

the forum

VOL. 2, NO. 1

MARCH 1999

RESEARCH FORUM ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND THE NEW FEDERALISM

Mapping Welfare Research—1999 and Beyond

by Ellen C. Berrey

Many large-scale, ongoing welfare research projects will release interim or final reports in 1999. In addition, the federal government is funding studies about different populations and programs that, in general, have not been the subject of welfare research. This article describes:

- ▶ Recent findings from some of the large-scale welfare waiver experiments and major national research efforts;
- ▶ Relatively new federally-funded research projects; and
- ▶ The evaluations that expect to release final reports in 1999.

This research is contributing to an extensive body of knowledge about the effects of the welfare waiver programs initiated in the early 1990's, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), and related social policies.

The Research Forum is currently keeping track of these and other research projects. Of the 43 large-scale research projects in the Research Forum's on-line database, 27 have impact studies (20 of which are controlled experiments). Also included are implementation studies (some of which relate to the impact research), child outcomes studies embedded in larger impact studies, and policy analyses. Many smaller projects are also underway. Summaries of the 43 large-scale projects and 60 small-scale projects, names of individuals to contact for additional project information, and existing and forthcoming publications are all accessible at the Forum's web site: www.researchforum.org.

Note from the Director—Barbara B. Blum

Research initiatives have proliferated during the past decade, as changes in welfare programs created opportunities to measure effects of new income security strategies. Findings from these studies are now beginning to emerge and will provide, over the next several years, highly relevant and much needed information for policymakers. Ironically, the findings are already suggesting the next generation of questions that research should address.

Since October 1998, interim reports from seven evaluations have been released. Findings from these evaluations, available on the Forum's web site, provide valuable insights into the implementation and early impacts of welfare reform. For example:

- ▶ Eighteen-month findings from Social Research and Demonstration Corporation's (SRDC) evaluation of the *Canada Self-Sufficiency Project* demonstrate that financial incentives, like wage subsidies, can increase employment, earnings, and family income.
- ▶ In January 1999, Abt Associates, Inc. released interim impact analyses of the financial penalties in *Delaware's A Better Chance* program. Of the 16,602 families enrolled by June 1998, 43 percent had been sanctioned. Clients often had difficulty understanding and complying with the rules. These and other factors, rather than clients' motivation to work, were strongly associated with sanction receipt.
- ▶ Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) is now evaluating the *Parents' Fair Share* program, which targets non-custodial parents (primarily fathers) of children receiving welfare. Interim impact findings show no increases in employment and earnings, although child support payments from some parents had increased. The report documents the importance of distinguishing between fathers who are unwilling to pay child support and those who are unable to pay.

Two major national research efforts have recently released reports. One paints a picture of life for low-income families; the other describes the implementation of welfare and social programs designed to serve them. In January 1999, the *Assessing the New Federalism* project of The Urban Institute released its first report using the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), a data set of over 44,000 households that oversamples poor families. The report, *Snapshots of 13 States*, describes how children in low-income households experience greater hardships with regard to health care, parental employment, social engagement, and child development in comparison to those in households with higher incomes.

States Studied in Federally-Funded Research Projects

	Child Outcomes	Child Indicators ¹	Welfare Leavers	Welfare-to-Work ²	Tribal Welfare-to-Work ²	Rural Welfare-to-Work	Employment Retention ³	Immigrants	Food Stamps Leavers	Transportation	Public Housing and Welfare Leavers
ALABAMA											
ALASKA		★									
ARIZONA			★					★			
ARKANSAS											
CALIFORNIA		★	★				★	★			★
COLORADO									★		
CONNECTICUT	★										
DELAWARE		★									
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			★								
FLORIDA	★	★	★								
GEORGIA		★	★								
HAWAII		★									
IDAHO											
ILLINOIS			★		★	★		★	★		
INDIANA	★										
IOWA	★				★			★			
KANSAS											
KENTUCKY											
LOUISIANA					★						
MAINE		★									
MARYLAND		★			★	★			★		
MASSACHUSETTS			★								★
MICHIGAN											
MINNESOTA	★	★			★						
MISSISSIPPI					★						
MISSOURI			★		★				★		
MONTANA											
NEBRASKA											
NEVADA											
NEW HAMPSHIRE											
NEW JERSEY							★				
NEW MEXICO											
NEW YORK		★	★		★		★				
NORTH CAROLINA							★				
NORTH DAKOTA											
OHIO			★				★				
OKLAHOMA											
OREGON											
PENNSYLVANIA											
RHODE ISLAND		★					★				
SOUTH CAROLINA			★				★		★		
SOUTH DAKOTA											
TENNESSEE							★				
TEXAS							★				
UTAH		★									
VERMONT		★			★						
VIRGINIA							★				
WASHINGTON			★		★	★					
WEST VIRGINIA		★									
WISCONSIN			★				★		★		
WYOMING											
Total Number of Projects	5	14	14	TBD	8-10	10	13	2	4	5	3

★ One or more research projects examining one or more sites in that state.

¹ States receiving technical assistance funding.

² States included in research project to be determined (TBD).

³ States receiving planning grants. States included in research evaluation to be determined.

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government is currently studying the implementation of changes in national welfare and related policies in 20 states. Researchers are also reviewing ground-level operations of welfare programs in 12 local sites. *Implementing the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996: A First Look*, published in early February 1999, discusses the influence of political and economic signals emanating from policy changes, the significant transformations within welfare bureaucracies, and the new configurations of responsibility and power over welfare programs.

Interestingly, the distribution of active research projects seems to correlate with Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF) caseloads. Of the 103 projects in the Forum database, 29 include California as a study site. Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Ohio also have a high volume of research activity. Fewer research projects are being conducted in states that are smaller or have fewer TANF recipients. For example, there are only 7 welfare reform studies in Alabama, Idaho, and New Hampshire.

Federally-Sponsored Research Spotlights Specific Groups

Several federal agencies have recently launched research projects to measure the effects of welfare reform on different populations. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), are responsible for coordinating the implementation of PRWORA. These agencies have initiated a series of studies that are clustered around specific topics relevant to welfare reform. To facilitate comparisons of findings across sites, the projects employ similar research questions and data collection methods. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Labor (DOL), Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and other federal agencies are also engaged in research activities. Funding for many of the projects is drawn from the \$5 million provided by Congress in 1998 to study welfare reform. Additional resources from states, localities, and private foundations are supporting these studies, as well. The accompanying chart lists the federally-funded sites and studies. Highlights of the research are described below.

Child Outcomes and Indicators

Children are a majority of the TANF caseload, and current program changes will affect children both directly, through provisions like immunization requirements, and indirectly, through parental provisions like employment requirements. While some welfare evaluations include child outcome measures, most generally focus on adult outcomes. Child outcome data, when collected, often do not provide in-depth, comparable information. In order to understand how welfare changes are influencing children, ap-

propriate and consistent measures of child well-being and development need to be collected at the state level.

Currently, ACF and ASPE are sponsoring *The Project on State-Level Child Outcomes*, enabling five states to augment their welfare waiver evaluations with comparable child outcome measures. The evaluations are being conducted by MDRC in Connecticut, Florida, and Minnesota, by Abt in Indiana, and by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. in Iowa. The first of the final reports on child outcomes, from the Minnesota waiver experiment, is scheduled for release in January 2000. Final reports from the four other projects are expected in February 2000 (FL), April 2000 (IO), December 2000 (IN), and September 2001 (CT). ACF and ASPE are also working with these and other states to identify a core set of child outcome measures and to incorporate these measures into their data collection systems. ChildTrends is leading this effort, which includes researchers who participate in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's Research Network on Family and Child Well-Being.

ACF contact: Alan Yaffe (202) 401-4537, ayaffe@acf.dhhs.gov

ASPE contact: Martha Moorehouse (202) 690-6939, mmooreho@osaspe.dhhs.gov (email preferred)

Child Trends contacts: Kristin Moore, Martha Zaslow, Kathryn Tout 202-362-5580, ktout@childtrends.org

To advance state initiatives around child indicators, ASPE, along with ACF, has awarded grants to 13 states. This project aims to help states develop child health and well-being indicators and institutionalize the use of these data in state and local policy activities. The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago is organizing technical assistance and coordinating collaboration between states, researchers, policy experts, and federal staff. Each state will release their own project reports.

Project summaries and state contacts web site: aspe.dhhs.gov/bsp/cyp/cindicators.htm

ASPE contacts: Jody McCoy (202) 690-7477, childind@osaspe.dhhs.gov; Martha Moorehouse (202) 690-6939, mmooreho@osaspe.dhhs.gov (email preferred)

Chapin Hall contact: Mairead Reidy (773) 753-2596, REIDY-MAIREAD@chc-smtp.spc.uchicago.edu

Welfare "Leavers"

As states begin to implement time limits and diversion programs, questions about what happens to families who leave or are diverted from TANF have become particularly salient. Until recently, few research projects have studied "leavers" from welfare programs over time. In September 1998, ASPE awarded approximately \$2.9 million to 13 grantees (10 states and 3 large counties or consortia of counties) to examine outcomes for welfare leavers. This amount constitutes the major portion of the money

authorized by Congress for welfare research. ASPE and ACF are monitoring the grantees' activities.

The definition of a "leaver" varies across projects. The studies all focus on families that no longer receive TANF benefits; three also look at parents whose children remain on welfare. The cause for leaving may be an increase in earnings, a sanction, the end of a time limit, or a reason not recorded or directly cited by the recipient. Researchers may also study those who: (1) are diverted through a formal diversion program, (2) are eligible but discouraged from applying because of program rules and requirements, (3) apply but are financially ineligible or fail to complete the application process, (4) appear to be eligible but are not enrolled, and/or (5) withdraw voluntarily. Each project is following at least two cohorts, although the cohorts may be from different time periods.

Thus far, researchers have reached consensus on at least one major issue: the individual or family is considered a leaver if they have spent at least two months off cash assistance. Consistent, similar definitions need to be developed and used for each topic, group, or outcome in order to produce information that is comparable across states.

The evaluators are using linked administrative data, survey data, or a combination, although there are differences in survey designs and data sets. The projects share some research questions. All of the grantees are exploring income supports, health insurance, child care, reasons for case closures, and barriers to self-sufficiency such as domestic violence, substance abuse, depression, and lack of transportation. Many will also delve into topics such as employment and earnings, child well-being, attitudes towards TANF and work, and changes in household composition since leaving TANF. Several of the studies look at the use of Food Stamps, Medicaid, General Assistance, Supplemental Security Income, and other public assistance programs. Interim reports from the states are anticipated in spring 1999. Final reports are expected between December 1999 and December 2001.

ASPE contact (until August 1999): Matt Lyon (202) 401-3953, mlyon@osaspe.dbhs.gov

Project summaries web site: aspe.os.dbhs.gov/bsp/isp/98grants.htm

In addition to DHHS, numerous organizations are compiling information about leaver studies. The Research Forum's database includes summaries of research on leavers, including many of the DHHS-funded studies. In April 1999, the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) will produce a report reviewing various welfare leavers studies. In early 2000, GAO also plans to publish a report on welfare sanctions that will address some related issues, such as diversion (see www.gao.gov). The National Conference of State Legislators and the National Governors' Association are compiling and promoting research on the DHHS-funded and other state studies examining welfare leavers (see www.ncsl.org and www.nga.org).

Welfare-to-Work Programs

PRWORA, reflecting a shift in philosophy from education and training to "work first," stipulates that only limited periods of time in certain activities can count towards federal requirements for work participation. For instance, job searches are restricted to 6 weeks per individual, although 12 weeks are allowed in states with high unemployment. The law places even greater limits on basic and post-secondary education. If states are to fulfill their TANF obligations and assist recipients in moving into the labor force, they will need to develop highly effective job training and placement strategies.

In the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA), Congress authorized \$3 billion in welfare-to-work (WtW) grants to help the hardest-to-serve TANF recipients and certain non-custodial parents of children on TANF get and keep jobs. At least 70 percent of the funds must be spent on the "hardest to employ" individuals—primarily long-term TANF recipients with substance abuse problems, low levels of education and basic skills, and/or poor work histories.

The law also stipulated an evaluation of WtW programs. DHHS, with DOL and HUD, has designed an evaluation that includes a descriptive assessment of WtW grantees, as well as impact, cost-effectiveness, and implementation studies. DHHS is now in the process of identifying in-depth study sites. Mathematica, the evaluator, and The Urban Institute and Support Services International, Inc. (SSI), the subcontractors, will complete an early implementation report to Congress in the spring of 1999. A report to Congress on the impacts of WtW services is due January 2001.

ASPE project contact: Alana Landey (202) 401-6636, alandey@osaspe.DHHS.gov

Mathematica contact: Alan M. Hershey (609) 275-2384, ahershey@mathematica-mpr.com

Evaluation description web site: wtw.doleta.gov/wtweval/evalsum.htm

Tribal Welfare-to-Work Programs

The PRWORA and BBA also made unique provisions so that American Indian (AI) and Alaska Native (AN) tribal organizations could develop and operate WtW programs. Five new programs now provide tribal governments with resources and flexibility to promote employment and establish time limits and work requirements for tribal nations.

As part of its congressionally mandated WtW evaluation, DHHS is also conducting a distinct study of tribal WtW programs. SSI, a Native American-owned research firm that has extensive experience with reservation evaluations, is leading this study. Mathematica and The Urban Institute will also be engaged. An advisory group of about ten representatives who are from AI/AN groups and have relevant expertise will provide evaluation assistance. The researchers will focus on the program models developed, the activities and services emphasized,

and the approaches used to integrate services. SSI is currently choosing 8–10 research sites. Findings will be included in the January 2001 report to Congress.

ASPE project contact: Alana Landey (202) 401-6636, alandey@osaspe.dbhs.gov

SSI contact: Walter Hillabrant (301) 587-9000, access@iamdigex.net

Mathematica contact: Alan M. Hershey (609) 275-2384, ahershey@mathematica-mpr.com

Evaluation description web site: wtu.doleta.gov/wtweval/tribevalsum.htm

Rural Welfare-to-Work

Families who receive welfare benefits and live in rural areas represent approximately 20 percent of all recipients. States face unique challenges to creating jobs that are accessible to this population. Rural economies have a limited capacity to absorb large numbers of individuals into the work force. Many of these recipients have low education levels and lack access to transportation and affordable, safe child care. To support information sharing and research about effective rural WtW approaches, the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE), ACF, DHHS, is providing the federal dollars for ten 17-month planning grants. The topics range from rural transportation in Iowa to the barriers to self-sufficiency—both actual and perceived—faced by TANF recipients in Missouri. The grantees will produce semi-annual progress reports and a final report by June 2000.

OPRE contact: James Dolson (202) 260-6165, jdolson@acf.dbhs.gov (email preferred)

Employment Retention

Welfare recipients who find employment usually work in service sector positions that are entry level and either temporary or part-time. These low-wage jobs rarely include benefits or opportunities for career advancement. In order to leave welfare, move out of poverty, and progress in the labor market, these individuals will need assistance in sustaining and improving the quality of their jobs.

ACF has allocated resources for a multi-site, random assignment evaluation of the most promising employment retention and advancement strategies. Thirteen states have received planning grants from the agency to refine their programs and prepare for possible participation in the evaluation. In late 1999, all states will have the opportunity to submit proposals for participation. The Lewin Group, with its subcontractor The Johns Hopkins University, is assisting states in these activities. ACF plans to choose the evaluator in 1999, and by spring 2000, select approximately 10 states for the five-year study. Profiles of the state programs and early implementation findings are expected by the end of 2000, and interim impact findings in 2002.

We must be concerned about two populations: those who are entering the work force and those for whom movement into employment is more difficult.

Existing initiatives are likely to require supplemental resources to study these sub-populations.

ACF contacts: Nancye Campbell (202) 401-5760, ncampbell@acf.dbhs.gov; Mark Fucello, mfucello@acf.dbhs.gov; Ken Maniba (202) 401-5372, jmaniba@acf.dbhs.gov

Lewin Group contact: Michael Fishman (703) 269-5655, mfishman@lewin.com

Project description web site: www.lewin.com/

Immigrants

Since 1996, welfare and immigration legislation has changed legal and illegal immigrants' eligibility for federal programs, dramatically reducing their access to Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Food Stamps, and non-cash services. The potential impacts on child well-being are significant. Twenty percent of children under age 18 living in the United States—approximately 14 million children—are immigrants or have immigrant parents.

DHHS (ASPE, ACF, and the Health Care Financing Administration), the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and USDA (the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Economic Research Service) are funding a major study: ***Welfare Reform, the Economic and Health Status of Immigrants, and the Organizations that Serve Them***. The Urban Institute, the grantee, is looking at immigrants' health, employment, economic hardship, and participation in government programs in New York and Los Angeles. The project also explores how cuts in food stamps and changes in immigration policies are affecting immigrants and the organizations and agencies that serve them. Researchers are currently conducting surveys and interviews with immigrants and community organizations and analyzing administrative and other relevant data sets.

On March 9, 1999, The Urban Institute released an interim analysis of immigrant outcomes, using data from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. The CPS findings basically replicate at a national level what was documented in an earlier study of Los Angeles County. For example, the researchers found that between 1994

and 1997, use of public benefits among non-citizen households with children fell more sharply (35 percent) than use among citizen households with children (14 percent). Additional interim reports may be published before release of the final report, due October 2000.

ASPE contact: David Nielsen (202) 401-6642, dnielsen@osaspe.dbhs.gov

Urban Institute contacts: Michael Fix, mfix@ui.urban.org; Leighton Ku, lku@ui.urban.org

Project description web site: www.urban.org/centers/ps_welfare.html

Food Stamp Leavers

The 1996 welfare law mandated changes in food nutrition programs, most notably a scaling back of the Food Stamp Program. In the past years, participation in the Food Stamp Program has declined considerably—approximately 28% between December 1995 and December 1998. Four studies in Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, and South Carolina are currently examining the status of households and individuals that leave the Food Stamp Program. The South Carolina project expands upon a welfare leavers study. The projects all pay close attention to able-bodied adults ages 18–50 without dependents, who are now subject to time limits if they do not meet specific work requirements. Researchers are using administrative records and surveys to analyze employment, support from earnings and income, and support from public/private programs. Final reports will be released in Winter 2000 (AZ), Spring 2000 (IL), and Fall 2000 (IA and SC).

Economic Research Service contact: Thomas Carlin (202) 694-5406, tcarlin@econ.ag.gov

Project description web site: www.econ.ag.gov/briefing/foodasst/

Transportation

Transportation to and from work is a primary obstacle for low-income workers. Two-thirds of new jobs are created in the suburbs, but three-fourths of welfare recipients live in either inner city or rural areas. Bridges to Work, a large-scale demonstration, supports organizations that are helping “ready to work” urban residents, including some TANF recipients, find and keep jobs in the suburbs. The program assists with transportation needs, as well as job placement and retention, in Baltimore, Chicago, Denver, Milwaukee, and St. Louis. Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), the contractor, is conducting evaluations in four of the cities to test if better access to suburban jobs can significantly improve outcomes for low-income workers and their urban neighborhoods. HUD’s Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R), with the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Transit Administration, is furnishing the federal funds. A descriptive report is expected in April 1999.

HUD contact: James Hoben (202) 708-0574, james_e._hoben@hud.gov

P/PV: Joseph Tierney (215) 557-4453, jtierney@ppv.org

Project description web site: tap.epn.org/ppv/b_to_w.html

Public Housing Assistance

Welfare reform will affect not only TANF recipients, but also public housing residents, agencies, and policies. In late 1996, approximately one million families—nearly half of the families who received housing assistance—were also receiving some AFDC/TANF benefits.

The new 1999 Welfare-to-Work Voucher Program, created by the President and Congress, enables families to use vouchers to subsidize rent for apartments in areas with better job opportunities or transportation systems. In April 1999, public housing agencies, along with the agencies and local entities receiving DOL welfare-to-work grants (described above), will submit applications to participate in the voucher competition. HUD will monitor the program and develop formal evaluation plans.

HUD contact: Kevin Neary (202) 708-3700, kevin_j._neary@hud.gov

HUD’s PD&R is supporting three “add-ons” to the DHHS-funded welfare leavers projects to explore questions related to public assisted housing. The grantees in Massachusetts, Los Angeles County, and the consortium of three Northern California counties (San Mateo, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara) will compare the outcomes of families who leave welfare with families that are assisted and not assisted by HUD. Final reports will be published in late 2001, although dates vary for each project.

Grantees, contacts, and project summaries web site: www.huduser.org/research/policy.html

Forthcoming Research Reports

In 1999, three random assignment evaluations will publish final reports. In April 1999, final findings are expected for Mathematica’s evaluation of the Post-Employment Services Demonstration, which uses intensive case management to help newly employed welfare recipients retain their jobs. Interim impact findings show that most recipients found jobs with low pay, poor benefits, and little room for growth. Researchers identified supports, such as counseling and assistance obtaining transitional benefits, which can help clients deal with employment-related problems.

In May 1999, Abt plans to release the final report for the Preschool Immunization Project Evaluation, which requires AFDC recipients with preschool-age children to verify that their child’s immunization status is up-to-date. Families that do not fulfill this requirement face a serious penalty—elimination of the child’s AFDC benefits. Two-year interim findings revealed that children in the

treatment group had higher immunization rates, but, when parents did not meet the immunization prerequisite, program administrators rarely enforced the penalty.

A final report from Mathematica on Iowa's Family Investment Program (FIP) evaluation is due for November 1999. FIP is a waiver program that has altered AFDC and Food Stamp policies to emphasize employment and training. According to a December 1998 two-year impact report, FIP has increased employment rates for welfare recipients but has not reduced welfare receipt.

Additionally, an estimated 54 reports from 22 other large-scale research projects will be released in 1999. The Publications Calendar on the Research Forum's web site lists these reports, as well as those expected after 1999, by projected date of publication. (To confirm any exact date, please contact the relevant research organization.)

Topics for Future Research

Progress is being made for many populations, but additional areas need further research. We must be concerned about two populations: those who are entering the work force and those for whom movement into employment is more difficult. In the latter group, TANF participants may be victims of domestic violence, suffering from severe depression, addicted to drugs, or mildly developmentally disabled. Existing initiatives, like the WtW and the leavers studies, are likely to require supplemental resources to study these sub-populations. New studies about these groups are clearly needed. More research about a subset of the leavers population—those who exit from TANF without finding jobs—is also essential. Finally, research is needed to explore how TANF recipients and leavers are connected to benefits like Medicaid, Food Stamps, and the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), or to service programs like child care, transportation, and housing.

Publications on Children and Welfare Reform Available from NCCP

In 1996, the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP) and the Foundation for Child Development (FCD) created the Leadership Network on Children and Welfare Reform to identify, support, and advance welfare policies that protect and promote the healthy growth and development of children in the context of welfare reform. NCCP convened the Leadership Network for a series of meetings in 1996 and 1997 and developed an issue brief series and background publications to explore the impact of the PRWORA of 1996 on the well-being of poor young children and their families and to give policymakers and program directors information on how to protect vulnerable children within the context of welfare changes. In early 1997, the Research Forum was established to facilitate the development of rigorous, policy relevant research about the effects of the new federalism on poor and vulnerable populations. One year later, the Forum began publishing its quarterly newsletter, featuring analyses of large-scale welfare research projects and discussion of issues pertinent to the field of welfare research.

ISSUE BRIEFS [\$5.00 each / 4 for \$15.00]

Issue Brief 1: How Welfare Reform Can Help or Hurt Children
by Ann Collins and J. Lawrence Aber

Describes the research base for NCCP's framework to assess welfare changes from a children's perspective and points to lessons from current and welfare-to-work evaluations. (1997). 12 pp.

Issue Brief 2: Anticipating the Effects of Federal and State Welfare Changes on Systems that Serve Children
by Ann Collins

Focuses on processes to assess how federal and state welfare initiatives will have an impact on state and community policies and systems that serve children and families. (1997). 12 pp.

Issue Brief 3: The New Welfare Law and Vulnerable Families: Implications for Child Welfare/Child Protection Systems
by Jane Knitzer and Stanley Bernard

Examines the potential impact of P.L. 104-193 on vulnerable families already in or at risk of entering the child welfare/child protection system. (1997). 20 pp.

Issue Brief 4: Responsible Fatherhood and Welfare: How States Can Use the New Law to Help Children
by Stanley Bernard

Outlines provisions in the welfare law related to fatherhood and offers states strategies to encourage responsible parenting by custodial and noncustodial fathers. (1998). 24 pp.

Issue Brief 5: Children and Welfare Reform: Child Care by Kith and Kin—Supporting Family, Friends, and Neighbors Caring for Children
by Ann Collins and Barbara Carlson

Summarizes the research on kith and kin child care, examines traditional policies, describes eight innovative program strategies, and makes recommendations that states and local communities can use to reach out directly to these child care providers and the children for whom they care. (1998). 20 pp.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Early Childhood Poverty Research Brief 1: Young Child Poverty in the States—Wide Variation and Significant Change
by Neil Bennett and Jiali Li

Describes the considerable variation among the states' young child poverty rates and suggests that changes in three demographic factors—family structure, employment patterns, and educational attainment—account for almost one-third of the changes in state young child poverty rates over the last two decades. (July 1998). 16 pp. \$5.00.

Map and Track: State Initiatives for Young Children and Families, 1998 Edition
by Jane Knitzer and Stephen Page

New edition continues to "map" state initiatives for young children and families (program development strategies, community mobilization and systemic change strategies, high-level leadership) and "track" them over time. Added for 1998 is information on whether states are implementing explicit strategies to link welfare reform with children's initiatives, additional state-by-state indicators of young child and family well-being, young-child-related state welfare provisions, and information on state tax credit programs and other income-promoting supports to low-income families. *Report*. (1998). 208 pp. \$19.95. March 1996 *Map and Track Report*. 171 pp. \$19.95. **Special pricing:** 1996 and 1998 *Map and Track Editions* \$29.95; both reports and June 1997 *Map and Track (Fatherhood)* \$39.95.

Children and Welfare Reform: Highlights from Recent Research
by Ann Collins, Stephanie Jones, and Heather Bloom

Summarizes studies that concern how children in low-income families may be affected by changes in welfare eligibility and processes. *Research Highlights*. (1996). 68 pp. \$10.00.

State Welfare Waiver Evaluations: Will They Increase Our Understanding of the Impact of Welfare Reform on Children?
by Ann Collins and J. Lawrence Aber

Examines how well evaluations of 21 state welfare reform initiatives address the needs of children as well as their parents. *Working Paper*. (1996). 37 pp. \$10.00.

NEWSLETTER ARTICLES FROM THE RESEARCH FORUM [Free]

Welfare Research Reveals Early Challenges of Time Limits
by Ellen C. Berrey

Analyzes research evaluations with findings on time limits, concluding that implementing time limits is difficult, benefits often end before time limits are reached, and research participants receiving welfare benefits usually know about program time limits. (*the forum*, January 1998), 4 pp.

Evaluating Welfare Reform: What Do We Know? How Can We Learn More?

by Ellen C. Berrey and Barbara B. Blum

Describes major findings from the past 15 years of welfare research, existing research gaps, and research tools in need of further development. This article draws from information in the Forum's March 19, 1998 testimony before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. (*the forum*, May 1998), 4 pp.

Financial Incentives Can Be Key to Moving Families Off Welfare and Raising Income, Research Reveals

by Ellen C. Berrey

Summarizes findings on strategies to alleviate the growing disparity between levels of income for welfare families moving into the work force, as compared to the incomes of wealthy families. Successful outcomes are observed for: (1) working families that receive generous earnings supplements; (2) custodial parents who are supported by case managers as they try to establish court orders for child support; and (3) long-term recipients who have earnings disregards and other financial incentives to work but must participate in work or job training full-time. (*the forum*, September 1998), 4 pp.

Teen Parent Program Evaluations Yield No Simple Answers

by Ellen C. Berrey and Mary Clare Lennon

Synthesizes findings from three evaluations of programs for teen mothers and their children. Forum staff describe the questionable benefits of the GED, the need for programs to address mothers' mental health and educational levels, and troubling outcomes found for some children participating in two of the programs. This analysis is based on a chapter written for proceedings from a November 1998 conference that examined the same research. (*the forum*, December 1998), 4 pp.

To order publications, contact NCCP Publications at (212) 304-7195 or email: nccp@columbia.edu

RESEARCH FORUM ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND THE NEW FEDERALISM

National Center for Children in Poverty
The Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health
Columbia University

154 Haven Avenue
New York, NY 10032-1180

Address service requested

RESEARCH FORUM ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND THE NEW FEDERALISM

The Research Forum, an initiative of the National Center for Children in Poverty, hosted at the Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health of Columbia University, encourages collaborative research and informed policy on welfare reform and vulnerable populations. The Forum's ultimate goal is to identify and promote strategies that protect and enhance the well-being of poor children and their families.

Research Forum Advisors

J. Lawrence Aber *National Center for Children in Poverty*
Susan Mayer *Joint Center for Poverty Research*
Thomas Corbett *Institute for Research on Poverty*
Deborah Phillips *Board on Children, Youth, and Families*
Howard Rolston *Administration for Children and Families, DHHS*
Patricia Ruggles *Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS*
Ann Segal *Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS*
Barry L. Van Lare *Welfare Information Network*

Research Forum Staff

Barbara B. Blum *Director*
Mary Clare Lennon *Director of Research*
Ellen C. Berrey *Project and Newsletter Coordinator*
Jennifer Farnsworth *Graduate Research Assistant*
Carole J. Oshinsky *Managing Editor, National Center for Children in Poverty*

the forum, March 1999, Vol. 2, No. 1

The newsletter appears four times a year, printed on recycled paper and accessible through the web at: <http://www.researchforum.org>. The Research Forum is funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Chase Manhattan Foundation, Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Russell Sage Foundation. For further information write Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism, NCCP, 154 Haven Avenue, New York, NY 10032. Tel: (212) 304-7132. Fax: (212) 544-4200. E-mail: info@researchforum.org.

Copyright © 1999 by the National Center for Children in Poverty.

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, N.Y.
Permit No. 3593