One of our goals has been a 60% retention rate. Right now, we are surpassing that goal with about a 65% retention rate. I recently started with the program as the Director, about three months ago, and I want to raise the retention rate even further. The program runs well, but I want to find any bugs it might have and get rid of them.

In speaking with some of the students and reading their testimonials, I've learned that Welfare to Careers helps them to be more well rounded individuals in society. They are becoming role models to their children. They are leading by example. Their children are saying, "Mommy, or Daddy, go to college," and get the idea that they too can go to college. The participants of the Welfare to Careers are actually heroes because they are uplifting to themselves and they are inspiring to their families. That is Welfare to Careers. Thank you.

Dr. Vivyan Adair

Dr. Vivyan Adair is an Assistant Professor of Women's Studies at Hamilton College. A former welfare mother, she is co-director of the ACCESS Project, a pilot program that assists low-income parents in Oneida, Madison and Herkimer Counties in New York State obtain higher education. She earned her doctorate from the University of Washington, Seattle.

Thank you, and thank you for inviting me here today. Like all of my students and, I suspect, like many of the people in this room, I grew up amidst poverty, violence and despair. Even though my young mother, a single parent of four, dedicated her life to bringing order, grace, and dignity to our lives, she, like many women today was trapped in a dead-end and demeaning job with which she simply could not support her family. As a result, my life and that of my brothers were often punctuated by hunger, lack of medical and dental care, and profound fear. Growing up I had very little reason to believe that my life would be that much different from my mother's. In fact, eventually I became involved with a man who left me battered, impoverished, hurt, frightened and despondent. Unfortunately, I know all too well the desperation and hopelessness in the

lives of poor women in the United States today. Yet, I was really very fortunate in that I was poor and broken prior to the enactment of the very punishing welfare reform of 1996.

With the support of a superb and dedicated faculty at a community college and later at a university, I was able to positively transform my life and that of my daughter. In 1987, I joined almost half a million welfare recipients around the nation who had enrolled in institutes of higher education as a pathway out of poverty. As a result, today I have a Ph.D. and am productively employed as a professor at Hamilton College, where I have the great fortune of working with bright and earnest students, and with friends who embrace, support, and nurture me. My daughter is now a high school honors student on her way to college and we truly strive to be conscientious, caring citizens and contributing members of our college, of New York State, and of the nation.

Without a doubt, access to post-secondary education has permanently changed my economic status, my self esteem, my capacity to think clearly, creatively and critically, my ability to care for my child, my commitment to citizenship, and my authority and value in the world. As we heard this morning, women in the situation today, that I was in fifteen years ago, don't have the opportunity to change their lives the way I was able to. Since the passage of PRWORA, the decrease in college enrollments, as we know, has been terrible, ranging from 35 and 90% around the nation. In response to this devastation of a population that I consider eminently viable otherwise, three years ago my colleagues and I, with the help of Senator Raymond Meier (R-47th District), began the ACCESS Program at Hamilton College. Like your Welfare to Careers Program, our mission is one of assisting profoundly low-income parents in central New York in their efforts to move from welfare and low-wage work to meaningful and secure career employment through

the pathway of higher education. Our program also works to affect public policy as we support this increasingly at-risk population with an intensive and fully supported introduction to liberal arts education. This academic help is coupled with comprehensive social service, family, and career support.

As a result, in the two years that our program has been in operation, our students have survived, indeed they have thrived, at Hamilton College. As our students embrace the challenge of becoming college educated citizens, and moving toward career employment, they demonstrate that with hard work and adequate support, low-income parents, often with no history of educational and/or career achievement, become increasingly successful, fulfilled, and contributing members of our culture. In the process, these women become role models for their families, friends, and neighbors and inspire us all. They are a testament to the power of dreams coupled with hard work and proof of the potential of humans to reach unimaginable heights when encouraged, supported, and inspired.

Over the past two years, over sixty of our students have met and surpassed the program goals we set for ourselves in our initial plan. Our retention rate and student grade points, additionally, surpass those of national averages for this student population. Nationally, welfare student populations--I would argue because of inefficient pedagogy and lack of academic supports--have averaged less than a 51% retention rate, with a grade point average (GPA) of about 60% around the nation. In contrast, the combined GPA of our three classes was 82.7%, with a remarkable retention rate for the past two years of 91%. This data also compares favorably to our traditional Hamilton College population, a majority of whom come from the top ten percent of their high school

classes. In fact, last year, our students surpassed the Hamilton College population's impressive grade point average. Moreover, 91% of the students who have finished the ACCESS Program have been accepted and matriculated into colleges in the region. Two students are currently being considered for acceptance into law school and one has applied to a medical school in Albany. Our students have also been honored with numerous scholarships, academic awards and placement on the dean's list. These are capable and motivated men and women who need support and encouragement, and if you give them the support and encouragement that they need, there is no telling where they will go.

In addition to successfully completing these programs--and I should note that ours is a very rigorous full-time program with very few breaks--most of our students also work 30 hours a week. But they work in career pathway positions that are connected to their chosen careers. So, people who want to study law work in legal clinics; aspiring teachers work as teachers aides while they are studying pedagogy. The work actually makes their scholarship much more vibrant for them. But these people also must care for their children, in the majority of cases as single parents. They must overcome myriad obstacles. On a daily basis, we help them deal with homelessness, domestic violence, abuse, medical emergencies, low self-esteem, undiagnosed learning and physical disabilities and a range of family crises.

I don't know about your program (Welfare to Careers), but we have found that when women come into our program and they're already involved in battery situations, the situation often grows worse as they become successful in the program because their spouses become jealous of the women's success. Throughout this process, students have

supported and counseled each other, which is an important part of our program. They celebrate each other's victories, large and small. They also benefit greatly from a full-time social service coordinator, full-time academic counselor, full-time career specialist, and a family support coordinator. As a result, our students are changing the way that they are valued and importantly the way they perceive and actualize their own value and contributions in our society, in their family, and to our nation.

Upon entering into our class, 100% of our students lived below the poverty level and were TANF eligible, 63% had depended on social service benefits for two or more years, 57% had experienced regular domestic violence, and none had been able to earn sufficiently steady incomes or received consistently adequate grades. Today, less than 10% of our population is receiving public assistance. As I said, over 90% have gone on to continue their studies. Importantly, in our assessments, students also regularly comment on their increased self-esteem, confidence about their future, increased motivation, ability to focus, and strong work ethic. They also demonstrate enhanced intellectual clarity and thinking ability, improved communications skills, better interactions with employers, creativity, increased financial skills, economic security and a new sense of citizenship and social responsibility, which I just learned from Dr. Edmund Gordon, may be termed polity. They provide compelling evidence that access to a liberal arts education coupled with a comprehensive social service network allows poor single parents to escape poverty to become educated and self-sufficient workers, children and parents. In the process, they transform lives, families, and communities in New York State for generations to come.

I want to end with a very quick anecdote. As I was preparing a similar presentation a year ago, I decided to go through and add up what it had cost the government to put me through school for four years to get my bachelor's degree. I was on, what was then, AFDC, food stamps, a Section 8 housing allowance, and heat assistance, and it came to what I thought was a really whopping \$30,000. But then I followed my colleague, Jill Stevens, in a telling calculation. When, that same day, I opened my W-2 Forms, I was really quite pleased to see (well, sort of pleased) that I had paid almost \$30,000 in taxes in that one year alone. If I continue to work for another 20 years, well, you can see that the nation will receive quite a return on its investment.

The fact is, I don't believe that education is a panacea for everyone. I think that there are other non-academic programs that we should concentrate on as well. But to prohibit those who are willing and able to be educated from becoming full taxpayers, scholars, citizens and parents, I would argue, is shortsighted and poor fiscal policy.

Thank you.

HENRY BUHL

Henry Buhl is an accomplished photographer, philanthropist and community activist. In 1992, Mr. Buhl saw a need to provide job training and job placement programs for homeless men and women living in New York City shelters. The initial program formed the basis of the SoHo Partnership (since expanded to TriBeCa and Hudson Square neighborhoods), which is now completing its tenth year of operation.

Thank you for inviting me here today. I'm Henry Buhl and the name of our parent company is the Association of Community Employment Programs for the Homeless (A.C.E.). We're taking care of some of the worse-off groups in the city. All of our partnerships' objectives are to take homeless men and women currently living in shelters all over New York City and get them full-time jobs and permanent housing

through a 6 to 9 month human development program, which includes attending 30 classes covering 30 different subjects. Our clients must complete a job-training program on the street, where they clean the streets, remove graffiti, care for trees and remove snow and ice. They are paid a stipend of \$6 an hour for working 20 to 24 hours a week.

I started this program in 1992 with just one homeless person; today we have an average daily workforce of 44. I heard there was somebody here from San Francisco--we also have the SOMA Partnership operating there with 14 to 16 clients daily.

We recruit our clients from 22 different shelters all over New York City. When we make a presentation at a shelter we ask, "How many of you would like to get out of the shelter, off the City dole and have your own job and place to live and to pay taxes back to the government?" About 30% to 40% want to get out of the shelters. We ask that 30% to 40% to stay and listen to the specifics: we explain they have to go to the classes, show up on time, and work for \$6 an hour (85¢ will be put into a free savings account to be used for a down payment on an apartment, furniture, etc.--not to buy drugs or alcohol). Saving is most important to the program because by the time they graduate, which means they have a job, most of them usually have between \$700 and \$1,500 saved. The savings program is important because it gives our clients incentives to complete the program and to rent an apartment. Out of the 30% to 40%, there are between 3% to 5% that want to join our program. Ninety-five percent of our clients have been incarcerated from 4 to 8 years. They're a tough lot.

We have one social worker for every five clients, which is a high ratio. We provide literacy classes. After graduation, we have an aftercare program where we follow each client for at least two years or longer after they get a job. Our aftercare

program is vital to their ultimate success. They are required to return at least twice a month, and often we send our people to their employers to see how they're doing. Following them for at least two years makes a big difference. New York City's welfare to work program has only a three-month training program, and does not track them at all after three months. Their clients often end up homeless again. Over 86% of all the clients we graduate keep their jobs for at least one and a half years or longer. This percentage will increase as we keep improving our program. We are constantly making the program tougher. Seventy-five percent of all our clients who enter our program graduate. We lose the largest percentage of clients in the first four weeks because they use their stipend to purchase crack. Like other programs, we randomly test our clients for drug use and require them to remain substance-free in order to graduate.

Contrary to most other programs, we're 95% privately funded. We raise money from each community: stores, businesses, galleries, and residents. Strangely, individual residents are not as interested in A.C.E. as businesses. If anybody wishes to know more about our programs, I have some material about them. Thank you for your time.

Kathryn K. Johnson

Kathryn K. Johnson is a Senior Policy Analyst and Program Officer for the Program on Gender and Social Policy at the San Francisco Urban Institute, San Francisco State University. She is the founder of the Stay in School Project. For more than 20 years, her career has focused on developing programs to improve the access of women and minorities to higher education. She holds a M.A. in Sociology and a M.P.H. in Public Health, both from the University of California, Berkeley and a M.A. degree with advanced graduate work from the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Hello, I am the “San Francisco” person, and I grabbed my coat from way back in my closet to come here. It’s not as cold as I thought it would be. I think it is important to put the Stay in School Project model in the context of the State of California and what the state allows CalWORKs to do. We have a strange situation since the California legislature isn’t sympathetic to higher education for anybody, much less, for welfare recipients. But, San Francisco, and San Francisco State University are very sympathetic to the “college option,” as is Santa Cruz County, which is part of the Bay Area.

California’s welfare program is called CalWORKs. CalWORKs says that after six to nine months of training, possibly 24 at the max, a single mother on public assistance has to take a full-time job for 36 hours per week. If after 24 months, a CalWORKs recipient doesn’t have a job, she faces “sanctions,” that is to say, her child or children can have cash assistance, but she can’t. CalWORKs recipients both lose income and child-care. Child-care is supposed to be available, but getting it is not easy. Access to continued health insurance is problematic. In short, the work first policy of the 1996 welfare reform legislation drastically curtails options for higher education beyond the six-month certificate or, at most, the 24-month associate’s degree program. Approximately, 10% of the CalWORKs population has enough education to go immediately to a community college or to a four-year degree program. It is this group that suffers from the denial of the “college option.” That’s the California context.

Now, to step back: I am from San Francisco State University (SFSU). Our undergraduate enrollment is 20,000. Many of our students are the first in their families to attend college. Two thirds are students of color. We’re ninth in the nation in terms of providing bachelor’s degrees to students of color. I work at the San Francisco Urban

Institute, an action-oriented think tank where we build university/community partnerships in the areas of workforce and job development, community and economic development, and inner city health and education. Welfare reform has been a centerpiece of our activities, and I'm particularly involved in gender issues.

The Stay in School Project (SISP) grew out of our response to the welfare situation. A group of CalWORKs students enrolled in a SFSU Health Education class titled, "Urban Community Organizing: Empowering Poor Working Families." It was taught by a dynamic, activist professor, who came to the San Francisco Urban Institute and made us look at the issue. The question we faced was, "What can the University do to make it possible for us to stay in school and have others follow?" We responded by saying, "We hear you. We want to see how your concerns are spread across the campus. We are going to talk to people." The Institute pulled together a taskforce of students, community partners, and advocates, among them the Coalition for Ethical Welfare Reform and LIFETIME (Low-Income Families Empowerment Through Education). They became our community partners and helped us share the campus response.

What we learned through this process parallels what Lisa Grossman and Susan Gooden have talked about. Barriers to higher education for CalWORKs students are the same as they described. In California, we have something called the Self-Initiated Plan (SIP). This is the loophole we can work through. It works like this: If you can get what is now called your employment specialist (your eligibility caseworker) to sign onto a plan that shows your schooling is marketable, it is possible to get an extension for up to 24 months. It means a CalWORKs recipient still faces sanctions, e.g., denial of individual cash assistance, but there is the possibility of extending time for up to 24 months. Not

many CalWORKs students know that this is an option for them. Another barrier to higher education is, of course, access to child-care.

Because I have one minute left, I want to move quickly to what we have accomplished. We have a three-part program of direct services, advocacy, and outreach. The direct services are run by the students. We have something called the Stay in School Family Resource Center, which provides information, referral, advising and advocacy for the students. We have a parent bring-your-child-to-school day. We have workshops and, most importantly, a supervised child activity center with a homework computer lab that is run by parents. We've done advocacy. I think these three parts are absolutely essential. If you just deliver direct services, your project becomes a bureaucratic unit. It is important to see the reality of these students. The existence of the Stay in School Project on our campus is political. The issue goes beyond campus walls. If the proposed reauthorization of the 1996 welfare reform legislation is passed with the 40 hours per week work requirement, hope for higher education is virtually gone.

To conclude: What are the lessons for those who are thinking of mounting similar efforts? One is that I really believe that there has to be empowerment from below. The students have to be involved in order to shape and design the services. But, at the same time, it is important to have a taskforce of stakeholders who can translate student demands into administrative language and identify, secure, and protect resources. Somebody mentioned work-study. That has been absolutely essential to the Stay in School Family Resource Center. The students who run the center, who run the supervised child activity, who do the teen parent workshop are paid from work-study funds. It is not enough to take advantage of work-study. It is important to fight for its

expansion so that low-income, poor working class kids who rely on work-study don't compete with CalWORKs student parents for jobs. The number of jobs available needs to be expanded. At SFSU, we have taken advantage of the expansion of work-study monies for work in non-profits and for work as tutors as part of America Reads. Both provisions offer an opportunity to combine learning with earning. Finally, it is also important to work closely with the Department of Human Services to coordinate work and academic requirements. Student parents receiving public assistance face two sets of demands. They must satisfy their work requirements and their academic requirements. So collaboration and community partnership is important. Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Esmeralda Simmons: Well, we've heard of four different program models that enable people to make the transition from welfare to careers. The first program was a description of the Welfare to Career Project that's here at Metropolitan College of New York, Medgar Evers College (CUNY) and Pace University. That was followed by Dr. Vivyan Adair, who told us of her own personal experiences and testified to her real life experiences and spoke about the ACCESS Program at Hamilton College. Mr. Buhl told us about the Soho Partnership and A.C.E. program. And, following Mr. Buhl, we heard from Kathryn Johnson, who described the San Francisco State University Stay-In-School Project.

We have approximately 20 minutes for questions and I ask you to direct your question to the panelists. One final note I'll make, which is a personal note: I not only work at CUNY and Medgar Evers College, but I'm actually a CUNY graduate (from

Hunter College). I was one of the single moms that started the Hunter Child-care Center. I was one of the few who were not on public assistance, most of the women--and there was only one man--most of the women who started that student-run, advocate-led program were on public assistance. At that point you were not allowed to attend college beyond two years. So you could get 35 credits toward your associate's degree, or 60 credits toward graduating for your bachelor's degree, and then you had to quit. That is where we were then, over 30 years ago. We welcome your questions. Please use the microphone.

Audience: Hi, this question is for Rae Mack. My question is about recruitment. I was wondering if you could tell me a bit more about your marketing plan. How you recruit students, how you get at that cap of 165? What are your selection criteria?

Ms. Mack: Basically, there is recruitment within the colleges themselves. There are some students who need our services, so they're referred to us from admissions. And there is also outside recruitment with community-based organizations. We ran newspaper ads. We did free cable TV ads. We sent out mailings to churches, daycares, beauty salons, anywhere there are people who may want to go to college. And, right now we actually have a waiting list of about 50, maybe more, people. We're still getting phone calls. We'll probably get more since an ad we ran in a church newspaper, which has a circulation of about 5,000 churches, just came out. Basically, we have to maintain a group of 180 students.

Audience: Can anybody call the office and apply?

Ms. Mack: Yes.

Prof. Kevin R. Kosar: I'd like each of the panelists to respond to this. What percentage of your applicants are accepted; and what are the sort of criteria that help you screen out those who are unlikely to do well in the program?

Prof. Adair: First of all, we're dealing with a much smaller population than you are in New York City, so we send about 1,500 applications out to people. We get about 50 or 60 people who come to our program. We only take 20 per year. But it's still a difficult decision to make, who is going to come to the program, because they don't have traditional academic backgrounds. They didn't do well in high school. They don't have high school diplomas. They don't have college credentials. So, we're very innovative in terms of our interviews, in trying to get them to talk about what their interests are. Some of them write poetry. Some of them are very good with figures, although they've never taken math classes. Some of them teach their children things that are very interesting to us. So, we look for different markers.

We also had a policy so far that we don't say no to anyone. For example, we don't have the capacity to help students who have English as their second and third language in our program. But we don't turn those students away. What we do is we use some of our private funds to help them go to another school to get some ESL training. Or, if they've never gone to school before, we might suggest that we pay for a term at a community college and then they come in and reapply to Hamilton. There are other people who can't come into our program because their lives are too influx. They don't have a home. We had one woman who came in recently who was living with her three children in her car. This is in upstate New York where it gets cold. Her life was just upside down, so we were able to give her about a couple hundred dollars worth of

assistance, tell her to get her life in order so she can come and reapply the following year. We're on a hill away from the city, and it's a very scary place. The tuition at Hamilton is about \$36,000 per year. To former and present welfare students, making it up that hill is a scary thing. But if they can make it up our hill with their application in hand, we will not say no to them. We will simply try to find the best pathway for them to reach their goals. But again, we have a smaller program.

Prof. Johnson: I wanted to speak for San Francisco State. The issue is not access and eligibility for us. It is retention. Access is determined by the University. In other words, we serve students who are already admitted or have transferred from the community college or have been admitted from high school. We have about 250 CalWORKs student parents who use the services of the family resource and participate in Center activities.

So, the issue is making sure the CalWORKs students don't drop out. We don't have records that can easily tell us what proportion of the 200 have graduated. But we have started a tradition of a graduation ceremony. We had six people graduate, one of whom is going for a master's degree in special education.

Ms. Mack: We're a bit similar to the ACCESS Program at Hamilton College. Number one, if they can pass the entrance exam, which is the TABE test (Test of Adult Basic Education) at Metropolitan College of New York (Medgar Evers has their own entrance exam), they're allowed to enter the program. Now, the students who are most motivated to go through admissions--registration, bursar, back and forth, back and forth--and are actually ready to start class, those are generally the ones who make it. It takes a

lot of motivation to go through all the different offices to register. We all know the registration process of college. If they make that, they're motivated enough to come to class every day.

Mr. Buhl: I think I explained that we get most of our applicants from shelters around New York City. We go and make presentations to them, and very few, about 5% of the total people in the shelters, actually want to sign up with us. We have a very hard recruiting process.

Audience: And how many actually stay in the program, Mr. Buhl?

Mr. Buhl: Well, we have about 75% make it through the program to graduation, which means they have an outside job. As I said (and somebody else mentioned here just a minute ago), retention is most important. We believe that we do it better than any of the other homeless operations, at least in this city. Of the people who get jobs, 86% have their jobs for one and a half years or longer. It's most important for us to have people succeed. That's what we're really trying to accomplish.

Audience: I have a very brief and concrete question for each of the panelists. Could you please give me a sense of your unit cost? What does it cost to put participants in a program and then per placement? Do you have those types of numbers off the top of your head?

Mr. Buhl: It costs about \$30,000 to \$40,000 over a two-year period to take a homeless person, clothe them, feed them, and give them a roof to live under and medical care. The medical is the highest component of the \$30,000 to \$40,000. And I know from

our point of view, it costs us between \$9,000 and \$10,000 to take a client into a training program and get them through the training into their own jobs, and out of the shelters.

Prof. Adair: It is difficult to say concretely, because Hamilton College covers private tuition. There are some services that are shared. But it's about \$25,000 per student.

Audience: Is that exclusive of tuition or is tuition included in that?

Prof. Adair: That includes the part of the tuition that we reimburse Hamilton for. It depends on the course they're taking. I should mention that part of our goal is to conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis and a transportability study. I want to say that one of the reasons I think that the Manpower study data convinced people that we should not let a poor, welfare women go to college is due to the way they skewed their data. It was a pretty geographically and chronologically narrow data set. But, it's also true that just letting a person go to college doesn't mean that they're going to succeed in college. The MDRC study showed that welfare populations did have very low retention rates and grade points across the nation. I would argue that this is in large part a function of ineffective pedagogy, and I think we need to realize as educators that it's not enough to change legislation, we also need to get colleges ready to support this non-traditional population that is otherwise a viable population. So, the short answer is \$25,000. We're trying to make that less expensive to make the program transportable to schools without so many funds. But that's still not a bad price for a year's worth of quality life and career altering education.

Audience: I'm sorry, that's \$25,000 per person per year?

Prof. Adair: Yes, per person. And that includes social service, career, family and educational supports.

Ms. Mack: Mine is a little tricky because basically we pay the tuition gaps of each college, whatever is needed. Now, it's different for CUNY, and it's different for Metropolitan College of New York. To give you an average, we're looking at \$15,000 to \$20,000, maybe a little bit more, per student. But that's a rough estimate. That's per year.

Audience: I don't know how many people were here earlier, but the HRA representative, Seth Diamond, mentioned that the agency was transitioning to a new philosophy. Many New York City recipients are still being forced into work programs. Your programs are not mandated, but if they were, what are some of the things that you would do to decrease the resistance of people referred to your programs?

Ms. Mack: Well, I can say, because I've worked with HRA and Employment Service and Placement (ES&P) contracts before, and we met a lot of resistance with people being sent there, you know, for job training, because they didn't have a choice. So, I think the biggest thing would be like when you do the orientation, you kind of present the program where they have choices, and this is going to expand their choices. It's all in how you present it and market it to the particular population that you're dealing with.

Audience: So, you're saying, "It's mandatory, but you do have choices."

Ms. Mack: Right. You know higher education is going to give you more choices. That's how we worked with the ES&P participants, and it actually went very well, because then they were showing up every day.

Audience: County social service providers have resisted letting our students go to school. I was quite surprised at what the HRA representative said, because I know that students are still regularly sanctioned for being in school. The county offers child-care only while you're working. And, so if you're on an internship, they don't count that as work even though it may count for your work hours. They won't pay for child-care. So it's no good to the students. They're regularly cut off of welfare and sanctioned for being in a program. Even though we have actually a good working relationship with the county executive on a person-to-person basis, we find that many of the social services providers are quite resentful that our population is in school. I think this rhetoric of putting the have-nots against the have nothings that we heard earlier is really quite problematic for us because then we all lose. And I think that often people who are welfare case workers are themselves one step away from being on welfare and some of them are resentful that they can't go to school. To deal with that, we should call them and invite them to apply for our program. Tell them, "We want you here too." So, there are ways that we can mitigate that disparity, but I think that there's real resistance on the part of county officials and some politicians to even implement the laws that exist already. It's one thing to say we have this new philosophy and we have all these things in place. But, the reality for women in their day-to-day lives is that they're continually sanctioned, and you need to be able to get a lawyer to come down to implement the law correctly, and I'm sorry, we're busy watching our kids go to school and working 30 to 40 hours a week. So,

when can my students leave their class to go fight in a case? Often they just give up and drop out of welfare, which is really the ultimate goal of all of this punishment in the first place.

Ms. Mack: I want to second those remarks about their resistance. If our programs were mandated, you know, I think we could deal with being overwhelmed, but the resistance is, in part, as you have said, about how the eligibility works. Now, we've responded; City College now offers a certificate for eligible workers to increase their skills and allow them to go to community college, but you know, it's a problem.

Prof. Adair: I have a book coming out soon and in it is a chapter by a woman who investigated social service delivery systems and looked at the rampant racism, sexism, heterosexism within the systems. And it was just quite striking that one of the caseworkers she interviewed referred to herself as the "leper keeper" and talked about the fact that she has to "touch people who no one wants to touch." It was frightening to think that you're going to someone for help with your life and they think of us you an untouchable. And I think, again, that we have to work with these people because they themselves are really the working poor. I mean, I don't know how much people in these services make, but I think that we have to take some of the things that have bothered us about Professor Mead's presentation and recognize that these are the arguments being used and we have to address these arguments and fight them. My book is called *Reclaiming Class: Women, Poverty and the Promise of Higher Education in America*. It will be published in March 2003 from Temple University Press. I should say it's written by women who were all former welfare recipients who are now professionals, social

activists and researchers. A middle section is written by students who are currently in the system. It's a fantastic collection.

Ms. Simmons: Any other questions? Well, then please join me in thanking the panelists.

REMARKS BY PATRICIA WHITE

Patricia White is a Senior Program Officer at The New York Community Trust where she manages grantmaking in the areas of Girls and Young Women, Hunger and Homelessness, and Social Services and Welfare. Ms. White also advises several public agencies including the New York City Administration for Children's Services and the Bronx Borough President's Office.

I'm especially pleased to be here this afternoon. I understand that you have been meeting since early this morning to discuss what can only be described as a topic of much interest--higher education and welfare reform. Hopefully, it is one of those issues that we will continue to hear much debate about as well as see some positive action thereon.

The New York Community Trust, the community foundation of this region, is a public charity that administers the philanthropic giving of individuals and institutions that have an interest in the quality of life in New York. Key among our grant work is, of course, a focus on issues that impact women and girls. When welfare reform became the buzzword and requirement of the day in New York public policy, we all sat around asking ourselves what will we need to do in order to make welfare reform work for those whose lives it will touch? I recall a conversation with our board in which we said welfare reform can help or hurt families. I think this particular conversation was around the issue of the availability of child-care for the thousands of mothers who were being asked to participate in workfare without benefit of quality child-care as a part of the mix. I don't know about you, but I think the last thing any parent would want to face is this dilemma: "Do I leave my child in a questionable child-care situation in order to meet the mandates of workfare? Or, do I remain at home and be the caring parent that I am and lose the financial benefits that are essential for keeping a roof over our heads and food in our mouths?" The reply to our board was that no one should have to make those kinds of

choices. So, we quickly moved to establish a child-care initiative to help address that issue.

As could be expected, the conversation raised other questions about welfare reform. For example, if parents are expected to participate in work, what will they need to truly secure meaningful employment? I can't think of a better place to share that question than in a college setting.

We all know that where we are today rests heavily on the educational experience that we have, and so if mothers and fathers were going to indeed, not just leave welfare, but become economically self-sufficient, education had to be a part of the solution. We also recognized that we were promoting that strategy at a time when public policy said, "work first, work only." While that was the policy of the day, and frankly still is to some degree, individuals and institutions of vision saw the importance of focusing their attention on ways to inform the policies of tomorrow.

And so it was in a series of conversations with leaders of vision, beginning first with the leadership of Metropolitan College, that college administrators came together to fashion a higher education initiative linked to welfare reform. During our conversations with college administrators, we all recognized that although students were raising their picket signs and demonstrating around the importance of college in welfare policy, college leaders also had a role to play. As a believer in the notion that it takes many voices to rally the troops, the voices of college administrators now have joined with those of students to advocate for the inclusion of college in the city's strategy to move families to economic self-sufficiency.

What is the goal of welfare reform? If the agenda was simply one of reducing the welfare rolls, I think we've accomplished that. But the vision and goal, for many of us, always had to be more than that, namely, the alleviation of poverty. With that in mind, it was not a difficult task for the foundation to consider a grant in support of the Welfare to Careers initiative. Because of the vision of the college administrators, our job was made easier. As college leaders, they shaped an initiative that was bigger than any one of them, and reflected the collective action of several colleges to ameliorate poverty through education.

As you know, Welfare to Careers is a collaboration among three colleges, each bringing to the effort a rich array of degree programs. This is one of the beauties of the Welfare to Careers Program because it says to any student--you have a choice of careers. It's not an education program limited to one location, nor is it a program with just one career option. It's about choice, choice of schools and careers for adults preparing to start new lives.

I've indicated that there are three colleges that are a part of this effort. My colleagues at Metropolitan, Medgar Evers and Pace will recall that when we started this effort, invitations were extended to over 20 colleges and universities in the New York area, asking them if they wanted to be a part of this initiative. While some institutions had a good reason for saying no, these three troupers stepped up to the plate and said, "Yes." And, for that we say, thank you.

A second factor that attributed to the foundation's decision to support this effort was the well thought-out process implemented by the colleges. Key to the process was the degree of lobbying and advocacy carried out by the colleges at the state and federal

level to secure public dollars for this effort. It also had the commitment of leadership at the top of all of the participating institutions. From the standpoint of the foundation, those were some of the elements that made for a good grant! Needless to say, the strategy also was “the right thing to do.”

I hope that this conference has provided the kind of dialogue with elected officials that communicates that while today’s policy does not embrace higher education, our expectation is that it will in the near future. Until then, and through efforts like the Welfare to Careers Program, we will continue to demonstrate the value and essential importance of education to one’s ability to thrive as an individual and to provide for one’s family.

Even with today’s conversation, much more debate will be needed in informing welfare reauthorization. Future discussions must address the stereotypical impressions of who benefits and why education must be an integral part of the solution. In closing, it is imperative that we all realize that poverty alleviation is the agenda of reform. Therefore, it is essential that we look to strategies that achieve that outcome. Anything short of that reinforces the notion that poverty is forever with us. I want to add my voice and that of my institution to those who say, “poverty alleviation, poverty alleviation.” That is the goal for our city and nation. Thank you.

CLOSING REMARKS OF DR. WILLIAM SPRIGGS

I want to close this conference and thank everyone for staying through the day. I want to again thank our colleagues and friends at Metropolitan College of New York. They stood by us back in the spring when we had a press conference on this with the late Senator Paul Wellstone. They took their students down to Washington, DC and have stayed involved in this issue.

We're going to get the message around the country now, we're not going to just leave it in Washington and not just leave it here in New York. By having good partners that's what we're going to be able to do. And we're going to carry this on. We have our other good partners, Medgar Evers College (CUNY), the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL), and The College Board, all of whom are going to make this happen. And I just want to make sure that we leave charged. Chuck Bremer of NBCSL mentioned that we need to get hold of the National Governors Association and the National Council of State Legislators. But we don't want to leave here thinking "Gee, it's a tough problem, and there's no solution." There really is a solution. This is a policy. It's a bad policy. Our representatives make policies and either we can get rid of the people who make the bad policies or we can encourage them that if they don't want to go, they need to get on our side. So that's what we need to do. We need to leave here charged up that we're actually going to do something, we're not just going to take it.

So, I thank you for your patience and I want to make sure that we give a round of applause again for the great host that Metropolitan College of New York was for this conference. Thank you, and I urge you to please write your congresspersons about this issue.

AFTERWARD:
WELFARE REFORM: WHAT IS HAPPENING IN CONGRESS?
BY KEVIN R. KOSAR

Kevin R. Kosar is a professor in the School for Public Affairs and Administration at Metropolitan College of New York. He is an editor of the Texas Education Review and a lecturer at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service at New York University.

The following information provides readers with a quick update on welfare reform in Congress with respect to work requirements and education. Readers can seek further details and updates on-line from the Senate Finance Committee (<http://finance.senate.gov>), the House Committee on Education and the Workforce (<http://edworkforce.house.gov>), and the Center for Law and Social Policy (<http://www.clasp.org>). For an introduction to welfare and welfare reform, readers may consult the short bibliography at the end of this piece.

Welfare and Higher Education: Proposals for Reform

In 1996, President William J. Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). This law did away with the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) entitlement. PRWORA replaced AFDC with Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and imposed work requirements on most recipients.¹⁸ Since PRWORA's passage, the number of people on welfare dropped 59 percent from 12.2 million in 1996 to 5 million in 2002.¹⁹

During the 107th Congress (January 2001-December 2002), many bills were offered to reauthorize and alter PRWORA. One of the topics of debate centered on

¹⁸ For a brief history of ADC/AFDC/TANF, see <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/AFDC/baseline/1history.pdf>.

education, specifically, whether recipients should be allowed to count college and post-secondary schooling as work. Liberals said “yes.” Conservatives disagreed, arguing that recipients ought to take jobs or short-term vocational training. Two bills that received serious consideration by Congress this past session reflected the diverging viewpoints. One exhibited the “work first” approach embodied in TANF and was generally favored by Republicans; the second emphasized education for careers and was generally preferred by Democrats. The bills are described in brief below.

#1 Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act (H.R. 4737) was approved by the House on May 16, 2002 by a vote of 229 to 197. Representative Wally Herger (R-CA), Chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, and John Boehner (R-OH), Chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, championed increased work requirements. On August 22, Boehner released a press release lamenting the WORK Act bill (see below), saying it is, at best, a “status quo bill” and, at worst, might “reverse some of the gains we’ve made over the last five years.” He noted that 58% of welfare recipients were not working for their benefits. President Bush supported this bill.

#2 The Work, Opportunity, and Responsibility for Kids (WORK) Act of 2002 was passed by the Senate Finance Committee 13 to 8 on June 26, 2002. The bill would have counted post-secondary and vocational education as an “approved work activity,” meaning those recipients who are participating in post-secondary education (like college) would be eligible for cash assistance, child-care subsidies, transportation subsidies, etc. paid with federal TANF dollars. Senator Max Baucus (D-MT) helped lead the fight for this bill.

PRWORA expired in September 2002. Congress passed a resolution that reauthorized the law for a short time. The 107th Congress expired before passing a final reauthorization PRWORA. According to the Constitution, all bills that do not pass

¹⁹ Will Potter, “House Passes Welfare Bill With Work Requirement,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 7, 2003.

before the end of a Congress die.²⁰ Thus, with the start of the new 108th Congress in January 2003, Congress began again.

The New Congress and Welfare Reform

The autumn 2002 congressional elections changed the partisan control of the Senate. Republicans now have the majority in the Senate (and, as before, in the House). Therefore, the G.O.P. has more members on all Senate committees and chose the chair of each committee. Thus, as of January 2003, Senator Baucus is no longer the chair of the Senate Finance Committee, which handles welfare policy; Senator Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) is. Baucus appeared to advocate loosening federal law to allow more education activities to count as “work.” Grassley, on the other hand, has said that he favors increasing the number of hours per week recipients must work.

In mid-February of 2003, the House of Representatives passed a PRWORA reform bill (H.R. 4) by a vote of 230 to 192. Under the 1996 PRWORA, TANF recipients had to work 30 hours per week, 20 of those in “direct work activities.” The other ten could be spent in college. Generally speaking, HR 4 requires states to make recipients engage in 40 hours per week of work activities.²¹ The percentage of recipients in a state that must work 40 hours per week grows each year:

2004	50%
2005	55%
2006	60%
2007	65%
2008	70%

²⁰ *United States Constitution*, Article I, section 7.

²¹ Exceptions, for example, include parents under age 20 who can meet the 40 hour requirement by attending high school full-time.

Of those 40 hours, 24 must be “direct work activity,” which is defined as working, on the job training, or supervised community service. The remaining 16 hours can go to “other activities” specified by the State that address a TANF purpose. What these activities include is unclear. Do states have the discretion to define “other activities”? May they count college attendance as a work activity? As this publication went to press, the Senate had yet to pass a welfare bill.

Brief Bibliography

Vivyan Campbell Adair and Sandra L. Dahlberg, *Reclaiming Class: Women, Poverty, and the Promise of Higher Education in America* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, 2003)

Elijah Anderson, *The Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner-City* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 1999)

Katherine Boo, “The Black Gender Gap,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, January/February 2003, pp. 107-109

Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work* (New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997)

Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson, eds., *The Urban Underclass* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution Press, 1991)

Lawrence Mead, *The New Politics of Poverty: the Nonworking Poor in America* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1992)

Charles Murray, *Losing Ground: American Social Policy 1950-1980* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1984)

James T. Patterson, *America’s Struggle Against Poverty in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000)

Theda Skocpol, “The Limits of the New Deal System and the Roots of Contemporary Welfare Dilemmas,” *The Politics of Social Policy in the United States* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988)

William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1996)

Valuable reports on poverty, welfare, and employment can also be found on the
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation website at <http://www.mdrc.org>