COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA
PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

- - -

Room 400, City Hall
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Wednesday, April 26, 2000
10:45 a.m.

- - -

RESOLUTION 000036 - Authorizing Council's Committee on Health and Human Services to hold hearings on the City of Philadelphia's welfare-to-work efforts, including the Transitional Work Program, Philadelphia @ Work and Work Opportunities, and to investigate the effectiveness of such programs at placing and retaining former welfare recipients in permanent jobs that promote self-sufficiency, with special attention focussed on the length of job programs, the appropriateness of wages paid, the practice of requiring attendance and unpaid training, and the retention rates of former welfare recipient placed into permanent jobs

PRESENT: COUNCILWOMAN MARIAN B. TASCO, Chair
COUNCILMAN DAVID COHEN
COUNCILMAN FRANK DICICCO
COUNCILMAN W. WILSON GOODE, JR.
COUNCILMAN RICHARD T. MARIANO
COUNCILWOMAN DONNA REED MILLER
COUNCILMAN ANGEL L. ORTIZ
COUNCILWOMAN BLONDELL REYNOLDS-BROWN
COUNCILMAN FRANK RIZZO

- - -

VINCENT VARALLO ASSOCIATES, INC.
Registered Professional Reporters
Eleven Penn Center, Suite 600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 561-2220

4/26/00 PUBLIC HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

I N D E X

4/26/00 PUBLIC HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

(Index, cont'd.)

(*- Also submitted written testimony attached hereto.)

Attached Written Testimony

- Letter from David C. Florey, Director, Bureau of Employment and Training Programs, Harrisburg
- Rosalind Spigel, Area Director, Jewish Labor Committee
- PCCY
- C. Edward Geiger, Executive Director, Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia
- Deatra Butler, Work Opportunities Program Participant

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

P R O C E E D I N G S

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Good morning. Could we have your attention, we're ready to begin the hearing.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Marian Tasco, the Chair of the Committee on Public Health and Human Services, and this committee will now come to order. I would like to recognize that we do have a quorum of the Public Health and Human Services Committee in the presence of Councilman DiCicco, Councilwoman Reynolds Brown, Councilwoman Wilson Goode, Jr., and Councilman Frank Rizzo.

I'd like to have the clerk read the resolution, please.

THE CLERK: Resolution 36, a resolution authorizing Council's Committee on Health and Human Services to hold hearings on the City of Philadelphia's welfare-to-work efforts, including the Transitional Work Program, Philadelphia @ Work and Work Opportunities, and to investigate the effectiveness of such programs at placing and retaining former welfare recipients in permanent jobs that promote self-sufficiency, with special

attention focussed on the length of job programs, the appropriateness of wages paid, the practice of requiring attendance and unpaid training, and the retention rates of former welfare recipient placed into permanent jobs.

Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

Approximately one year ago, we found ourselves in these very chambers, anticipating the many changes and challenges that welfare reform would bring to Philadelphia. And prior to that hearing, we spent many months visiting different communities to prepare our families and citizens for the welfare-to-work initiative.

We are back today see how we have fared. We want to evaluate what has been successful and what may need some rethinking. We want to hear about transitions that families have had to make, and how they have succeeded. Clearly, we need to talk about training and education, child care, and transportation, wages and prospect for upward mobility. And we welcome your observations and suggestions.

I have convened this hearing with the

intent of sharing our findings with the State Department of Welfare to the end that we can achieve some modifications of the policies and regulations. I am deeply grateful for your willingness to come here today and to testify. And so I thank you for your confident and faith in our desire to represent you with you.

What happens in welfare reform is critical to the life of our city. We know that Philadelphia is home to approximately 50 percent of the welfare caseload in the entire state. There are, therefore, a great number of benefits that can accrue to the City. On the other hand, we have to sow seeds of greater discontent and frustration, and we do not want that to happen.

We also know that many of the programs are evolving. That is, the program that we have today on many fronts is more comprehensive and more responsive to the needs of our constituency than the program of last year. Consequently, we can anticipate that some of the problems that we are confronting today will be solved with greater success stories.

We are particularly concerned about

personalizing a program for a family. That is, creating a program that will actually move each family toward self-sufficiency, which will become a building block for continued growth and development.

We will be taking testimony from participants, providers, advocates, and examining their various perspectives. You will hear that we are doing some things very well. Nevertheless, there are some things that can be done better. We will see what they are as we proceed.

Are very pleased to have been asked by public unemployment project through the MOMs, Mothers on the Move, to hold and host these hearings. We are here today because of them.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And it is our intention to work with them to influence the State to make the changes and at least listen to the changes and recommendations that will be made here today. So this hearing was initiated because of their tireless work, and all of the many groups that support them, and you will hear testify today, as they have operated programs, worked

through programs, and have intimate knowledge and observation of what has happened but what good ideas can come forth to improve a program that has been put in place by the federal government and the State.

So as a way of introduction, we have a video that has been prepared by the Women's Association for Women's Alternatives (WAWA), and it is called "New Voices," is that right, Carol? And we're going to see this video, and then we will begin with our testimony, and we're going to have the testimony provided by panels.

And then after the video, we would like to have John Dodds, Yvette Miles, DeVita Armstead, Sonja Pough, Adrienne Jenkins, Kati Sipp, Shavell Gordine, Tracy Lester, Cynthia Rice, Bernadette Williams, and Gwyntha Carter to come forth, and we will have them again the testimony. These are representatives from Mothers on the Move, One Day at a Time, and the Philadelphia Unemployment Project.

So we will have the video, and then we will have the first panel to come forth. Thank you very much.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

We would like to put on the record that Councilwoman Donna Miller has joined us.

("The New Voices Video" by Women's Association for Women's Alternatives is shown.)

- - -

(Proceedings resume.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

As you can see, this video talks about three women and their journey towards self-sufficiency and, of course, it points out some of the obstacles they have had to overcome. And we certainly want more success stories, there can be more success stories. There are many obstacles. The day-care issue is one that is very real. And today, as we listen to the testimony from the people who are running programs, people who are in the programs, we will hear some of the problems that some of our participants in the program have faced and are facing, and we want to hear from them how they believe that the system can be improved to make it better for them so that we'll have more success stories.

And I don't know how many of you saw

20/20 just recently the other night, where a young lady in San Francisco was in a shelter and is now making $50,000 in Silicon Valley. Now, we would like to be able to have some of those success stories in the Philadelphia area, and there are a lot of women and men who can achieve that success, but we want to know how we're going to do that.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So now I'd like to have our first panel, and I called -- let's have Panel A. first, which will be John Dodds, Yvette Miles, DeVita Armstead, Sonja Pough, and Adrienne Jenkins come forward. If they are here, come to the table, please. And then we will have the second panel come up because I don't know if we have enough space for everybody.

(Witnesses come forward.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you for coming, and we appreciate your asking us to introduce the resolution and have these hearings today. Would you -- John, I imagine you're going to go first?

MR. DODDS: I think DeVita's going to go first.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. Would you please identify yourself for the record and present your testimony.

MS. ARMSTEAD: Good morning, everybody. My name is DeVita Armstead but first, before I start, I'd like all our MOMs to stand up and give they selves a hand.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: MOMs, Mothers on the Move.

(Applause.)

MS. ARMSTEAD: All the women in the program too, that's all MOMs, all the women in the program.

Hello. My name is DeVita Armstead, and I am a mother of 11 children. I was a participant in the Philadelphia @ Work Program, and I was placed on a job at the Philadelphia Unemployment Project. I have been hired permanently by -- to work with Mothers on the Move. Originally, I was placed as a receptionist, but I started training to be a community organizer, which I am now.

I have never worked up until now. This is my first job. Up until now, I have been raising my 11 children. Working has been a real

change. I really enjoy it but I have to adjust to dealing with my children part-time.

I missed a number of days from work to deal with some of my children, some of the problems my children have been having in school, such as fighting, playing in class, talking back to each other, back to the teacher. One of my children had to have a major eye operation. Also, I have been having problems with my child- care money. The Welfare Department is supposed to pay for child care, but the money is always late, and sometimes I have to take my rent money to pay my babysitter; otherwise, I won't have a babysitter and I won't be able to work.

I have gotten better at managing my children on my non-work hours, but I still have problems sometimes. A longer time at TWC would have let me still learn how to deal with those problems better. Once the summer rolls around, I am going to have to have a lot more problems because my kids won't be in school.

If I were still in a transitional job, that would be easier to deal with. I definitely think that the program should last up to 18

months. That would also allow me to get my GED, that would also help to make me more employable.

MOMs believe that we should be paid a decent wage. We are providing viable services and we are doing the same jobs as others. We should be paid for our efforts. I am getting a real paycheck now, and it's so much better than the minimum wage. The wage at Philadelphia @ Work is too low and it needs to be raised.

I had a great experience in the Philadelphia @ Work Program. I learned a lot, but I and other women in the program feel that we should have time to really get settled into a working mode and be able to increase our skills.

Mothers on the Move is asking for Philadelphia @ Work and Work Opportunities to provide 18 months of employment at $7 an hour wage and training that is a part of the paid work.

(Applause.)

MS. ARMSTEAD: The training needs to be more relevant and of high quality. With your help, we could make these programs better so that the women could move ahead with their -- so that we could move ahead with our lives and support our

children with our welfare.

This is life and death for so many families. Let's not skimp on these programs problems. The State has almost $175 million in welfare money that they haven't spent yet. Why not spend to it make these programs better.

(Applause.)

MS. ARMSTEAD: Too much depends on these programs really leading to self-sufficiency.

Thank you for having these hearings and listening to MOMs.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much for your testimony.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: Good morning City Council.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Good morning.

MS. MILES: It is a honor to be here this morning.

First I would like to let you know that my name is Yvette Miles. And I was at Philadelphia @ Work. I am a 34-year-old mother of 6. I have two sons, ages 13 and 14, and four daughters who range from the ages of 6 to 12. I live in the Olney section of this city.

I have been on and off welfare for about 12 years before I started at TWC, but I am not on welfare anymore. When I was at TWC, I worked here at City Hall, in the Department of Records. I am happy to be working, but full-time work is scary.

When you are used to staying at home with your kids, you might get bored, but you don't know what it is like to be working 40 hours a week either. I didn't want to go to work, but I knew because of the changes in the welfare system, I had to do it.

I want to talk to you today about what is needed to make this program longer. Six months is not enough time for us to be in these programs. The way I look at it, it takes six months to learn about the company you are placed in and to learn how to do the job and, at the least, another six months to actually get good at doing your job.

Women deserve to get enough training, because if you don't have enough training, you will go to a real job and they will tell you to do something and you don't know how to do it, and

that is embarrassing. I am the kind of person who learns something by doing it a few times. I'm a very fast learner, but I do need to learn things as far as hands-on, not by just hearing a fast explanation at one time.

Another reason that women need more than six months in this program is that women have to learn how to juggle their responsibilities as a parent.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: I have had problems around report card times. My kids' teachers -- excuse me. My children's teachers want to schedule conferences for me to come in and talk to them, and since I am either at work or at training, it is very hard for me at times to see them. This makes me feel less than a parent on hands.

People who work from 9 to 5 have a hectic life because you can't always get your personal stuff during your lunch hour. I need time to learn how to deal with my responsibilities of working and raising my six young children.

I also think that we need longer programs because we need to learn budgeting

skills. For me, I am not embarrassed to ask anyone that I know who has good budgeting skill to help me juggle my personal budgeting.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: One of the reasons that it is so hard to juggle bills is that $5.15 an hour is not enough money for anyone live on.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: Now that I have closed my case, the little bit of money is all that I have for me and my children. I don't even get food stamps or medical anymore. We need to make at least $7 an hour.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: I don't like the fact that I am at a worksite side by side with City workers doing the same job, and they get paid a lot more than I do. I don't think it's fair.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: Like I said before, I like working, I don't have a problem with going to work. Work is my welfare now.

I will be going to school for nursing eventually, and I am glad to be getting up each

morning, because receiving benefits kills your dreams. If you have dreams that you want to go in life, you can't sit home and think that it's just going to be coming to you. You have to get up and work for it.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: I don't want my dream of being a nurse -- and that's a registered nurse, not a CNA or not an LPN, but a registered nurse, I don't want that to be killed. I have children that I want them to look at me and say, "My mother is a survivor."

But in order for me and other women to achieve our dreams, we need a little more help, we need a little more time in these programs and a higher rate of pay. That's what we need. This is not of what we want; this is a necessity. Like if we need gas and water, that's a necessity.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: Longer months in these programs are a necessity, a higher rate in pay is a necessity.

And I would like to thank you for listening to me and sharing your time.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay, thank you.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

MS. JENKINS: Hello. My name is Adrienne Jenkins, and I want to thank Council for holding these hearings with us today. It's really important for you to understand what we welfare mothers are going through and that you just not hear about it from the people who run these programs. We are not here to trash the programs; we just want them to be better so we can succeed. I don't think that's asking for too much.

I am a mother of three and I have a grandchild. My daughters are 16 and 9, and my son is 11 and my granddaughter is 2. I live in the North Philadelphia area and I am in the Work Opportunities Program. I work at the Frankford Ministries as a receptionist right now. I have received welfare for about 12 years on and off, although I have been on and off the system for jobs in the past that I had. I have worked as a cashier, done retail customer service, been a housekeeper, a receptionist, I even done

telemarketing.

I've been in five of you all welfare-to-work since welfare reform happened. Connections failed me, PIC failed me, Greater Philadelphia Works -- they work with you, but I have something that stands in my way, which stops me from obtaining employment of my criteria -- because I have a criminal record.

And my thing is taxpayers, you all spend a lot of money helping us go through program to program to get us prepared for the workforce, but we can't get together for the workforce because we can't get the credentials we need. Like some the us in the program the last six months, we might need a GED, we go for the GED, and before that program is over, we don't accomplish the GED, 'cause we're moving to another program, so that means you got to redo your whole planning all over again.

And let me say if you all let these programs be 18 months, that gives you time to accomplish your GED for where you want to go at in life. And I feel as though the money is out there for you all with these programs. And we -- why

couldn't we get the help that's needed to us, that's due to us anyway.

And right now, I only have a month left in this program, and this -- then I will be out pounding the pavements on my own, looking for a job on my own. I did a resume on my own. I haven't got much help from Work Opportunities in finding a job might. They might tell me about a job opening, but there isn't any other help. I am just like anyone else off the streets applying for a job.

One of my main problems in finding employment is that I have a criminal record from when I was 18 years old. I got probation for that. My record has kept me from obtaining employment to my satisfaction. I know there are jobs out there, but Burger King and McDonald's is not where I want to go, thinking I can raise my family, you know?

And for me to get responses from jobs telling me, Well, you have the qualification but you have a criminal record and that withholds you from obtaining employment. So that's discouragement for me. I done took the steps to

try to have it expunged -- nothing's happening. So now all I could do is fight for and help somebody not go through what I'm going through.

As far as the minimum wage, it's a good start, but it's not enough, it's not enough. We are still receiving TANF while earning that 5.15. I look at it, if you take the TANF from us, the cash assistance that TANF's giving us, you all can give us $7 a hour.

(Applause.)

MS. JENKINS: And you all pay us for the wraparound, we coming out with a fair paycheck like anybody else. It's up to you to maintain and do what's needed to be done for you and yours, but if you don't -- I mean, we asking you all for help, just like you all want us to help you all stay where you all at, to go higher and higher. I mean, it's just, give us a chance like you all want us to give you all a chance. That's all we asking for.

Thank you all for you all time.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

MS. POUGH: Good morning. My name is Sonja Pough, and I would like to thank you all for hearing us out.

I'm a single parent of three children, and we live in Southwest Philadelphia. I have a boy, age 7, who goes to (unintelligible) Elementary School, and I have two girls, 5 and 11. My older daughter goes to Tilden Junior High School, and my other daughter isn't in school. My sister watches her during the day.

I've been on and off of welfare for about ten years, and I worked doing security, dietary, day care, and telemarketing. I was in telemarketing last year for, like, nine months. Welfare told me that I couldn't stay there because I didn't meet the qualifications or the requirements. I had to come and go to school.

Now I'm doing telemarketing and I'm working. You know, why bother me? You know, I'm trying to maintain my home part-time, and they told me that I had to come to TWC, which at the time, I wasn't doing nothing there, doing wraparound? Let me tell you all about wraparound.

(Laughter.)

MS. POUGH: Wraparound service, I have been there since March 6th. In wraparound, we didn't do anything -- and I'm not trying to slander wraparound because some of the people there were good and some of them wasn't, but we sat in a classroom ten hours for one week, and we did nothing, we didn't accomplish nothing.

And I'm so happy that I'm with my boss now, you know, for the six months. We have wraparound at her, you know, facility now. And I'm glad to be with her.

I'm still having problems with my children, number one. But I'm maintaining, I'm taking care of my children. I go do my job and come home and I'm with my children. So, therefore, I'm, you know, working. I'm being a mother. Now I really know what it is to be a mother and a parent.

The $7, you know, I want the $7 an hour 'cause I'll be able to close my cash account, and it would be great.

I believe the program should be extended 18 months. Six months is not enough time. You know, you have some women who can't

read or write, don't have their GEDs, and they're being pushed out after six months, and what are they going to do? I don't understand it at all. They just boost us up to fail us, that's what it is.

(Applause.)

MS. POUGH: The State has a lot of this welfare money, and they're not using it. They should be using it to improve the programs. If you all giving us 5.15 to do the 20-hour service, why not give us the 5.15 for the 10 hours wraparound that we don't get paid for.

(Applause.)

MS. POUGH: Some of the women -- like in my own group, we have about 53 girls. I only know one girl that got hired -- City Hall. And I'm so happy for her. She's permanent here in Traffic Court, one girl, one.

(Applause.)

MS. POUGH: Out of 53 girls, one girl? I mean, it's crazy. Then I know a lot of girls that photocopy. That's not training, that's not helping 'em for the six months -- sharpening pencils, shuffling papers. That is not enough, I

really don't think it's enough for myself. I really don't.

What else did I want to talk about, let's see.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Could I ask you a question while you're thinking there. You said you were working at a job as a telemarketer.

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And then you were taken out to go to --

MS. POUGH: TWC -- Transitional Work Corporation.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: How long did you work as a telemarketer? Are you saying you were taken out during the day or --

MS. POUGH: No, they told me I didn't meet the requirements.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: How long had you worked as a telemarketer?

MS. POUGH: Nine months.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And then they told you weren't quali -- didn't meet the criteria?

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And then they put

you where?

MS. POUGH: At TWC, Transitional Work Corporation.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So what did you do there?

MS. POUGH: This is where I did the wraparound. I started March 6th. I stopped my job in February, and I started TWC March 6th.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And what do you do there?

MS. POUGH: Oh, I don't go there now, and I'm with my boss at QUADS, 52nd and Masters -- Qualified Unique Alternative Development Service.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. What you were you doing at TWC?

MS. POUGH: Nothing.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Nothing?

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: I have a question.

MS. POUGH: I'm serious, I was doing nothing.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Councilwoman Miller?

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: I have a question for you too, Miss Pough.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Shh, shh, could we have it quiet, please.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: When you said that "they," meaning the welfare --

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: -- your caseworker said you did not meet what requirements, whose requirements? Welfare's requirements or the telemarketer's requirements?

MS. POUGH: Welfare requirements?

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: And what are they -- what were they?

MS. POUGH: 20 hours. You had to be working either 20 or more hours. And then I only got paid 1st and the 15th.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Well, how many hours were you working at the telemarketing job?

MS. POUGH: It varied from, like, 15 to 20 hours.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Okay, so it was the hourly working requirement that you were not meeting.

MS. POUGH: Yes. And I was struggling, maintaining myself, working part-time. And welfare told me that I couldn't do that, I had to come, you know, to TWC.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: So that you --

MS. POUGH: I could have stayed at telemarketing for that --

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: So that --

MS. POUGH: -- being paid 6.50 an hour.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Okay, so that you could get a 20-hour-a-week job, that's why they told you that you had to come back?

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Okay. I just wanted to understand that 'cause that wasn't real clear.

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: So now you're working a 20-hour-a-week job?

MS. POUGH: Well, it's through the six months, through TWC.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Right.

MS. POUGH: Through welfare.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Okay. I have TWC

workers in my office.

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: And I've had people on the Transitional Work Program.

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: So I'm, you know, pretty much familiar, but I just was kind of confused that if you were working, how you had to come back.

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: And start all over again.

MS. POUGH: It's in the form, saying I had to come in to them because I didn't meet the requirements.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: And that was specifically to help you gain whatever skills, knowledge, competencies you needed --

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: -- to go back out?

MS. POUGH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: And get a 20-hour-a-week job.

MS. POUGH: Yes. When I could have

stayed there --

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Stayed there --

MS. POUGH: -- and made --

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: -- and work your way up.

MS. POUGH: Yes. Even it was for part-time.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Right.

MS. POUGH: You know, 5.15 to 6.50. They just took from me instead of trying to help me.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I may have some questions later.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay.

MS. POUGH: Okay, thank you for your time and I appreciate you hearing me out.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: John?

MR. DODDS: Okay. Yeah, my name is John Dodds. I'm the Director of the Philadelphia Unemployment Project and one of the organizers for Mothers on the Move.

We very much appreciate your --

Councilwoman Tasco's willingness to look into these programs that are designed to help women transition from welfare to self-sufficiency. These kinds of programs are of extreme importance due to federal welfare reform, which ends welfare assistance to families after receiving five years of welfare in a lifetime. State law also requires recipients to be at work after 24 months or lose their benefits.

As you already know, you're hearing from women who take part in the programs, and these women desperately want to succeed so they can take care of their families and maintain a decent lifestyle. I wanted to summarize the positions of Mothers on the Move on the welfare-to-work programs.

First of all, the advent of welfare reform has created a potential disaster for poor women and their children.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: The expectation that thousands of welfare recipients can all find work in our free-market economy is one that we at PUP have always found to be totally unrealistic. The

reality of welfare reform has taken place during the longest economic expansion in 150 years has somewhat reduced the potential damage. The fact that the State is restrained from cutting off of welfare rolls does not change the fact over 8,000 Philadelphia mothers who must be working under Act 35 are currently not employed. Thousands more will be joining that number as time goes on.

With the passage of welfare reform, we saw the need for new kinds of support for poor people in Pennsylvania. We joined with Senator Vincent Hughes in an effort to create public jobs for thousands of people being forced from the welfare rolls.

Job Opportunities and Basic Services are jobs bills introduced in Harrisburg in 1997 that attracted much attention and support around the state; however, with the Republican-controlled legislature, the bill was never passed. Its need was recognized, however, and is the basis for the programs we are talking about here today.

The City created the Philadelphia @ Work Program using federal welfare-to-work funds,

State TANF dollars, and a grant from the Pew Foundation. Philadelphia @ Work provides a 25-hour work week, six months work experience at 5.15 an hour, with 10 hours of unpaid training. Later on, just prior to the 24-month deadline for Pennsylvania recipients to find work, Governor Ridge announced the Work Opportunities Program, which also provides 25-hour per week, six-month jobs, at minimum wage, with unpaid training.

These programs have their flaws, particularly Work Opportunities, but they're a step in the right direction. They have given with limited work histories and often limited educations an opportunity to work. We have found that the vast majority of women are positive about being at work. Women feel they are moving in the right direction by having a job. However, the MOMs are not as positive about the length of time on the job, they're not positive about the pay or the training that they receive.

We see both Work Opportunities and Philadelphia @ Work as the beginning of programs that will increase the number of jobs available in the City of Philadelphia and provide strong

foundations for mothers to move toward self-sufficiency. We have put forward several items we think need to be changed, however:

MOMs believes the current 6-month program should be extended to 18 months;

We believe the program should offer a longer time of employment to allow people to really settle into a job, fully learn the responsibilities, and enhance their future employability by having a long-term job on their resume;

We believe the program should run for 18 months for recipients who want to remain. An 18-month position would actually be a job, not just another program.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: Placement activities can continue to move people into the private-sector jobs, but by making this a longer-term job, women will come out of the experience much more suited to the demands of the private sector. They're also more likely to end up in a situation where their employer wants to find a way to keep them in permanent employment.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

A major concern with welfare reform is about problems of retention for recipients and other entry-level workers. Allowing recipients a longer-term employment before they go into the private sector should help mothers do better with retention. It will allow them to make the change from full-time mother to a working mother before they have to confront the often harsh standards of the private sector.

According to the Transitional Work Corporation's, TWC's, February monthly status report, only 203 women were enrolled in Philadelphia @ Work. The program was designed to employ 750 at a time at 1500 per year. The low numbers reflect poor coordination with the Welfare Department and other issues within the program.

But the lack of numbers of women in TWC may also stem from the fact of the 5.15-an-hour wage that's being paid to the mothers. This wage is almost an insult in 1999.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: The minimum wage is being held hostage by politics in Washington and should not be the standard used to pay people in the City

of Philadelphia. If the wages were higher, we believe there would be a rush of welfare mothers to go to work in Philadelphia @ Work and Work Opportunities.

We also should be sending a message to recipients about the value of their labor, which the current minimum wage does not send. We believe that workers -- and I emphasize "workers" -- in this program should be paid at least $7 hour. Our survey shows that all women who responded to date feel that 5.15 is an inadequate wage. Also, similar welfare-to-work programs in other cities pay more than the minimum wage.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: New York City's new jobs program pays $7.50 an hour, Baltimore pays 6.10, and San Francisco pays 6.26. Why does Philadelphia pay minimum wage?

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: Also, training is important for people leaving the welfare rolls. However, the training portion of these programs needs to be strengthened. Attendance at training has been an issue, and the majority of the women feel the

training has not been high quality in Philadelphia @ Works.

Sanctioning women out of the program for not attending training is one approach that has been tried. However, a better approach might be to pay women for their time and training.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: Training is not optional to participants; they must attend. Our survey found that nearly all those responding felt they would be more likely to attend if training was paid. Most private-sector workers are paid for their time in training, and this incentive could raise the wages of mothers and also increase their incentive to attend.

Training is a much bigger problem in the Work Opportunities Program. No formal training is provided to participants, although they are required to participate for 10 hours in the weekly wraparound. Funds must be made available for women to get quality training in areas that can enhance their employability. And certificates should be provided for women so that they have something when they leave the programs.

Raising pay and making training part of the work week would have another benefit, as it would allow women to leave the welfare rolls while they are working. Why should mothers gainfully employed being using up their five-time lifetime limit to welfare? A modest $7-per-hour wage at 35 hours a week would allow women with 3 children to leave welfare altogether.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: At the current minimum wage, nearly all workers in this program are still on public assistance. This should not be.

Such changes would mean we are actually creating real jobs in the City of Philadelphia. Jobs in the City are important for women with children and child care. Being long distances away from home in the suburbs with poor transportation is not a good idea for single parents concerned about the well-being of their children.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: Some would say that with such a strong economy, it's not appropriate for the government to be creating jobs. However,

welfare reform, by pulling out the safety net from under poor families, makes such job creation essential.

I'd also like to point to other government-creation initiatives like the Empowerment Zone. Hundreds of millions of dollars are put into private-sector subsidies, and the result is minimal employment for those in need of work. Philadelphia @ Work and Work Opportunities Programs target those in need and actually create jobs and salaries to go to the women who need them in return for our public investment.

Let me just say that those are some of the specific issues we should raise regarding the Work Opportunities Program run by the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation. This program has been mismanaged and poorly designed, and it's been plagued with staff turnover.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: They have had a difficult time placing women into work slots and have provided very minimal supports to women while they're going through the program.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: Work Opportunities has an almost nonexistent job placement system. When we brought this to the attention of dozens of Mothers on the Move who are facing the end of their placement to the Work Opportunities officials, we were told that we had to get them resumes. In six months, Work Opportunities had not even prepared resumes for these women who are being prepared to go to work. Now, that tells us something about how that program is run.

Changes are now being made in the program, and more resources are being put into it, and we're happy for that, but the women who have already used up their time, with no training or no placement services have been done a disservice.

Both the State and the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation must provide resources to make this program a real stepping stone to self-sufficiency and not a throwaway, last-resort program. The women treat this program seriously, and PWDC and the State must do the same.

Lastly, I want to talk about child care. Mothers are concerned about how child care

is being provided. Delayed payments of child care money has been a very big problem. Child care money comes six to eight weeks after the care has been provided, and many mothers are put in a bad position and even have to leave their jobs. Child care payments come this late even if there is not a problem with the monthly reporting. If there is any problem with the monthly reporting forms, there could be delays of up to three months and more for child care.

Now, the State has instituted a vendor payment system for licensed day-care providers so that they could get their money on time, and this is a good thing. However, the vast majority of women we have talked to have their children watched by relatives or close neighbors, and their payments are tied to a monthly reporting system with long delays.

If women are to work, we must make sure that their child care is in place and on time. All child-care providers should be placed on a vendor-paid system for regular payments, including grandmothers who are taking care of children, including relatives and neighbors.

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: These welfare-to-work programs are not the answer to all the problems that are resulting from welfare reform. Many families are going to need welfare beyond the five-year limits. Some women are better off caring for their children and raising strong families than working in menial jobs.

But we have found that most women very much want to work and they want to succeed for themselves and their children. These programs are a start to helping mothers make it, but it can't be done on the fly and it can't be done on the cheap.

Let's provide the time and the training to make women ready to succeed. The resources are there to make this happen. Harrisburg has over $175 million in unspent welfare funds that must be spent for the poor. Let's put some of these funds into better job programs that will prepare women to work --

(Applause.)

MR. DODDS: Programs that will prepare women to work and provide services for our

communities. The stakes are high for our neighborhoods and for the thousands of women and children in Pennsylvania and across the nation.

Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much for your testimony.

We had asked the representatives from the Department of Welfare in Harrisburg to come down for the hearings today, but they are having a -- they sent a letter to us stating that they were in an annual employment training and education conference on the 26th through the 28th, and they have submitted a letter outlining some of the things that they are doing.

And maybe I should read this for the record -- we'll put it in the record, and I'd like to read it because I don't know if they really address some of the issues that you have raised this morning, which are real valid issues. And we hope that some of the people here in Philadelphia who are working in these programs can offer us

their ideas on what they're doing as local advocates to address some of the concerns that you all have raised here this morning.

First, before I read the letter, are there any questions on behalf of our -- I'd like to recognize Councilman Ortiz, who has joined us.

(Applause.)

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Mr. Dodds?

MR. DODDS: Yes, sir, Councilman?

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: The Work Opportunities Program, who runs that program?

MR. DODDS: It's the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation. It's a State program that's run through the old PIC, which is now the PW -- Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: And the wages that are paid in those jobs are just minimum wage?

MR. DODDS: 5.15, yes.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: And what are the benefits, if any?

MR. DODDS: There's no benefits.

MS. MILES: And no benefits.

(Laughter.)

MR. DODDS: It's 5.15 an hour, that's it. Because it's 5.15 an hour, most of the people are still on welfare so they have the benefits that come with welfare. People are not able to leave welfare on these programs.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Do we have any clear numbers from the Welfare Department at all in terms of the individuals and families that have gone off the welfare rolls and where they're at at this point in time?

MR. DODDS: Well, the numbers are down, but I don't think they're tracking where the people have gone very well. And the numbers are down basically because the economy has been good, but there are still tens of thousands of people --

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: But there is no tracking.

MR. DODDS: As far as I know, there is not a clear tracking of where people go when they leave.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: So we don't know whether they're doing better or worse or whatever it is.

MR. DODDS: That's correct.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: We had -- again, you know, all through the last year and a half of last year, we tried to put into place a living-wage legislation for the City of Philadelphia. Your testimony and the testimony of the other individuals makes it even more clear that we need at least a minimum living wage bill from the City of Philadelphia as to what we can control.

(Applause.)

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: So I would hope that my colleagues can join us this time around and maybe hold hearings on that, because it is imperative, because if you hear -- in terms of child care, you know, you didn't even mention what -- how many slots we have available with child care, the accessibility of child care for welfare mothers, if it's there at all. Is it there at all? Is it accessible and affordable and available?

MR. DODDS: Well, I mean, the main issue we've seen is that the payments just come so late that people really get fouled up with it. I mean, the child care money is available but they're not -- people get their checks two and

three months behind, and it's really a problem. And then you're trying to get somebody to watch your kids on credit and -- DeVita can speak to that more than me, she's been through it. It's a difficult problem.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Nobody wants to watch your kids on credit, no matter how nice they are.

MS. ARMSTEAD: They ain't going to watch them on credit.

No, listen, excuse me. When I was in Transitional Work Corporation -- I have 11 kids, and 8 of them had to be watched. And, actually, they had to be tooken (sic) to school, for the ones that was in school, and I have three babies at home. So my child care payments was late, and I actually had to take my rent money and pay for my babysitter. And in that time, my phone had got cut off and my electric was about to get cut off, so I did go through a struggle.

And I did thank God that I did get hired at the Philadelphia Unemployment Project and that I am a organizer for Mothers on the Move because these women all in this room, this is

very, very serious.

(Applause.)

MS. ARMSTEAD: This is a part of your lives. You know, these women are trying, these women are motivated. Everybody in here is motivated. You know, they get in the program, they get motivated, but some of these women -- I never worked but some of these women like me never worked, don't have a GED, and what's the rush? Why are they pushing these women through these programs so they can end up back at the welfare office?

(Applause.)

MS. ARMSTEAD: So that's why it's so personal to me and I'm glad I'm doing what I'm doing because now that I have a job, I can help pull up some of these other women up as well.

(Applause.)

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Is there any attempt to coordinate with Community College, for example, in terms of training, or is that permitted as part of the --

MR. DODDS: Yeah, well, one of the problems is, in the ten-hour wraparound, they

could possibly contract with the Community College as part of the wraparound. At Work Opportunities, there's no training. There's a requirement of ten hours of training and there's no training. So people -- women are required to be somewhere and there's nothing being done for them.

I see no reason why they could not contract with Community College to run programs or any other reasonable training providers so that people get something and come away with a certificate or some kind of a program that they can show, that they can sell on the marketplace to get hired. It's not happening now.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: One welfare official told me work once that they can go out and work their ten hours and then they can go to Community College. And I asked them, I said, "When do they go see their kids?" and they had no answer to that.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Let me ask you a question on that, also about the training. Who determines the rules for the program? Is it the State Department of Public Welfare, or is it the local program?

MR. DODDS: Well, the State set up the rules for Work Opportunities and the City actually set up the Philadelphia @ Work requirements and program.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Following the State guidelines?

MR. DODDS: There was some interaction between the State and the City, but the local program is run -- was set up through the Mayor's Office and so forth.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Would the local have the option to provide a contractual arrangement with Community College to provide education?

MR. DODDS: Yes, they would.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: They do have that option?

MR. DODDS: Yeah. And I will say, the City program does have actual training, as opposed to the State program. It's not with the Community College as of now, but it could be, yes.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. What about Pennsylvania in relationship to other State programs in the access to training? Is

Philadelphia, in terms of quality of program content, where do we stand -- first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or forty-fifth? Or fiftieth?

MR. DODDS: Well, I don't know that. I mean, I think in some ways, we are ahead in that we have these program at all. Many states -- most states do not. So, I mean, in one way, we've got a good start. On the other hand, as DeVita said, why are we rushing women through these programs and so forth? We've got a good start, let's build out on it and make them decent programs.

So it's not -- we're not in the worst shape, but it's not enough, clearly not enough, and it needs to be better.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: So what happens to the 170-something million dollars? What happens to the money that is not spent?

MS. MILES: Well, you're asking that question, and right now, I see that the Mayor, which is John Street, is looking to find a place to make a stadium.

(Applause.)

MS. MILES: Now, can't we take some of

that money out of that $175 million and place it somewhere where we could have efficient day care for parents with children. 'Cause, see, some of these jobs require parents to work on weekends, some of 'em require parents to work at night, and we don't have everybody that's accessible to our needs to do this.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Our suburban residents need someplace to go and be entertained. I'm just kidding.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. Councilwoman Brown.

Could we have your attention, please.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Good morning, John Dodds.

You mentioned last year, and I'm very much aware of the efforts that were underway with you and Senator Hughes around minimum wage. Since so much of this is tied to what is and what is not happening at the State level, have there been any opportunities where you've had a chance to register these same issues with those at the State, since so much of what happens and doesn't happen rests with the State legislature?

MR. DODDS: As the Mothers on the Move know, we met with Feather Houstoun, the Secretary of Welfare, two weeks ago and brought these same issues to her. I think she was amazed to find that people actually want to work. She had a room full of women that want to work, and she couldn't say anything bad.

So we're hoping that that -- that we are going to have some impact. And maybe if Council joins with us and keeps pressuring the State, we could make some changes. What we're asking for is very little now. I mean, it's modest, what we're asking. It should be done.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Well, did you get any sense on what her next steps will be?

MR. DODDS: Well, she's supposed to get back to us. In fact, some of these meetings you're talking about today are probably dealing with these very issues, but we're not confident that she's going to make those changes, no.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And, finally, on the issue of child care, I completely, completely empathize with you ladies 'cause I too am a

working mother with a little one that has to be dropped off and picked up every day before and after work. So what kind of dialogue has been had with the State Department of Public Welfare with regards to the reimbursement since they control that; and, B, waiting lists? Any? Because if not, then that's another opportunity we need to look at.

MR. DODDS: They were -- Feather Houstoun was interested in the idea of vendor payments for the parents and the grandparents and so forth. Right now, the lobby of the day-care providers is much stronger than the mothers, so the day-care providers, the licensed centers are getting taken care of. The issue now is, can we take care of day care for the women who have their children with their neighbors and with their relatives?

And some others might also want to add to that.

MS. ARMSTEAD: Okay. Actually, I have like -- my two little babies that's at home now, they're with they grandmother, but I have a person coming out investigating and saying, how am I

getting to work every day, how am making it to work if somebody's, you know, not there watching my kids? Just like this man came out and investigated my home, this strange man came in my house, and my daughter didn't know who it was, but she started talking to him anyway. And he started asking questions about me, my children. I mean, if I didn't have a babysitter, I wouldn't be at work.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Sure.

MS. ARMSTEAD: So, you know, I just don't appreciate how they sent someone out to my house, a stranger. And I have a 14-year-old daughter that had a baby, I have a grandbaby. So she's, like, you know, recovering from having the baby, then she will go back to school in September.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Sure.

MS. ARMSTEAD: But no strange man was not supposed to come to my house and investigate anything. He was supposed to call me on my job and meet with me and meet with the provider, the one that's doing the child care for me.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And that's helpful

just in terms of the dialogue we need to have with the State around child care.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Yes, would you state your name for the record.

MS. RICE: Hello. My name is Cynthia Rice and I have five children in a household. I live in the Southwest Philly area.

And I'm a participant in the Work Opportunities Program. I now have been residing in the program for four and a half months. I now have two and a half months left.

As for myself, as a mother of five children, I'm very concerned about my child care. I work Monday through Friday. I even do overtime. Why do I do overtime? Because I'm trying to improve myself and better myself as a parent and to be successful, to get off of the welfare system.

And when it's time for me for my child care, I feel like I'm being very humiliated because I have to argue with the caseworker, I have to threaten the caseworker, I have to use authority with the caseworker, I have to go over her head with the supervisor, supervisor,

supervisor, supervisor.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: And supervisor and Dr. Lynch and then other supervisors and Don Stuvile (ph.). And then when I get to the top of the list, then my cash is in my ETP account.

And I'm tired of that and I want to know why, after all that, I wait two months, plus I only get 5.15 an hour. I take that, go to the check cashing place. That's $165 and they charge me $5 to cash it and I only have like $150 to spend. Then I got to take almost $40 of that for token money for that month and then turn around and take 20 more for the next month, then pay the child care. Then we got to eat, we might need some bread or some meat and look over and (unintelligible) don't have none. And where's the (unintelligible) coming from? That's what I'm saying.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: So this program for child care was set up for failure because all we doing is rotating and taking our check -- what we working and slaving for -- and paying it back into

the system.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: Now, that's my issue.

Now, my concern is about my child care. I want to talk about child-care benefits. I am concerned because I need my child care in order to work. I need it so that I can become self-sufficient and find a good, decent job. And every month, I am depressed, oppressed (unintelligible), and I'm getting ready to be jobless 'cause I don't have my child care on time.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: So how am I supposed to come ahead in society to get off of welfare and be self-sufficient if I don't have my child care on time?

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: If I don't have my child care on time, how do you think we are going to be self-sufficient? We don't have the support in the system, the system is not giving us enough support. We are single mothers who need that support and child care.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: I have to make my paycheck every two weeks and pay a babysitter out of what I earn through my training job. I only make 5.15 an hour. Of that money, I have to give half of that to my babysitter and make arrangements -- I said "arrangements." Then when you go to make the arrangements, she come up with all kinds of questions, 'cause she want to know, well, thinking you lying, you know, are you shooting some kind of game with her? And then you turn around, then you out of a babysitter. Now you trying to find the next babysitter.

Then if you call and explain that to your worker or explain it to your job site why I don't have no money, I don't have -- the money ain't in my account and they ain't put it in there, then they think you shooting some game, then you out of another babysitter, then you travel and find another babysitter.

I cannot go to work like this. I can't go to work depressed and oppressed and suppressed. I can't work like that. People are losing their minds out here 'cause they oppressed trying to find out how they going to survive and

make it with their children out here. We got bills to pay -- I got electric, I got gas, I got water, I got to eat, and I like to dress the best. So I need a decent job and some child care.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: My child care is important to me. I need it so that I can get a steady job. I want to work for my family to support them, I want to be independent and I don't want to keep paying on the system.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: So please put the support system in place so that I and other Mothers on the Move can move on to become self-sufficient.

(Applause.)

MS. RICE: Thank you for listening to my testimony, and please help us mothers be self-sufficient and fix the child care system.

God bless. .

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: You know that we're going to be spending taxpayers' money. You know, we're going to be putting forward around close to $500 million to make rich people richer.

(Applause.)

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: You know, to build some stadium. So remember that.

But we complain when we -- we start complaining when we cannot pay working people more than 5.15 an hour and some benefits. You should see -- you should see when we had the living-wage hearings, how all of those individuals that get tax breaks from the City, that get land from the City, that get grants from the City so that they can build their businesses, you should have seen them all here testifying against the living-wage bill.

But no one -- like I said, no one really comes forward and said, If we give welfare to the rich, why not give some welfare to the poor? Nobody talks about that.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. Who's next, John? Do you have some other --

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

MR. DODDS: We have the next panel, Councilwoman.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: The next panel, okay. Kati Sipp, Shavell Gordine, Tracy Lester, Bernadette Williams, and Gwyntha Carter.

(Witnesses come forward.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: After that, we will ask Mr. Jones to come forward, along with some of the other program providers so that they can talk about the programs and what they see as their support for making some of these changes.

Would you please state your name for the record. We'll begin with this young lady.

MS. SIPP: Sure. Hello. My name is Kati Sipp, and I'm a researcher and organizer for the Philadelphia Unemployment Project. I'm testifying today about a survey of women in the --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Excuse me just a second.

As you move through the chambers, please move quietly. The noise is distracting, the stenographer cannot hear. This testimony has to be a part of the record so that we can glean from it the recommendations that we want to make

to the State, so we'd like to have your cooperation, please. So move around quietly.

Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Would you state your name again.

MS. SIPP: Sure. My name is Kati Sipp and I'm a researcher and organizer for the Philadelphia Unemployment Project, and I'm testifying today about a survey that of women in the Philadelphia @ Work Program that PUP carried out from August 1999 to February of this year.

The Philadelphia @ Work Program, as you've heard, is a Transitional Work Program for welfare recipients, pays participants 5.15 per hour, the federal minimum wage, for 25 hours a week in jobs at nonprofit organizations or public agencies. The jobs last six months, and they include ten hours a week of unpaid training.

We've provided the Council with copies of our survey, as well as the analysis of the data, so I'll going to focus my testimony on some anecdotal evidence that wasn't reported in the survey.

We contacted 103 participants in the

Philadelphia @ Work Program and asked them a series of 32 questions about their experiences in the program. Women overwhelming responded that they liked working, but they also felt very strongly that six months was not enough time for them to be on the job, and obviously, you've heard testimony to that effect already, and you're going to hear some more.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: We have personal knowledge of that since I too have women in the program who have worked for me and didn't feel it was long enough.

MS. SIPP: Yeah. Many of the women who have no work experience felt that they would need to build up a stronger work history and a longer work history before a private-sector employer would take them seriously.

And in addition, as you've heard, women who lacked a high school diploma or a GED felt that if the program were longer, then they would have a better chance of getting their GED, which would, in turn, make them more employable.

Most of the women reported that they were unable to live on the combination of minimum

wage pay and their reduced welfare grant. Despite the fact that this combination generally added up to a slightly higher amount of money than their original welfare grant, the additional costs that were created by the needs of work seemed to offset any minor advantage that women made as workers. Even though, Philadelphia @ Work, which is a relatively research-rich welfare-to-work program, and contributed to the cost of clothing and transportation and the State-provided subsidized day care, women still felt that their dollars were so stretched that they were no better off than when they had only received welfare. This perception contributed to many women feeling frustrated and depressed about their experience in Philadelphia @ Work.

I was personally surprised to see that when asked what they would consider to be a reasonable wage for the program, most women answered something between 6.50 an hour and $8 per hour. For a woman with three children, raising the wage to $7 an hour and paying for the training time would enable her to close her cash case entirely. This would help participants feel like

they were really moving somewhere because they would actually be moving off of welfare and be totally dependent on wages, and they would not feel so much like they're just cycling through another welfare program.

Many of the respondents reported serious problems with their subsidized child-care system. Most of the problems resulted from the design of the program, where women get reimbursed for their child care payments six, eight, and sometimes twelve weeks after care has been provided for their children. Needless to say, it is naive to expect that women who are earning minimum wage are able major to wait up to three months for repayment by the State. We heard countless stories of women who were choosing to pay their babysitter over their rent or over their other bills, and women who have lost jobs because their babysitters would no longer wait for payment.

As a mother of a seven-month-old girl, I've had my share of problems with day care, and I personally know the fear and frustration attached to leaving one's child with someone else. By

creating a system where mothers also have to worry about whether their babysitter will continue to work from one day to the next, the State has not served this population well.

After our initial survey of 103 women, we conducted a follow-up survey to determine how participants were faring once they moved into permanent work. We were able to recontact 70 of the original surveyed participants, and of those, 54 percent had found permanent work. Since the longest that any one of these women could have possibly held a job with six months, based on the timeframe of our survey, their retention data at this point is not statistically significant, although we will be recontacting women again in sort of six-month segments to see, are they keeping jobs, are they moving to better jobs, how are people being served by the program in its retention phase?

Wage information for the jobs that women are finding are fairly hopeful. Fifty percent of the women that reported having found work found jobs that paid between $7 and $9 hour an hour. Since the majority of workers had gotten

their job through Philadelphia @ Work's job placement services, this speaks highly of their abilities. However, of the women who found permanent work, over 60 percent found jobs that did not provide health insurance. The remainder had access to health benefits, although many had to serve a period of probation before they would be eligible for health care.

I'd like to thank the Council for allowing me to testify today, and especially Councilwoman Tasco for meeting with Mothers on the Move and sponsoring this hearing.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

Would you identify yourself for the record, please.

MS. GORDINE: Hi. My name is Shavell Gordine, and I'm a participant in the Work Opportunities Program. I live in the Feltonville section of Philadelphia. I have four children -- three boys and a baby girl. My children range in age from 10 to 9 months.

I've been on and off welfare for about seven years. There's times I just decided to go look for a job because I didn't want the, you

know, the hassle of welfare anymore. There's times that I left because I did have a job.

Right now, I'm working in Frankford Group Ministries. I've been there since December of 1999. I'm looking for a job in the mental health field. I have a deaf son and a autistic son, you know, so that makes me want to work with children and, you know, adults and families that deal with the same problems that I do. I'm very lucky because I do have a highly functional autistic child. He goes to a regular program, you know, a regular elementary school and a autistic program.

I did apply for one job, and I'm waiting for a response. I mean, like, I call them every day and, you know, I'm calling about the status of my application.

Right now, I'm working in the emergency assistance department at the Frankford Group Ministries. I help clients apply for, you know, crisis and applications, I bag food for people who need food -- we have a food bank, we have a clothes bank. And I might answer phones.

Unfortunately there's really no, you

know, real training there. It's the kind of job that I do want. You know, I do need some type of degree and -- not really a degree, even if I had my GED, that would help and I could get in and then maybe start at the bottom and hopefully work my way up to the top. But right now, that's not possible because when I got into Work Opportunities, my wraparound was supposed to be for, you know, GED education. And, evidently, there's no funds to help for that. So, I'm, you know, I'm just out.

I really -- I really enjoy my job, I really do. But if the only thing I'm doing is, you know, really copying paper, you know, and helping people sift through clothes, I mean, you know, what kind of experience is that?

I do get wraparound services, but basically, that psycho-support group, we work with -- we basically deal with the problems that we have that are, you know, causing us to not be able to find a job right now and the things that are getting in the way. I've been in this program for almost six months. I haven't even had a resume, I have never even met my case manager. And, you

know, like I said, I don't have a resume, so that's like the first start there. And to be honest with you, I don't even know to do a resume.

Minimum wage is not enough in my personal opinion. It makes us feel, you know, that that's all we're worth. And my personal opinion is, we're worth very much more than that.

(Applause.)

MS. GORDINE: We're strong women, we're out here, we're raising our children, and we're trying to teach our children values and to let them know, you know, you are somebody. But with 5.15, you know, really what can we do, what can we do with that?

I'd like to ask the City Council by helping us push the Work Opportunities Program to fund for a training program so that women like myself and all these other women can get real training. If we had a 18-month program, I feel that that would help me and, again, the other women get off of welfare forever.

Thank you very much for supporting us Moms on the Move, thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very

much for testifying.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Would you state your name for the record and could you summarize your statement. We have a lot of people who have to testify today, so if you could just kind of summarize what you're going to say, I'd appreciate it very much. Kind of brief it up.

MS. CARTER: Hello. My name is Gwyntha Carter. And I'd like to thank you for being here to listen to my views. I am here today speaking on behalf of myself and other parents in the program Work Opportunities.

I want to give you a little of my personal history. I entered this program December 11, 1999. I've been at 2 jobsites, 2 independent job searches, and 7 or 8 job fairs, per my caseworker. I have now been currently told by my district that I'm not in compliance with Work Opportunities, even though my case manager sent me out on these jobsites, sent me out on these job fairs.

The issue with child care, as far as what John Dodds was saying I want to comment on

that. They were saying that licensed vendors are being paid on time -- I'm a prime example that they are not being paid on time. I've been on Work Opportunities since December up until the present, and my child-care providers at Nicetown Boys Club have not been paid, although agreement with CAO, the County Assistance Office, has now been made that they were being paid. But, however, I'm considered overpaid because my case manager had me doing the wrong thing, so I have to pay back the money. If I'm being paid 5.15 a hour, how can I pay for child care and pay back some money to the CAO that I couldn't even pay in the first place.

I have four children, two of which are here with me today because they told my day-care facility not to send my children anymore until the status of my case manager and agreement between me and case manager and the CAO has been determined.

I've been bounced from program to program, I've been in Work Ops. Before Work Ops, I've been on an independent job search. Before that, I've been in -- maintaining job searches before and I've been in TWC -- not TWC, excuse me,

RTC, and none of them have been successful. However, I found a job on my own, which was exactly like a night clerk, which I have the skills for, which was paying 11.75 a hour, starting wage. I was denied child care because it was a overnight job and it was weekend hours, and they told me that they do not pay for overnight care, they do not pay for weekend care. There was my job right there, so I had to settle for work opportunities at 5.15 a hour against 11.75 a hour -- my own job that I went and found on my own.

Now I'm terminated from the program for good cause, but when I was in the program, if they didn't send me at a jobsite, I was sitting in a classroom, and everybody in the classroom was sitting in there talking -- notice I said "talking," not taking up a trade or learning a skill or, you know, doing something useful with my time.

I never met my case manager. She -- my caseworker at my district called my case manager to verify that I was in the program, which I was. However, my case manager denied ever talking to me. Ten minutes later, when I got off the phone

with my caseworker at the district, my case manager called me and asked me how I was doing. How does that (unintelligible).

Anyway, I've been placed on a job search since February, per my case manager. But before that, in January, I was working at a jobsite, which was clerical duties, which was fine. I was only at that jobsite for two weeks, that's all they required of me. Now, it was a clerical position, it was real good, I enjoyed the job. But how could I put two weeks of a clerical position on my resume and take it to somebody and say, you know, I would like to apply for a clerical position within your corporation but I only have two weeks of experience -- when nine times out of ten, a position like that, handling clerical issues and payroll duties, which is what I was doing, they going to want more than two weeks of experience, anybody's going to want more than two weeks of experience.

So I would like for City Council to back up MOMs and 12 to 18 months more in the program, as opposed to 6; $7 a hour, as everyone has pressed the issue, instead of 5.15, because if

we get $7 a hour, we can close our cash assistance and those mothers who do have their fathers paying child support, we could get that child support instead of it going to the county, and that could also help us in our financial situation.

(Applause.)

MS. CARTER: Now, I don't have -- my children are not in day care. My oldest two, they're in school. When they come home, they come at 2:55 every day. If I was to get called today or tomorrow from various places I put in applications, which I think I made a very good impression to them employers, how can I go to the interviews lugging my two children? That's not even going to look 'cause they're going to say, "She can't even get a babysitter to come to the interview, how can she work for our company?"

How can anybody look for a job without day care, and how can the county, the CAO, say they're going to provide us with day care, but it takes six weeks, seven weeks, eight weeks, three months for anyone to even get their child care money. And nine times out of ten, it's not going in the hands of the parents themselves, it's

supposed to go to the facility or the day-care provider, which is not happening. So, therefore, we're stuck at the end again.

How can anybody with little or no skills or someone who's never worked be in this program for six months without a certificate, without a GED. Some of these people in here can't even read and write, and some of these people are foreign or are trying to get their citizenship, and how can a six-month program benefit them when they try to go out in this workforce and try to look for a job by theyself (sic).

I come here to you today asking for maybe 18 months in this program, with quality training, because I don't want to sit in no classroom and talk; I could do that at home, on the phone and watch the stories ask.

I'm asking for $7 a hour instead of 5.15, because actually, 5.15 is nothing. Burger King and McDonald's pay more than that. And, actually, I went -- I went as my last means to the Burger King at the corner of my block, and you know what they told me? I was too qualified to be a cashier. I have very good skills, I can find a

job on my own, but my child care is my main barrier.

The system was designed to help families in need, but if they keep shutting the door on us, how can we go to them for help, and who are we supposed to turn to then?

Thank you for hearing my views.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Before we go to the next participants, I'd like to call Sherry Honkala up to make a presentation. She has another appointment this afternoon and she was due on earlier. So, Sherry, if you'd like to come forward and make your statement, 'cause it's in keeping with what these women are saying too, 'cause you represent Kensington Welfare Rights.

Thank you very much ladies.

(Witness comes forward.)

MS. HONKALA: Thank you very much.

It's a shame I got to be here and then try to figure out how to deal with the question of housing, which -- I think when we talk about

welfare reform, we got to make sure not to just talk about child care, but we got to talk about the fact that Philadelphia yet has been able to solve the question of the fact that we don't have any affordable housing whatsoever, and now if you go down the Office of Emergency Social Services, which I hope that Councilmembers know, that when you go to apply for emergency affordable housing, you can no longer -- when you entered the shelter system, you used to be able to get on the waiting list for affordable housing.

That list has now closed. You can no longer even get on a waiting list when you enter a shelter in Philadelphia to ever get any housing ever again in Philadelphia.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: That's for the Section 8 Program, right?

MS. HONKALA: Pardon?

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: That's for the Section 8 Program?

MS. HONKALA: For any -- any emergency housing whatsoever. And this just happened right before Christmas.

Like the commercial states that makes

the Kensington Welfare Rights Union sick when we turn on the television or listen on the radio, when we hear the young woman who says, "Who can speak for welfare recipients? I can," we as welfare recipients and formerly homeless people in Philadelphia say, "We can speak for welfare recipients. And for us, the picture is not very rosy."

Good morning, Councilmembers. My name is Sherry Honkala. Although people like to erase it from my history, I am a recent former welfare recipient and homeless mother who was sanctioned in Philadelphia as a result of the new welfare reform bill -- not 20 years ago, but as a result of the new welfare reform bill in Pennsylvania.

Having no money and fighting everyday to survive, I got lucky. It was like my child won the lottery. My son, Mark Weber, last month was in the number-one family movie in the country and is now a movie star.

(Applause.)

MS. HONKALA: I tell you my story because this is the story of a welfare recipient that people don't want to talk about. My life and

my daily struggle was no different than any of the women that have spoken here today. I, like the other women here, love our children, have worked all our lives to try and feed and clothe them, and we never hear about children that continue to fight and go on and have better lives, yet they had to deal with one barrier after another.

Without public assistance in my life, I never would have made it. My child would have never have become a movie star, let alone made it to the next year.

While the media tends to focus on the stereotypes, they generally don't focus on the barriers put before welfare recipient. Well, my child knows these very real barriers and isn't donating all of his money to a program or more shelters, but instead, he is dedicating all of his money to organizing and politicizing and building a movement of strong, articulate women and youth to end poverty Philadelphia and in America.

(Applause.)

MS. HONKALA: Because he knows, like KWRU, this is not about lazy welfare recipients who don't love their children, but he knows that

living in a city and in a state and in a country that has messed-up priorities, he knows that the reality is that given a chance, we too can overcome things and live beautiful lives.

Stories of how welfare reform is not -- we know the stories of how welfare reform is not working at the Kensington Welfare Rights Union. Yes, we continue to work in the area of Philadelphia, in which the number-one source of income is welfare, and the second is drugs. Yesterday, I spent the day with a young man, 23, trying to kick heroin. On Thursday, I spent a day with a young man who was doing life for a $22 robbery.

And, I'm telling you, I am tired and sick and tired of not only us, as young, single mothers not having opportunities in Philadelphia, but the welfare system is set up to not let us have the kind of families that we should all be able to have -- where families can stay together, raise their children, and live better lives.

Our Human Rights Houses are now filled with a different population of homeless families that live in them. For example, a homeless mother

who was once on welfare now is working at K-Mart, homeless, with three children.

Another woman, from Montgomery County, she goes out there to a factory every day, she pays her bills, she tries to pay her bills at the end of every month. She gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning, drops her kids off at 5 at day care, works from 7:30 to 4 o'clock, then goes home at 6 o'clock, where her children need her attention. She's now two months behind in rent and utilities.

And because she's disappearing from the welfare rolls, is that what we really call a success story? Is she really doing better once she's going to have to come to our office, needing some place to sleep, because she's considered a success now because she so-called works?

People working at the welfare-to-work programs and people who are on welfare or who are poor are human beings first and foremost. They need to be treated like that, like human beings who all, given an opportunity, can shine like stars.

Let's extend the six-month program,

let's invest more money into creating living-wage jobs. Welfare recipients are disappearing from the statistics, but they're not disappearing from misery and poverty and from the criminalization of poverty.

(Applause.)

MS. HONKALA: Let's concentrate on giving our youth opportunities instead of incarcerating them. Let's concentrate on the real blight in our city, let's concentrate on removing homelessness and poverty with the same passion as we have for removing abandoned cars.

Lastly, we encourage you to join us on May 1st, as we begin a bus tour around Pennsylvania to highlight what is really happening to welfare recipients. We will go to urban and rural areas in the state and show what is really happening to welfare recipients.

We will also be demanding on July 31st as we organize the biggest poor people's march to the front doors of First Union Center on opening day of the Republican National Convention.

(Applause.)

MS. HONKALA: We will make sure that

the poor will not disappear in America.

My son will be marching alongside me, and we will ensure that we track what is happening to welfare recipients. Because, after all, my son cannot leave his history behind him, because he knows that the people that he loves are still living below the federal poverty level.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much for your testimony. We appreciate it very much. Thank you for all the good work you do, and congratulations on a fine son. We saw you on television.

MS. LESTER: Hi.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Could you summarize your statement, please. We have a lot of people to testify.

MS. LESTER: Yes, I will. I will try to be as brief as possible.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay.

MS. LESTER: My name is Tracy Lester, and I'm with Philadelphia Unemployment Project, and I'm involved with this program for the last

couple of weeks. I'm also representing One Day at a Time, you know, as a recovering addict, and as a mother, a single mother.

I'm a 32-year-old woman who basically was raised on welfare, you know. So really, there is nothing that I haven't experienced involving this whole welfare-reform thing.

I'm hearing a lot of women complaining about this Program these programs. They're not all that bad, you know. They have their good points, they have their bad points.

It's my experience that, as a single mother, raising children, that the fundamental issue involving failure of the whole system as a whole is the fact that too many of the mothers have mental-health issues, housing issues, financial issues, because there is not enough money to support single women with children.

As a recipient of welfare, it's my experience that most programs do not offer training that's long enough. Six months to a year is not being realistic when considering the adjustments that many of us go through when making the transition from being homemakers to being

working moms.

In order for these programs to work effectively, the programs need to be more than 25 hours per week, so that women who are considering working full-time can get used to managing their time on a full-time basis. This is something that we're not used to doing. You know, when all you've ever had to do is stay home, go to the bank, get your check, your food stamps, you become kind of complacent in that system 'cause that's what you're used to doing. You know, it's a very hard transition when most of us have been born and raised on welfare. Not only for moms, but for fathers as well, dads as well, but most importantly, for the children.

Six months is certainly not enough time to learn about time management so that you get to work on time, budgeting so that you have car fare, lunch money, money for necessities, and money to pay bills. These are the skills that are needed to be successful in the workplace. Not to mention, time is needed to search for highly-skilled qualified professionals to care for our children while we're in training.

It's my experience that a lot of these women -- 'cause I tried to do it myself and I had my own demise at hand. And I don't mind being honest today about where I made my mistakes at. I was greedy. I seen so much money coming my way that I lost sight of what was important.

It's not one woman in here, if they're not honest with themselves, that can say that if they did it a little bit differently in connections with this child care money that they would be able to maintain a certain sort of life style. You know, we leave our children home alone and we collect that child care. We spend it getting high -- because I did it, and I know I'm not the only one that did it. We let our bills go and then we cry because people get tired of feeling sorry for us, you know. But it's reasons because of that -- it's stress, you know, a high level of emotional stress.

Also, individuals that are involved in these programs should be paid, you know, as an incentive. Nobody should have to go to any institution, be it college or a training program, for free. I graduated from Community College, and

believe me, I didn't go for free. You know, I went there for the education, but I also went for some sort of financial freedom as well -- be it a grant or a student loan, something for me to have some sort of income coming in, where I didn't have to worry about failure or how I was going to feed my children or pay my rent or pay my bills, you know, but this was before I decided to have a whole bunch of children.

You know, these are some of the things that women need to start thinking about too. What kind of choices do we make as women before we go out and have 10 and 12 and 13 children. You know, we're making some bad choices from the beginning. Now, I'm not condemning anybody because of that, but that's something that needs to be thought about too, you know.

And 5.15 an hour, $7 hour is a ridiculous figure in itself. Pay should be at least 10 to $12 an hour, and reimbursement for car fare, clothing, lunch as well as necessities should also be offered so that there's never an excuse to miss days of training. And these reimbursements should be received on time -- not

weeks and weeks late, causing everyone unneeded stress. Why not promote success as opposed to failure.

There should also be health care set up for families during their training as well as after so that the stress of worrying about medical bills would not become a barrier to becoming successfully employed. This health-care coverage should not only be offered; it should be free, quality health care, yet nondiscriminatory.

Not to mention, if 18 months is not enough time, more time should be allotted. Because a lot of people involved in these programs have more issues than others. Guaranteed job placement should also be offered, no matter how long it takes, so that time and money is not wasted.

Drug and alcohol assessment, individual counseling, and housing assistance should also be offered.

These are the things that, when put into place, will ensure success and a stress-free learning environment and a stress-free work place. These issues are certainly of the utmost

important.

However, I feel that the need for better health coverage is of the utmost importance. For many women, as well as men, poor health and the lack to pay for health care causes many of us to be unable to work. For example, I'm in desperate need of glasses. Yet the health care coverage provided by the State does not even cover the cost of eye glasses. Why is that?

Also, as a person who suffers from the disease of alcoholism, I find that my needs were not quite met. The inefficiency, the lack of concern, and most importantly, the lack of funds of the lack of allowing us to know where to find services for our addictions is very difficult.

Today, I've come to say we need help -- not just for longer periods of time in regards to welfare-to-work programs, but we need help -- we need help in regards to health care. We need better health care that's affordable or free, with qualified professionals who understand all of our needs as women with children, as well as single fathers raising children. I became stressed out completely because of the lack of knowledge about

what to do about health-care issues. Not only did I lose every job I ever had, I nearly lost my life.

I've come to think that somehow, there is some hidden agenda, that the people in positions of power, the people who claim to be qualified, failed me as a whole, as well as my children many times. When does this attempt at mass suicide stop? We --

MS. SIPP: Okay, thank you, Tracy, for your testimony. We do need the other women to be able to speak. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. LESTER: Thank you. Thank you for hearing me.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much, Tracy.

MS. LESTER: You're welcome.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: We hear everything that you're saying and we hear the frustration in your voice and your cry for help. Thank you.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Would you identify yourself -- you're coming next, you're coming

next, you're coming next, but we want to hear from some of these providers so that you can hear what their side of their program operation is, so we would like for you two ladies to testify, then we will call up the next panel.

MS. DANZY: Thanks for letting me testify.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Mm-hmm.

MS. DANZY: Hello. My name is Madesia, and I am a member of Mothers on the Move, I am a mother of three children -- two girls and one boy, and they are 13, 7 and 11 months old. We live in West Philadelphia now, but until December, we were in North Philly. I was born in Danbury, Connecticut, and I moved to Philadelphia when I was 10.

I have been on and off of welfare for about seven years. I was off of welfare for about a year, between 1997 and '98, while I worked at a Burger King in Bensalem, but I lost my job because of transportation problems. When I worked there, I took the R7 to work, and then walked a mile to get to work.

Right now, I am TWC. I started the

program on March the 13th. I work in the Records Department, here at City Hall, and I mostly deal with customers -- people come in and I pull (unintelligible) for them and I print them for 'em. I also do some filing and typing.

The thing I want to talk about is child care. I have talked to other mothers, and I know that lots of people have problems getting their money from the DW. I have been lucky so far -- my money was right on time. I think that allowing babysitters to be on the vendor system would be a good improvement because it would mean the babysitters would get paid right away, but I think it should be the mom's choice, because not everyone can be on the vendor system.

Right now, my daughter, my baby daughter, is watched by a relative. The system really wants me to put her in a day care center, but I would worry too much. She is too young to be able to tell me if something is wrong or if someone is abusing her. After that story about a baby being taped to a wall in a day care center came out -- that was just two weeks ago -- I know -- I knew I could never take my baby to a center

-- that's until she get older.

I need to feel good about where my daughter is in order to be a good worker. I can't be doing a good job if I have to spend the time, the whole time, worrying about what is happening to her. I would hate to pick her up and hear that she is in the hospital. She is shy, and I don't want her to be screaming and hollering because she doesn't know anyone where she is and no one is paying attention to her.

Thank you for listening to my story. Please help us succeed with the day care centers.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is Bernadette Williams, and I'm a West Philadelphia mother of five children -- two boys and three girls, ages 6 to 23. I also had another son who has passed away.

I have a high school diploma and over ten years work experience in the clerical field. I have worked at companies like CMA, Colonial, and GMAC. I have been on cash assistance for about

five years and I am currently in Philadelphia @ Work.

Originally, I was placed on a worksite in Representative Ronald G. Waters' office, but due to extreme verbal harassment and discrimination, because I was a welfare recipient, that didn't last, and now I am placed at TWC. I do filing, type reports, keep a log of people receiving Transpasses and other duties. Last year, I graduated from the OIC program, and I was placed on a job at Hawthorne Suites. After I worked there for a little while, they told me because they didn't have enough business, they were going to lay me off. They told me that they would call me back, but they never did.

I feel strongly that we need these welfare-to-work programs to be longer. I have a lot of clerical work experience, but I need to learn computer skills in order to get a better job. I have been on job interviews in the private sector, to temp agencies and employment agencies. And because I have no computer skills, they won't hire me. TWC has helped me to learn the computer -- I have already learned how to turn it on and

off, how to open up programs like Mavis Beacon Typing Tutor, and Microsoft Word, but they are trying to rush us out into jobs because the program only lasts six months. You can't learn a computer program in six months if you only go to class for a few hours a week.

(Applause.)

MS. WILLIAMS: I need to learn advanced computer programs like Microsoft Excel, and Powerpoint. I need to be able to do spreadsheets and presentations. At one time, I could type 40 to 45 words on a typewriter, and if I could get up to that speed on the computer, I could get a good clerical job that would allow me to take care of my children and myself.

Thank you for listening to me today. Please help the Mothers on the Move by extending these programs to 18 months.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you for your testimony, and I see you're juggling that baby there very well.

What we want you to do is not go away. We have some of the providers here, particularly people who run the Philadelphia program, who are -- I want them to respond to the comments that have been made here this morning, and to then, you know, we can come back after they have made their presentation.

We'd like to call on Ernie Jones, Mr. Greenwald, Carol Geortzel, Vivian Norton, and Linda Hicks.

And you are?

(Unidentified persons respond off mike.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Oh, yes, from Catholic Social Services, yes.

Why don't you begin, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you. Why don't you begin, Mr. Jones, since you're in charge of the big program here in Philadelphia.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And we would have

brought you up in the second panel had we thought of it, but we wanted to hear some of the comments from the participants in the program so that you can respond to what they're talking about.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

I have prepared written testimony, which I have submitted to you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Sure.

MR. JONES: And in the interest of time, I just want to get some of the highlights that were submitted in there.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: All of the testimony -- if you have any written testimony from any witness, the full testimony will become a part of the record. So if you want to summarize what you have to say, that would be fine, and we will put -- the full testimony will be put in the record, which is important.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

Initially, let me say, lest you believe that the only welfare-to-work programs in Philadelphia are the Transitional Work Corporation and Work Opportunities, I want to tell you that there are six different welfare-to-work programs,

four of which are actually operated under the aegis of the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation, I want to spend a few seconds talking about each of them and then perhaps try to address some of the concerns that you've heard today.

By far, the largest welfare-to-work program here in the City is a program called "The Greater Philadelphia Works Program." It is a federal initiative that was started in 1998, and it is targeted toward the most difficult segment of the welfare population -- those with no high school diploma, those with no work history, and those with drug and alcohol problems. Since the program has started, 9,025 individuals have been enrolled in the program, and a total of 6,254 have been placed in jobs -- these are unsubsidized jobs in the private sector -- at an average beginning wage of $7.11.

And, again, what you will find with most of these programs is that because they have been around probably less than two years, getting long-term retention figures is difficult, but we follow them for -- actually, in this program, we have statistics on three months after they've been

placed in the jobs, and about 50 percent of the people that are placed stay in after three months.

The next program I want to talk about is something called "The Single Point of Contact." We refer to that as the "SPOC Program." This program is the State's primary training program for welfare clients. For the past year -- and we're talking about July 1 up to now -- 2,352 clients have been enrolled in the program. Of that figure, 1,085 still remain and they are receiving training, 541 were negatively terminated from the program for one reason or another, and 726 were placed in unsubsidized jobs at an average hourly wage of $7.94.

The third program I want to talk about is something called "The Up Front Job Placement Program." This is a job placement program funded by the State Department of Public Welfare. It is an eight-week job placement program for welfare clients who have some work history and who have a high school diploma. The clients are engaged about 30 hours a week in various activities leading to actual job interviews, and finally job placement. So far this year, the program has

exceeded its goal of enrolling 681 by, in fact, enrolling over 800 welfare clients in the program. Of that number, 265 have been negatively terminated, and another 384 have been placed in unsubsidized jobs at an average starting wage of $8 per hour.

The last program I want to talk about, and the one that you've heard the most about today that we operate, is the Work Opportunities Program. First let me say that Mr. Dodds' characterization of the program was correct. The program was -- and I apologize for that, I apologize to him and the ladies before and do so today.

The program was ill-conceived, and certainly we did not do the job that we should have doing in managing the program. And as a result, the program has been placed on probation. We have sat down with the State and developed a corrective program that will make it an effective program.

But having said that, let me explain -- and I've tried to explain this wherever I could -- that Work Opportunities was never designed to be

the kind of training program that clients have been asking for. It was started in -- last -- right after March of 1999, when we thought everybody was going to be kicked off welfare. It was started by the State basically to be a place where those individuals who had been on welfare for two years and were at risk of losing their benefits, unless they engaged in some work activity, could go involve themselves in any work activity and still receive their welfare benefits. It was not designed -- and it currently is not designed -- to be a training program for welfare clients. Those clients who want training -- and I've, you know, said this to them -- ought to be in the SPOC Program or ought to seek other training opportunities from other programs.

The real culprit -- if you're looking for that -- is Act 35, which mandates that once you're on welfare for two years, in order to continue to receive benefits, you've got to engage in a work activity for at least 20 hours a week. And there have been a lot of efforts -- and I've join those efforts -- to change the definition of "work activity" to include some training. If

that is done, then we can reshape the program in such a fashion that, you know, that work activity can include some training. But until Act 35 is amended -- you know, clients can get training, but it has to be over and above the 20 hours that they put in for the work activity.

Let me just comment briefly -- and then I'll close -- on the other issues about the duration of the program, the wages, and I think I've addressed the issue of training.

Our experience -- well, let me preface that by saying that it is my belief that the goal of all of these programs ought to be to get clients out of the welfare system as quickly and as expeditiously as possible. That should be the goal, and that is what I think the goal is.

Our experience has shown that the appropriate time for placing a client is around three months. If the client comes in and is cooperative and, you know, is willing to go through what is being offered, that we can place the client in a job. And as you can see, all of these jobs -- or most of them -- pay above the $7 an hour.

So I don't think extending the program for 18 months is the answer, it really is not the answer. In fact, if you're looking for a step to self-sufficiency, extending it and keeping clients in another, quote, welfare program for 18 months, I think, will get the opposite effect.

Finally, on the issue of the $7 per hour wages, I love to see people get as much money as they possibly can get. However, this is a program that is set up, it's supposed to be short-term, and it's supposed to lead people to jobs in the private sector, making more than $7 an hour. To pay people while they are going through this training program for work activity at a level that may be, in fact, higher than some of the starting positions in the private sector, I think, in the end, will serve as a disincentive for those clients to move out of the program and into the private sector. It is -- you know, the --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: But you can have a cutoff date, they don't stay forever.

MR. JONES: Well, they stay for six months, but if this were extended for 18 months and people were getting paid $7 an hour for 18

months, I think you would find more people staying for that long.

Also, let me just say this, that it's not just $5.15 'cause that is an astronomically low wage. There is what they call "a disallow" for welfare in calculating how much their grant will be. If there wages were to go up to $7 an hour, part of that will still be deducted from there welfare benefits.

And also, in addition to the 5.15 an hour, client are still getting child care, they're still getting medical benefits, and the only other benefits that come with being enrolled as a welfare recipient, taking that in its totality, I think, far exceeds $7 an hour.

Now, the idea has been floated today that, you know, give people a $-7-an-hour job and then terminate the cash assistance. I think that's something that the State would buy 'cause I think the State will come out, in the end, making -- you know, doing a lot better economically.

With that, I'm going to stop and, you know, answer any questions that you might have.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: In trying to

revamp the Work Opportunities Program, are you involving our State representatives from Philadelphia to help work through some of the problems? Do we have their ear?

MR. JONES: I have spoken to some but at this stage -- I have met and my staff have met with Moms on the Move and with the people at PUP to see if we can't come to some common understanding about how the program ought to be done. There were a lot of technical deficiencies that we committed, and we are correcting those, and I think, again, within the current parameters of the program, we'll be able to do a better job. We'll be able to get people and get them into an unsubsidized job.

But on the broader issue of changing Act 35 to accomplish some of the things I've suggested, I have spoken to several of our State representatives.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Can you elaborate on what the feedback has been? And if you had to look long term, at what juncture do you see the reaction actually come into place with regards to Act 35, the amendment actually taking place?

MR. JONES: Well, I believe the bill has actually passed the House -- it's one of the chambers that it has passed.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay.

MR. JONES: Which calls for redefining what "work activity" is, to allow training, you know, after you've been on welfare for 24 months.

(Mr. Jones confers with colleague off-mike.)

MR. JONES: I'm advised that there is a discussion Monday morning to see exactly what's going to happen on that bill. You know, some people say that if you open this up, you will allow some of the conservative members of the state legislature an opportunity to make it even more tougher on welfare clients, but notwithstanding -- and I do think that the definition of "work activity" needs to change to be expanded to include some training after the 24 months.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Might it also include involvement with the completion of GED and/or Community College level?

MR. JONES: Absolutely. That's part of

the new definition.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay.

MR. JONES: That would include -- educational activities would be included under the definition of "work activity."

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay then.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: What about the day-care issue? I mean, how is that being addressed in terms of payment on time or paying those day-care providers who are not the normal state licensed facility, like the grandmom or the cousin or whoever it might be that's taking care of the baby?

MR. JONES: There are significant problems with the payment system. DPW made some changes recently, where they -- one of the problems is, they would calculate on a monthly basis the eligibility for day care. So if a person got a job today and worked for a week and then lost that job, they would basically assume that this person is working for the full month, and then it would take two or three months to catch up. They have now agreed not to do that for certain, I think, licensed day care people, to

just pay them, and do it every six months rather every month.

But I think there are other people here who can, you know, speak to the issue of child care much better than I can.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay, all right. Thank you very much.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Mr. Greenwald, I'm glad to know you're working with the Unemployment Project and MOMs. And, again, this is to gather information today so that we can go to Harrisburg to ask for some changes.

Mr. Greenwald?

MR. GREENWALD: Thank you. I also want to say that we have spent a lot of time with Mothers on the Move and the Philadelphia Unemployment Project and CLS and members of our community to be a part of board subcommittees and to just have access to our community.

We view yourself ourselves as an open demonstration, and as much input as we can get from you and everybody in this room, we'd be glad to and have accepted and acted on stuff that we could act on.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Identify yourself for the record so we know who we are.

MR. GREENWALD: My name is Richard Greenwald, and I'm the President of the Transitional Work Corporation.

I'm going to read my testimony and then I can go --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Do you want to summarize it.

MR. GREENWALD: You want me to summarize it?

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Yeah, why don't you summarize it and we'll present it in the record.

You've heard today -- I want your reaction to what you heard today, and you can give a little background about what you do, but also --

MR. GREENWALD: Okay, okay.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Do we have your testimony?

MR. GREENWALD: You do have my testimony.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay, thank you.

MR. GREENWALD: Let me start by saying,

first of all, thank you very much and thank you, members of the committee who have sponsored some of our participants at your offices. It's been a tremendous success, and you've played a part in it. And I also wanted to say thanks to everybody in the room who has contributed to our success so far.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: I will tell you, I had one young lady work for me. And, you know, you have to look at people and their background, their personality, their strengths, their weaknesses, and certainly she was a capable young lady, very nice, very good on the phone, but I just wasn't ready to let her go.

I needed her there a little longer 'cause she wasn't ready to go, she just didn't have the -- you know, some of us are bodacious and, you know, we can go out and make it, and then there's some of us that need a little more care, a little more coaching, a little more nurturing, and we wanted to nurture her a little more. And I would imagine that she's probably not working 'cause she need to do build that self-confidence to just go out there. And she was a very nice

person, and we wanted to hold on to her longer than the six months.

So when you talk about extending the program a little longer, it's for that kind of thing that you need for us who are willing to work with these young women and nurture them and give them that one-on-one kind of training and help, 'cause it's not just doing the job, it's helping them to understand all the nuances of going to work when you haven't worked in a long time.

And so those are the kinds of things that we learned -- at least I learned -- in working with the women who've worked with me.

MR. GREENWALD: Yeah.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Then I've had others who were just like so gung ho, they could be okay. But everybody's not like that, everybody's not at the same level, they're not the same temperament they're not the same personality, and we've got to kind of like walk with some of these women.

MR. GREENWALD: Right. I mean, I think that we have a diverse group of people is an important point. We do have parameters that guide

our program. We have certain funding that's given to us to pay wages for people, and most of our funding goes to the wages of our participants. And we do have parameters that require ten hours of training and require up to six months of participation before we have to get somebody into an unsubsidized job.

But the key is, we do have a group of diverse people with different backgrounds, as we heard today, and some of the people who spoke today were from our program. And we need to acknowledge that.

And we also need to acknowledge your point that we've got to believe in people. You know, the worst thing we can do as advocates is to say that people are incompetent and incapable of working, and it's the last thing that they're going to hear from us, that's for sure, and I know that that was the experience in your worksite.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: So is that to say, then, that you do understand and recognize that six months is not too long -- I mean, is far too short. It's far too short for adults who got it together and need to make a transition from one

job to another, let alone from welfare to work. Is that what I'm hearing?

MR. GREENWALD: I think that so far -- no, it's not exactly what you're hearing.

I think that six months so far in our experience and in the experience that I've seen around the country has been adequate for us to get people to get into jobs that we've needed to move into jobs.

However, I think we should hear alternate endings and maybe figure out ways for people who may need it, that we maximize the resources better in the community to extend services. There's a lot of post-placement training opportunities that are out there, that we haven't done. All of us haven't done a good enough job connecting our participants into those services, and we need to do that. We need to -- before they even get to us -- make sure they take advantage of all of the services that are available.

So, really, the 18 months -- you really do have 18 months because you're taking advantage of services in advance of coming to us and in

taking advantage of the post-placement opportunities. But what I hear from our staff -- and believe me, I've heard what people have said today, and we change all the time. But what I hear from my staff all the time, who are doing this work, who are in the field every day, is that we'd better be very careful about how we extend and grow our program.

As much as our egos, as far as program managers, would like to have a bigger and longer program, we want to be very careful that we do it in a precise and exact way and that we get the input from you guys and everybody else here, but that we do it carefully so that we don't have people lingering in our program and a malaise happening in our program and a modality funk that happens in our program by just coming back day in and day out to our ten hours of wraparound and going back to a worksite where you shouldn't be there.

So, for some people, we may have to consider an alternate ending. Right now, we haven't seen that. And for the people who shouldn't be working and can't work, so far, DPW

has worked with us to find another solution than termination from their assistance. But right now, it seems to be working, and for everybody who gets to program completion, almost nobody doesn't end up with job at this point in our second year.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Well, one of the -- you don't have to have a one-size-fits-all.

MR. GREENWALD: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: You have to have -- maybe ten months may be all right for somebody. I think you have to develop an evaluation process and a criteria for that evaluation so that the young lady who worked for me may not be ready to go in six months, she may not be ready to do the job that she was doing for me but something else.

And then that wraparound training, if it's not going to be worthwhile, if there's not something going on, I'd rather have that person in my office 'cause she's certainly getting better training with me than going and sitting in a room talking.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So if the training

-- and I know it's not your program design, but we're saying, while we're talking about how we want to change it, make the training, the wraparound service meaningful. Are they getting job readiness counseling?

MR. GREENWALD: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Or is someone talking to them to motivate them? And what's going on in the wraparound? If not, let them stay and instead of giving me three days or four days, give me five days a week.

(Applause.)

MR. GREENWALD: Right. Let me address, I think three critical points. One is, I concur, let's evaluate and see. If we need to do something that's individualized for a person, we better figure it out, 'cause definitely, one size doesn't fit all. I'm definitely amenable to listening to that. I'm not in charge of how our funding works, but I'm definitely willing to participate in the dialogue on how that would work.

Secondly, we actually have had people who are getting better experiences transitional

worksite, do their ten hours of wraparound there. It's very few people that we do it with, but some people it has worked out better for.

One of the reasons we bring people back for ten hours of wraparound training is because the advocates here wanted to make sure that people got mandatory literacy and math training, as well as job-readiness training. So that's one of the reasons we bring it back and do it at our site.

Another reason is because we've got to get people into jobs after six months, and need to see them and we need to know them and we need to -- jobs happen fast and they close fast, they open fast and they close fast. We need to see people and get our arms around them and connect them into a job opportunity before it closes. It's another reason I have people come back to our site for wraparound training -- which, by the way, we call "professional development training," because the connotation of "wraparound" has a negative stigma attached to it.

And then, thirdly, we want people to take advantage of this free service. And I must say, in defense of our staff, who have knocked

themselves out, working 60-hour weeks to put together an outstanding curriculum that has an entry and exit that's not always exactly the same, we've put together an outstanding-quality professional development training for that ten hours.

Now, we always are getting better, and I would love to have you guys come in and sit in, and people have done that from the community who've had problems with our training. And for those who have done that, we've acted on their suggestions. But we actually have a very good one. We can get better, but we have, again, a diverse group of people who -- we can't lump in 2nd-grade and 8th-grade reading-level people, nor can we do that with the math people.

So we try to do as individualized training as we can, as well as get job people enough job-readiness training so that they're ready to grab that interview, make the connection, and solidify a job when they have that opportunity. And we have created a very good professional development training that encompasses all of those things -- literacy, math, job-

readiness training.

And, finally, people have serious issues. We have a huge system, there's lots of supportive services issues out there that are -- particularly child care -- that we heard today. We have career advisors that are like job coaches, that have no more than 25 people on their caseload who are in transitional work, who are experts at dealing with the static in people's lives and particularly in going through the bureaucracies of the County Assistance offices.

Having people come back to paid wraparound training is good way for us to talk to them and see how they're doing so that we can solve some of their issues. And that's one of the keys to our success. A lot of people get jobs, but it's the recidivism rate that trips us up. We have these personal coaches that stick with people, not only in six months of transitional work, but in another six months of unsubsidized work so that we can be both their advocate and partner, as well as supervisor, to keep them going to succeed.

So -- I know that was a long-winded

answer about paid training -- I mean, about wraparound training, but I think it's a worthwhile one.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

Linda?

MS. HICKS: Good afternoon and thank you for hearing me.

I am Linda Hicks, and I represent an organization called "One Day at a Time," which is a community services program better known for drug and alcohol services and operating and being advocates for the homeless and operating shelter services, which we prefer to call "Havens for Women and Children."

I have just a few observations to make and I hope I will be heard. I want to make a few observations on my experiences in working with the Work Opportunities Program in particular. About a year ago, through the Workforce Development Program --

Well, you know what? Before I say anything about the Work Opportunities Program, let me say that it's really disturbing to me, as a person who works on almost every level with the

very people whose lives we're speaking of here and who has had a welfare-to-work program Transitional Work Program, been a contractor with slots for over a year, it's really disturbing for me to sit here today and hear about so many programs doing so well, that the actual people that I work with have no idea about and aren't a part of. I don't understand that. And I think that if we were listening to most of the actual MOMs who spoke, they are speaking of the programs and what doesn't work for them. I don't think they're a part of the programs that Mr. Jones, whom I do hold in much esteem, spoke of that are successful or Mr. Greenwald. So I'm just wondering, we're missing something here.

I'm here to talk about some not so good experiences that I have personally seen with the women I've worked with, and there are hundreds, and listening to the other women represented here, why aren't they a part of these successful programs? Because I'm not going to deny that the stats that have just been presented are true and that there are some successes and there's some programs working, but why do we have so many

people and why are the people that we, the hands-on people, who they're actually working with, even such as yourself, not a part of these programs? That's one question that I just wanted to put to the floor.

(Applause.)

MS. HICKS: Work Opportunities is the only program that I have personally been involved with because when Workforce Development, which used to be PIC, asked our organization to provide slots, we provided 100 work experience opportunities for women. And regardless of how shaky that program has been, and God knows for whatever reason, it has been a failure, we put forth every effort we could to provide a positive work experience for the women and -- well, there was some men too -- but for most of the -- for the participants that came to our organization.

I do need to share with you that what happened was, I was so interested in what this country and what would we do with welfare reform and who these folks were -- I mean, I had an idea because, you know, of what I do, but I wanted to know, who are the people who are going to be a

part of these programs, and how can I help? because I had a personal interest in helping. How do I integrate them into our program and how do I make an impact on their lives? So what I did was, I took on the undaunting task of interviewing every one of them personally, so I can speak here with some knowledge.

Out of approximately 150 women who came to our organization, regardless of what my duties were, I took out the time to speak personally with them, to ask them some questions. And what I can speak to here today, without having to take a formal poll, is that most of the women do not have a high school education. So if we don't have a GED and a high school education, how in the world are we going to be effective in moving anywhere in six months? I don't see how we cannot address basic education. I'm talking fact.

I mean, I had a few women out of 150 who had some prior -- who had GEDs or a diploma, but the overwhelming majority of these women that I talked to since August up until March did not have basic -- they did not have GEDs or diplomas, they did not have the basic education. We're

talking about most not finishing 10th grade. That is a problem, and we do an injustice when we expect these people to move into the workforce and be viable members of the workforce.

The other part is skills. I don't want to focus a lot on it, it's obvious. People, if they don't have education and if we are trying to move them from welfare rolls, where most of them have not worked because of the children or whatever, we know that they need skills. I'm not an advocate that we should pay people's tuition for four years and they should get a higher education, but people do need basic education, and they do need skills.

And you have been bringing up a great point. Some of those skills and the training they could receive right at the sites. There was an opportunity here that we missed -- I don't want to rehash it. Just as you, I had people who we were able to probably offer some training to a few people, but six months was not enough time, because, first of all, you have to deal with the fact that you're dealing with a lot of people with a lot of issues -- uneducated or lower level of

education, 'cause this is not to insult anyone.

But there's the need for education and social skills. I was really surprised that we got a lot of women who had never really been out of their home environment and were totally frightened of those of us who represent the working world. We have to have some type of program in place to address the human need also. We just can't talk about statistics and these are people getting our taxpayer dollars, but it's okay to spend all those dollars in programs that aren't benefitting the people who really need them. So we've got the aspect of socialism. We've got people who are frightened, who have no idea what it means to stand up next to some of us and work.

And then we've got child care -- oh, my God, I don't even want to really waste time talking about child care. I am frightened as a God-fearing woman and as a citizen of this country to think how we are putting children at risk when we make these women come to work and we do not provide the dollars on a timely basis that they need to care for their babies.

(Applause.)

MS. HICKS: I have two children myself and I am totally appalled when I think of the fact that of all the money we're putting up, that everybody and their brother's getting a day care center today. And we understand and we know that most of these ladies -- when you start talking about day care, you introduce another whole arena of problems. And we know that other people care for our children and we know that we need to broaden the horizon on how children are cared for.

And yet we want to pay all of the business people to operate day-care centers, but if person has a mom or a grandmom or a sister or an uncle -- I used to pay my sister to take care of my child, okay, even though I had to also go out and pay babysitters. But when cut the options and we limit the options, we put these children at risk. So that's another whole issue.

Money is not being paid on time. And basically, as a provider, I don't want to waste time on it, but with DPW, everyone from there should have been here to talk about case workers and, as someone said before, supervisors and the bureaucracy. I had to call on somebody at another

organization, my parent organization, GPAUC, to help me to be able to not go down to welfare and put up a sign myself, because I was so sick and tired of spending my valuable time talking to case workers who would call me -- no mind that at the Work Opportunities, they're supposed to have a case manager.

But welfare, people should be here from the DPW, they should be here to address that this is not working, the partnership with them. I mean, I don't know where this emanates from or what the problem is, but I just recently had to get someone to help me to facilitate a conversation. After faxing over timesheets for a worker, sending over a signed letter as an administrator of a program that the person had worked, returning a phone call, being completely rude to the worker and saying, "I cannot keep wasting my time, I'm sorry, I'd like to help you, I'm busy."

I sent the timesheet, fax it, give them what they want, and then having this person say, "I don't have a babysitter, I didn't get my money. Please, Linda," and bringing their child

to work two and three days a week. And then I get a call from a supervisor after I think that all I've done all I can, the hours she worked, when she started, here's the timesheet, and all of this as a providing agency, with no assistance from the provider agency that's really getting the money to do the job, and then having to have another party facilitate my getting someone at DPW to pay this woman's child care when she is coming to work every day and had been with me for six months, and this worker has been dealing with her for six months and still can't get paid. Those are the kind of ridiculous happenings that do not foster healthy working relationships and do not help folks to be able to stay at work.

So I am for looking at the education -- that is a problem and why some of these programs don't work. And I want to go back to where these working programs are. If we got programs that work, put these people in them. And for a person to sit in a work experience slot for six months and no one to have ever contacted them and even said there's a job fair around the corner, or as someone said earlier, "I cannot do a resume," this

is from personal experience.

I had at any given time 80 to 90 women at our jobsites and never did I, as an administrator -- I take that back, I got a fax one time about a job fair or about jobs being available. So people don't get information on how to find jobs.

So I would like to advocate anything that stops setting all these women up for failure. We are not assisting them. I am a proponent that money needs to be spent on educating them, and even if it's not 18 months, but at least extending the program or subsidizing it in some way, the slice that they occupy, and doing some type of progress so that we are not wasting our time here and that we are not creating a level of frustration that is going to cause these people to never be a viable part of the workforce, and that we do not endanger their children by making their mothers come to work and setting up unreasonable limitations, like it has to be Monday through Friday, 9 to 5.

I operate shelters. I need people -- if they're going to work with me, you got to be

willing to working 11 to 7, Saturday and Sunday, 'cause that's the real world. And child care needs to be paid for for various times.

So if we look at child care, education, and some type of skills training, which may already be here, it seems to me. But if we look at being able to direct those of us concerned today the women that we represent and all of those women who are lost to the system -- obviously they're lost to the system -- into these programs, perhaps we can make some leaveway (sic).

I thank you for your time.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Carol, could you sum up. Then we'll go to social services and then to the Urban Coalition.

MS. GEORTZEL: Thank you. I'm Carol Geortzel from the Women's Association for Women's Alternatives, and I really appreciate the opportunity to talk before you.

As some of you know, we've been working very hard to bring the issue of economic self-sufficiency to the table of welfare reform,

and I have some standards and information to pass out to be people.

I'll be fairly brief. We're an organization that has worked since 1978 to try to provide opportunities both within the child welfare system to keep families together and to promote economic self-sufficiency for families. We have also run the Work Opportunities Program, and I'll just talk for two minutes about a couple of the things we do in terms of TANF advocacy and the Work Opportunities and the job training program in North Philadelphia that we run.

The North Philadelphia job training is a SPOC Program in that we're able to have moms in the program for eight months. We have a 75 percent placement and an 85 percent retention -- not 50 -- over a 2-year period. That is because people are in training for six to eight months where they get adult education, get human service skill development, get some computer literacy, and their placement in jobs is long- and not short-term.

And the recidivism that has been talked about as a problem does not occur when you give

people enough time, and the time varies so that you can work on the family issues of family violence, child care, sick children. All of those issues can be worked on -- skill development, education development, and job-readiness and placement. When you can do all of that with people, they stay on the job and they don't fall back and they get promoted.

When you have the six-month programs, like Work Opportunities, without the real wraparound case management and in the system up until now -- and I know that it's changing -- their agencies were not paid to provide full case management plus placement plus paperwork, etc. and education. So it was not happening. You had people on jobs for 20 hours a week where they were getting 5.15 an hour without the education and case management and job placement, and they're not going to be -- the women that we worked with will not be anywhere, in the long run, as if that he had gone to training.

We also have a TANF advocacy project in West Philadelphia where we work with four family centers, and we have been working with people

who've lost their jobs because of the child-care issues that have been raised. They've lost their jobs because they've been robbed on the way to work and scared to go back. And then they're told they're not in compliance. We have people who have lost their jobs because they don't have enough of an educational background to be able to have transferable skills.

I want to mention something about the importance of people working with the State to expand the definition of "work activity," because if you do that, after 24 months, people will be able to combine education and work in ways that will work for them in the long run and not the short run.

I also want to talk about economic supports and the importance of taking away the stigma of getting food stamps, of getting child care assistance, of having your children enrolled in the CHIP Program for health care. Right now, you get food stamps mostly through the Welfare Department, so people aren't doing that. And you can't -- if you're working, if you want to get food stamps, you have to leave your job to go to

the office to be able to get food stamps. People can't do that.

So as we're as looking at really systems that work for people who are moving from welfare to basically being working poor, in most cases, we feed to change all of the systems so that people can work and have a chance to move upward.

If you look at my testimony, you'll notice I've rolled out from the budget worksheet that we've developed what it means to earn: 5.15 an hour for 20 hours a week; 5.15 for 40 hours; and $7 an hour -- which is not high wage if any of you would think of supporting your families on less than $15,000 a year -- $7 an hour at 20 hours and at 40.

And at 5.15 an hour, unless you're in public housing, there is no way you can support your family even very moderately. Your wage adequacy is about 60 percent of what you need, 60 percent. So even if you're placed on a 5.-15-an-hour job successfully, you then gain employment 40 hours a week, you really won't be anywhere. And if you haven't had the educational

background, you're not going to necessarily go anywhere.

All of the states that have done research show that people don't automatically move up if there isn't some skill intervention for people to move up. And programs that have wanted to work with people after they're placed have not been successful because people have so many issues around day care and fulfilling the job requirements unless they've built in a relationship with people while they're working with training.

So if your case manager has built a relationship with people, then you work with people after they're placed, and when they lose a job, they get a job, because they call you back.

I just want to add some feedback on the stories of the three women in the video. There were three women there: one Latino woman who was doing factory and back room that involved some clerical work; a Caucasian woman who was doing non-traditional work -- and the race doesn't really matter, it's just three people from three different walks of life and backgrounds; and an

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

African-American woman going to college.

When we did the video, they were all working and working their way upward. When we followed them up two months after the video, two of those women had left their jobs because of problems with their children. We were able to intervene because we were working with them so that they received case management again and they're back in the workforce.

The woman who had a non-traditional job had to do mandatory overtime, and her issue was not child care for young children; her issue was her teenagers. She was going two hours to her job, she was gone then 14 hours a day doing mandatory overtime, and her 16-year-old son out on the streets. She was a former user and she was fearful for her child because she had been clean and sober now for many years. She quit her job because she feared for her children. She became depressed, she did not go back to using, and because we were tracking and working with her, we helped her get back into a job where she's now working in construction and is back on her feet. But this is what happens.

Myra had children who have a lot of health problems and a lot of mental-health problems, and eventually, the child welfare system took temporary custody and told her that she had to be working full-time and not part-time in order to be reunited with her child, and she couldn't go to all of the appointments to be reunited with her child. So, again, through a lot of people intervening, she's now back on her feet going through reunification and has a different job where she's not working a night shift. Because for her, the night shift didn't work because of the rotating child-care issue and her kids being alone every dinner and evening time.

So that the issues that people have raised are real because we're talking about real people.

And I'll go back to the wage structure of 5.15 an hour. That is not enough for people to feel respected, to get on their feet in the long run, or to have enough money to really be able to do that.

So, again, from the Women's Association for Women's Alternatives and all of us who are

working to help people be able to move out of poverty and not into poverty, we ask that you really consider having the City of Philadelphia not only have a living wage that I know that --

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Well, why don't we form a coalition of all of these organizations across the City to demand that we pass living-wage legislation in this City Council?

I would love to see that come together out of this hearing. If you guys can do that and organize -- because last time, it was just one grouping of people organizing around it.

MS. GEORTZEL: It has to be broader.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: And that's not enough.

MS. GEORTZEL: That's right. It has to be broader. They've done it in Los Angeles, they've done it in many other cities.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: I need the help of everybody organized around this issue so that we can pass living-wage legislation. I think we have a Council that is very cognizant, committed to equal justice and good-paying jobs. I don't think that this Council that is presently -- that has

been presently elected, for instance, is one that just wants to keep on giving and giving to the corporate world without saying to that corporate sector, "You have to give something back."

The something back that they have to give, at least for all of the TIFs, for everything, for all of the breaks that we give them, 25 years, 20 years without paying any tax taxes, land that we acquire for them, all of these things that actually create wealth for them, at least the Simon Group, for example, down at Penn's Landing, they're getting incredible breaks. They should pay a living wage. The hotels that are being built with taxpayers' largesse, they should pay a living wage. The janitors across the City that clean and so on, they should earn a living wage.

So -- but this Council will not move unless we see people here in different organizations. You know that when we have a hearing about the stadiums in this Council, every seat is filled with people from the building trades, all right, demanding that this Council pass that, notwithstanding -- in fact, not even

that we ask any questions about it, just pass it blindly, without seeing what the taxpayers' responsibilities are going to be, what the impact is going to be on the City, what is it really going to bring economically to the City. No, no, no, don't ask no questions, just pass it.

But when we have a hearing -- like, for example, we've had hearings on displaced workers, well, we've only had a few displaced workers, and the only thing crowd that comes in are the people who are affected. Now, you know that those displaced workers, those janitors that are taken off their jobs, if they don't find another job that pays them, will be homeless, will be on welfare, will be on the streets with their kids and so on.

But when we have living-wage legislation hearings, we don't have a coalition of people filling every seat here. And I would like to see a coalition of people come together in this city about the human rights issues that we're facing, and I think it's about time that we really started discussing that, and you coming into this house to do certain things about that.

(Applause.)

MS. GEORTZEL: I think --

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: The friendly amendment I would make to that is, we cannot find any seats in here when the stadium is on the table for a discussion, debate, friendly dialogue, and we have too many seats when it comes to issues affecting public education.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: That's right.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: School uniforms, safety and discipline. So we need to echo what Councilman Ortiz is saying and look at our own priorities and where they rest or should lie with regards to where we register our support.

MS. GEORTZEL: And I think that a broader coalition than has happened really needs to happen, and can happen, in this city. And I think the hearings now that are talking about going from 5.15 to $7 an hour are only a beginning because that isn't the living wage. I mean, neither is $9 an hour really, but it's a step toward moving in that direction. And at $7 an hour, full-time people can be saving their time practically, and that's the beginning for people

not having to be on TANF.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: But we have should have organizations out there, for example, that keep track of what is going on in this city, in this Council. For example, if we we're going to have hearings about building down at Penn's Landing and the Simon Group, and we're going to be discussing that that -- well, that should be of interest to every organization that wants jobs, that wants people to be employed. That should be of interest to every organization that is in terms of organizing the working folks and the poor people in the City. And they should come in here and testify and say, "Hey, fine. If you want to do that, demand that they do these other things, put it into their contract," 'cause we can do that. Put it into their contract that these other things have to happen.

Like, for instance, Blondell has an idea that we all share, and that I share very deeply, because we've been talking. If there's going to be a stadium, well then they're going to have to take money from their tickets and set up a children's fund of some sort, all right? Well, if

you're going to build down at Penn's Landing, let's make sure they at least pay a living wage. Let's ask in the contract that a living wage be included. That's all.

MS. GEORTZEL: Thank you for the opportunity to testify. We'll be meeting with Senator Loper to try to get them to open up their minds a little bit to House Bill 1266, which would broaden the definition of "work and education."

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Good luck.

MS. GEORTZEL: Thanks.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Who's next?

MS. NORTON: May I suggest something to our fellow panelists?

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Identify yourself for the record.

MS. GEORTZEL: Thank you for the opportunity.

MS. NORTON: To my fellow panelists, I agree --

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Identify yourself for the record, please.

MS. NORTON: I'm Vivian Norton, from the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition.

May I suggest to my fellow panelists that in the organizing efforts, that if we bring our constituents, our clients, to hearings, and every one of them raises a voter registration card, we will be heard.

MS. GEORTZEL: Excellent idea.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Excellent idea.

Who is next?

MS. NORTON: I am, I am.

COUNCILMAN ORTIZ: Go ahead.

MS. NORTON: I want to say that I am very much experienced with the same kinds of things that those panelists have spoken. I represent the Work Opportunities Program, which I manage for the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs coalition.

Last year, when we entered into our subcontract, we agreed and maintained 500 work slots in about 60 agencies across the City of Philadelphia, and over the ensuing year, we have seen approximately 500 clients.

We found early on that there were needs that we were not equipped to meet but in that -- in the time that we had, because the Coalition,

since 1973, has successfully fielded all sorts of jobs programs for youth from 14 to 21, for adults in many, many classifications and categories, and this is something that the Coalition does extremely well and extremely willingly.

With the Work Opportunities Programs, there are, as was reiterated earlier, many problems that emanated from the fact that Work Opportunities was conceived in haste. However, we took that as an opportunity to add two logical programs to the Work Opportunities, and they feed from the Work Opportunities Program. One of them is called the "Career Education Program."

When a client comes to us in Work Opportunities, they may stay in Work Opportunities about three months. When we find out that they there is no high school diploma or GED, then that person is referred to the Career Education Program, if we and the worksite supervisors feel that they are ready for that. Because a goal of the CEP program is to take those persons and place them in private-sector employment, with the proviso -- and this is already agreed with the participating employers -- that those persons

within the next year to 18 months will get their GED, and provision is made in that program for them to do that. There are persons who will take those clients under their wings and do retention counseling and follow-up while they're going through there.

Now the second program is Project EARN, which stands for "Employment Advancement Retention Now." That program is a granted program, which provides for persons who have come through Work Opportunities and/or CEP after they have gained employment. Project EARN has a state-of-the-art computer center that people can come to after work. It provides some child-care subsidies, it provides some transportation subsidies, it provides some clothing subsidies, and it provides retention counseling as well -- for the employer, as well as the employee.

Now, we can't serve the entire population, but those persons who come through us have that opportunity. We have some success stories that we can point to, and they are real. We have had at least one quarter of our worksites to hire full-time the Work Opportunities clients

who were placed with them. That to me says that this program -- that piece of the program was a success.

We also in one case -- and this is my favorite. In one case, the place hired the lady, who was a client there. She now is the supervisor for the unit for which she hired, and she is really a good one. She is an excellent supervisor. She has never forgotten from whence she came, and she encourages and mentors those persons who work under her supervision. I don't know her very well on a personal level, but I see the results of what has become of her.

These are the possibilities in Work Opportunities -- they're not built into Work Opportunities. We have our share of Work Opportunities glitches. And, make no mistake, child care is a huge problem that I personally have attacked from client to client through supervisors and supervisors and their supervisors and their supervisors, with some success sometimes and with some resounding failures other times.

However, I think that what we have -- without being Pollyanna about this, Work

Opportunities is a far better solution or a way to a solution than none at all. I think that 90 percent, if not more, of the clients who come through these welfare-to-work programs are well motivated, they want to be independent, they want to govern their own lives, and most of them are looking for direction, which we have made a mighty effort to provide and are still providing.

There are barriers, there are glitches. In anything, you may have glitches. This one has more than its share, and the biggest one is that child-care issue.

However, I think that banding together with other providers and working to change the legislation to be responsive to a more diverse group -- because I'm old enough to remember Pogo Possum and his statement that "We have met the enemy and they are us." And I think that we and our clients need to take that to heart. We have met the enemy and they are us.

All of us need to be patient, to work together, to understand that one person can't serve 500, that one person can do only so much, that the employers that we seek to influence don't

want to hear us, but we're going to keep knocking on their doors until they open.

So with the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition, we have a reverse-commute project that we relate to, we have the CEP Program, we have the Project EARN, and we have Transitional Employment, as well as Work Opportunities. We within our organization are working together, and we would be delighted to work together with those others that are out there in the field to see what we can do beyond what we're doing.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

Mr. Thompson, I'm so sorry. You've been here all day -- you started with the first hearing, and that was at 9 o'clock.

MR. THOMPSON: That's quite all right.

For the record, my name is Frazier Thompson. I'm with Catholic Social Services, and I'm the Program Coordinator in the Welfare to Work Initiative.

And I am very encouraged even more today, after being here and listening to the

Mothers on the Move, and to also find out that there is now a forum where a lot of these issues can be aired, put on the table. And maybe if we can find a way to become more aware of the challenges that face not only the participant and client, but the providers and also those in the legislature who are having to deal with program guidelines, etc., how we can all coming together, as Mr. Ortiz was talking about, in terms of a coalition.

We can be a much stronger force because, I tell you, our communities are suffering when neighbors and family members are ill-mannered or anxiety-ridden as a result of not being able to take care of themselves. On that point, you know, I was going to say, there was a couple things that were brought up today, and I want to reiterate the fact that, you know, this continuous dialogue, you know, we have to do it on a lot of other different levels. This cannot be the only place to voice and make some initiatives happen. We need to encourage provider to provider, agency to agency, as Carol was talking about.

And one of the strong points that I

feel strong about, I should say, is the area that Carol mentioned in terms of case management. How do you identify this particular client, how do you keep them motivated so that they are not just being pushed to the end of their time according to State guidelines, time limit, but they are motivated and encouraged to go to work.

I have devised a little system within my own program. I do a certified nursing assistance and I also do resident child-care assistance -- resident child care aides. One of the things that I provide for them is a support system and an extensive case-management support system that takes them from the initial presentation. I go down here to PWDC, the SPOC Unit that Mr. Jones was talking about, and I do my own recruiting.

So as a result of the recruiting, I am the first one that they get a chance to speak to in terms of identifying what are there objectives, and then I can help them move forward to the next phase, which is another assessment through the SPOC Unit. Now, once moving through the SPOC Unit, we set up an interview, and they are

actually interviewed by the people who are actually going to be doing the hiring, because within the Archdiocese, we do have our own resident centers for disadvantaged youth, and we also have our own nursing homes for certified nursing assistants.

So if they have chosen our training program, we provide them the training by the people who are actually going to do the hiring. So once they've completed the training, I've had assessments at the end of training and say, "Look, I'll take all of them." You know, and I know this might be a little bit different than some of the other providers, but the point I wish to make about that type of support to the participant is that if you can keep them motivated -- and I know there are a lot of other things that happen between PWDC, the District Office, the child care, the housing, and other -- maybe behavioral health issues that might come about.

One of the things that I take upon myself in terms of a case manager is to provide the resources so that during this dialogue with this participant, and if I'm doing the ongoing

treatment plan or retention follow-up, then I am that much more aware of what this individual needs, because they're going to call me back. They're going to say, "Frazier, I need this, I need your help with this. What do you think about this or that?"

Consequently, the case management never ends. It starts from the beginning at the presentation, where you are motivated to make a change, and it follows all the way through to the retention so that you are encouraged to stay on the job and maybe enhance some of your own capabilities at that point even further.

One of the other things too that was brought up earlier was about basic education. I don't know the answer in terms of how and extended training programs may work out with some of the current guidelines, but I'm more than willing to be a part of any dialogue that would encourage that, because basic education is a guarantee of -- I almost want to go back and say "our constitution," you know what I mean?

Because if they don't have the basic education, there's nowhere to move. They might

stay at $7 an hour or $8 an hour for 10 years, and then they're really going to be at a loss, because our economy is growing.

But we've talked about basic education, job readiness, socialization skills, and one of the other things that is provided at our center is computer literacy because I've been able to institute a computer lab that will allow them to do job research, resume writing and also, hopefully within the next ten days, I'll have at least one computer set up for the Internet so that we can do our own job searches within the office.

But there were so many things that were brought to the table today, and this room was so full of energy from 9 o'clock this morning, I could not sit back here and not say anything. Because on the provider side, there's a lot that's happening, I know. I'm involved with PWDC. Usually on Friday afternoons, I'm downtown here. We do have a workshop and are trying to connect with other providers to encourage them to be more attentive to the SPOC guidelines or the State guidelines that have been given to them.

The other thing too is to encourage

program coordinators and managers to be more attuned to what it is that the needs are of the individuals that they're trying to help through this transition. And, you know, we need to expand our own capabilities to show true compassion. This is not just a statistics game; we need to have viable, healthy people, who are encouraged to find themselves self-sufficient, self-empowered, and then self-motivated.

Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

Before I call up the next panel, I want to ask Mr. Greenwald something, then we have to break for the stenographer for about two minutes, and then we'll come back.

But are most of these programs funded through your head organization, the old PIC?

MR. GREENWALD: I can answer that question, but I'm not the representative. The Transitional Work Corporation, which runs the program Philadelphia @ Work, it's our only program. It's synonymous with who we are -- we're TWC. We are not the Work Opportunities Program,

we are an independent nonprofit organization.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Do you contract out?

MR. GREENWALD: We don't contract out.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So the program is run by you at your site?

MR. GREENWALD: That's correct. And we're a nonprofit joint of -- while we're a nonprofit, we're a joint venture of GPW (Greater Philadelphia Works) and the Pew Charitable Trusts. They all came together in a confluence of ideas in 1998 saying, What can we do to coordinate?

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And where do you all get your funding from?

MS. NORTON: We are subcontractors of PWDC.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: What's that?

MS. NORTON: That's Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation -- formerly PIC.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay, you also.

MR. FRAZIER: Yes, indeed, that's right. We have -- in fact, I have another contract coming up in June.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. So when you talk about the providers getting together to deal with some of the issues, would you be a provider also?

MR. GREENWALD: Yes, I would.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So you come under that umbrella also?

MR. GREENWALD: We execute our contract through PWDC.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. So what we need is to have like a provider network to sit down and talk about some of the problems in the program, and then you all can become an advocate for change. I mean, although you may be competing, but you're all getting some money so, you know, it's worthwhile to think about that.

MR. GREENWALD: There are plenty of the people who need our services -- you know, we're not competing.

MS. NORTON: We're not competing.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: All right. I think it's worthwhile for us to look at how we form a coalition, as Councilman Ortiz said, so that everybody's not off doing everything, and

then we can focus in on what the problems are with the program and serve as one voice in advocating in Harrisburg with our local elected officials for a change.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: I do have one follow-up question to Councilwoman Tasco's inquiries. Funding is a block grant or is it reimbursement based on success?

MR. FRAZIER: Is that for anyone?

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Yes. Well, for all of you.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. I think for the purposes of our program, what we are contracting for -- when we go to the contract table, we have already slots identified. So then we're going in to the SPOC Unit on a Tuesday or a Thursday, and we're doing some actual recruiting.

I have a resident child-care aide's program that started in early November. I did the recruiting, we had the slot for ten. I lost one as a result of health issue -- she was prenatal, too close, and would miss time because of training. And another we lost because of some behavioral-health issues, some D-and-A issues, but

that was part of the assessment and we were able to catch that up front. But as a result of that, you know, eight were placed, and eight are successfully employed today.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: So were you penalized for the other two?

MR. FRAZIER: We were not. We had one (unintelligible) become a negative because we caught it in time. So you have to also have -- along with these programs, you have to have a timely turnaround of the paperwork and the tracking activity so that you don't get penalized. That's another facet of program guidelines that come down through SPOC. You have -- within the first month of recruiting, you can identify individuals that have challenges that are way beyond your scope.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay, I understand all that. I'm formerly a social worker and worked with those kinds of programs.

My question is, for the two that weren't successful for very legitimate reasons, did the funding entity withdraw dollars, penalize you? Did you get dollars up front and that was

the end of it? And what happened with those dollars as it related to your slots?

MR. FRAZIER: I think what happens is -- and I'm not really clear on how the funding system works because it goes downtown here, it doesn't come through my desk. But there was one negative that we reported because we didn't catch her in time.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. And what happened with negative in terms of funding?

MR. FRAZIER: In terms of funding, it goes -- I think what it is, we lose some funds or some access to future funds.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay, then. Mr. Greenwald?

MR. GREENWALD: We have three streams of funding -- the TANF Block Grant that you're referring to.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Oh, so that's a block grant, okay. BROWN:

MR. GREENWALD: And we take -- so some of the funding comes from there and most of that goes towards our participant wages.

Then we have a stream of funding from

the welfare-to-work money -- that's that Department of Labor money that came through the governor and was executed by PWDC, and that's about equally 45 and 45 percent of our money.

And then 10 percent of our administrative money comes from Pew Charitable Trusts.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. So you're not penalized at all --

MR. GREENWALD: We're --

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: -- if there's no success with the block grant dollars.

MR. GREENWALD: We're acting like we would be but, in reality, we're a grant demonstration project, so we're not being penalized.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay, all right.

MS. NORTON: In our case, we contracted for 500 slots. There were benchmarks along the way for the year, and they were quarterly. And we maintained our 500 slots, so I can't answer as to whether we would have been penalized had we not because we didn't.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay, but the

bottom line is, you were funded for that which you requested for. You slotted for 500 in your proposal?

MS. NORTON: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And you got --

MS. NORTON: We got funding for 500.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Funding for 500, okay. That's what need to know.

MS. NORTON: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you all very much. We appreciate it.

We're going to stop for about five minutes for our stenographer to take a break and change the paper. And we'll come back with the next group of panelists.

And we appreciate your patience. You know, this is you tough issue and we're going to be here all day. We were all day here two years ago, we're going to be here all day here today.

(Break taken.)

- - -

(Proceedings resume.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay. Thank you.

You know, this is a tough issue and

it's going to take all day, and I'm sorry that it takes time when people want to testify.

These are the people -- let me just check and see who's here.

Is Sharon Dietrich here? Okay.

Sharon Ward? PCCY. Not here.

Ed Geiger. He left his testimony.

Vivian Schatz? She left.

Dawn Moody?

Rosalind Spigel?

Doris Kensey-Chandler?

We know Ed Schwartz is here.

Is Aaron Mooney here.

(Unidentified person responds off-mike.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: For Aaron, so you're the wrap-up, okay.

Who else is here to testify other than these four people at the table? And you are?

MS. SPIGEL: I'm Rosalind Spigel.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay, why don't you come forth. We will make this all one panel.

And you are?

MS. SACKEY: Ann Mitchell Sackey.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: We'll call on you after we finish this panel, and then we'll have Sharon wrap it up. Thank you very much.

Since we started out with the 21st Century League two years ago, when all of this started, and you came forth and we had testimony, and some of the things that you pointed out are true today.

So thank you, Ed. We'll ask you to make your presentation and we know you have a lot to say. Do you have typed testimony?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes. You have it.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Oh, we have it? Okay, thank you very much, Ed.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Councilwoman. My name is Ed Schwartz, and I'm here for the Institute for the Study of Civic Values. And even though I'm on this advocacy panel, that is not the primary basis of being here and asking to be able to speak.

We have been both an advocacy group, as you know, but also a provider, under both SPOC and Work Opportunities. And right this minute, we are one of only two citywide agencies that are under

contract for the coming year under the Work Opportunities Program. So we are a part of the solution, or seen as, to some of the problems that you've been wrestling with here today.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: You have to speak into the mike; I can't hear you. Is the mike on?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Can you hear me now?

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, the mike is working, I just need to make it closer.

We are, as I said, one of only two organizations -- and there may be a third, but there are only two right now that I know of that are getting contracts under Work Opportunities for the coming year, the year having begun April 1st. Right now, we have 70 people, 50 of whom have been in our office in the last two weeks, placed in nonprofit organizes under the Work Opportunities Program. That is the role that we have been asked to play.

So I am here to try to answer some of the questions about where things were and are that I've heard raised by you folks up there, and perhaps provide clarity, and then also to give my

perspective on what are the things that are currently being sought that are barely doable and one, frankly, I don't think are going to be doable, given the political realities of what we're facing.

Let me just make a couple of comments about a fundamental difference in philosophy, if you will, between what everybody in this room who's testified to, including me, believes and what is believed in Harrisburg.

What we believe is --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: I'm not surprised, but go ahead.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I don't think there's any -- I mean, this is not going to -- I need to define it because it makes all sorts of differences in terms of the operational issues that we're describing.

We believe that the first objective that should have been started on March 3, 1997 was to build a five-year process where people on welfare, on TANF, ended up with the skills to enter the workforce in the most competitive basis, and that that ought to have been the standard by

which we organize the specific programs for these people. In other words, their development and their competitiveness ought to have been the criteria.

That's been our philosophy, and in the name of that philosophy, JOIN, the coalition I put together, came into being. John Dodds got Vince Hughes to introduce the jobs bill, and we all backed that. It's that philosophy which now is behind the bill that we're also supporting to make education and training a work-related activity. The testimony I provided to the previous Council on the literacy gap, when you had your hearings on that.

All of that was built around the premise that a person needs to be given a competitive advantage in entering the workforce, and that requires a mix between job experience, education and training, child care, and all of the rest of it. And that's what needed to be done.

And if it meant that somebody would be outside the workforce for a while because they needed training, then that was given their opportunity. That's what we believe.

What Harrisburg and Act 35 reflects is a totally different premise. Act 35 is an act of rage by people who got tired of paying for other people to stay home and sit and do whatever they do and take care of their kids. They want their money back. They want to be told, these legislators and the constituents who elect them, that whatever is happening here is resulting in the fastest possible reduction of the welfare caseload that we can accommodate. And, yes, there's some concern that they don't want people lying in the streets 'cause that probably would look bad.

In the end, if they don't know what happened to anybody who left the caseload, they're not really going to look too hard, even though they kind of say, "As long as they're not in the caseload, they're no longer a problem."

And I have to say to you that part of the political challenge that we have in getting anyone to take our philosophy seriously is that from that vantage point, their program has been a staggering success. We started in March 3rd of 1997 with 67,000 households on TANF. And now, we

end up, in April of 1999, you know, with 37,000 households.

Now, I think -- and frankly, I've given you, as a separate matter, the latest caseload report, which is now available statewide for this county, and we could go into a little bit. If you look at what we need to do between now and March 3rd of the year 2001, when people's federal benefits run out, this is an alarming number still.

But if you start two years ago and the goal was to reduce the caseload, that in fact has been largely achieved. The Inquirer removed Monica Yant (ph.) from covering this as a story, welfare reform in the public --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Well, she had a personal issue today, I was just told.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I'm just saying that Monica Yant used to have -- and this is not her doing, but Monica Yant had this beat as a full-time beat. She was removed from it as a full-time beat so she could cover City services. That's the Inquirer's decision, that welfare reform is no longer a matter of, you know,

full-time concern. And that's exactly what happened here.

Now, the other aspect of this, which has operational consequences, is the so-called "work first" philosophy. And what that says is that in the past, welfare reform -- welfare programs have failed because they have given excuses for people not to work. Training is not looked at as an advantage, unlike everybody else in the population. Training in this setting is an excuse for somebody not to have a job.

And so the first objective built around this "get 'em out and get 'em jobs" is to get people focused on getting a job and into jobs. And once they have a job, even a part-time job, then maybe we'll talk about giving the mother supports in the context of that. But until they have a job, they will not support anything that looks like it's an excuse to keep somebody out of the workforce.

Sherry Hellyer, who's the lead person in this -- and I had a personal conversation about this in December at the United Way conference, and she said, "Look, Ed" -- and it was the only civil

conversation I've had here, and she's the one, two years ago, when I banged my hand on the table, that's Sherry Hellyer, so that's who we're talking about.

She said, "Look, I have to report back to people who want to be told that people are getting jobs. If I can justify a strategy on grounds that helps them get jobs, that's the only basis to do it. If it looks like an alternative to getting a job, getting into the workforce as quickly as possible, then I can't deal with it. They won't accept it." Which is why between every one of these programs, people are then sent back on a 30-day job search. This allows her to say to these legislators and conservatives, "Well, yeah, we sent them on another 30-day job search and it didn't work, so now we've put them in X," whatever "X" is.

So this helps you to understand the sequence of events and the context of these two work experience programs. Harrisburg has not wanted any program like this -- either the Transitional Work Program or Work Opportunities. These are alternatives to what they really want,

which is to help people get into the workforce.

And they also fully understand that some of the community-service jobs are actually pretty good work assignments for people -- they get to work in their neighborhood or near it, they get to work with people who care about them instead of employers who care about, you know, something else. You know, they can get settled into a community-service job program. We have been running one for seven years out of the Institute. I speak from experience on this.

And that's exactly what they don't want. They don't want somebody to get put into a work assignment under the public's subsidy that becomes an excuse for them not to get out from under the public subsidies.

It make Pennsylvania the only state that I know of with a work-first philosophy that has not had workfare as a major component of the program. In New York City, 35,000 people are being paid by welfare there to work in the city government, and the big issue of the advocates like in us New York is the treatment that these people get when they're working. Workfare is not

a part of this equation.

So for two years, we demanded this jobs bills, Dodds and I and other groups. That never happened, and it wasn't going to happen as long as the legislature is controlled by the people who control it and as long as we have this governor and this philosophy in government.

Then March 3, 1999 comes along, and now suddenly, we're facing a situation where hundreds of people, maybe thousands, are going to have to do something 20 hours a week to stay -- to keep their benefits. The City's program, which you've heard of, the Transitional Work Program, was the response to Ed Rendell's effort as mayor to get Congress to kind of give forbearance. And in the end, what happened is that big cities like us got these programs.

So Philadelphia got a $52 million grant from the Department of Labor, and the Pew Charitable Trusts put up $3 million. And so now we have Philly @ Works and the Transitional Work Program. That accounts for, in a given year, 6,000 people who are essentially on a supported job search kind of mission under the auspices of

Philadelphia @ Works -- that's the City's Labor Department-funded program -- and the Transitional Work Program, which you've heard described by Richard Greenwald as being primarily funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. The community-service jobs component of that is primarily funding that, and that takes into account in any six-month period 750 people, but they are way under-enrolled for that.

But they're well-funded, because of Pew mostly. They're well-fund to do administer and support the people that they've got. They have caseloads for case managers at 15. They are able to give the kind of support, you know, that those folks, you know, would need beyond the community-service assignments, which are comparable to every other community service one, including what we're doing. They're placing people in neighborhood and nonprofit groups. That's the program that basically Donna Cooper put together.

All right, now we come to a year and a half ago, about December of 1998, and March 3rd is coming, and people are hysterical about what, in fact, will happen to these clients. The City had

made some proposals, and the State had not responded. Finally, the response was what we now call "the Work Opportunities Program."

And what happened here is this: a whole bunch of nonprofit groups, including the Institute, were put under contract to take a minimum of 100 work activities, to identify 100 work activities that people could perform for 20 hours a week. And we would not have responsibility to answer the kind of question that Councilwoman Reynolds asked -- to place them in full-time jobs. Our only role was, in fact, to manage them in these community placement situations around the City. You had to take 100.

We had a subsidy of $400 a person for that. The average subsidy for a SPOC program, which you've heard of, SPOC being the showcase training program, is over 2 to $3,000 a person. So there is the difference. But the presumption is that $400 permits you to manage. If you have 100 slots and $400, the fast math there is $40,000, so you end up with one staff person, one and a third staffpeople, somebody onsite, that's all you had money to do. And a whole bunch of

groups went under contract on that basis.

Now, your expression, Councilwoman Tasco, reflects what we all looked like about February of 1999. Oh, my God, how are we possibly going to handle all of that?

Well, what happened, in fact, was quite the opposite of what we feared, because the City vastly overestimated the number of people who actually would be in the situation that was described. The issue around which I banged my hand on the table in December of '98 with Sherry Hellyer was precisely this issue. I asked her, "What are they going to do on March 3rd, when people have to work and they don't have jobs? What are they going to do with that?"

And she didn't really answer my question, but later I learned what the answer was: that the language of the legislation said, "The willful refusal to cooperate." So there was some discretion on the State's part or on the City's part as to "willful," and it really is the State call.

So what Harrisburg did is basically say, As long as somebody is looking for work under

a supervised program, we will consider them to be in compliance. So instead of immediately going into jobs, a whole bunch of people went off for this endless job search. And the result of that, the City -- Mayor Rendell speaking to 32,000 people would be affected. The fact that the -- the broadest number was 19,000, of whom 8,000 were exempted for medical reasons, so you got down to 11,000. And when you started adding up all these other programs -- SPOC, Work -- they were all present and accounted for.

So 26,000 contracts were given at a rate of 2600 slots. We all got $10,000 checks as first payment, and we saw no one, no one, as intake from April 1st into August or September of last year. And I began to wonder, Well, now, you know, what happens? And finally, in fairness to the groups, they made the payment on the basis of the slot maintenance, because you can't put a group under contract and then, you know, sort of, for budget reasons, take it away.

Starting in August and September of last year, intake began to increase. And, for example, in our operation, we have a big project

in the American Street Corridor, Councilman Ortiz, that Raphael Feliciano, whom I know you know, who has worked with us.

I have to say, just parenthetically, that I have a staff now of eight or nine people, depending on whether you count full-time or part-time. Four of my staff are graduates of the program that I'm talking about. And they are not sweeping the floors; they are running that program. So, you know, I have put our organizational money where our commitments are. We've hired people and they are now directing what we are currently doing.

So this is the setting. Work Opportunities is the court of last resort for people who have been failed by everything else. If they end up in Work Opportunities, they been through SPOC and didn't make it, they have been through the Transitional Work Program and didn't make it, they have been through something else and didn't make it. That's why they end up in Work Opportunities.

It's "ass-backwards," if you'll pardon the expression, because my judgment is, if

somebody has no work experience, a program like Work Opportunities ought to be the first thing that they do to get some work experience, and then they should go into more intensive educationally-service ones. This is the opposite. What they're doing is taking people through intensive programs, and when they fail all of that, then they are sent to Work Opportunities, as the least intense.

Well, the contracts that have now been given out as a part of the solution to this -- and let me say, the State is very unhappy with the way the City administered this program in the current year, but the framework for their misery is not the framework of us. They're just angry that the City over-budgeted the number of people that they thought they would (unintelligible), there was no intake, there was very, very bad monitoring procedures, they didn't know where clients were. What these folks are bean-counters; they want to be able to tell themselves in Harrisburg, Here are the number of people who are looking for work, here are the number of people who found work, here are the number of people who are out of compliance and might need to be sanctioned.

And that kind of information was not easily and readily available from PWDC, which is why Harrisburg was so angry about it, and the program is in fact hanging by a thread, to use the language of a monitor whom I heard last week at one of the meetings about all of this.

So the solutions that are now in place are as follows: Organizations, some of them. That had contracts under the previous Work Opportunities Programs that have clients that are still there -- I mean, your contract ended March 3rd. If you took intake in February, you have some people who still have the right to be in the program until May.

So a number of groups were given transitional contracts for six months that began April 1st to basically close out the existing caseload. And they are meeting regularly with Rufus Lynch and with the PWDC around that set of issues.

A group called "the Pioneers" and maybe -- I'm not sure where they stand -- the Universal Community Homes were given contracts that begin April 1st. We don't have them yet, but we're

being given contracts. Each of our contracts right now is looking at a minimum -- they're 15 months, from July 1st -- from April 1st of this year to July 1st of the year 2001.

The presumption is 25 people a week for each us, so that's 375. Plus we took on 20 people at the very end of March because we were the only ones who could take intake. So we have as many people now -- we have 70 -- close to 70 people that we're working with in the last three weeks. That's more than we had the whole year, and that included a SPOC contact last year.

So what are we given? We're given now $500 for each of these people, and it's not on the basis of slots; it's on the basis of people. But, frankly, I'm not worried about this because if you cut from 15 groups to 3, my judgment is, our intake, based on the current base of intake, we're likely to have well over 400 people over the course of the year, for a maximum $600 a slot -- for a maximum of six months, rather.

What are we asked to do? We're asked to monitor them for 20 hours a week in their work assignments, and we are now supposed to provide

ten hours of wraparound, for which there really is no money. The Institute has its own adult literacy program -- we're using that. And the Free Library has some excellent services that we've been discovering, and we are going to use that. And wraparound can be job search, it can be driver's ed, as, you know, somebody suggested. There's a wide range of activities here.

So we are using our vast network of organizations that we work with to try to help them provide the support services for which there is no direct funding. Transitional work had all this in-house because of Pew I have felt all along that the problem is, we have groups that do different things well, but not everything well. And the partnerships that you need to make this work are what -- at least on the operational level, in terms of the issues that you've heard here, are what is the solution to that side of it, if there is one. It would be better to have 500 to $1,000 per slot for literacy and training, but there isn't, so you make the best of this bad situation.

But that's where it is. We've been

taking intake. As I say, we took 50 people in in one week. Now that's leveled off because one of the other groups is in the equation.

As far as the issues of concern to me as well as to everybody here, I do not believe -- I don't even agree with Ernie Jones. I think that I would much prefer to have the flexibility to have somebody in a training situation for longer than six months, if that's really what's necessary to help them get into the workforce.

But you have to understand, Harrisburg's perspective on this is as follows: A full-time job is 40 hours a week, so it is not unreasonable, therefore, to ask a welfare TANF recipient to 20 hours a week at work and 10 to 20 hours a week in addition, doing education and training. In fact, that does them a favor because it gets them into a habit of going to a 30- or 40-hour week. That's specifically the way they look at it. So if you're asking for them to spend 20 hours a week in education and training instead of work, that's their response.

Are they providing enough resources to do the extra 10 or 20 hours a week of education

and training? Not right now they're now, but that's their philosophy around it.

The final thing I want to say, and just in terms of something that came in, Harrisburg's belief is, you get people into the workforce and then you get them support. So now on my desk -- this just came in, I guess, Monday -- is a request for proposal of this thickness that I haven't even opened 'cause I haven't had the time for so-called retention services that would be provided by community-based organizations and agencies to people who are in the workforce. And that's where they're coming from -- consistent again with their philosophy of "work first, support later."

So I think we can and get -- and we are working -- I wouldn't have taken this assignment, which is a difficult one, if I didn't think we could make progress in building the kind of integrated self-sufficiency system that we have been advocating since before welfare reform became a reality. That's the challenge that our organization has assumed in taking on what is an under funded, difficult role.

I am certainly in favor of increasing

the payments, increasing the time, and all of that, but that is going to require, I'm afraid, a political revolution at the State level before we get the kind of people in who will listen to it, because right now, the people who are in charge have a philosophy that is exactly the opposite of what we're trying to achieve.

Thank you for the opportunity. I can stick around for a couple questions, then I have to go, but I am certainly available for follow-up in my office, and look forward to working with you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Again, I apologize. I have been here all day too. Thank you, Ed.

MS. SAKEY: I guess I should be saying good afternoon, Committee Councilwoman Tasco and other committee members that may be present.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: They're here, they're on their --

MS. SAKEY: They're on their way.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Let me just say this to you: This microphone carries into all of the Council offices. So if a Councilperson isn't here, it doesn't mean that they're not listing 'cause we do listen on our squawk boxes.

MS. SAKEY: My name is Ann Mitchell Sakey, and I'm the Executive Director of the Greater Philadelphia Federation of Settlements. And with me this afternoon is June Cairns who is the Executive Director of United Communities of Southeast Philadelphia. June is also wearing two hats in that she is also a board member of the Federation.

I don't know that there's really a lot more that I can say that hasn't already been said this morning, and I'm well aware of the time, so I'd like to try and capture my comments in three primary ways, if I could, and to share my remarks for the record a little bit later, as well as to provide some information on our organization.

I'm not clear about why I'm on this particular panel, except for maybe now I am an advocate, having formerly been a provider of services for the Work Opportunities Initiative.

For us, it comes in three ways, and so I think I should, one, share our successes, and then share our frustrations, and then try and indicate our support for the Philadelphia Unemployment Project's policy position that the programs be extended to 18 months, and that the training include paid work experience based on a wage of at least $7 an hour.

For the successes, we were one of those providers that signed a contract with the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation back in April of 1999. In fact, to do just that -- manage the work activities, which for us we define as work-readiness skills, development types of things. We did that for 155 individuals over a 7-month period -- a 7-month period because, as has already been indicated, we did not begin to receive referrals of individuals until September of 1999.

I think that we have been successful with 155 individuals through 22 worksites compromised of settlement houses in Philadelphia. I think also that we've been successful in that I know for a fact that we have placed and retained

at least six of those individuals where we managed their work experience, one of whom is currently employed at the Greater Philadelphia Federation of Settlements in a full-time, unsubsidized position.

And now our frustration. I can probably sum that up in, I guess, four words: management, management, management, and finally, payment. And I say management because I recognize that there has been, given the history that has just been indicated, a number of challenges with this particular program, the Work Opportunities Initiative. I would say that the first challenge is the fact that it is thought of, or was thought of, as the program of last resort, as opposed to fast track.

With that being said, as community-based organizations, which the Federation is, with subcontract providers, who are also community-based organizations, the issue of management, administrative policy development, changing the rules on us from April to today, has been a very difficult situation for us to try and manage an effective program for individuals that we got to know and, I think, got to know rather intimately.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: For a non-social worker, tell me what you're talking about.

MS. SAKEY: Well, what I'm talking about is the fact that you sign a contract in April. In September, you get individuals that you were supposed to have gotten back in April. I know that there were issues with that, that that changes the dynamics of how those work programs are actually going to work.

The other issue would be, as we were told initially, that we were talking about five hours of wraparound service, and then we find out that we're talking actually about ten hours of wraparound services, without the dollars there to be able to support them.

Finally, clearly, there are some issues that were going on administratively within the PWDC, and I think several of them have already been mentioned, but I would like to put on the record the fact that the Greater Philadelphia Federation of Settlements sent worksite agreements to that agency at least four different times to at least four different individuals, in which case, all four times, it got lost, and all four

individuals are no longer there.

So the ability as a contractor to even be able to figure out what step to make in partnership becomes problematic, especially when you also have other subcontractors that you are responsible for.

I'm really glad that Mr. Jones indicated that apologies are in order. I know that he indicated that for everyone, however, except for the contractors -- I being one of them.

I also think it's interesting that what I consider to be management issues are what he referred to as "technical difficulties." I don't see them as being technical difficulties that could not have been overcome if there were going to be regular meetings and networking to share the provision of resources that are available within the Philadelphia community.

I am gratified to know -- and I might be going longer than my three minutes, but I've sat here for a long while and have been dealing with many of the women that had come through the offices of the Federation that I got to know personally and felt in so many ways that it was my

responsibility to help these individuals to achieve their next level, how ever that was going to be. And I took that job, as well as all of my staff, very seriously, although I have yet to be paid for any of that work.

So what that means is that, as a bottom line, when you begin to talk about, well, how is it that you're going to work more with the community, and how is it that you're actually going to make a change, I as a community-based organization cannot afford to float the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation for an entire year and not be paid for my services.

I also cannot afford to continue to have a colleague calling me at home on a weekend to address policy issues that ended up changing in midstream on Friday afternoon so that we would be able to handle something on Monday.

And, finally, I guess, what I would like to say -- and this is more visionary, because I don't know all of the politics that are involved in it, but it would seem to me that if you're really talking about not just moving from welfare to work but moving to self-sufficiency, it may

behoove us to look at some of those clusters that are spoken about in the survey done by the Philadelphia Unemployment Project, where you have job clusters about child care, about health. I notice that drama was not done, and certainly you have clerical. All of that is really great.

However, the 21st Century League has done some very interesting work where clearly it shows that for Philadelphia citizens to be successful in the 21st century, we need to look at the new job market dynamics, and those new job market dynamics are around information technology, and they are around hospital and tourism.

And so to the extent that these programs can be looked at in that way -- forgetting the fact of whom it is that we are working with -- all citizens deserve the right to be able to participate in that opportunity.

Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Very well said. Thank you.

MS. CAIRNS: Good afternoon. I think it is afternoon -- at least here in Philadelphia. Wish we were in California.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

I'm June Cairns. I'm the Executive Director of the United Community Southeast Philadelphia. You have my testimony, which lists our programs. We serve families and individuals in South Philadelphia, and I wanted to speak specifically about some of the systems issues that affected us as a subcontractor of the contractors with the Federation of Settlements.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So you were subcontracting with the Settlements, who was subcontracting with --

MS. CAIRNS: With PWDC, the old PIC, right, because they couldn't supervise the 150 folks, so they asked us, as the neighborhood organizations, to help them out.

The overall assumption that community-based nonprofits were not all Catholic Social Services -- a lot of us are a lot smaller, they're the biggest human service provider in the City. Assuming that we have the capacity to help these folks in large numbers of them, I think, is somewhat faulty. Many of the staff at United Communities and the other settlements have at one time or currently are receiving benefits.

Because of our commitment to serve the community and support individuals, we often provide additional supervision, loans for workplace clothing, advances for apartment securities, and other supports as staff may need them. This was nothing new to us. Rather, the system was asking us to take on additional folks to provide them this work opportunity.

The supervision issues and the child care issues and all those other things were enormous. So when I got a call requesting us to participate, I met with my staff and we hesitantly agreed to take five slots. We did it out of commitment to the neighborhood and to the people who needed the opportunity, but it was a fiscally imprudent decision for the agency. I had a master's level staff person working at least a day and a half a week on this, and we were reimbursed a whopping $400 per person. That's $2,000 for six months of a master's-level person working with these folks.

We originally, as Ann mentioned, had agreed to do 5 hours of wraparound services; it ended up being 10, okay?

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So that would impact on the quality of service provided.

MS. CAIRNS: Actually, no. What it did was, the quality of services was extremely high, and all of our people got jobs, I am pleased to say. However, what it meant is that staff person had to revise what she was doing in terms of some of her other job responsibilities, and a number of things got back-dumped on me, as the director of the agency, which really would have been great if she was doing. So that was an issue.

My particular example of the poor administration of this effort, I think, is pretty dramatic. Participants in the Work Opportunities Initiative were asked and encouraged to sign up for direct deposit, which seemed a good measure for them -- they wouldn't be going to check-cashing places to cash their checks, and that was like giving them bank accounts, all those kinds of things about getting a real job.

And they were told that they would be notified when direct deposit would occur. Yet one Friday afternoon, we picked up the paychecks, only to discover that the direct deposit had occurred

and none of the women had Mac cards, okay?

A phone call to our contact person at First Union -- who I am really sorry didn't stay from the hearings this morning -- was that they were unaware of the program and the community development officer was unaware of the program, the Work Opportunities Program.

My 9 o'clock phone call on a Saturday morning to my contractor was, these women needed money. They had planned on buying food. This was early fall -- school supplies for their children. And they had direct deposit and could not get their money. She authorized me to take money out of my bank account because I did have a MAC card.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: And you had money.

MS. CAIRNS: And I had money.

MS. SAKEY: That I was going to reimburse back.

MS. CAIRNS: Right, right, because I knew I'd get my money back. And she authorized me to deliver money to the women on Saturday morning that needed the tide-over until Monday.

This does not make a lot of sense. I did that. However, the nightmare in terms of

getting their paychecks worked out the next week was horrible. I didn't want to hear about that. These women did not get a Mac card until two weeks later, okay?

Now, the PWDC is telling us that we have to manage all of this and we have to provide nurturing work environments for these folks, which we want to do. The cost is enormous to community-based organizations who already have a tradition of doing these kinds of things.

We wanted people to help them -- to help individuals in the program deal with life skills, but yet they're not giving us the tools to do it. We have cancelled our contract. We are not doing this program anymore. It's one that we would consider as one of the tools in our toolbox of helping people to become self-sufficient in our community. It's not the only way to do it, but it's one that I will not engage in until a number of these issues have been ironed out.

We encourage the program to be longer, that we stop the clock and let some women get some education -- all the things that have been said earlier. But I want to let you know that it's

really tough on the community-based organizations and it's not that we're not supportive, because we are. We advocate long and hard for this community, but the impacts are enormous, and it's one that the folks haven't measured.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. CAIRNS: I need to go. So thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much for coming in. Thank you for your testimony.

MS. DIETRICH: I'm Sharon Dietrich, from CLS, and I'll try to keep it short for you. I've submitted written testimony so let me just highlight a few points.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Mm-hmm.

MS. DIETRICH: Let me start by saying -- I want to make sure this is clear. The two different programs in this town are of two very different qualities. The PWTC, I will hand it to them, they have resources, they have management that cares, they listen to feedback, they seek out feedback, they have data to measure how they're

doing, and I give them a lot of credit for, like Work Ops, being a program that had to get up and running with not a lot of lead time. But they are doing, in my mind, a pretty good job under difficult circumstances -- not that there aren't things that couldn't be improved, but overall, I would give them some credit for being a well-run program.

As you've heard all day Work Ops is not that. Women sitting in the waiting room for weeks, sometimes longer, waiting to get placed in one of these positions that has gone unplaced that have been discussed in this last panel. People who have never met their case managers. Case managers with ratios of 150 clients to 1.

Maybe the best way I can draw out for you the distinction between the two programs is the telephone system. If you call TWC, you get right through, your phone is picked up, you get a please voice who immediately directs you to whomever you want to speak to.

I cannot locate a switchboard number for Work Ops. My colleagues did an investigation, trying to find out, is there a telephone number

for Work Ops? And if you called me today at my office and said,"Could I have the phone number for Work Ops?" I would have to respond, "I don't know what I it is."

So these are two different programs that have different struggles. And I was glad to hear Mr. Jones say that they're going to work to make it better. And I hope that that's right. It's not as though these problems haven't been brought to their attention prior to the last couple of weeks.

This has probably been going on for a long time -- with, I might add, some really severe consequences women who have been sanctioned by the Welfare Department because the Welfare Department thinks that they're not doing what they're supposed to be doing, when they've gone to Work Ops and this mismanagement has resulted in their not being able to go out and work the way they're trying to.

Let me say that there are a couple things that Mr. Jones said that I found distressing. And one was what he had to say about training, that this is not the program for

training. If you want training, you go to SPOC. Well, the women in Work Ops are required -- required -- to spend ten hours a week in training. Now, there's no training for them to be in, so it strikes me as a bit ludicrous to say that they're not entitled to try to get some training in this program when they must go to the training ten hours a week, the nonexistent training, in order to continue to participate in the program. That makes no sense.

And I think incumbent upon him to figure out how to get women trained in the same way that TWC does.

(Applause.)

MS. DIETRICH: Another response I wanted to make to what he had to say is about how long the program should be. He said, "We can place clients in three months." Well, I could place clients in three months, but let me tell you that I have been doing employment-log cases for the last 12 years, and I know that placing someone in a job is not the same thing as keeping it.

And I have no doubt that you can find a job in this economy for a lot of women after three

months, but the real question is, Where are they three months after that, or six months after that? And I can promise you that the women in these programs have some severe problems to be worked out.

I heard recently at a meeting that was attended by employers who are providing slots, much like the two women we just heard from, that they are really concerned about what happens to their workers after they leave in six months -- much like you said yourself. They have women who are trying to be file clerks who cannot alphabetize.

You know, it takes more than six months in order to learn a lifetime's worth of things that you need to know to be successful on a job. Even if in that length of time, we don't know that they can succeed -- we hope they can, but for the two gentlemen that run those programs to sit here and blithely say that six months is more than enough, I find stressing because I think that that's based on what Harrisburg wants to hear and really not based on what they know is going to work.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

Just a couple of comments on the six-months thing. You may hear from Harrisburg that they're not allowed to put people in these programs longer than six months, that there is a legal requirement in Act 35 that says that they cannot do that. I'm here to tell you that my legal opinion is that they are not correct about that. They are reading Act 35 in a way that serves their purposes.

And what Ed Schwartz said about this whole, you know, quick attachment thing is absolutely what this is about. It's the same as though, go out and look for work -- well, this is kind of like admitting that you couldn't find work when you looked for it, but we're going to do this as quickly as possible for you so we can still push you out into some kind of job at Burger King. That is really what Harrisburg wants to do.

Act 35 can be read that either their positions could be renewed or that there's no limitation at all, but they choose to read it so that there's a six-month limitation. I do not think that that is a necessary reading of the law, and I believe that if there were interest in

making these programs longer, they are not legally prohibited from doing that.

Another question about the six months that sometimes comes up is, Well, how will we fund a longer program? Well, I think the point was made earlier today that both programs -- Work Ops and TWC -- are under-subscribed for the number of slots that they currently have, particularly Work Ops. Governor Ridge appropriated money for 16,000 slots statewide, 16,000. Currently there are about 1500 out of 16,000 people in those slots. Clearly, you could simply use some of the unused capacity in order to lengthen the slots. The money is there. It's not even a matter that you need to tap into, you know, rainy day reserves and TANF surpluses. The money is allocated in those programs. If there is a will to make those program longer, there is a way, both legally and in terms of funding.

Two other issues quickly that I want to highlight.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Let me ask you a question before you go forward.

MS. DIETRICH: Sure.

4/26/00 HEALTH, HUMAN SVCS. - RES. 000036

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: This program at the end of five years, all of the -- the program stops, the TANF -- the assistance stops.

MS. DIETRICH: For people who have been on TANF for five years, that's correct.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Five years, so they're off, they can't get any other help any place?

MS. DIETRICH: That's correct.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So what happens to the program?

MS. DIETRICH: Well, let me step back for a minute. TANF doesn't stop, it's not like DPW's going to stop getting money. What stops is somebody's eligibility to get welfare benefits. In fact, the Welfare Department could use that TANF funding in order to provide jobs. And, essentially, that's what they're doing in these two programs.

Which gets me to my next point. The Welfare Department could be setting this whole thing up so that these women are not having this time counted against their five-year clock. And I think it's reprehensible that we have who are

women working like they're supposed to and are having that count against their 60 months, when the Welfare Department has been given the authority by the federal government to say, You don't have to be on the clock.

The Welfare Department could be using other funding streams and little technical tricks that I won't bore you with in order to make sure that women who are doing what they're supposed to be doing are not using up that five-year safety because, you know, net five years -- two years from now, it could be that the economy is not what it is today, it could be that these women do not yet have a wage history to qualify unemployment compensation. They lose a job and they're out of luck. There is no safety net to the safety net.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: But we talked about this when this program first started, remember?

MS. DIETRICH: Yes, yes.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Okay, go ahead.

MS. DIETRICH: Finally, let me say this about child care: The Welfare Department wants to say that they fixed a lot of things a couple of

weeks ago, and it's true that the governor's budget this year made some improvements in terms of copays for parents and eligibility limits and stuff like that, but a lot of the problems that have been described by the women today are not going to be cleared up by the changes that have been made because the key issue here is that if you get into the bureaucratic nightmare that these women have described with your paper work, nobody gets paid. We've had people go through the six months' program who have never had a dime of child care come through.

And there is a solution to that. This solution is being offered to people who put their kids into day care centers, which is, have the Welfare Department pay the provider directly and immediately -- don't go through all the paperwork nonsense and the i-dotting and the t-crossing and the lost papers, just put them into what is called "the vendor pay system" so that they get regularly and without a lot of fuss.

DPW has decided to do that for people who have their kids in day care centers, but for people who do not, which constitutes 80 percent of

the people in this city, they are going to be going along with the same old problems, unless and until DPW gets to the position where they're ready to say, Let's fix that too. But I am very concerned that people think that the day care situation has been dealt with, and I'm sorry to say that it has not.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So those mothers who have their children in a day care center, the checks are sent directly to the vendor?

MS. DIETRICH: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: But the State has a problem with us giving the money directly to the client, to the mother?

MS. DIETRICH: The State puts mothers through hoops that it will not put --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So they have to really justify the fact that the child is in day care.

MS. DIETRICH: They got to get the paperwork in, and there's lots of paperwork snafus that cause everybody these problems. I think people testified about, you know, We fax in the hours, we send them, we call them, it's lost, it's

not right.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So if you have a provider doing, it that gets lost.

MS. DIETRICH: No. The providers are not required to do that, they get paid, it's a hassle free system, and we need the same hassle-free system for women who are using the woman down the block that we are getting for the day care provider.

And if there are no further questions, I will --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Which -- well, that's another story. Go ahead.

MS. DIETRICH: Those are really the highlights of the points that I wanted to make.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much for your testimony.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: We're certainly going to have some follow-through, you know, in follow-up meetings to discuss the results of the contents of this hearing. And as we -- really, it's the political will of what happens in Harrisburg, and that's what we really are up

against, but I really appreciate your coming today thank you. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: I just need to say something for the record.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Come forward.

Miss Weiss, would you like to come forward.

Oh, I forgot the Miss King lady. Let those two ladies make their statements and then we're done. You can sit at the table.

(Witnesses come forward.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Is there anyone else to testify? When we finish with this panel, with these two ladies and Miss Weiss, we're going to recess the hearing, okay?

Go ahead.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Veronica Johnson and I represent PWDC. I am the outreach recruitment specialist for that unit, SPOC, Up Front, as well as Work Opportunities. This is the reason that I'm here. Originally, I was the assessment counselor for that unit.

Most of the client that have came in

here, I think they know me well. I think I have not responded to any issue that has ever came across in Work Opportunities, could never have solved it, but we definitely have addressed it. The reason I stepped up is, I wanted to state for the record the phone number for Work Opportunities with any concern as far as community-wise.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you. I think those ladies who questioned the issue of the phone number left, but I think maybe you all ought to make it available to all of the providers.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. So we are here and we do care.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: But if there a question about the number, I think you ought to take it back to them and let them know that there is some issue with that.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. I just had to state that we are here and that we care.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

Yes?

MS. PETERKIN: Good morning. My name is Margaret Peterkin (ph.). I volunteer as a resource coordinator with Miss Rose King at QUADS,

Inc.

The issue this morning with TWC and wraparound, they were saying a few of their ladies are allowed to do wraparound at that worksite. There are three interns, because they dread wraparound. So we thought since we did -- and we sort of operate out of the box with our interns because, as we tell them, they hit the ground running. The first day they come to work, they work. We take them to meetings with us. You know, it's a small nonprofit --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Now, who are you with?

MS. PETERKIN: QUADS, Inc. -- It's Qualified Unique Alternative Development Services. It's at 1419 North 52nd Street, but we wanted our ladies because they had had such a success rate with us as interns to stay with us for wraparound. You know, in the ten hours that they need for wraparound, we're teaching them Internet access and we're also teaching them Access and Excel.

And we ask them, "Well, were you learning this at TWC?" They said no. So we

thought, Well, why can't they stay with us. You know, training is training, however you get it. But when you think out of box, sometimes that gets to be a problem.

But one challenge we put to our interns is that all major retailers do corporate donations for clothes, and everybody needs a, quote/unquote, monkey suit to interview in. Everybody needs interview outfits. So Cynthia Bledsoe (ph.), who's very aggressive and doesn't take no for an answer called Ross, she called TJ Maxx, she called Marshalls, and she called Jones New York. Within two weeks, we had gift certificates from Ross, we had gift certificates from Marshalls. She spoke to the vice president of human resources at Jones New York, and they're sending $100 gift certificates for our interns.

Because one thing about -- it's very good to say "Go ahead a job," but you have to have clothes to wear to interview, and you have to have the right type of clothes to wear to interview. Some people don't know this. You know, if you don't have the work experience, if you don't have the experience, you don't know.

So they did this, and a lot of these companies -- and I don't know that the other providers know this -- are very receptive to this process. You know, they say, "We do this all the time." We called Sears and Sears said we have to do that through United Way.

But I think some of the thinking, if it could come just out of the box just a little -- and I'll give you a personal example. In 1995, after my company was downsized, my unemployment ran out, and in January 1996, I applied for welfare. In March of 1996, I got a letter from a caseworker to come in 'cause they were doing job training. I went through six weeks of training with PIC. There were 45 of us in a room. Three of us had high school educations, one person had post high school education -- that was me. The bulk of the women in that room had between 3rd and 7th grade education, but the focus was everybody go get a job. How, how? How do you do this when, you know nobody -- they never did a skills assessment, they never addressed skill level. It's just go get a job.

That was easy for me, that wasn't that

hard for me. In May, I got a job, you know. And as a matter of fact, I came to work for PIC and I worked for the summer in Youth Works. When that job was over, a company that came to Philadelphia, called (unintelligible), who handles Health Choices now, the medical assistance program for welfare recipients, came to Philadelphia, and I got that job. They downsized in March, and that's when I came to volunteer with Miss King, you know, and it's almost time for me to go back to work again because my unemployment. . .

But I think if they just -- I understand that all of this is about numbers, that they, you know, there are masses of people that have to come through the system, that they want to see work. But this is also about people, and until you address some quality-of-life issues, this is going to be a colossal failure, it really is. Because it -- one size does not fit all; it never has, it never will. And until you address some skill levels and some quality-of-life issues for people to make sure that they not only have a job but they have a career and that they can see the light at the end of the tunnel, they're not

going to have any kind of successes.

And in raising the minimum wage, because my children this summer worked in summer jobs that paid them $7 an hour, and I think it is an insult to an adult to expect them work for 5.15, it's an insult.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, I appreciate your testimony.

And now to Miss Weiss.

(Witness comes forward.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Hi.

MS. WEISS: Hi, Councilwoman.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: You have been here a long time, right?

MS. WEISS: Yeah. I --

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Did you really think you were going to testify this morning?

(Laughter.)

MS. WEISS: I was hopeful. Well, I guess I'm last and presumably not least. I'm Cheryl Weiss with the 21st Century League, and the League is a nonprofit organization in Philadelphia

that has researched and issued two major reports on welfare reform and it's impact on Philadelphia. I've brought some copies just in case you've misplaced yours or never got them in the first place, I'm not sure.

What I want to do is not comment on the two programs that have been the focus of this hearing; rather, I want to call attention to some broader public policy issues that may have some bearing on these and other welfare programs.

As I'm sure you know, the twin goals of welfare reform are to reduce the welfare rolls and to encourage self-sufficiency. With TANF now into its third year, the welfare rolls across the country and in the Commonwealth are now at their lowest point in 30 years. And, in fact, as others have said, the welfare rolls in Philadelphia have declined significantly to the point where there are about 45,000 TANF recipients as of January of 2000. So I think there's very little dispute that the rolls have fallen due to a combination of both the strict time limits of the new welfare law and the robust economy.

But the decline in welfare rolls does

not equate to the achievement of self-sufficiency, the other significant goal of welfare reform; nor does it speak to those TANF recipients who are quickly approaching their five-year lifetime limit. And these are the two issues I just want to a couple of minutes to highlight for your consideration.

With respect to self-sufficiency, the key question we have to ask, now that we're into the welfare reform three years is, How is Philadelphia and the State overall doing? According to the State's own report, we're not doing very well. From March 3rd of 1997 through December 31st of 1998, the State looked at roughly 185 welfare recipients that passed through the welfare system. Well, about a third of them left the welfare rolls, obtained a job, and stayed on that job for a year. But one-third, the other third -- it's about 65,000 people -- left welfare but came back on. So retention was not very good.

And then, the most distressing, I think, is that another third, or more than 60,000 adults and their children, simply disappeared. They left the welfare rolls and they reported no

earnings. And the question is, What happened to those people? Nobody knows.

So according to the Department of Public Welfare's own study, as well as the League's study, what we have learned is that retention rates across the board, regardless of the program, are not very stunning at all.

In addition, as you've heard time and again, what people are earning hardly puts them on the road to self-sufficiency. The average wages from all of the programs that Mr. Jones identified is somewhere between $6.30 to $7 an hour, so folks are living at the poverty level.

You've got testimony written, so I'll skip over some and really get to the second broader issue, and that concerns time limits and the reauthorization of TANF. As of January 2000, some 23,000 welfare families -- which is to say 70,000 kids and their parents in this city -- will have exhausted 3 years of their 5-year lifetime limit. Their lifetime limits will expire at about the same time that the TANF law, the federal legislation, comes up for reauthorization.

What will happen to these families when

they reach their five-year lifetime limit? Will they lose all of their cash benefits? What will happen to the children who, after all, comprise two-thirds of the welfare population here and across the country?

TANF does not address issues except in a vaguely-worded clause that allows states to exempt 20 percent of their TANF population.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: What does that mean?

MS. WEISS: Well, according to the federal law, states are given -- are allowed to exempt 20 percent of their population from the rules of TANF. The problem here is that -- to our knowledge anyway -- the State Department of Public Welfare has said nothing about how it will use this exemption, who will be exempt on any kind of permanent basis. They have not engaged any of the key stakeholders, to our knowledge, in a discussion of what will happen when we come to this five-year limit.

So mostly all of what we've heard is that welfare reform is a smashing success because the rolls have dropped dramatically, but the point

here is that some 23,000 families in Philadelphia are fast-approaching their lifetime limit. So we would urge members of City Council and the City Administration to not only examine these particular programs that have been the subject of your hearing, but really to raise the bar and look at some of these broader issues, like the reauthorization of TANF, the lifetime limits, really what will happen to people who exhaust their five-year lifetime limit and still don't have a job in what is the most prosperous economic times that we've enjoyed.

And I would say this not only in terms of having that conversation with the members of the State, but also our Congressional delegation, because even in Congress and our national leaders, people are running around saying that welfare reform's been really successful, and they need to know that there are some very real issues confronting the people and urban areas such as Philadelphia.

Thanks.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Before you go, when you talk about the people who disappeared, I

think you said it was 60,000?

MS. WEISS: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: The State is not doing any tracking to find out what happened to those individuals?

MS. WEISS: Well, the State, according to this report, which is "Welfare Reform After Two Years," is to get some information about earnings through the Employment Bureau and try to do matches between who's on the welfare rolls and reported earnings. And, to my knowledge, they don't do a great deal of tracking. And, in fact, one of the salient points of the League's report, both the latest one and first one, is that DPW has a woefully inadequate database and really does not collect the kind of data that it needs to do informed social policy planning and decision-making.

So they just disappeared, Councilwoman. I don't know where they went.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: It's very sad.

MS. WEISS: Yep.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: We hear you on your challenge to Council to follow up on some of

the other issues, which we will sit down and talk with you about to see what the next steps would be to follow that through, but it's a daunting task.

And I would like to thank everyone who came today to present their testimony. I'd like to thank the Unemployment Project for keeping the issue before the public. It's -- you know, we do have people out there who are not -- we don't know what's happened to them, and we don't know if we're going to be successful with the 23,000 moving to self-sufficiency.

MS. WEISS: That's right.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So it's an ongoing challenge to the Council as well as to our State legislators.

And we appreciate again MOMs keeping forth their fight to keep the issue on the table.

(Applause.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: We read about you going to Harrisburg, making the fight, and we'll continue to work with you, and I want to thank you.

And I'd like to ask my colleagues if they have anything to say before we adjourn the

meeting.

(No response.)

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: There being no further comments -- we won't close this 'cause we might want to come back again to continue to review what's going on.

We will recess this hearing on this issue. However, if we raise the other issues about the reauthorization, we would have to do it in a resolution. So we will recess this hearing on this issue till the call of the Chair, and we may have to come back with additional information and continue the dialogue.

But we do plan to work with the MOMs and the Unemployment Project and their coalition to help advocate in Harrisburg for some of the issues that they have raised here today.

Thank you very much and we thank our colleagues for listening.

(Applause.).

(Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.)

- - -

C E R T I F I C A T E

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing proceedings of the Council of the City of Philadelphia of Wednesday, April 26, 2000, were reported fully and accurately by me, and that this is a correct transcript of same.

RE: COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RESOLUTION NO. 000036

_____,

JOSEPHINE CARDILLO,

Registered Professional Reporter