Employment Plan Evaluation



June 30, 2004

Dr. Norma Harris Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson

EMPLOYMENT PLAN EVALUATION:

A Compilation of Administrative and Self-Report Data

Principle Investigator:

Norma Harris, Ph.D. nharris@socwk.utah.edu

Project Coordinator:

Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson mvogel@socwk.utah.edu

Project Interviewers:

Debbie Abrams-Cohen Christie Ackman Rachel Armstrong Kelli Bennett Emily Christensen Dianne Cunningham Marie Curtis Jackson Alisa McNulty

DWS Steering Committee:

Mary Barth Sarah Brenna Suzette Martellaro Mary McConaughy Cathie Pappas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Method	3
	Table 1: Number of months on assistance
Findings	4
	Table 2: Distribution of Sample by Region4
	Table 3: Demographics and Employment barriers5
Discussion	8
Conclusion	10
References	10
Recommendati	ions11
Attachment 1:	Employment Plans - Administrative Data12
Attachment 2:	Employment Plans - Self-Report Data14
Attachment 3:	Qualitative Responses

INTRODUCTION

Background

The introduction of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) as part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 brought about many changes to our nation's social welfare policy. Attention is commonly focused on the issues of time limited benefits and work requirements. Indeed these were significant changes in policy. Another, less discussed yet equally important feature, was the Individual Responsibility Plan (IRP).

While time limited benefits and work participation requirements were mandated in TANF, individual plans outlining participation activities for each person receiving cash assistance (termed universal engagement) were not. The use of such plans for engaging all clients was left to the discretion of the states, nonetheless, the Code of Federal Regulations clearly defined the purpose and structure of the IRP. The main goal of an IRP is to develop a plan for moving immediately into whatever private-sector employment the person is capable of handling as quickly as possible, over time increasing responsibility and the amount of work. The obligations of the individual are to be outlined and could include non work related activities such as keeping school age children in school, immunizing children etc ("Ensuring..., 1999). While the use of such plans was new to many states, it was not new to Utah.

Prior to the reforms of 1996, many states had obtained waivers allowing them to experiment with innovative methods of administering welfare programs. The state of Utah had obtained such a waiver entitled the Single Parent Employment Demonstration (SPED) program. The SPED program called for the use of universal engagement and individual employment (self-sufficiency) plans. Starting in January 1993, demonstration sites in Kearns, St. George, and Roosevelt tested these new initiatives. Universal engagement and individual employment plans became the statewide norm in July 1996. The state dropped the waiver as TANF was fully implemented in October 1996 (H. Thatcher, personal communication, May 21, 2004).

TANF Reauthorization

Early in 2002 the Bush Administration presented an initial proposal regarding the reauthorization of TANF. This proposal included the requirements for universal engagement, individualized plans and close monitoring of participation activities (Bush, 2002). The original Tripartisan Senate Bill, House Bill H.R. 4, and other major proposals have also consistently required universal engagement with the development of an IRP for each family within 60 days of TANF enrollment (CLASP, 2003). While there has been a significant lack of agreement among legislators in areas such as child care funding, countable activities and work hours, universal engagement and the use of IRP's have been fully endorsed.

On March 30th, 2004, Utah's Senator Orrin Hatch noted the many successes of universal engagement as implemented in Utah as he spoke in favor of the PRIDE bill, the latest version H.R. 4. Senator Hatch connected universal engagement to the use of employment plans (Utah's version of the IRP). He spoke of this plan as a "roadmap toward independence and success" necessary to move a family toward self-sufficiency and not allow them to fall through the cracks (H.R. 4).

Currently, very little has been published regarding universal engagement and the use of employment plans. One author who did publish a review of New York's universal engagement

process felt that only moderate reductions in benefits for non-compliance with the employment plan led to higher non-compliance rates (Turner, 2003). All current major TANF reauthorization proposals, including the PRIDE bill, require full benefit sanctioning for non-compliance with the employment plan. Utah's sanctioning process already adheres to the new policy being promoted.

Current Study

Given the pending changes in TANF policy, it is timely that the Department of Workforce Services (DWS) has chosen to evaluate the use of employment plans throughout the state. In the Summer of 2002 DWS contracted with the Social Research Institute (SRI) at the University of Utah in an effort to better understand the scope of how employment plans were being used to move cash assistance recipients toward self sufficiency. SRI was asked to add questions regarding the employment plan to the ongoing study of long term recipients. Both administrative data and client self-report were to be used to further understanding of the issue. The report which follows outlines what has been learned.

METHOD

The Social Research Institute has been gathering data from former FEP recipients since 1998. Data for this report is based on a set of questions added to the original instrument. The protocol for data collection has remained the same throughout the data collection process.

Respondents

Participation in this study was limited to persons who had reached the 36 month time limit or had experienced the closure of a cash assistance extension in Utah, and had not received cash assistance for between 2 and 6 months. For ease of language, this combination of those initially reaching the 36 month limit and those reaching the end of an extension will be referred to as the "36+ sample." While the study continues to this day, the particular set of questions used for this research was asked of a limited group (N = 500) as it was determined that no new information was being gained. As Table 1 below indicates, just over one half of the sample had received more than 36 months of assistance indicating an extension. The cases with 35 months had been closed for the time limit (TL) and were reviewed to determine if the case had been closed prematurely. In all cases there was a problem with the number of months recorded and it was determined that the case had been closed appropriately.

Table 1: Number of months on assistance

Cash assistance months:	N = 500
35 months	15 (3%)
36 months	229 (46%)
More than 36 months	256 (51%)

Of the 500 cases, 37 respondents had received some months of cash assistance out-of-state. Thirteen respondents had received more than 36 months out-of-state.

Participants in this study experienced cash closure between August 2002 and June 2003. Interviews were conducted between December 2002 and August 2003. The average response rate for the months in this period was 71%, a very acceptable rate from which to draw conclusions from the research findings.

Data Collection

Both DWS administrative data and respondent self-report data were collected for this study. Administrative data were collected through examination of information in the two major DWS data collection programs, PACMIS and UWORKS. Employment plans from June 2000 to present were reviewed. This date was set according to the direction of DWS personnel who indicated that this would be the most accurate information given a change in computer systems.

Self-report data were collected through the use of structured interviews. Potential respondents were contacted by mail 2 months after their cash assistance closed and invited to participate in the study. Additional contacts were made as necessary to determine interest in study participation.

All interviews were conducted in-person, typically in the respondents home. The participant determined the interview location. The interviews ranged in length from 35 to 165 minutes, with an average interview lasting about 70 minutes. Respondents received a \$20 remuneration for their time.

The study instrument covered a wide range of issues. Participants were informed they could refuse to answer any questions they did not feel comfortable answering. While this option was rarely used many respondents expressed appreciation for this option. All names of study participants remain strictly confidential.

FINDINGS

While the study instrument covered a wide range of issues, for purposes of this report, only a limited number of questions will be analyzed and discussed. Included in the discussion will be all questions related to the employment plan and interaction with the employment counselor. In addition, questions germane to respondent characteristics and barriers will be used to provide a profile of participants in the employment activities described.

Participant Characteristics

Table 2: Distribution of Sample by Region

	Central	North	Mountainland	Eastern	Western
Study Sample N = 500	239 (48%)	169 (34%)	53 (11%)	21 (4%)	18 (4%)
All FEP Cases N = 6090	2729 (45%)	1677 (27.5%)	707 (11.5%)	395 (6.5%)	583 (9.5%)

The distribution of respondents generally reflects the overall distribution of FEP cases. With a slight over representation in the Central and North regions and a slight under representation

in the Eastern and Western regions. All regions have approximately the same portion, 4 - 5%, of time limit closures per month.

The personal characteristics of respondents and the presence of employment barriers, as described in Table 3, is very similar to that found in prior 36+ samples. The demographic and barrier data is significant in that it describes the population for which the particular employment plan activities were offered. Because the same data has been collected for all Utah's time limit closures since the implementation of TANF, it can be determined that the above demographic and barrier data has not changed significantly since 1999. Program participants who are reaching the time limit or receiving extensions are displaying similar characteristics over time.

Table 3: Demographics and Employment barriers

Characteristic - Demog	N = 500	
Age		32.8
Gender	97% female	
Place of birth:	278 (56%) 173 (35%) 49 (10%)	
Average # of children on	3.2 2.4	
Race/Ethnicity:	134 (27%) 288 (58%) 24 (5%) 23 (5%) 9 (2%) 3 (.5%) 19 (4%)	
Currently in school Of these percent of	61 (12%) 19 (31%) 19 (31%) 12 (20%) 11 (18%)	
Current employment:	88 (18%) 94 (19%) 318 (64%)	
Additional Re	413 (83%) 261 (52%) 207 (41%) 38 (8%)	

Current living situation: Rent Own Living with friends living with extended family Live in shelter Other	384 (77%) 20 (4%) 12 (2%) 71 (14%) 2 (.4%) 11 (2%)
Characteristics - Potential Employment Barriers	
Education High school diploma GED No high school diploma or GED	237 (47%) 79 (16%) 184 (37%)
Criminal Record Of those with a record, record includes: Felony Misdemeanor	156 (31%) 60 (39%) 106 (71%)
Physical Health "fair to poor" health indicating a health problem	243 (49%)
Ever diagnosed with a learning disability - yes	106 (21%)
Poor work history: (less than 6 months as any one job in past 5 years)	92 (18%)
Mental Health fair to poor indicating a mental health problem Diagnosed with mental health issue CES_D - Depression indicated	218 (44%) 273 (55%) 333 (67%)
Severe domestic violence indicated: In the past year Ever in lifetime	74 (15%) 368 (74%)

Employment Plans: Administrative Data

Administrative data, as compiled in Attachment 1, provide a summary of the employment plans of all study participants. All employment plans created since June 2000 for each study participant were examined. The activities were categorized under the titles provided to DWS employment counselors for the creation of employment plans. Each activity was counted if it appeared on any employment plan. Totals for each activity reflect the number of participants who had the particular activity on the plan. If an activity was repeated for a particular individual it was not recounted, avoiding duplication. Analysis of the administrative data reveals several trends.

As would be expected in a work focused program, individual job search (60%) and employment retention (46%) were the most commonly noted activities. To support these activities

almost a third (28%) had received child care assistance and 30% received "other" support services. Commonly, the "other" support service involved regular meetings with the employment counselor.

"Problem solving assessment" and "non-participation assessment" are activities that indicate involvement or imminent involvement in the conciliation process. A full third of the study participants had involvement in one or both of these activities. Since only 7 (1%) of the cases actually closed NP (non-participation) it appears that these problem solving attempts were successful, at least in helping the client avoid this type of case closure.

The client demographic and barrier information listed above informs other significant areas of participant involvement. High levels of physical and mental health difficulties were acknowledged and addressed in many of the employment plans. Of the study participants, 226 (45%) had physical health treatment and 197 (39%) had mental health treatment as part of their employment plans. Not all physical and mental health concerns were permanent problems but 68 (14%) did have "pursuit of disability" as a component of the plan. While there was a close connection between physical and mental health issues and employment plan activities, other issues were not as commonly reflected in the employment plans.

Of the sample 184 (37%) had no GED or high school diploma. The review of employment plan activities indicates that only 76 (15%) had pursuit of this level of education on their plan. There were 106 (21%) respondents who reported having been diagnosed with a learning disability. This disability, in addition to physical, mental and substance abuse problems, would indicate possible help from vocational rehabilitation. The employment plan review indicates only 9 (2%) respondents had participation in this service as part of their plan. In general, partner programs were almost never listed on the employment plan as part of participation activities.

Employment Plans: Self-report Data

Each respondent was asked to recall the activities that had been listed on their employment plans while receiving cash assistance. This was a difficult task for some respondents. Many needed additional prompting to remember the content of the employment plans. Some respondents did not even seem to be familiar with the concept of an employment plan. Interviewers used various terms and visual prompts to insure the respondent knew what was being discussed before proceeding.

Respondents were first given the opportunity to list all the activities they could readily remember. After these were discussed, the interviewer went through the possible choices to help respondents remember additional activities. As reported in Attachment 2, respondents were asked several questions about each activity.

After respondents identified the activity or services on their plan, they were asked to indicate whether or not they had complete the activity. Respondents could answer "yes," "no," or "not attempted." If the person had not attempted or completed the activity they were asked to explain "why not?" When discussing various activities respondents sometimes indicated they had requested such an activity to be part of their plan but this request had been denied. They were then asked to discuss "why" they had been denied access to a particular activity.

As with any self-reported data, these findings reflect the respondents' memory of the employment plans. In some areas the results are very similar to the administrative data, in others it is widely different.

Similar to the administrative data, employment focused activities including job search (82%) and job search assistance (61%) were the most frequently reported activities. Support services (34%) and life skill services (34%) providing help in areas such as transportation and child care were also common responses. The self-report data clearly reflects the respondents' experience

of the program as work focused.

Another area of high involvement was "treatment issues." Nearly half (48%) of the sample reported mental health treatment as part of their employment plan at some point. Involvement in physical health treatment (29%) was also relatively high. Again, these results are consistent with the high percentage of respondents with physical and mental health issues.

Reviewing the completion rate of the various activities, it is clear that some activities produced a much higher completion rate than others. The assessment (both initial and problem solving), life skills, supportive services, and physical health treatment activities had completion rates near 90% or higher. The lowest completion rates were found in education: basic education (36%), employment related education (57%) and work site learning (59%).

The reasons for lack of activity completion varied widely. Lack of ownership of the goal by the respondent was, overall, the most common barrier to completing an activity. When the activity was "not my idea" participation rates were much lower. Some activities were more effected by particular barriers. Transportation, lack of child care, mental health and physical health issues were common barriers for completing basic education, job search and attending job search workshops. Lack of completion of basic education was also hindered by learning problems. This is not surprising when it is recalled that 21% of respondents have been diagnosed with a learning disability. Comments found in Attachment 3 provide additional insights into reasons for noncompletion of activities.

The number of respondents who requested particular activities and were denied was relatively small. The denials were concentrated in the areas of basic education (7%), employment related education (15%), and life skill resources (7%). Education was most often denied because DWS did not support the particular educational program or the employment counselor did not feel it would be a good idea. The "other" comments (See Attachment 3) reveal "time on assistance" as another issue. Respondents who requested to pursue further education but only have a few months left on assistance are routinely denied support for this activity since it can not be completed within the time available.

DISCUSSION

Much of what was learned in this study reflects the principles supporting the individual responsibility plans as proposed by congress for welfare reauthorization. Such plans have the potential to serve as guideposts for marking progress toward self-sufficiency. In order to achieve this goal, several important elements must be part of the plan development process.

Personal ownership of the specific tasks and overall goals of the plan is vital to success. When attempting to discuss the employment plans, many respondents had a difficult time recalling what they had done. Interviewers were trained to continue describing the employment plan until the respondent understood to what we were referring. The number of prompts needed to help a respondent remember the employment plans does not speak to great ownership of the plan as a goal setting device. One factor contributing to ownership is the tone and content of the plan itself.

Reviewing the administrative data revealed an wide range of tones and orientations among the employment plans. Some plans were written from the employment counselors perspective, using phrases such as "the client will do....," or "if she doesn't do this.....," or "the client will report to me...." This type of list might reflect the required activities, but is lacks an inviting, cooperative tone and might even feel punitive. Other plans were written in the first person from the client's perspective. Phrases such as "I will begin working toward my GED by the end of march...." or "In order to improve my interviewing skills I will attend a workshop on May 24th and if I am unable to

attend I will call my employment counselor to let her know immediately." The second set of comments, spoken in the first person with specific actions and goals feels much more personal. This list could be posted on a person's refrigerator and serve as both reminder and inspiration.

As the administrative data were reviewed it became clear that some employment plans were revised and updated on a regular basis, while others reflected an accumulation of activities. Respondents spoke of being overwhelmed with the sheer number of activities on a plan and felt it useless to try and do *anything* when they could not do *everything*. Those with mental health issues and learning problems were especially likely to feel overwhelmed with large numbers of tasks. It was common for respondents to comment on feeling forced to agree to the plan because "that was the only way I could get the benefits I needed." When the tasks on the plan matched the respondent's goals there was a much greater likelihood that the tasks would be completed.

In addition to requesting better pacing of the tasks, some respondents were frustrated because they never felt their accomplishments were acknowledged. One woman said, "if she [the employment counselor] could have just given me a pat on the back for getting my GED before yelling at me for being behind on my job logs it would have meant so much." Sometimes it is difficult to remember how overwhelming even the smallest tasks on an employment plan can feel to some recipients. Giving praise and positive reinforcement for completed tasks helps build confidence for moving forward. Those who had received such acknowledgment were very grateful. One respondent even noted, "my employment counselor [using the counselor name] was the first person to ever believe in me! She knew I could do it and soon I did too!"

The qualitative comments regarding the "other reasons" why activities were not completed also speak to the need for support. The comments do not reflect a strong trend as to why any one particular activity was not completed. However, taken as a whole, the comments reflect an overall struggle with some basic life skills. Many of us take such things as transportation or a telephone for granted. When these resources are not available attending an interview or following-up on job leads can be made very difficult. The lack of appropriate clothing, language barriers and past failures can bring an activity to a halt if the client feels alone in managing these struggles. In many situations just having someone to help problem solve and think through the difficulty might have led to greater success.

The respondents actually self-reported *more* employment plan activities than were recorded in the administrative data. This indicates that respondents were not as aware of whether an activity had been part of their employment plan as they were that they had simply engaged in the activity. Given the multiple agencies and "plans" which follow many of these families, it is not surprising that they sometimes find it difficult to distinguish what they are doing for whom. Respondents spoke with appreciation of workers who were able to include "mandates" from other agencies on their employment plan as it helped keep the requirements both realistic and focused.

It is important to view these results in the context of the population under review. The demographic and barrier data presented above reminds us that this group is dealing with multiple, significant barriers to employment. The high percentage of respondents dealing with just the mental and physical health issues during their 36 months makes involvement in education and training difficult. There is often no extended period during this time when the person is able to focus on work readiness and employment seeking activities.

It was not uncommon to find participants in the situation mentioned above; just as the person is able to focus on work activities, the time limit or the extension comes to an end. Since the cash assistance period was needed to deal with some employment barriers, the person is not able to take full advantage of education and training resources needed to move toward lasting employment. The second set of qualitative data presents some respondents views of *why* they were

not allowed to include certain activities on their plan. Many of these comments come back to the idea of "running out of time." While respondents generally do not question the idea of limiting assistance to 36 months, they do become frustrated when they have not been able to take full advantage of that time to receive employment focused assistance as they were dealing with other barriers during those months.

CONCLUSION

The results of this evaluation of both administrative and self-report employment plan data reveals much about the experiences of long term recipients. Employment plans, used effectively, can be powerful tools for helping shape the experience of a person while receiving assistance. Everything done to increase personal ownership, build on success and provide encouragement enhances the critical role of the employment plan in leading to self-sufficiency.

REFERENCES

- Bush, G.W. (2002) Working toward independence: Maximize self sufficiency through work and additional constructive activities. White House Press Release. Retrieved May 20, 2004, from http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/print/welfare-book-04.html
- Center For Law and Social Policy (CLASP). (2003, September) Key provisions in TANF reauthorization bills passed by the Senate Finance Committee and the House. Washington, D.C.
- "Ensuring that recipients work." (1999). Code of Federal Regulations: Title 45 Public Welfare. Chapter 2, part 261. Retrieved May 21, 2004, from http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_99/45cfr261_99.html
- H.R. 4, The Personal Responsibility and Individual Development for Everyone (PRIDE) Act. Statement of Senator Orrin G. Hatch before the United States Senate, March 30m 2004. Retrived May 20, 2004, from http://hatch.senate.gov/index/cfm?FuseAction=Press Releases.Print&PressRelease id=1006&supp
- Turner, J. (2003, May 8) "Universal engagement" of TANF recipients: The lessons of New York City. *The Heritage Foundation Backgrounder*. (Available from the Heritage Foundation, 214 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002).

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) **Do everything possible to create a positive sense of employment plan ownership for the participant.** Lack of personal ownership of the tasks and goals on the employment plan is the single greatest reason for lack of follow through. There should be a distinction made between items on the plan which are "required" by DWS, and items which are part of the plan at the client's request. This gives the person more sense of control over the activities which are part of the plan by choice.
- 2) Refer to employment plan often, not as a threat, but as a way of measuring success and identifying areas of difficulty.

Respondents often had difficulty remembering what was on their employment plan. This indicated low sense of ownership of the overall goals and lack of simple knowledge of what they were suppose to be doing to fulfill their agreement.

- 3) Create a history of success. Start with plan goals which are manageable and easily measured. Acknowledge success in small areas and build to larger goals. Respondents have often had a history of failure in many areas. Poor school performance, getting fired, bad interviewing experiences, etc. often contribute to fears for trying these activities again. Gaining success to build self-confidence helps create a new sense of self to build on.
- 4) Employment plans should contain a manageable number of activities. Clients who feel overwhelmed are more likely to do nothing if feeling that they can not do everything required. Some employment plans carry over all past activities and thus become large lists of activities, some of which are no longer relevant. When a plan is reviewed all activities should be updated to insure they are pertinent to current needs.

TANF REVIEW STUDY - RESEARCH TEAM

Norma Harris, PhD - Principle Investigator Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson - Project Director Contact us at: 801-581-3071 mvogel@socwk.utah.edu Attachment 1: Summary of Employment Plans from UWORKS/PACMIS - N = 500

Objectives	Service/Activities	Offered	%
Assessment	Initial/Comprehensive Assessment	101	20
	Formal Assessment	100	20
	Assessment Review	127	25
	Problem Solving Assessment	156	31
	Non-Participation Assessment	121	24
	DWS Social Worker Assessment - New	26	5
Basic	GED/HS Diploma	76	15
Education	Basic Skills / Remediation (B.E.)	12	2
	English as a Second Language (B.E.)	7	1
Employment	Employment	232	46
Employment	Applied Technology	64	13
Related Education	Associate's Degree	18	4
	Bachelor's Degree	6	1
	Masters Degree	0	
	Other Employment Related Training	49	10
	Required Training-Related Services/Supplies	1	.2
	Refugee Re-certification Training	0	
Life Skills	Cultural Assimilation	2	.4
	Employment Mentoring	14	3
	Family Counseling	29	6
	Life Skills (other)	101	20
	Pursuing Disability Income	68	14
	Housing Issues	23	5
	Transportation Issues	43	9
	Child Care Issues	54	11
	Rural Location Issues	3	.6
	Court/Legal Issues	40	8
	Child Support Enforcement	126	25
Intensive	Intensive Employment Services (E-2)	87	17
Employment Services	Choose to Work	5	1
	Welfare to Work (GROW)	1	.2

Job Search	Individual Job Search	300	60
Assistance	Pre-Employment Skills Training Workshop	88	18
	Job Readiness	44	9
	Job Retention Skills Training Workshop	23	5
	Job Connection Act.	61	12
	Out of Area Job Search	1	.2
	Relocation Assistance	3	.6
Supportive	Child Care	140	28
Services	Transportation	5	1
	Other Support Services	152	30
	FEP-Enhanced Payment	18	4
	Needs-Related Pay	10	2
Treatment	Physical Treatment	226	45
	Mental Health Treat.	197	39
	Substance Abuse Treatment	45	9
	Family Violence	35	7
	PCN Requirement	5	1
Work Site	Apprenticeships	0	
Learning	On-the-Job Training	11	2
	Private Paid Internship	1	.2
	Public Paid Internship	3	.6
	Private Unpaid Internship	12	2
	Public Unpaid Internship	27	5
Partner	Adult Education	0	
Programs	School To Careers	0	
	CSBG Employment and Training	0	
	FACT	0	
	HUD Employment and Training	0	
	Job Corps	0	
	Native Am. Programs	0	
	Migrant & Seasonal Farm-Worker Programs	0	
	Older American Program Title V	0	
	Vocational Education	1	.2
	Vocational Rehabilitation Services	9	2

ATTACHMENT 2: SELF - REPORTED ELEMENTS OF EMPLOYMENT PLANS - N = 500***

* - Explanation of chart:

Column 1: Objectives were taken from the DWS options tree for employment counselors as they assign tasks in the employment plan.

Column 2: A description of the services or activities connected with each objective. When appropriate specific services are broken down with an indication of how many respondents included that activity.

Column 3: "Offered" - here it is noted if the particular service or activity was offered to the customer.

Column 4: "Completed" - it is noted where the activity was Y = completed, N = not completed, or NA = not attempted.

Column 5: "Why not?" - if the activity was not attempted or not completed it is indicated here why not.

Column 6: "Requested not received" - this is where the customer asked for this service or activity but was not given the opportunity to do it.

Column 7: Why not received? - this indicates why the customer was not allowed to have the given activity or service on their plan.

Objectives*	Service/Activities	Offered	Completed	Why not?	Requested not received	Why not received?
Assessment	OVERALL Initial/Comprehensive Assessment Formal Assessment, Assessment Review	183 (37%)	Y - 166 N - 13 NA - 3 Completion rate: 91%	Not my idea 5 Transp. 2 Child care 3 Phys. hlth 2 Mental hlth 1 Fam. resp. 2 Other 4	0	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should DWS says cost too much Other
	OVERALL Problem Solving Assessment Non-Participation Assessment DWS Social Worker Assessment - New	101 (20%)	Y - 90 N - 11 NA - 0 Completion rate: 89%	Not my idea 5 Transp. 4 Child care 2 Phys. hlth Mental hlth Fam. resp. 2 Other 1	1 (<1%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should DWS says cost too much Other 1
Basic Education	OVERALL HS/GED - 166 ESL - 10	148 (30%)	Y - 54 N - 84 NA - 10 Completion rate: 36%	Not my idea 9 Transp. 14 Child care 12 Phys. hlth 13 Mental hlth 11 Fam. resp. 16 Tests too hard 12 Prior ed. prblms 5 Other 19	37 (7%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 9 Tried before, didn't work 1 EC didn't think I should 10 DWS says cost too much 3 Other 15

Objectives	Service/Activities		Offered	Completed	Why not?	Requested not received	Why not received?
Employment Related Education	OVERALL Applied Technology (CNA, CDL, BOOST, etc.) Associates Degree Bachelors Degree Masters Degree Refugee Re-cert. Training Short term tecn/Com. ed	112 33 17 1	115 (23%)	Y - 65 N - 46 NA - 4 Completion rate: 57%	Not my idea 11 Transp. 3 Child care 4 Phys. hlth 7 Mental hlth 9 Fam. resp. 4 Prior ed. prblms 4 Other 18	74 (15%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 26 Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should 30 DWS says cost too much 5 Other 13
Life Skills	Cultural Assimilation Employment Mentoring Family Counseling Life Skills (other)		85 (17%)	Y - 66 N - 9 NA - 10 Completion rate: 78%	Not my idea 6 Transp. 2 Mental hlth 1 Other 4	3 (< 1%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should DWS says cost too much Other 2
	OVERALL Pursuing Disability Income Housing Issues Transportation Issues Child Care Issues Court/Legal Issues Child Support Enforcement	41 6 112 74 7 23	169 (34%)	Y - 160 N - 8 NA - 1 Completion rate: 95%	Not my idea 2 Transp. 1 Phys. hlth 1 Mental hlth 1 Child care 1 Other 3	34 (7%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 14 Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should 3 DWS says cost too much 4 Other 28
Intensive Employment Services	OVERALL Intensive Employ. Services (E-2) Choose to Work Welfare to Work (GROW)	54 4 4	68 (14%)	Y - 46 N - 20 NA - 2 Completion rate: 68%	Not my idea 3 Phys. hlth 3 Mental hlth 2 Other 15	0	None reported
Job Search	Individual Job Search		408 (82%)	Y - 349 N - 56 NA - 3 Completion rate: 86%	Not my idea 7 Transp. 17 Child care 11 Phys. hIth 7 Mental hIth 7 Fam. resp. 4 No jobs avail 2 Rural area 1 Other 21	8 (2%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should DWS says cost too much Other

Objectives	Service/Activities	Offered	Completed	Why not?	Requested not received	Why not received?
Job Search Assistance/ Skill building	OVERALL Pre-Employment Skills Training Workshop, Job Readiness, Job Retention Skills Training Workshop Job Connection Act., Out of Area Job Search, Relocation Assistance	305 (61%)	Y - 231 N - 53 NA - 21 Completion rate: 76%	Not my idea 21 Transp. 9 Child care 5 Phys. hlth 10 Mental hlth 7 Fam. resp. 4 Other 23	4 (< 1%)	Not supprted by DWS/ 1 prog. didn't qualify Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should 2 DWS says cost too much Other 1
Supportive Services	Child Care, Transportation, Other Support Services, FEP-Enhanced Payment, Needs-Related Pay	186 (37%)	Y - 172 N - 12 NA - 2 Completion rate: 92%	Not my idea 2 Child care 1 Phys hlth 2 Other 9	15 (3%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 3 DWS says cost too much 1 Other 10
Treatment	Physical Treatment	146 (29%)	Y - 136 N - 10 Completion rate: 93%	Not my idea 1 Phys. hlth 1 Not Ready 4 Other 5	4 (< 1%)	Other 4
	Mental Health Treat.	239 (48%)	Y - 189 N - 38 NA - 12 Completion rate: 79%	Not my idea 21 Transp. 3 Child care 4 Mental hlth 5 Fam. resp. 2 Not ready 5 Other 20	7 (1%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 2 Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should 1 DWS says cost too much 1 Other 3
	Substance Abuse Treatment	64 (13%)	Y - 45 N - 11 NA - 8 Completion rate: 70%	Not my idea 6 Transp. 1 Phys. hlth 2 Mental hlth 1 Fam. resp. 1 Not ready 2 Other 8	0	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should DWS says cost too much Other
	Family Violence	91 (18%)	Y - 67 N - 15 NA - 9 Completion rate: 74%	Not my idea 7 Transp. 2 Fam. resp. 1 Not ready 4 Safety Issues 3 Other 8	3 (< 1%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 2 Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should DWS says cost too much Other 1

Objectives	Service/Activities	Offered	Completed	Why not?	Requested not received	Why not received?
Work Site Learning	OVERALL Apprenticeships 2 On-the-Job Training 39 All type Internships (WEAT, etc.) 44	79 (16%)	Y - 47 N - 25 NA - 7 Completion rate: 59%	Not my idea 8 Transp. 5 Child care 1 Mental hlth 3 Phy hlth 4 wrk not challeng/ interesting 3 Other 13	15 (3%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 2 Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should 6 DWS says cost too much Other 7
Partner Programs	OVERALL Adult Education School To Careers CSBG Employ. & Training FACT HUD Employ. & Training Job Corps Native Am. Programs Migrant & Seasonal Farm-Worker Prgrms Vocational Education 2 Vocational Rehab. Services 67	75 (15%)	Y - 45 N - 25 NA - 5 Completion rate: 60%	Not my idea 7 Transp. 3 Physcl hlth 6 Mental hlth 6 Fam resp 2 Other 11	8 (2%)	Not supprted by DWS/ prog. didn't qualify 2 Tried before, didn't work EC didn't think I should 4 DWS says cost too much Other 2
Other	General Youth Services					

^{*** -} The first 500 respondents in this cycle of interviewing were asked in depth about employment plan activities.

Attachment 3 - Qualitative Responses

Why each activity could not be completed:

1. Assessment (skills testing)

	If not completed, WHY? Other
6032	"didn't get around to it"
6042	starting working
6210	couldn't get an appointment
6238	too scary to make appointment

2. Assessment (conciliation, etc.)

If not completed, WHY?

	If not completed, WHY?	Other:
6011	Did not follow through	
6362	partner would prevent her from	m going to appointments

Other:

3. Basic Education

	1 /
6012	Time ran out
6032	still working on it currently
6034	still working on it
6037	not enough time
6073	In WA, wanted her to quit school to go to work
6091	Had to continue working. She couldn't work and go to school with young children.
6153	(HS/GED) - failed test
6193	(HS/GED) - too busy with work
6205	(HS/GED) - too young and influenced by bad friends
6315	kept getting pregnant
6333	got job
6362	partner would prevent her from going to appointments
6370	(HS/GED) - just never happened - never brought it up again, didn't understand what they were helping me with
	didn't get letter
6413	(HS/GED) - was looking for a job
6437	(HS/GED)- I was always bad in school
6482	(HS/GED) - money was required

4. Employment Related Education

	If not completed, WHY?	Other:	
6086	Worker pulled from the progr	am	
6092	Got into a difficult program as	nd took time to	get up to speed and then it was a 2 year program - she's still
	working on it.		
6093	Told her to quit going to Steve	ens Henegar or	else lose benefits.
6098	Criminal background		
6110	Moved away from SLC		

- 6119 Don't recognize her school as one they'll pay for/count.
 6155 (associates) had to got to work per DWS
 6158 (applied tech) domestic violence record couldn't get CNA job
 6162 (applied tech) failed CNA test
- 6162 (applied tech) failed CNA test
- 6175 needed to work more hours to pay bills and couldn't keep up on school
- 6203 (associates) domestic violence
- 6214 (associates) classes were too hard
- 6221 (associates) frustrated trying to get in
- 6232 (applied tech) didn't pass the test
- 6239 (short term tech) just put it off and put it off
- 6251 (associates) teacher conflict
- 6258 (applied tech) couldn't go to school and work
- 6283 (applied tech) cut me off before I could finish
- 6289 (applied tech) paperwork problems so quit
- 6410 (associates) I felt like I needed a job rather than school
- 6421 (applied tech) jail
- 6431 (applied tech) don't know
- 6517 Too much to do.

5. Job Search Assistance (workshops, etc.)

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- 6007 School started and had no time
- 6023 no work permit
- 6037 case ended not enough time
- 6059 Drugs
- 6112 Needed test from ATC
- 6129 got a job
- 6135 never felt it was necessary
- 6143 already had job
- 6178 I don't have any experience to put on a resume
- 6190 thought I had more time to do it
- 6247 they never got back to her time ended
- 6284 I don't have papers or SSN
- 6286 no social security card
- 6304 was optional
- 6307 I can't work no SSN
- 6333 got a job
- 6342 forgot to go
- 6350 language barrier
- partner would prevent her from going to appointments
- already had a resume and didn't need the workshop
- 6380 I was already working
- had a job during those times offered and couldn't attend
- 6388 didn't need it
- 6405 didn't need it because she was already taking a similar class at school
- 6479 too early in the morning
- 6512 I got hired quickly.

6. Job Search Assistance (job search/connection)

If not completed, WHY? Other: 6016 Got SSI 6028 didn't apply self No day care resources 6037 6059 On drugs/didn't care No clothes 6077 6120 Drugs could not speak English 6141 already had job 6143 6188 both worker and client decided she'd be better off pursuing education 6204 not needed 6307 language 6346 too hard - I don't speak English 6350 language barrier partner would prevent her from going to appointments 6362 6380 sometimes I forgot to do the job logs 6405 worker had no respect for me being in school, she wanted me to be job searching 40 hrs wk (at first client said 10-15 hrs/day)

all the jobs she looked at wanted a HS diploma so she didn't finish pursuing them

they wanted paperwork on my past DUI's - I didn't want to do that

Other:

7. Work Site Learning

used the money for drugs

If not completed, WHY?

currently doing it

6432 6437

6500

6028

6032	couldn't find desired work in Vet Assistant
6063	Not available right now in phlebotomy
6114	in process, still working at internship
6147	I got a job on my own
6204	housing (had none)
6209	got job before it began
6217	(internship) - had to go to court
6232	(WEAT) - by the time they offered it her months of cash assistance were up
6341	got another job
6342	my supervisor didn't treat me right
C	

6389 (on the job training) - found a job

- 6405 (internship-WEAT, etc..) she was sent home because too many volunteers and nothing to do so she quit going
- 6414 (on-the-job training) worker changed her mind and wanted her to just get a job

8. Work Site Learning

If not completed, WHY? Other:

DWS offered WEAT but when client would show up to do the program they'd keep sending her home saying there was no work

9. Mental Health Counseling

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- Felt forced to go even though it wasn't client's idea
- 6045 Didn't like counselor
- 6052 waiting list
- 6070 Made Dr. appointment 2 months out, Dr. cancelled and she never rescheduled.
- 6093 Couldn't get off work to go.
- 6095 Social worker never called to set up appointment
- 6114 in process, still working at internship
- 6116 on-going
- 6118 didn't feel like getting anything out of it.
- 6144 She already was doing "4 corners mental health"
- 6148 Medicaid stopped
- 6149 didn't need it
- Weber Mental Health kept switching counselors 7 times
- 6214 I was already doing it on my own through the courts
- 6216 didn't feel like I needed it
- 6236 took Medicaid away and couldn't afford it
- 6239 couldn't get a hold of counselor because he left, changed counselors and went back to work
- made too much money for medical card couldn't afford it
- 6380 Medicaid changed and my co-pay became too high (I couldn't afford to go anymore)
- 6389 didn't need it (but she knew it was available)
- 6390 Medicaid took away my counselor she wasn't a preferred provider and I didn't want to change therapists
- 6400 dealing with DUI court issues
- 6509 DWS cancelled my scheduled appointment and never called back to re-schedule.

10. Substance Abuse Counseling

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- 6149 didn't need it
- 6189 (NA) didn't need it
- 6234 client didn't need it
- 6256 didn't need it
- 6338 kicked out of rehab
- 6389 didn't need it (but she knew it was available)
- 6400 dealing with DUI court issues
- 6404 didn't need it

11. Family/DV Counseling

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- 6095 Social worker never called to set up appointment
- Not my idea/plan wanted her to get a divorce and a protective order and she didn't want that and then they gave her pills
- 6114 Still in process of going
- 6135 counselor reported to case worker client felt betrayed and stopped going
- 6149 didn't need it
- 6189 kids didn't want to do it
- 6380 client doesn't recall why

- 6381 I was working so I couldn't complete it
- 6389 didn't need it (but she knew it was available)
- 6404 didn't need it
- did it on own at Valley Mental Health their counselor never called back

12. Physical/Medical treatment

If not completed, WHY? Other:

6317 job security issues (job in jeopardy)

13. Life Skills

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- 6204 lost paperwork, missed appointment
- 6413 they never got back to me
- They haven't come through with money to fix her car.

14. Life Skills (resolving barriers)

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- phone SSI can't contact her because she has no phone
- 6371 (child care) "didn't hold"
- 6404 (child care) never had the chance because I didn't ever get a job
- (child care) helped while she was looking for a job but then they closed it because she wasn't participating (but client said she did do all that was asked)
- 6479 (transportation) they promised to help me get a car and they never followed through (BRAG program)

15. Intensive Employment Services

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- 6003 coach was not helpful
- 6032 didn't want someone to help her wanted to do it alone
- 6098 (E2) Didn't like E2 worker
- 6099 (E2) Rude E-2
- 6135 case worker didn't believe client or job tracker that jobs weren't available.
- 6137 nothing happened removed from plan
- they never showed up to help
- 6177 (E2) nobody is hearing me that I can't read
- 6204 (job coach E2) coach didn't follow through with anything
- 6216 (job coach E2) my coach wouldn't follow through so they cancelled me and said it was my fault
- 6246 (job coach E2) coach honked for her 1st time never met her before and client went out to find out who she was and coach got scared off and left
- 6256 (job coach E2) domestic violence
- 6257 (job coach E2) got a job quickly
- 6300 (GROW program) went to work
- 6455 Was same thing as normal job search, same jobs and would rather do it in town than far away

16. Supportive Services

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- said she could have child care for school and work, then said NO.
- DWS never gave bus pass! Offered to give \$25 bus pass but they never gave it; only gave 7 bus passes.
- 6216 didn't need it
- 6217 worker said I didn't qualify because my kids were supposed to be in school
- 6239 couldn't take kids out of house and couldn't find anyone to come to house
- 6259 clothing store was never open when I was there
- has own partner
- sister watch kids, so she didn't take advantage of this service

17. Partner Programs

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- did interview, but not receiving help because of internship-acting as back-up
- 6118 Emotional issues
- 6180 (voc rehab) too intimidating
- was already working at the time and didn't feel it would be helpful
- 6234 (voc rehab) DWS offered it but then she never heard anything from them
- 6300 (voc. rehab) moved
- (voc. rehab) worker quit and new one was supposed to call but never did
- 6338 (voc. rehab) too many other meetings to attend to follow through
- 6357 (voc. rehab) they won't help until she gets her CDL license
- (voc rehab) it was too much with DCFS expectations

Why Respondent was not able to engage in a particular activity or receive a service:

1. Assessment (skills testing)

2. Assessment (conciliation, etc.)

Requested but not received Other:

"Can't do it until you follow through with mental health counseling"

3. Basic Education

Requested but not received 5. Other

- "Can't do it until you follow through with mental health counseling"
- 6076 Said client should get a job to be able to support her kids
- 6114 Couldn't complete due to health problems
- 6137 told her to just work and that she didn't have enough time (she had 24 months left)
- not enough time left on financial to go to school and they wouldn't pay for child care
- 6171 time was too late on assistance when I asked
- 6177 (HS/GED) it took too much time to learn to read

- 6187 (HS/GED) client doesn't know why they didn't help her
- 6217 (HS/GED) counselor said, "why waste my time and yours?" and wouldn't let me do it
- 6218 (HS/GED) my months were almost up and they said there wasn't time to complete it
- 6227 (HS/GED) I had been on cash too long
- 6231 (HS/GED) was already enrolled in night school on her own
- 6237 (HS/GED) I had to work and didn't have enough time
- 6244 (ESL) SS card was more important so I could work
- 6247 (HS/GED) employment counselor never sent/gave the info to the client
- 6257 (HS/GED) got job and quit
- 6265 (HS/GED) worker didn't agree with my plan; no SS card
- said can't help because not legal here
- 6351 (ESL) I didn't know this was available
- 6359 (APPLIED TECH) because she was over 18
- 6366 (HS/GED) "they never got back to me about it so I didn't ask again"
- 6367 (HS/GED) "I don't know why"
- 6392 I am not a citizen. I had to do as they told me
- 6438 (HS/GED) too close to the end of my 36 months
- 6476 (HS/GED) said I didn't have enough time to finish
- Utility assistance—the employment counselor said the "need didn't suffice".

4. Employment Related Education

Requested but not received Other:

- 6019 no money
- not enough months left to complete
- "it just never happened"
- Already used 36 months and was on extension
- 6075 3-4 year program and she only had 2 yrs on assistance so worker said DWS wouldn't support it.
- Too educated because graduated high school
- 6094 Not for Stevens Henegar college.
- 6095 Said it was too late
- Employment counselor didn't think I should do it: Told couldn't have ir on her plan-needed to focus on full-time employment
- 6168 too close to time limit
- 6176 (applied tech) "worker didn't think I was smart enough"
- 6204 (applied technology)- they said to get a job
- 6206 (short term tech/commun ed) because she's not a citizen
- 6274 (associates) not enough time left when I asked for it
- 6365 (bachelors) said they would only help for 2 years but not 4 years
- 6398 (applied tech) they never told me my test scores and never followed up with me
- 6408 (applied tech) said time left was too short (asked @ 20 months)
- 6412 (applied tech) DWS wouldn't pay for it
- 6420 (applied tech) they said I only had 2 months left so not enough time to finish
- 6432 (applied tech) was told to get a job instead
- 6447 (bachelor degree) not enough time left to complete
- (short term tech/comm. ed) wanted to go to cosmetology school, they told her her assistance was almost out.
- 6467 (bachelor degree) not enough time per DWS
- No reason given. They just said no.

5. Job Search Assistance (workshops, etc.)

Requested but not received Other:

- 6206 because she's not a citizen
- 6348 because of lack of SSN or legal papers to work
- 6414 worker only wanted her to get a job
- 6509 Employment counselor didn't help.

6. Job Search Assistance (job search/connection)

Requested but not received Other:

- 6206 because she's not a citizen, and had no green card (lost it and couldn't get a new one)
- 6244 I was told I had to get a SSN before I was eligible to receive help to work
- 6441 illegal no documents
- received card in mail saying not qualified undocumented
- 6509 Employment counselor didn't help.
- 6524 Don't know why.

7. Work Site Learning

Requested but not received Other:

- 6103 They didn't know what I was talking about
- 6131 counselor didn't know anything about it
- 6200 (on-the-job-training) none available
- 6301 Said it was not offered by DWS
- 6432 (WEAT) was told she needs to be named to do it
- 6455 (WEAT) said it was only for single people without kids and that she was able to work another regular job also told her they didn't have it anymore
- 6524 She would forget I asked and then say they had none.

9. Mental Health Counseling

Requested but not received Other:

- 6187 couldn't do mental health counseling and Project Reality at the same time
- she was denied medicaid because she was on unemployment

10. Substance Abuse Counseling

11. Family/DV Counseling

Requested but not received Other:

- 6232 they said it wasn't their problem
- 6256 didn't need it
- 6296 only social worker could refer

12. Physical/Medical treatment

Requested but not received Other:

- 6024 CAT Scan
- 6093 Until insurance kicks in, they said they couldn't help.
- 6114 Still in process of going
- 6120 Drugs
- 6144 can't afford no medicaid anymore since 9/02
- for Hep C shots weren't eligible for Medicaid anymore because kids left the house was told she needs to pay \$50 to be eligible for a different health care plan.
- 6331 worker didn't believe that I had the problem and said there are plenty of things I can do, like operate cash reg.
- 6509 Employment counselor never followed through.

13. Life Skills

Requested but not received Other:

- required parenting classes but wasn't eligible because no DV was present in relationship
- 6182 too busy with work and life
- they said they'd get information on it but they never followed through with it
- 6512 She never turned in my paperwork for childcare (client has stamped/dated copies showing she turned them in).

14. Life Skills (resolving barriers)

Requested but not received Other:

- Took 2 months to approve then it was two weeks before closed.
- That is what I had to do myself (SSI)
- found out they could have helped when on cash, but not now
- 6076 (child care) never paid day care had to take kids out
- 6093 couldn't find anyone to take son to school
- 6095 (transportation) closed case
- 6096 (transportation) not enough time left on assistance
- 6135 counselor supported it verbally but didn't help (on paper)
- 6167 said ORS is doing it
- asked for bus pass and they said they don't do it anymore
- he said okay to get car fixed; I brought in receipt and he didn't pay for it
- worker didn't have time to help me
- 6203 (transportation) couldn't authorize it
- 6204 (transportation) didn't give a reason, but wouldn't help fix or register car
- 6206 (ORS child support) because she's not a citizen
- 6227 (pursuing SSI) did it on her own because worker wasn't helpful
- 6236 (transportation) case closed
- 6239 (child care) couldn't take kids out of house and couldn't find anyone to come to house
- 6243 (transportation) time was up
- 6258 (transportation) car was too old to help her fix it
- 6260 (transportation) can't remember why
- 6262 (pursuing SSI) said they'd help but never followed through
- 6366 (child care) "they never sent me anything when I asked for it"
- 6415 said she could not receive child care for going to school while on unemployment
- said there were not funds to fix a car if she wasn't working and just going to school

15. Intensive Employment Services

If not completed, WHY? Other:

- 6003 coach was not helpful
- 6032 didn't want someone to help her wanted to do it alone
- 6098 (E2) Didn't like E2 worker
- 6099 (E2) Rude E-2
- case worker didn't believe client or job tracker that jobs weren't available.
- 6137 nothing happened removed from plan
- 6172 they never showed up to help
- 6177 (E2) nobody is hearing me that I can't read
- 6204 (job coach E2) coach didn't follow through with anything
- 6216 (job coach E2) my coach wouldn't follow through so they cancelled me and said it was my fault
- 6246 (job coach E2) coach honked for her 1st time never met her before and client went out to find out who she was and coach got scared off and left
- 6256 (job coach E2) domestic violence
- 6257 (job coach E2) got a job quickly
- 6300 (GROW program) went to work
- Was same thing as normal job search, same jobs and would rather do it in town than far away

16. Supportive Services

Requested but not received Other:

- 6168 because of overpayment
- 6272 wanted child care so she could go to school but was told she didn't qualify
- 6317 Counselor wouldn't give bus money or money to fix the car and counselor said she shouldn't have had kids if she can't afford to take care of them.
- 6399 they said they were out of bus passes and I didn't get them
- said she didn't work enough hours to get child care so she had to quit
- "asked for bus passes and they said they didn't do it no more"
- 6414 client said she needed help with car registration but they wouldn't help unless she had a job
- 6416 no daycare without first getting a job
- it all fell through and they stopped helping
- she was an undocumented immigrant
- 6512 She said they'd have bus tokens up front, but they never did.
- They ran out of bus passes and I didn't get any.

17. Partner Programs

Requested but not received Other:

6138 told her to look for a job - too late (just gotten out of treatment)