THE INVOLVEMENT OF AMERICA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS (JOBS) TRAINING PROGRAM: A NATIONAL STUDY

By

TIMM JAMES BLISS

Bachelor of Science
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas
1984

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1989

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1994

THE INVOLVEMENT OF AMERICA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS (JOBS) TRAINING PROGRAM: A NATIONAL STUDY

Thesis Approved:

Stephen Gregory Katsinas
Thesis Adviser

Ronald Beer

Clement E Ward

Thomas Karman

Thomas C. Collins
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Stephen Katsinas for his intelligent supervision, constructive guidance, inspiration, and friendship. His knowledge of the community college system, administrative policy and practices, leadership models, and educational funding practices shall always be remembered and extensively used in my own professional career. Steve, you have taught this "Texan" a great deal. My sincere thanks extends to my other dissertation committee members Dr. Tom Karman, Dr. Ron Beer, and Dr. Clem Ward, whose guidance, assistance, and encouragement are also invaluable.

Moreover, I wish to express a sincere gratitude to Dr. Jim Osborn, Department Head of Agricultural Economics at Oklahoma State University, for his willingness and generosity in supporting this research endeavor. Without his graciousness, this research study would of had to have been shortened, revised, or even shelved. Dr. Osborn's support for my continuing education is greatly appreciated.

I would also like to give my special appreciation to my parents, Bob and Skeet Bliss. Without their precious teachings, strong encouragement, patience, unselfish giving, and wisdom, I would not be who I am or where I am at today. Thank you, Mom and Dad - I love you. My life-long hope has always been to

make you proud of me and never to disappoint you. I also thank my three older brothers, Scott, Todd, and Gregg who allowed me to live as a child. All three of you have encouraged and inspired me in your own "unique" ways. For that, I am grateful.

A special thanks goes to Paul "Femur Dog" and Julie Weece, Greg and Tammy Baker, Tim and Jennifer Jones, and Lisa and Tasha Bliss for helping me stuff, lick, and label 1,170 envelopes. I am fortunate to have such willing friends and family.

I personally thank Dr. James McKenney, Director of Economic Development, American Association of Community Colleges for providing me with the addresses and mailing labels of the community colleges invited to participate in this research study, and Dr. David Pierce, President, American Association of Community Colleges for endorsing my research instrument for my dissertation.

Lastly, my unspeakable thanks and praise to the Lord above, who has truly blessed me and has forever held me and my family in His hand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

NOMENCLATURE

AACC	American Association of Community Colleges
AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
DHHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
FSA	Family Support Act of 1988
JOBS	Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act
NETWORK	America's Two-Year College Employment Training and Literacy Consortium
U.S.	United States
WIN	Work Incentive Program

THIS RESEARCH STUDY IS DEDICATED TO MY WIFE LISA AND DAUGHTER TASHA. WITHOUT THEIR LOVE, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND SACRIFICES, THIS WHOLE PROCESS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE. I AM HONORED AND FORTUNATE TO BE A HUSBAND AND FATHER TO THESE TWO SPECIAL LADIES.

John Gardner has told us that, "Sometimes our institutions are like sand dunes in the desert - shaped more by influences than by purposes." The message for those of us who plan to be around to anticipate the changes in the future is clear: We can create our own future, but we have to see clearly what changes are occurring, and think clearly what our purposes are so we remain loyal to our philosophy as institutions of lifelong learning.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> The community college, at its best, can be a center for problem-solving in adult illiteracy or the education of the disabled. It can be a center for leadership training, too. It can also be the place where education and business leaders meet to talk about the problems of displaced workers. It can bring together agencies to strengthen services for minorities, working women, single parent heads of households, and unwed teenage parents. It can coordinate efforts to provide day care, transportation, and financial aid. The community college can take the lead in long-range planning for community development. And it can serve as the focal point for improving the quality of life in the inner city (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990).

In the mid 1990s, in local communities and across the nation, an increasing stratification seems to be taking place along economic, educational, employment, and ethnic lines. Statistics continue to show increases in the number of individuals and families in the lower-income strata and below the poverty line. There is also a steadily increasing gap between low- and middle-income families and upper-income families (Angel & DeVault, 1991). When considering the situation of the "fortunates" and the "less-fortunates" in our nation's society, typically the politically conservative observe the facts and aver that competition and choice are the keys to helping the poor. In other words, all ships rise with the tide: major emphasis must be placed upon overall economic growth if the poor are to be helped. They believe along with an improved national economic program, local and state efforts should be mounted to strengthen the capabilities of individuals and families to meet their needs. On

the other side of the political aisle, the liberal tend to look at the statistics and call for a national full-employment policy with jobs at the heart of the anti-poverty strategy. They announce that all barriers to working should be removed and some type of federally funded job-guarantee program should be developed. National, state, and local efforts must be exerted to help young mothers and young children which includes emphasis on child-care programs for working mothers, and federally financed help in improving reading and math of poor children.

But as the political forces continue to debate and disagree, the pool of the poor continues to grow. The poor continue to be caught in a cycle of unemployment, loss of self-esteem, and welfare (Bush, 1988). Unfortunately, the vast majority of the poor are women with children. This has prompted the National Council on Economic Opportunity to say that all other things being equal, if the proportion of the poor in female-household families were to continue to increase at the same rate it did from the late 1960s through the 1970s, the poverty population would be composed solely of women and their children before the year 2000 (Ehrenreich and Stallard, 1982).

For the single woman with children there have been few provisions and scant encouragement to seek additional education and training to help break the cycle of welfare dependency and move into the economic mainstream. In fact, much U.S. public policy appears unfortunately to deny low-income women many opportunities for upward mobility (Stein, 1985). America's community

colleges deserve plaudits in this area. They must be given the opportunity to help the single mothers with dependent children and the dropout problem in our nation. If they do not, minority students will continue to leave school at the current rate, an increasing proportion of our citizens will face the prospects of social and economic failure, and communities will languish.

The figures for high school dropouts are startling. The average dropout rate across the country is 26 percent, but in many areas, particularly in the inner cities, it is as high as 40 percent. Every day, 1,512 youngsters dropout of school (Children's Defense Fund, 1990). This means that 20 million young people are not college-bound. Fifty percent of those who are leaving the public school systems do not intend to go on to get a college degree or participate in a postsecondary education program. There is a large untapped source out there, and it is untapped not because we need students, but because these are people who must be served in our educational programs if our society is to move forward. In this society that is emerging, the special challenge will be to overcome the social separations that restrict the quality of education and diminish prospects of civic health (W.T. Grant Foundation, 1988).

The nation's community colleges can be leading architects in building new communities in America. As partners in a network of institutions stretching from coast to coast, they can help the least advantaged move into the mainstream of American life, serve students of all ages, and provide continuing education, civic empowerment, and social integration for a growing number of

citizens. Such community building amidst diversity is vital to the future of the nation. As our nation moves toward the year 2000, the proportion of 16- to 24-year olds in the United States will shrink by almost two million, or 8 percent. It has been reported that most new entrants to the American work force between 1990 and the year 2000 will be individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds (Hudson Institute, 1988). And more than 80 percent of the growth in the work force will come from women, immigrants, and minority groups traditionally undeserved by the educational system (Stern, 1987). These populations will clearly need special services and assistance if they are to succeed in the workplace. As open-door institutions that have historically served disadvantaged students, community colleges have the expertise and the commitment to provide the kind of special attention that these new workers will need (Hodgkinson, 1985).

Gabert (1991) states that students at community colleges in the 1990s will come from a variety of backgrounds and have a variety of reasons for attending. Several generalizations can be made about community college enrollments in the 1990s:

1. 70 percent of the students attend part-time.
2. The average age of the students is about 29 years.
3. The largest age group of students is about 19 years.
4. 53 percent are women.
5. Community college enrollments constitute 37% of all higher education enrollments and 47 percent of all minority enrollments, including:
   - 43 percent of all blacks in higher education,
   - 55 percent of all Hispanics in higher education,
   - 56 percent of all Native Americans in higher education, and
   - 42 percent of all Asians in higher education.

The community college will have a pivotal role to play in rebuilding communities by responding to local economic needs, preparing an educated workforce, and through offering training and retraining opportunities. With the threat of excessive fragmentation and division within our communities, cultural separation and racial tensions are increasing. Families are unstable and many neighborhoods, small and large, have lost their center. Robert Bellah, co-author of *Habits of the Heart*, observed that since World War II, the traditions of atomistic individualism have grown stronger, while the traditions of the individual in society have grown weaker. The sense of cohesive community is lost, he argues (Bellah, 1986). As never before, this nation needs its educational institutions to recognize not only the dignity of the individual but also the interests of community. At their best, our nation's community colleges recognize and enhance the dignity and power of individuals. They are a great resource for helping people to achieve their fullest potential. Students come to college to pursue their own goals, follow their own aptitudes, to become productive, self-reliant human beings, and, with new knowledge, to increase their capacity and urge to continue learning. Serving individual interests should remain a top priority of community colleges. But they can do much more. By offering quality education to all ages and social groups, community colleges can strengthen common goals as individuals are encouraged to see beyond private interests and place their own lives in larger context.

Yet, despite providing opportunities to hundreds of thousands of persons who would not have pursued advanced education (Cohen & Brawer, 1989); having made significant efforts to design programs that reach out to the single parent and the displaced worker who must work; and having the mechanisms in place to comprehensively support the training and education in federally funded welfare reform programs such as the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS), these educational institutions are continually overlooked in the employment training and development partnership (Yglesias, 1987).

The Family Support Act of 1988 created the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program under titles IV-A and IV-F of the Social Security Act which made a fundamental shift in welfare policy. The Family Support Act (FSA) grew out of a combination of political, social, and economic trends plus findings from research projects concerning Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients (Lurie & Sanger, 1991). The goals of this act were increased financial self-sufficiency and heightened parental responsibility of AFDC recipients, objectives that were embraced by both conservative and liberal framers of this legislation. It was also hoped that achievement of these objectives would reduce welfare costs.

The specific purpose of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program was to encourage, assist, and require applicants for and recipients of AFDC to fulfill their responsibilities to support their children by

preparing for, accepting and retaining employment (Blank, 1992). To assure that needy families with children were provided the means to avoid long-term welfare dependency, the JOBS program had the objectives of:

(1) Providing individuals with the opportunity to acquire the basic education and skills necessary to qualify for employment;

(2) Providing necessary supportive services, including transitional child care and medical assistance, so that individuals can participate in JOBS and accept employment;

(3) Promoting coordination of services at all levels of government in order to make services available for individuals at risk of long-term welfare dependency, and to maximize the use of existing resources; and

(4) Emphasizing accountability for both participants and service providers (Public Law 100-485, The Family Support Act of 1988).

Statement of the Problem

During these last two decades, observers and politicians on both sides of the aisle began to realize that funneling only small subsistence payments to welfare mothers would not help them or their children break the cycle of poverty permanently. A consensus developed that the welfare system should be reorganized to foster long-term self-sufficiency by placing AFDC recipients directly into jobs, or alternatively, into appropriate education and training. Those favoring education and training were bolstered by studies which showed that the most important characteristic of women able to earn an adequate income was a high level of education.

> As Martha Ackelsberg observed, "The kinds of jobs which allowed unskilled or low-skilled workers to 'make it' in the United States in the earlier years of this century are rapidly disappearing. Poorly-skilled workers, whether male or female, increasingly find themselves at the margins of the economy. When the would-be worker is a woman with children to support, poverty figures soar. (Ackelsberg, 1988, p.2)"

The 1988 Family Support Act was enacted to revise the AFDC program to emphasize work, child support, and family benefits and to encourage and assist needy children and parents under the new program to obtain the education, training, and employment needed to avoid long-term welfare dependence (Public Law 100-485, 1988). The Act was aimed at transforming the existing AFDC system into a *transitional* welfare system. It created a presumptive right to basic education and child care, backed by greater federal funding for these activities. In terms of postsecondary education, the law made four significant changes (Gold, 1990):

1. For the first time, postsecondary education on a half-time or more basis was specified as an allowable training activity. The definition in the law included a full undergraduate education as well as shorter term training.

2. Although the law allowed states to impose other requirements on AFDC recipients in college (for example, the state can require a half-time student to get a half-time job), the act provided that "any other activities" imposed on the recipient "may not be permitted to interfere with the school or training."

3. While Congress could have required postsecondary training to be directly and narrowly focused to a particular job, the law requires only that the training be generally consistent with the individual's "employment goals."

4. Finally, the Act mandates that child care, transportation and other services be made available for recipients in postsecondary education as well as other training activities in the program.

The problem, however, is that the law says only that the states may *consider* college as "satisfactory participation in the program." The new provision imposes no obligation on the states to approve postsecondary training. The law in no way alters the basic ethic to get people off the welfare rolls quickly. Without a more affirmative federal or state mandate to approve college, or a change in the ethic of "quick case" disposition, it appears unlikely that state approval practices for higher education will change dramatically.

Purpose of the Study

The evolving importance of providing services at America's community, junior and technical colleges to unemployed and underemployed individuals was highlighted by the creation in 1989 of NETWORK, "America's Two-Year College Employment Training and Literacy Consortium." NETWORK is a consortium of 400 community colleges originally based at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Ohio. NETWORK's objective is to expand community college participation in employment, training and adult literacy programs across the nation.

In 1989 and 1990, NETWORK embarked on a research agenda to determine the level of involvement of America's two-year colleges in employment, training, and literacy service delivery, especially under the auspices of the Job

Training Partnership Act (JTPA), the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program, programs sponsored through the Carl Perkins Vocational Education funding, and services offered to business and industry to improve the productivity of the local workforce (NETWORK, 1990a). In an effort to gather this information, NETWORK conducted a national survey in November of 1989 of the nation's 1,126 two-year colleges who were members of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). Of the 1,126 colleges surveyed, 384 two-year colleges responded (a 34 percent response rate) to the survey. Of these, 56 institutions, or 15 percent, offered programs funded through the JOBS program, which were granted by a state or local level human services agency (NETWORK, 1990b).

It is important to note that the Family Support Act, which was signed into law in 1988, assumed a five-year phase-in. Regulations had to promulgated at the federal level, and appropriate statutory and regulatory changes had to made at the state level. Given the phase in period assumed by the Act, it would appear that on its face the 15 percent participation figure of community colleges is low. There has been no comprehensive survey of community college participation in JOBS since the 1990 NETWORK survey.

The need for this study is readily apparent. America's system of 1,200 community, junior and technical colleges emerged as the nation's largest delivery system of formal education to adults in the late 1970s, beginning with the Vietnam-era veterans who used their GI Bill benefits to attend community

colleges (Katsinas, 1993). In the 1980s and early 1990s, the enrollment of these institutions continued to steadily expand, as more adults returned to acquire educational skills that would allow them to command better employment within a fast-changing economy. By 1993, over 50 percent of all first-time college students chose to enroll at community colleges, and community colleges served higher proportions of underepresented groups (women, minorities, low-income families) than did residential universities (American Association of Community Colleges, 1993a).

It is critically important to note that the development of the nation's employment and training, and welfare-to-work systems preceded the development of the nation's premier system of formal education beyond the high school for adults by at least fifteen years (Katsinas & Swender, 1992). Given the fact that all recipients of AFDC and all participants in the JOBS program are adults beyond high school age, it follows that a study that assessed the participation level of community colleges in JOBS would be of significant value to policy makers concerned with the coordination and integration of employment, training, welfare-to-work, and literacy programs.

Significance of the Study

There exist several specific reasons for conducting this research study. First and perhaps most important, no study has been developed since the 1990 NETWORK study, and that study occurred too early in the history of the JOBS

program, assuming the five-year phase-in, for it to be an accurate barometer of community college participation in the JOBS program. The proposed study is therefore timely, and would address the apparent void of data related to model JOBS programs at community colleges. This in itself would represent a significant contribution to the current knowledge base.

Second, with the phase-in of JOBS now just beginning to occur, there is great need to assess the perceptions of community college professionals regarding what works, what doesn't, and other key issues related to the integration of JOBS programs and community colleges, including but not limited to (1) level of community college involvement; (2) barriers to effective involvement; (3) involvement of community colleges in JOBS policy development; and (4) issues, problems, concerns, and options regarding successful implementation by community colleges of the JOBS program.

Third, there are few studies that have addressed the policy or institutional barriers to education beyond the high school for recipients of AFDC. How successful have community colleges been in developing programs to serve the needs of this important client segment, and what has worked best? Again, what are the model programs appropriate to rural, suburban, and urban/inner city settings?

Fourth, this study may be helpful to the state departments and/or officials who regulate the JOBS program at the state level, who should be interested in promoting an efficient and effective expenditure of federal and state funds for

JOBS sponsored educational programs. Several states, including Illinois, have turned over the entire responsibility for the administration of their JOBS programs to the community college systems; other states, including Ohio, Oregon, and the Carolinas actively promote community college involvement in the JOBS program. Some type of welfare reform is likely to pass Congress in 1994 or 1995, this is therefore an appropriate time to conduct such a study.

Fifth, this study can be beneficial to the community colleges currently involved with JOBS programs. In addition, those concerned with policy improvements regarding improved integration of JOBS and other employment and training and adult literacy programs may find this research valuable.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study and to assure common understanding, the following significant terms are defined.

Adult Education Act of 1966 - This act transferred the funding of the adult basic education program to the U.S. Office of Education. It provided additional funds for experimental projects in adult basic education and for the expansion of a series of training programs for teachers, superintendents, and administrators that had been initiated under a Ford Foundation grant in 1965. The act established a national advisory committee to supervise all federal programs in adult basic education.

Adult Recipient - refers to an individual other than a dependent child (unless such child is the minor custodial parent of another dependent child) whose needs are met (in whole or in part) with payments of Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) - is the principal federal-state welfare program that provides cash assistance to single-parent families with children and to a limited number of two-parent households. It serves approximately 5 million families.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1988 - The 1963 Vocational Education Act and the amendments of 1968 and 1972 vastly augmented the federal funds available to community colleges. Later reauthorizations amended the 1963 act, producing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1988, which broadened the coverage of federal aid to include postsecondary and adult vocational programs, programs for handicapped and disadvantaged students, sanctions against sexual and racial discrimination, and such support services as counseling and job placement.

Community College - In a Carnegie Foundation technical report entitled *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (1987), two-year community, junior, and technical colleges were defined: "These institutions offer certificate or degree programs through the Associates of Arts level and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees"(p.7). The terms "community

college," "two-year college," "junior college," and "technical college" were used interchangeably in this study.

Family Support Act of 1988 - reflects "a new consensus that the well-being of children depends not only on meeting their material needs, but also on the parent's ability to become self-sufficient". It requires all states (1) to strengthen child support enforcement, (2) to provide supportive services for AFDC families engaged in education, training, or employment, (3) to offer one year of transitional child care and medical assistance to families that leave AFDC because of earnings, or unemployment, and (4) to provide the AFDC-Unemployed Parent Program to eligible families with two parents (Public Law 100-485, The Family Support Act of 1988).

Gross National Product (GNP) - is the total market value of all the goods and services produced by a nation during a specified period.

Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program - Established under the Family Support Act, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program offers AFDC recipients opportunities for employment through basic education, work experience, and skills training. Specifically, JOBS programs must provide vocational and occupational skills training; teach job readiness skills; assist in job placement and development; and provide high school or equivalency education, remedial education, or education in English language proficiency. Programs must also include an assessment of each

participant's needs and a plan outlining the activities the individual must participate in to reach the employment goal.

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) - refers to the federally funded employment and training program that is awarded to each Governor by formula, and through the Governors to local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs), as designated by local demographics, population and unemployment statistics. This federal program is designed to help youth and unskilled adults gain entry into the labor force and to afford training to economically disadvantaged individuals and others facing serious barriers to employment.

Likert Scale - consists of a series of statements all of which are related to an individual's attitude toward a single object. The individuals are directed to indicate the extent to which they endorse each statement. Typical response options are strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, and strongly disagree.

NETWORK - "America's Two-Year College Employment and Training Consortium." The consortium was founded in December, 1988 and as of June, 1994, is based at the Washington office of the American Association of Community Colleges.

Private Industry Council (PIC) - consists primarily of business people, with other members drawn from economic development, education and rehabilitation agencies, organized labor, community-based organizations, and public employment services. Under provisions of the JTPA, PICs decide what services

will be provided, plan job training programs, and contract with job training providers through JTPA funds.

Postsecondary Education - refers to a program of postsecondary instruction offered by:

(1) An institution of higher education determined by the Secretary of Education to meet section 1201(a), or section 481(a), (b), or (c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended;

(2) An institution of higher education or vocational school determined by the Secretary of Education to meet section 435(b), or section 435(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended;

(3) A public institution that is legally authorized by the State to provide such a program within the State.

State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCC) - are councils required by JTPA to develop state plans for spending federal JTPA funds, and formed by state governors to provide the state with recommendations on training components of job-training acts and to play a primary role in planning employment services authorized by the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Wagner-Peyser Act - refers to the act passed in 1933 during the Roosevelt Administration which created the first national public employment system financed by the federal government. The system was administered by the United States Department of Labor and a bureau known as the United States Employment Service, which evolved into the Employment and Training

Administration. The U.S. Employment Service was designed to address what economists referred to as "structural" barriers to unemployment, by providing information on job placement to job seekers and employers, and placement-related services including counseling and testing.

Work Incentive Program (WIN) - Since 1968, the federal government has required states to operate WIN programs for AFDC recipients considered employable. The states could provide AFDC recipients with a wide range of services, including job search assistance, on-the-job and classroom training, public service employment, child care, and transportation assistance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

> People think welfare mothers don't go to college because they are stupid, lazy and don't want to get off the dole. That's nonsense. The problem is that everybody tells them they can't do it. Somebody has to tell them they can. I was a seventh grade dropout and an unwed mother on welfare. People told me I was either stupid or crazy. But I made it through college and got my master's degree (Sasaki, 1986, p.33).

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature relevant to community college participation in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program. The literature review included the issues and concerns related to federally funded welfare programs; the Family Support Act of 1988; the attempt of welfare reform to break the cycle of poverty; the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program and its attempt to build a competitive and literate workforce; the states' participation in JOBS; barriers to effective community college delivery of JOBS services; the multitude of problems facing JOBS and postsecondary education; the effective coordination and collaboration between state agencies and community colleges; the community college; and source(s) of information relied upon for information on JOBS and related human resource issues.

Overview of Federal Welfare Programs

Between 1960 and 1992 government spending on means-tested transfers to the poor increased from 1.2 percent to 3.9 percent of Gross National Product (GNP). Over the same period, the caseload in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program increased by 460 percent (Burtless, 1992). Such enormous growth in the United States welfare system has generated much concern, not only about the monetary costs but also about the social costs involved. Public alarm over welfare has spurred government response. Since the 1960s legislators and administrators have devised programs and policies intended to encourage welfare recipients to work and become economically self-sufficient (O'Neill, 1993).

The Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program was initially created in 1935 by the Social Security Act as a cash grant program to aid needy children without fathers (Dickinson, 1986). Today, the program provides cash assistance for needy children who have been deprived of parental support or care because their father or mother is absent from the home, incapacitated, deceased, or unemployed. Effective as of October of 1990, all states were also required to implement AFDC programs to provide benefits to children in two-parent families who are needy because of the unemployment of one of their parents (National Governor's Association, 1993). This program is known as the AFDC Unemployed Parent Program (AFDC-UP).

The AFDC program is voluntary and is jointly funded by both federal and state governments with federal resources covering from 50 to 80 percent of the cost of benefits and 50 percent of the cost of administration (Liem & Rayman, 1982). In fiscal year 1988, AFDC served 3.7 million families or 11 million people, two-thirds of whom were under age 18. AFDC benefits totalled $17 billion, of which $9.3 billion was federally paid. In fiscal year 1992, benefit payments of approximately $21.9 billion went to over 4.7 million families or 13.6 million individuals (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1993). Eligibility for AFDC requires that a family meet two income criteria: a gross income test (defined as 185 percent of the state's need standard), and a net or countable income test (defined as 100 percent of the need standard) (National Governor's Association, 1993).

Since 1968, the federal government has required states to operate Work Incentive (WIN) programs for AFDC recipients considered employable (Levitan, 1985). States could provide AFDC recipients with a range of services, including job search assistance, on-the-job and classroom training, public service employment, child care, and transportation assistance. Those required to participate were usually registered to receive employment-related services with the state employment service agency which was jointly responsible with the state welfare agency for administering WIN. Between 1981 and 1984, the Congress enacted legislation giving states several options for operating other welfare-to-work programs. Instead of WIN, a state could operate a WIN

Demonstration program, which allowed the state welfare agency to administer the program on its own (Gueron & Paley, 1991). States could also choose to offer additional programs and require participants to: (1) work a certain number of hours to receive their AFDC benefits, (2) engage in job search, or (3) work for wages subsidized by AFDC benefit dollars.

The Family Support Act of 1988

The Family Support Act (FSA) of 1988 passed the House of Representatives by 374 to 53 and the Senate 96 to 1, and went into effect in October 1990 (O'Neill, 1993). The FSA revised the Social Security Act by repealing title IV-C (the Work Incentive Program), adding title IV-F (JOBS), and making changes to title IV-A, which governs the AFDC program (Ganzglass & McCart, 1990). As envisioned by its authors, it constituted a major new approach to welfare reform. Its chief thrust is a complex program planned to move most Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients from economic dependency to independence (Chilman, 1992). The FSA is based on the premise that there exists a mutual obligation between government and its citizens, or put differently, that the government has a responsibility to provide sufficient tools and opportunities for work, while recipients have an obligation to use these tools and seek employment.

The Family Support Act provides support to individuals and families in four primary areas:

Employment Assistance. The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program provides a variety of services to promote self-sufficiency, including education, job training, job placement, and child care. States are given broad flexibility regarding program design and administration.

Child Support Enforcement. FSA strengthens states' ability to establish paternity and to improve the collection of child support payments.

Child Care. FSA guarantees child care for all JOBS participants, as well as AFDC recipients who are in other approved training, education, or employment programs.

Transitional Services. Individuals who leave public assistance are eligible for 12 months of child care and medical services, including Medicaid, as long as their incomes are low enough to meet program requirements (Congressional Budget Office, 1989).

Regarding jobs, education, and training, this new welfare law is essentially a broadened and better funded version of the federal WIN program. For years under WIN, AFDC recipients had registered for jobs or training programs approved by their welfare case workers. Because of underfunding, few jobs or training opportunities were actually made available. The AFDC recipients stood to lose their welfare benefits if they failed to register, or if they participated in a training program which the state disapproved. Under WIN, the states had flexibility to approve postsecondary education as a "training" program for AFDC recipients. However, this rarely happened in practice, even though federal student aid could pick up most tuition costs. As a matter of policy, many states disallowed postsecondary education altogether; others provided little information about it, and tended to allow only short-term job-focused postsecondary education (U.S. Department of Labor, 1977).

Under the FSA, for the first time postsecondary education became an allowable activity. However, the actual degree to which postsecondary education would be incorporated in JOBS programs was dependent upon how state regulations were written and enforced in practice. Lawrence Gold, who as of January 1994, served as director of research for the American Federation of Teachers, wrote that there is good reason to doubt whether welfare reform will make much difference to AFDC recipients who wanted to get a college education. Gold offered four reasons for this:

1. The states had usually discouraged AFDC recipients from going to college in the past;

2. The new law still left it up to the states to decide whether college would be allowed;

3. New federal regulations clearly discouraged the states from approving postsecondary education; and

4. Federal student aid was still being counted against welfare eligibility (Gold, 1990).

Gold's anticipated negative projections may seem surprising, considering the fact that both common sense and hard research show that people with a postsecondary education are unlikely to return to the welfare rolls, while a sizable percentage of recipients in low level jobs do return. (Vargyas & Campbell, 1989). The problem was that the welfare system rewarded quick closure of cases, and because it took a comparatively long time to go to and then complete college, welfare case workers were bound to push their clients into whatever jobs they could get immediately, or into participation in a short,

job-focused training program (Goldman, 1989). The AFDC recipients were made to feel that their goals were educationally unrealistic and fiscally irresponsible--even if they had shown the intelligence and fortitude to get accepted into college, and even if they were already in college and doing good work. This was particularly true of individuals who wanted to participate in baccalaureate programs.

Breaking the Cycle of Poverty

The National Commission on Children (1991) found as a group that children were the poorest Americans. Bureau of the Census data for 1989 revealed that almost twenty percent of all children in America, and more than forty percent of black children, resided in a family whose income is beneath the official poverty line (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1990). The 4.7 million families enrolled in AFDC in 1991 represented approximately 5 percent of the U.S. population and included an estimated 8.5 million children, approximately 13 percent of the total population of children (National Governor's Association, 1993). The Commission observed that living in conditions generated by poverty and economic instability could "take a dreadful toll on children" regarding their health, emotional well-being, educational development, and future opportunities. Moreover, the Commission noted that children growing up in families dependent on welfare would more (or less) repeat the pattern of their parent's lives and

continue the cycle of poverty when they reach adulthood (The National Commission on Children, 1991).

Research on welfare recipients has shown that while the average length of time an AFDC family receives assistance is approximately two years, many families remain on the welfare rolls for protracted periods of time (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989). Harvard University sociologist, David Ellwood found that about twenty-five percent of those families who ever receive AFDC continue to do so for ten or more years. He estimated that this group of long-term recipients accounts for about sixty percent of those on the welfare rolls at any one time and at least sixty percent of the cost of AFDC (Ellwood, 1986). Many of these long-term recipients possessed barriers to employment such as low education and literacy levels, and a lack of work skills and experience (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989).

By establishing JOBS, the Family Support Act redirected federal welfare policy away from providing mere cash-assistance and toward helping AFDC parents and teens obtain the services they needed to get and keep jobs. Although states had been required to assist AFDC recipients obtain employment since 1968, many of these welfare-to-work programs prior to JOBS were criticized because they tended to serve few persons and emphasized services for those with marketable skills - who were likely to obtain employment without receiving assistance (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991). Such an emphasis

on the job-ready limited the ability of those programs to enhance the knowledge and skills of those with employment barriers. However, during the 1980s, evaluations in several states demonstrated that some welfare-to-work programs produced modest increases in earnings and employment for AFDC recipients (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

The JOBS program targets three distinct populations that are defined as follows: (1) individuals applying for or receiving AFDC for any thirty-six of the proceeding sixty months; (2) custodial parents under twenty-four years of age who are without a high school or equivalent degree and had little or no work experience in the preceding year; and (3) members of families in which the youngest child is within two years of making the family ineligible for AFDC because of his or her age (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989). While JOBS programs targeted toward these specific subgroups of AFDC recipients could be effective at reducing long-term welfare dependency, informed observers have noted that it is important to realize that it will take many years before large reductions in welfare rolls will be seen (Gueron, 1990). The problems facing the underepresented are complex and a simple solution does not exist.

In recent years, welfare dependency combined with limited attachment to the labor force has often been associated with the underclass. Moreover, some researchers (Ricketts, 1989; Danziger, 1989) have characterized the underclass as a subset of the poor whose problems have not been, and are not likely to be,

improved by cash benefits alone. Sawhill (1988) defines underclass areas as census tracts in which each of four indicators is one standard deviation above the mean for the country as a whole. These indicators are the high school dropout rate, the female headship rate, the welfare dependency rate, and the proportion of prime-age males not regularly attached to the labor force. Poor families, especially underclass families, face multiple barriers as they attempt to overcome their circumstances. No one single program can overcome all the obstacles they face. An effective strategy will have to be multifaceted and include coordination among agencies involved with income security and social services, housing, health, employment and job training, education, economic development, transportation, and criminal justice.

The JOBS program through its ability to provide, mandate, and coordinate numerous services, may be a starting point in developing such a comprehensive strategy. To the extent that the long-term welfare dependents exist on the fringes of the wage-labor market, JOBS could be viewed as an attempt to reintegrate the underepresented back into the mainstream economy. In this way, JOBS might broaden vocational options and attend to the supportive service needs of recipients by addressing problems that undermine employability, such as poor health, emotional problems, and substance abuse. The goal of JOBS is to facilitate movement from the welfare rolls to self-sufficiency. The hope held out by JOBS is that the number of underepresented

individuals who make this transition can be increased through program intervention.

The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program

On October 13, 1988, President George Herbert Walker Bush signed the Family Support Act (the Statute) Public Law 100-485. Title II of the Family Support Act of 1988 requires all states to establish a Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program to help needy families with children obtain the education, training, and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependence (Turner, 1990). JOBS represents the federal government's latest and most comprehensive effort to transform the nation's Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) program into a system that helps families avoid long-term welfare dependence. Under JOBS, states must provide AFDC parents with the education, training, work experiences, and supportive services they need to increase their employability and assume responsibility for the support of their children (Rovner, 1989). Therefore, JOBS is designed to develop an effective nationwide welfare-to-work system while providing states enough flexibility to operate programs that reflect local needs.

In addressing the problems of welfare dependency, the Family Support Act mandates certain JOBS activities, and requires State IV-A agencies (Human Services, Human Resources, Welfare) to choose to implement two of four optional program activities: (1) job search, (2) on-the-job training, (3) work

supplementation, and (4) community work experience programs (Downey, 1991). Previously, State IV-A agencies were required to have a Work Incentive (WIN) or WIN Demonstration program in place and could elect to provide other work programs. Under the work program option, the State IV-A agency chose which type of work programs to implement. The Family Support Act is more specific than prior work program authorities regarding the activities which may be offered by State IV-A agencies and the individuals they are obligated to serve under the various program laws and regulations.

State IV-A agencies are required to assure coordination of JOBS program services, including child care and supportive services pursuant to the regulations, with related services provided by other agencies. In each state, the governor is required by law to assure that JOBS Program activities are coordinated with programs under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), and with any other relevant employment, training, and education programs available within the state (National Governor's Association, 1993). At a minimum, this means that the appropriate job training and preparation components of the state JOBS plan shall be consistent with the coordination criteria specified in the governor's coordination and special services plan required under section 121 of the JTPA.

A state's JOBS program must include four services and/or activities, which may be combined rather than offered discretely (Federal Register, April 18, 1989):

a) Any educational activity below the postsecondary level that the State IV-A agency determines to be appropriate to the participant's employment goal. Including, but not limited to, high school education or GED preparation, basic and remedial education, and English as a second language (ESL).

b) Job skills training including vocational training.

c) Job readiness activities to prepare participants to enter the world of work.

d) Job development and job placement activity by the agency to solicit employment for participants.

In addition, a state's JOBS program must include, but is not limited to, at least two of the following four components:

a) Group and individual job search.
b) On-the-job training.
c) Work supplementation.
d) Community work experience program, or other approved work experience program activities.

A state's JOBS Program may include referral of a participant to postsecondary education, as determined necessary to meet any individual goals that are directly related to obtaining employment in a recognized occupation within limits established by the State IV-A agency and reflected in the state JOBS plan (Johnson, 1992). Educational institutions that wish to participate in JOBS programs, including community colleges, therefore need to carefully

review the status of their state's JOBS plan, and the implementation of the program, both in the state and local subdivision. Opportunities exist for enhancing supportive services to AFDC recipients who are already enrolled in the community college, in terms of personal and academic counseling, tutoring, job placement assistance, assessment and career development/exploration. All of these services would be designed to eliminate barriers to educational attainment and/or employment for AFDC recipients who are enrolled in associate degree or certificated programs. While the direct costs of tuition, books, and fees would generally not be paid through JOBS (rather traditional financial aid), JOBS could pay the direct and indirect costs associated with the enhanced supportive services which would be delivered to JOBS clients (Greenberg, 1990).

The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program combines elements of previous federal welfare-to-work programs into a single, more comprehensive program and encourages states to move in new directions to address some of the weaknesses of the previous programs. In general, JOBS broadens the range of services to be provided nationwide and expands the base of AFDC recipients required to participate in activities. One study estimated that, while previous programs exempted from 53 to 91 percent of adult AFDC recipients from participation requirements, 31 to 65 percent will be exempted under JOBS (Child Trends, 1989).

In Table 1, "A Comparison of AFDC Welfare-to-Work Provisions Before and Under JOBS", a selection of major provisions of JOBS are compared with previous welfare-to-work provisions.

TABLE 1.

A COMPARISON OF AFDC WELFARE-TO-WORK PROVISIONS BEFORE AND UNDER JOBS

	BEFORE JOBS	UNDER JOBS
Program(s)	WIN, WIN-Demonstration, JOBS Search, Community Work Experience, Work Supplementation	JOBS
Administrative control	WIN: State AFDC agency and state employment service agency All others: State AFDC agency	State AFDC agency
Geographic coverage	Job Search: Statewide Other: Not required to be statewide	Statewide (by October, 1992)
Required to participate	Generally: AFDC recipients aged 16-64 with children aged 6 or over; nonparent teens aged 16-18 and not in school	Generally: AFDC recipients aged 16-59 with children aged 3 or over; teen parents with children of any age; nonparent teens aged 16-18 and not in school
Participation requirements	WIN: Those required to participate were to be registered, but no participation rate was specified	For federal fiscal years 1990-91, 7 percent of those required to participate must average 20 hours in activities a week; this rises to 11 percent in 1991-92, 15 percent in 1994, and 20 percent in 1995
Targeting requirements	WIN: Priorities stated, but not enforced: 1. Unemployed parents who are principal earners in 2-parent families 2. Mothers who volunteer 3. Other mothers and pregnant women under the age of 19 who are required to participate 4. dependent children and relatives aged 16 or over	At least 55 percent of JOBS funds must be spent on the following: 1. AFDC recipients or applicants who have received AFDC for any 36 months out of the past 5 years 2. AFDC parents under the age of 24 who (a) have not completed high school and are not enrolled in high school or (b) had little or no work experience in the preceding year 3. Members of AFDC families in which the youngest child will in 2 years be old enough to make the family ineligible for aid

TABLE 1. (continued)

A COMPARISON OF AFDC WELFARE-TO-WORK PROVISIONS BEFORE AND UNDER JOBS

	BEFORE JOBS	UNDER JOBS
Activities	Could include, but not limited to, development of employability plan, job placement assistance, training, work experience, and subsidized employment	Must include assessment of employability, development of employability plan, education (high school, basic and remedial, English proficiency), job skills training, job readiness, and job development and placement Plus at least 2 optional activities: job search, work experience, on-the-job training, or work supplementation May include postsecondary education and other approved activities
Supportive services	Child care and other services needed to find employment or take training	Child care guaranteed if needed; transportation and other work-related assistance provided

Source: United States General Accounting Office. (1991, September). Welfare to Work: States Begin JOBS, but Fiscal and Other Problems May Impede Their Progress. Washington, DC.

In addition, JOBS encourages states to move their programs in new directions so as to correct the weaknesses found in previous welfare-to-work programs and provide individuals with the services they need to become employed. These new directions include states' serving a required proportion of their AFDC recipients and targeting their resources to address specific employment barriers. The JOBS program encourages states to do this by establishing a financial penalty that reduces the federal share of funding available to a state if it fails to serve a certain proportion of individuals each year and spend at least 56 percent of its total JOBS funds each year on targeted groups identified as long-term or potential long-term AFDC recipients (Hagen & Lurie, 1992). In addition, JOBS regulations emphasize the importance of educational

activities for those with educational deficiencies and training to help individuals find employment.

Within the framework of the federal provisions, states have flexibility to design various aspects of their JOBS programs. Many decisions about the design and operation of JOBS programs are left to state legislatures as well as state and county AFDC agencies. For example, states and counties decide who will be served and what types of activities and services will be emphasized for participants. In addition, states and counties must decide how to assess individuals' needs and skills. States and counties must also develop criteria for assigning participants to activities. Finally states and counties must determine the exact content of activities, the order in which they are provided, and how long individuals may participate (Johnson, 1992).

To help states pay for JOBS, the act authorizes two types of federal payments for states to fund their JOBS programs and related child care expenditures. The first is a new capped entitlement that is provided each year to pay a share of states' JOBS expenditures as shown in Table 2, "The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program: Funds Authorized by the Family Support Act of 1988", below (Rovner, 1988). The second is an open-ended entitlement that states may use to supplement their expenditures on JOBS-related child care. Most of the capped entitlement is allocated among the states according to each state's share of all adult AFDC recipients in the nation. For example, for fiscal year 1991, Wyoming's $1.4 million JOBS

allocation is based on its less than 1 percent share of the nation's adult AFDC recipients; California's $160 million allocation is based on its 16 percent share.

TABLE 2.

THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS TRAINING (JOBS) PROGRAM FUNDS AUTHORIZED BY THE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT OF 1988

Fiscal Year	Federal Funds Available
1989	$600,000,000
1990	800,000,000
1991	1,000,000,000
1992	1,000,000,000
1993	1,000,000,000
1994	1,100,000,000
1995	1,300,000,000
1996 and each year thereafter	1,000,000,000

Source: Rovner, J. (1988, April). Senate finance endorses modified welfare bill. Congressional Quarterly.

Each state's allocation of the capped entitlement is available to supplement the state's spending on JOBS, excluding child care, at three different matching rates (U.S. House of Representatives, 1992). First, most spending on the direct costs of providing JOBS services and the cost of full-time JOBS staff is matched at the state's AFDC benefit match rate or 60 percent, whichever is greater. Second, for administration and supportive services, such as transportation, the federal share of these costs is generally 50 percent. Third,

$126 million of the federal funds available each year is matched at 90 percent for any allowable JOBS cost and allocated to the states based on their 1987 WIN or WIN Demonstration allocation. However, if a state fails to meet either the participation or targeting requirement, the federal share of all JOBS program expenditures is limited to 50 percent (this provided financial incentives or penalties to states, to provide more comprehensive service). Federal AFDC funds are available to states to share child care costs of JOBS participants at the same rate as AFDC benefits. Child care administrative expenditures are matched at 50 percent. The AFDC's JOBS-related child care funds are not subject to the funding cap for JOBS expenditures, but are generally limited by what states decide to spend on child care (U.S. House of Representatives, 1992).

In short, JOBS represents a renewed federal commitment to welfare-to-work programs with new policy guidance and funding for states. Although states have operated welfare-to-work programs for over 20 years, the programs generally were not considered very effective in providing services to those most in need. The JOBS provisions in the FSA established new requirements concerning who is required to participate and what services must be offered and authorized new federal funding to help states with their program costs.

State Participation in JOBS

States have made significant progress in implementing JOBS and in moving their welfare-to-work programs in new directions. All states met the October 1990 deadline to establish their JOBS programs, and many moved rapidly to operate them on a statewide basis. Thirty-one states had met the requirement to operate JOBS statewide by October 1990, two years ahead of the deadline (Palmer, 1992). In October 1990, it was estimated that eighty-five percent of the nation's adult AFDC recipients lived in areas served by JOBS programs. Not all of these AFDC recipients, however, have been or will be served by JOBS. From January 1 through March 31, 1991, a monthly average of approximately 510,000 individuals (out of about four million AFDC families) participated in JOBS programs nationwide (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 1991). For fiscal year 1991, federal expenditures for JOBS and related child care are expected to be about $800 million. Total spending for that same year by the federal and state governments is estimated to be about $1 billion for JOBS and $350 million for JOBS-related child care (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991). These funds, however, are only a portion of the total resources used to provide services to JOBS participants. About half of the states reported that forty percent or more of their JOBS participants who received education and training services were participating in programs paid for by organizations and providers other than JOBS (Offner, 1992).

Studies also found that states were moving their JOBS programs in the new directions of comprehensive, coordinated services envisioned by Congress and the administration in the FSA. The states have responded positively to JOBS' new emphases of serving more participants and targeting resources to long-term and potential long-term AFDC recipients. Forty-five states planned to spend at least fifty-five percent of their funds on these targeted groups in fiscal year 1991, and 44 states planned to meet the 1991 seven percent participation rate. State program philosophies have also changed. Before JOBS, 32 states said they emphasized immediate job placement as their program's goal. Under JOBS, however, 26 states said that their program emphasized basic skills and long-term education and training (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

Although states reported progress in implementing JOBS, they also reported difficulties as they tried to move in new directions while meeting the new requirements. Most states had experienced or expected to have difficulties with various tasks and procedures related to the targeting and participation requirements (Riccio & Friedlander, 1992). Moreover, virtually all states reported difficulties in attempting to meet new reporting requirements under JOBS. In addition, almost all states reported service shortages of one type or another. More than half of the states indicated that they had, or expected to have, shortages in alternative and basic/remedial education programs throughout their states. More than forty percent of the states had, or expected to have, statewide shortages of high school equivalency and job skills training

programs. Even more states reported all of these programs to be in short supply in rural areas. And more than two-thirds of the states cited child care and transportation as being in short supply (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

While it is still too soon to fully assess all of the implications of state implementation difficulties - the FSA passed in 1988 and JOBS fully implemented in 1992, most states agreed that service shortages were affecting their ability to operate JOBS in certain geographic areas and to serve certain types of clients. Thirty-nine states believed that operating JOBS in rural areas was difficult because of insufficient funds for transportation (Peskin, Topogna & Marcotte, 1992). Thirty-six states said shortages in infant care had made serving teen parents difficult. In addition to service shortages that impair states' ability to operate JOBS, JOBS's ability to help participants become self-sufficient may be lessened by states' limited spending on JOBS and fiscal problems, many of which have been related to the recent recession. About thirty-eight percent, or nearly $372 million, of the federal JOBS funds available to states were expected to go unused in fiscal year 1991 because many states were not planning to spend enough of state funds to obtain all of the federal matching dollars available. It is estimated that state usage of available federal JOBS funds ranged from eight to one-hundred percent, with the average being sixty-five percent. And, while some states that did not plan to spend all of the federal JOBS funds available to them had programs that were still being phased-in, 18 states out of the 31 that operated programs statewide planned to spend

less than 75 percent of the federal JOBS funds available to them in fiscal year 1991 (Peskin et al., 1992). Other studies note that state spending on JOBS could be further reduced by the fiscal difficulties affecting many states. In April 1991, the National Governors' Association reported that 29 states had enacted or proposed cuts to their fiscal year 1991 state budgets. Should such fiscal conditions continue, become worse, or spread to other states, spending on JOBS could be reduced even further. Such spending cuts would most likely mean that fewer participants will be served or fewer dollars will be spent on each participant (Howard, 1991).

Research also indicates that states' progress in moving participants out of JOBS and into employment may also be slowed by poor economic conditions. In 1990, 75 percent of the states reported that the need for employment opportunities exceeded supply throughout their states (Waddell, 1990). And even when the national economy recovers, JOBS programs at the local level could still be confronted with insufficient employment opportunities for program participants looking for work. Thus, even if AFDC recipients receive education and training, they may not be able to find employment that would allow them to move off the welfare rolls and become self-sufficient (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991). This speaks to the need for the JOBS program specifically, and federal and state welfare-to-work programs generally, to actively promote postsecondary education degrees through the baccalaureate.

Without minimizing the significance of the implementation difficulties or the economic conditions in which programs operate, one can view their overall impact upon JOBS' ability to help welfare recipients become self-sufficient as setbacks, not permanent barriers. Even under the best of circumstances, the transformation of the AFDC program into a system that focuses on moving recipients into employment was never expected to happen quickly or easily. A 1989 study by the U.S. Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected that JOBS would have only modest effects on the number of AFDC recipients in the early years. The CBO estimated that in the period between 1989 and 1993, only about 50,000 families would leave AFDC as a result of JOBS, a one and one-third percent reduction in the number of AFDC families (CBO, 1989). And while JOBS is by no means the final chapter to welfare reform, it is one of the more promising programs in terms of its potential to change the service delivery system for poor families and their children.

Barriers to Effective Delivery of JOBS Services

Marilyn Gittell and Janice Moore (1989) in their study *Denying Independence: Barriers to Women on AFDC*, cite AFDC womens' experiences with barriers to postsecondary education:

> "If AFDC workers find out about any school aid or college work study, they subtract it from their benefits. Consequently, these women were afraid to let their caseworkers know they go to school, and so they cannot apply for transportation, day care, or tuition assistance through the welfare office (Gittell & Moore, 1989. p. 463)."

According to Gittell and Moore, many women generally find the welfare office is their major barrier to a postsecondary education. As a financial aid officer pointed out in a similar study, "In general, the public assistance programs operate on a very short-term philosophy (Rosen, 1986. p. 28)."

Gittell and Moore interviewed 85 AFDC women enrolled in education or training programs and found, "When we asked women who set education as their goal what prevented them from achieving this, the major barrier AFDC women said they face is an uncooperative and often difficult welfare agency" (Gittell & Moore, 1989, p. 462). According to Edelman (1987), states formally allowed welfare recipients to receive postsecondary education, but that the opportunity of college was approved only rarely and only when the education was highly career focused and short-term in nature. Few states allowed a full two years of college; only three - Massachusetts, Maine and Connecticut - allowed four years of college, and then only in rare circumstances. An educational opportunity counselor in Tacoma, Washington reported that it was very difficult to encourage welfare recipients to get their Bachelor of Arts degree because they usually have a worker threatening them to get a short-term training program for one or at the most two years of training. Most of the shorter, vocational courses do not provide jobs with decent wages (Kane & Frazee, 1988).

Throughout their interviews with training and education program administrators, Gittell and Moore pressed to find out why greater effort was not

made by government agencies to use colleges and particularly community colleges to conduct programs for AFDC women. Invariably they were told that colleges do not know how to train people for jobs, that their curriculums were not suited to these purposes, and that they were unable to convince college administrators and faculty that the traditional time allotted to complete programs is too long to suit their needs. Private proprietary schools and community-based organizations, they claimed, were more flexible in developing and scheduling programs (Gittell & Moore, 1989).

Joint efforts by training and education experts probably can offer the most thoughtful response to the problem. The example of Harbor City Learning Center in Baltimore suggests this is so. That program combines the knowledge and experience of training and educational personnel in a cooperative education program that offers work experience and traditional learning skills and job placement (Maryland Department of Employment and Training, 1985). LaGuardia College in New York City has long and successful experience with cooperative education with a largely lower-income population, and their success could be used as a model for community college education programs for AFDC women (Levitan, Rein & Marwick, 1982). A different emphasis, but an important one, is the North Carolina community college system, which stresses the role of the colleges in economic and community development, and uses vocational education funds to educate students for specific jobs connected to their development activities (Thurow, 1979).

Many of the community colleges have tailored their programs organizationally to serve lower-income women. Easy access to facilities in the neighborhood and availability of day care in these colleges are important attractions. In addition, these colleges make major allocations for remedial courses, counseling, and student aid advisement, which they know are special needs of their students. Research indicates that government officials have limited knowledge of these institutions and their long experience with lower-income populations. The colleges have not been particularly successful in developing relationships with training and welfare agencies to conduct funded programs (Lively, 1992).

There is general agreement among policy makers, the public at large, and AFDC women that economic independence is preferable to welfare. There is not agreement about whether *any* employment constitutes independence or whether training and education is a reasonable alternative to immediate employment, because it offers greater opportunity for economic independence in the future. Policy makers and the public seem to accept that any job is better than welfare; AFDC women know that is not true. The issue of whether or not AFDC women, or any other welfare recipient, should have the option, the opportunity, or in fact an incentive to pursue an education has been subverted, ignored, or rejected out of hand by social policy (Levy, 1979). As a society, this nation has tended to blame poor people for their condition, ignoring the failure of macro-economic policies to address their needs. In addition, society refuses

to recognize the importance of government policies as determinants of dependency. While the mythology of American democracy stresses the value placed on education, as a society we eschew its importance to this population.

Research indicates that there is a significant interest in education and career training on the part of AFDC women, particularly as a means to more gainful employment (College Entrance Examination Board, 1984). A multiplicity of personal, social, economic, and political barriers, both real and perceived, impede their pursuit of these objectives. Public policies are a deterrent to these goals and that there is a lack of appropriate training and education opportunities available for these women. Many women on AFDC, while eager to be free of the welfare system, recognize that they lack the skills, the experience, and the self-confidence to secure employment that is more stable and offers opportunity for advancement. There are AFDC women in career training programs and attending college, some at great sacrifice to themselves and their children and often without the knowledge or support of welfare agencies. An even larger number would choose to attend college or any advanced training program if they could acquire basic education, if there were reasonable incentives to do so, and if the many existing barriers were reduced (Moffitt, 1992).

The Problems Facing JOBS and Postsecondary Education

When the Family Support Act was passed by Congress in 1988, many observers hailed the legislation as a major reform of the nation's welfare

system. Its centerpiece, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program, was seen as a new vehicle for moving welfare recipients into the labor force and toward self-sufficiency (Turner, Barbaro, & Schlank, 1990). The responsibility for making it happen was handed to federal, and in turn, to state administrative agencies. These agencies were: (1) to formulate plans, regulations, and procedures, (2) get the money where it was supposed to go and ensure that it was spent for its intended purposes, and (3) stimulate the development of local programs to provide the education, job training, and other services that lie at the core of the JOBS strategy.

Yet, rather than strengthening the postsecondary education option (for the first time in history of federal welfare legislation, postsecondary education was specified as an allowable training activity), the implementing regulations issued in October of 1989 by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) actually discouraged state agencies from approving college. For example, the preamble to the regulations allows states to approve postsecondary education, and, quite properly, notes that this permit(s) enrollment in a baccalaureate degree program if the program is offered by an "institution of higher education" (Federal Register, October 13, 1988). Later in the same text, however, the regulations specify allowed activities as including postsecondary education that results in other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree (Federal Register, October 13, 1988). This is contrary to both the law and the regulatory

preamble, and could have been intended to discourage state approval of postsecondary programs.

Furthermore, DHHS appears to impose a direct and job-specific test for postsecondary education that was not intended by the law. The preamble stated that the offering of postsecondary education is an entirely optional matter for the state IV-A agency to address in its JOBS plan, except that it has limited such education to that which is directly related to the attainment of an individual's employment goal, i.e. to obtain useful employment in a recognized occupation (Federal Register, October 13, 1988). The Department went on to state that shorter programs leading to specific occupational goals were preferable to longer education programs that may have far less specific employment goals (Federal Register, October 13, 1988). However, there is nothing in the 1988 law to declare short-term programs preferable to longer programs, and all the economic data concerning long-term self-sufficiency argues the precise opposite.

Finally, the guidelines encouraged states to use resources that were otherwise available to fund postsecondary education for JOBS participants (Federal Register, October 13, 1988). While it certainly makes sense to encourage AFDC recipients to employ traditional federal student aid programs to pay for college, the thrust of this statement, like the others, could be seen as discouraging the states from approving postsecondary education altogether. Frequently, all or part of the federal student aid received by AFDC beneficiaries

is counted as *personal income* to the beneficiary, either disqualifying the person completely from AFDC or significantly reducing their benefits. National legislation, federal regulations and state practice all contribute to this condition (Gold, 1990).

The law governing treatment of student aid, set by the federal Higher Education Act amendments of 1986, establishes contradictory tests for counting and disallowing student aid income. On the one hand, the law specifically provided that federal student aid attributable to tuition, fees and college-going expenses such as transportation, books and child care were not to be counted as personal income for the purposes of any other federal program. On the other hand, the law stated that any aid in excess of these expenses was considered a "living allowance," and can be counted against eligibility for other programs. The law does not fully specify allowable expenses, nor does it indicate the documentation required. The problem with this policy is that student aid does not provide recipients with general-use income (Blaug, 1992). This is demonstrated by the fact that student aid by law cannot exceed the costs of attending school determined under government formulas. To treat welfare-eligible individuals as "too rich" for subsistence by virtue of their student aid creates a catch-22 which can only prevent individuals from improving their economic circumstances through education. Also, there is no federal law or policy regarding the treatment of non-federal public or private

student financial aid. Thus, any state aid or private scholarship may be counted as income and prove disastrous for welfare eligibility.

Federal AFDC regulations, promulgated before the 1986 Higher Education Act amendments were enacted, stated that any federal grant or loan to an undergraduate student for educational purposes and used under conditions that preclude their use for current living costs should be disregarded as income in determining AFDC eligibility (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, 1984). This posed two operational problems to those institutions of higher education wishing to service AFDC recipients. First, it left unclear the status of aid received under the federal College Work-Study program, although work-study should be covered under the 1986 higher education provision. Second, it provided no guidance to the states about how to determine education-related costs as opposed to living costs. The result was that the states differ dramatically in what they allowed and the documentation required of students, and all to often adopted a much too restrictive position. As Margaret Dunkle states,

> "AFDC calculations often include only a standard allowance for such expenses as books and commuting and may not recognize other costs to students...If a student receives financial aid sufficient to cover the cost of living, the excess' cost over the AFDC allowance may be viewed as income' in AFDC calculations, thus reducing the AFDC grant and perhaps eliminating eligibility for both AFDC and Medicaid." Just as state rules vary, determinations often vary from welfare officer to welfare officer. "In fact," Dunkle notes, "two AFDC recipients attending the same college, with the same income, the same number of children, the same educational costs, the same student aid funding, and even the same caseworker could be treated differently under current AFDC and Federal student aid rules and practices" (Dunkel, 1988. p. 129-130).

Effective Coordination Among Participating Agencies

Over the past decade, a torrent of major reports have focused on the problem of improving public education and services to children and families. Resulting from an unprecedented recognition that our nation's children face numerous problems, these reports have generally told us what we know simply by living in the America of the 1990s: That nearly all systems - education, health, human services - are in a state of crisis, unable to provide effective assistance to children and families in need. Wide recognition exists that the main cause of the crisis in the American welfare state is the remarkable fragmentation that characterizes its provision of services (Harkavy and Benson, 1992).

With the passage of "welfare reform" through the Family Support Act, human service professionals and their respective agencies in direct practice now face the challenge of serving and empowering families who are receiving AFDC and who are mandated into the nationwide, state-organized JOBS program (Caputo, 1989). Because decisions and changes at the national, state, and local levels will affect neighborhoods, families, and individuals, it is essential that these professionals understand and coordinate the issues at all multiple system levels, as California Senator Alan Cranston argued (Cranston, 1990).

State-organized JOBS programs include provisions to strengthen child support enforcement, recognizing that both programs offer essential services to help families achieve self-sufficiency. However, the FSA is not the only act

that provides services to welfare recipients. There are other federal statutes with objectives that relate to the JOBS' program objective of promoting self-sufficiency among welfare recipients, including, but not limited to the following:

> The **Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)** focuses on providing training and employment services to help economically disadvantaged youth and adults move into employment. Among these services are assessment, on-the-job training (OJT), classroom training, basic skills training, employment counseling, and job placement services.
>
> The **Wagner-Peyser Act** created the Employment Service to provide job placement to job seekers and employers and placement-related services including counseling and testing.
>
> The **Adult Education Act** supports educational services to adults age 16 and over, not currently enrolled in school, who lack the basic skills necessary to function effectively in their lives as workers, parents or citizens of their communities. Adult Education Act programs include Adult Basic Education (ABE), English as a Second Language (ESL), and Adult Secondary Education (ASE).
>
> The **Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act**, as amended, focuses on establishing a closer linkage between attaining basic educational skills and entering occupational skills training. It also now includes increased targeting of the hard-to-serve or most-in-need.

In reviewing the services authorized under each of these Acts, it is easy to see that the services often connect or overlap. They all share a common goal of building futures. Collectively, these acts and their specific programs should offer a brighter tomorrow for those who are willing to work for it. Although they are packaged differently, they were developed and implemented for one common purpose - to build lives. This is why coordination is so important. Each one of these program's recipients and their families are unique. Their problems do not necessarily fit within any one program, or any one agency's jurisdiction.

If the interest lies in putting the needs of these families first, the circumstances demand that everyone works together. Furthermore, individual states and local communities are distinctly different. The mix of individuals, programs, priorities, and politics are all different. These differences in state and local welfare programs make it essential for everyone involved to work together - to coordinate.

Congress intended coordination among training and welfare programs, and education for a variety of reasons. Perhaps chief among these was the perception that recipients need all the help possible to simplify their entry into a welfare-to-work system. Greater efficiency is achieved when duplication is eliminated and coordination is enhanced (Dumas, 1992). *Basically, a more comprehensive approach is essential to serving the client in the 1990s.* Recent federal welfare initiatives such as JOBS are clearly focused on promoting this outcome. The JOBS program requires coordination with JTPA and other job training/education programs available within each state. Specifically, at the state level, the JOBS plan must be reviewed by the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC), whose purpose is to ensure an integrated and coordinated approach to meeting education and training needs. At the local level, welfare agencies must consult with the Private Industry Council (PIC) on the development of contracts (Federal Register, April 18, 1989).

While these acts appear to mandate coordination, it should be perceived as more than a statutory or regulatory mandate. Coordination is not only a useful

tool for achieving a specific goal, but also a means by which all agencies can enhance and improve their individual performance (Magruder, 1988). Coordination means helping each other assist those in need. By working together rather than in isolation public agencies can create partnerships that benefit all agencies involved by providing improved comprehensive services to clients that better promote self-sufficiency for JOBS participants.

Developing coordination partnerships among various agencies requires enormous effort and commitment. There are obstacles to overcome, and removing each obstacle is a separate challenge. The most critical strategy for the creation and maintaining of coordination among agencies, according to Lawrence Bailis, is creating and maintaining a consensus that coordination is in the self-interest of each of the participating agencies (Bailis, 1991). He states that when this perception exists, all participants will find ways to overcome the inevitable barriers. But he contends that the opposite is also true. In the absence of the self-interest perception, participants will use the barriers as excuses not to coordinate. Most other factors that promote coordination lie beyond the control of state and local administrators; therefore if they are to depend on anything, it has to be on strategies that foster efforts by state and local officials to work together to develop programs that benefit recipients and the participating agencies. Most successful coordination efforts begin with an eye to meeting specific recipient needs, and even agency needs, not with a goal of promoting coordination. Coordination will only be achieved when everyone

involved fully understands and appreciates the array of services available through all the programs, knows their counterparts by name, face, and phone number, and when they know in each community where to send a family to receive the education, training, and human services they require to become self-sufficient and skilled contributors in the nation's workplace.

Today the population needing assistance is a much more challenged constituency. Therefore it is imperative to enhance program quality for the severely disadvantaged as well. Agencies involved in job training and education are aware that the disadvantaged population they serve faces a variety of problems to become economically self-sufficient. While each agency has something to offer, their clients' needs often go beyond the expertise and resources of any single agency. These agencies all have the same goal: to help its clients achieve self-sufficiency. Coordination can help them reach that goal by providing benefits to clients and agencies alike.

At the state and local welfare system levels, agencies can play a critical role in documenting the positive and negative effects of policies and policy changes on the lives of welfare recipients, their families, and their communities. Effective state and local JOBS programs can be described, evaluated, and shared with agencies in other states and localities. These agencies should coordinate to share the results of these effective job development activities. If the JTPA agency or the local Employment Security Service has information about an employer's needs and openings, but does not share them with those operating

the JOBS program, many suitable matches could be lost. At the same time, documentation of negative consequences for parents and children of inadequate support services, inappropriate mandating of vulnerable recipients, or debilitating pressures from full-time work or job training and full-time family responsibilities can provide materials with which to lobby for needed program modifications and policy changes. Diann Dawson of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services stated that The Family Support Act of 1988 has been instrumental in changing the nation's welfare system with an emphasis on what was primarily a payment system with a very insignificant work component, into a system that is striving to become a JOBS system. The very nature of JOBS requires coordination, Dawson argues (1991). And coordination thus requires discipline, commitment, and hard work.

The Community College

For nearly 100 years, community colleges have served the nation. William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago at the turn of the century, is credited with popularizing the concept of dividing the classes in colleges and universities (Reinhard, 1993). Harper was at the forefront of a movement to place the first two years of an undergraduate education in a separate institution, the junior college. Since the first junior college opened its doors in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901 (Brint & Karabel, 1990), it has evolved into an institution offering variations of five types of education: (1) general education or the first

two years of a baccalaureate program; (2) career-oriented vocational, occupational and technical programs that can culminate in an associate degree; (3) continuing education; (4) developmental or remedial education; and (5) community services. Community colleges have also emerged as one of the major providers of workforce training, which is needed to revitalize and maintain the competitiveness of the nation's business and industry (Dilcher, 1993). Nearly all community colleges - large and small, urban and rural - have accepted training and retraining of employees of local business, industry, labor, and government as a logical extension of their career preparation, continuing education, and community service missions.

With more than 1,200 delivery sites and an open admissions, open-door philosophy, community colleges are the most accessible educational system for the emerging workforce of the 21st century, their credit and non-credit enrollment surpassed 11 million students in 1993. There is a community college located within commuting distance of over 90 percent of the total population of the nation - as well as within nearly every congressional district (American Association of Community Colleges, 1993b). Community colleges enroll approximately 43 percent of the nation's undergraduates and 51 percent of all first-time freshman students. Community colleges also serve the most diverse student population enrolled in U.S. higher education: they enroll 45 percent of all minority students in college, and women represent 58 percent of the student

body, with an average age of nearly 30 years (American Association of Community Colleges, 1993b).

This growth in community college enrollment is not because of expensive marketing campaigns though it would be incorrect to state that community colleges do not aggressively market their programs. Enrollment is increasing because these colleges offer the right quality education programs at the right time and at the right price. A recent report focusing on rebuilding the economic base of the southern United States, *Greater Expectations: The South's Workforce is the South's Future*, released by the nonprofit Manpower Demonstration Corporation, stands as a strong statement for the growing importance of community colleges. The report states that community colleges represent the (nations' or southern states') best hope for retooling the current workforce and that they can translate employers' changing needs into effective training for workers, whether that means learning basic reading and computation skills or implementing a new process control system (Smith, 1991).

Community colleges are particularly well situated to effectively prepare special populations to become more productive members of the future workforce. By the year 2000, fully 87 percent of net new entrants to the workforce will be non-traditional workers, defined as Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, returning women, and immigrants, who bring with them an entire panoply of special needs (Johnston & Packer, 1987). The magnitude of our nation's unmet

training need is enormous. Table 3, "The Magnitude of the Nation's Unmet Education and Training Needs: Community College Market Potential 1990", below, examines important special population segments and estimates that between 15 and 40 million people from these groups would benefit from additional training (Frances & Associates, 1990).

TABLE 3.

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE NATION'S UNMET EDUCATION AND TRAINING NEEDS: COMMUNITY COLLEGE MARKET POTENTIAL 1990

Workforce Group	Approximate Group Size: Millions	Percent Needing Training: Range	Calculated Magnitudes: Millions
Current Workforce:			
Upgrading Skills of Existing Workers: 10% of Total	12	20-50	2-6
Underemployed: 10% of Total	12	20-50	2-6
Unemployed	6	20-50	1-3
Dislocated Workers	10	20-50	2-5
Re-entrants to Workforce	6	20-50	1-3
New Entrants to Workforce Annually	4	20-33	1-1
Underprepared Workers: High School dropouts	20	10-20	2-4
Women Entering Workforce	9	10-33	1-3
Disabled People of Working Age	12	20-50	2-6
Immigrants	6	28-50	1-3
Total			15-40

Source: Frances, C., & Associates. (1990, January). Calculated from a special computer run projecting the labor force by race and gender. Office of Employment Projections, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

These special population groups include: employed, underemployed, unemployed and dislocated workers, labor force re-entrants and new entrants, underprepared workers, returning women, the disabled and immigrants. In general, federal workforce training and welfare-to-work programs were designed by Congress to help these individuals acquire additional training to fulfill their potential as participants in the labor market.

The proper balance between training for specific skills and general education is an issue of critical concern for the long-range development of a proficient workforce. The pressures for immediate acquisition of skills for students and employers often take precedence over basic educational needs of workers. As technology advances, businesses can simply trade in their workers for newer, better-trained ones, yet the out-of-date workers remain citizens of the community and the state. An inherent dilemma for creating and maintaining a proficient workforce is the need to balance the immediate needs of the state for continued economic development and a highly-skilled workforce. One way to resolve this dilemma and to insure a workforce capable of adapting to change is to educate individuals rather than only train them for specific skills.

The noted educator and philosopher John Gardner once observed that community colleges were "the greatest American educational invention of the twentieth century" (Gardner, 1968). While Gardner's statement may be true for a number of reasons, the "invention" that is called community colleges is perhaps making its greatest contribution by carrying out state economic

development policies and initiatives. More specifically, community colleges are the best vehicle available to the states for investing in human capital.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used in this research study. Major topics addressed in this chapter include: objective of the research study, selection and description of the population, description of the research instrument, pre-test survey to assess readability and completeness, procedure for collecting the research data, and statistical procedures used to manipulate the collected research data.

Objective of the Study

This study uses descriptive methodology based upon a research instrument, administered nationally, designed to assess the level of community college participation in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS), and to examine the attitudes and perceptions of community college professionals toward key issues, problems, concerns, and barriers related to coordinating, implementing and the delivery of JOBS programs. These attitudes and perceptions will be taken from a representative sample of community college professionals who are involved on a daily basis with the administration of JOBS programs. These individuals can include institutional JOBS coordinators, adult literacy specialists, chief academic officers, and chief

executive officers. The researcher is interested in learning the views of these professionals regarding five specific topics:

(1) What is the level and extent of community college participation in the JOBS program?

(2) What identifiable model programs exist to provide postsecondary educational services to AFDC recipients? Are there identifiable models appropriate to specific types of community college settings (rural, suburban and urban/inner city)?

(3) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development?

(4) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding communication and collaboration between state agencies that oversee JOBS programs and community colleges?

(5) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges of the barriers, both internal and external to the institution of effective community college delivery of JOBS services? These include but are not limited to the community college business office; state community/higher education rules and regulations, state audit and expenditure regulations; lack of understanding of the accounting of grant and performance-based contracts, and inclusion of such services in the community college mission statement).

Selection and Description of the Research Population

This research study investigates criteria to address the level of involvement of 1,170 community colleges in federal welfare reform by examining demographic data and the perceptions of community college professionals associated with the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program. Again, these professionals can include presidents, vice-presidents, institutional JOBS coordinators, counselors, and literacy specialists. All community colleges

located in the United States that were current members in good standing, as of March, 1994, of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) were invited to respond. The complete list and mailing addresses of the 1,170 community colleges was obtained with the cooperation of officials at AACC.

Description of the Research Instrument

This research study primarily used descriptive research methods to compare the general demographic information of the community colleges and the attitudes and perceptions of the community college professionals selected to participate in this study. Descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are and is usually concerned with the assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions, and procedures (Gay, 1987). Typically, descriptive data are collected through questionnaire surveys, observations, or interviews (Tate, 1988).

The research instrument for this study, formally titled, "The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program: A National Study" was developed, revised, produced, and distributed specifically for this research project by the researcher. The instrument was developed to collect demographic data and to assess the perceptions of community college professionals who are involved with the

administration of JOBS programs within their institution. A copy of the research instrument is provided in Appendix D.

The research instrument was organized into two primary sections. The first section of the instrument requested demographic information about the respondent's community college and offers the respondent the opportunity to provide additional information (awards, model programs) attributed to their involvement with the JOBS program.

The second section of the instrument was aligned to a Likert-type Scale, with five available responses: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided/Unknown, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. The researcher selected thirty-three criteria from three major areas of interest in relation to the community college's involvement in the JOBS program. After developing the research instrument, the three areas of interest were: perceptions of community college involvement in JOBS policy development, barriers to effective community college delivery of JOBS programs, and the communication and collaboration between state agencies and community colleges.

The final section of the research instrument offered the community college professionals the opportunity to provide any additional comments that they felt would be appropriate.

Pretest Survey

The need for pretesting the items in questionnaires is already well-known but must be stressed. Designing research questionnaires is not easy and demands thought and systematic testing (Walker & Burnhill, 1988). Each item should be tested on a roughly equivalent population. This gives the opportunity to detect ambiguities, to ascertain the range of possible responses, and to ensure that the items on the questionnaire are yielding the desired information. As Dillman states, "Pretesting to identify construction defects is a highly touted part of questionnaire design" (1978, p.155). The reliability and validity for the research questionnaire is established through the pretest.

The pre-test procedure for this research study was to administer a draft of the research instrument regarding community college involvement in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS) to seven community college professionals and welfare reform specialists. These individuals were chosen because they have demonstrated a sincere interest and professional involvement in welfare-to-work/JOBS programs and the community college system. These professionals examined the draft instrument to determine if it adequately and accurately measured the intended content area. Their responses helped to identify any need for further refinement of instrument items, improve overall clarity and simplicity, and to identify sufficient time requirements for completing the research instrument. The seven individuals who evaluated and refined the research instrument are identified in Appendix B.

Procedure for Collecting Data

Due to the relatively large number of community colleges in the nation, it was decided that the mail survey of all 1,170 community colleges was the most appropriate procedure for the research study. According to Rosier, "Survey research in education involves the collection of information from members of a group of students, teachers, or other persons associated with the educational process, and the analysis of this information to illuminate important educational issues" (1988, pp. 107). In addition, survey research is best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes. It has the advantage of wide scope as a great deal of information can be gathered from a large population (Kerlinger, 1986).

Don Dillman's work entitled Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method provided the framework for data collection in this research study. Dillman (1978) describes the Total Design Method as "...a carefully integrated system" (p.122) and reported achieving average response rates of 74 percent for mail surveys that adhered to his comprehensive and detailed instructions for developing and distributing questionnaire booklets, cover letters, follow-up post cards, and follow-up letters.

The research instrument, "The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program: A National Study," was printed in two colors on 8 1/2 inch by 11 inch white paper prior to mailing. The instrument was mailed to the president of the 1,170

community colleges on April 4, 1994 under the letterhead of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), with this cover letter explaining the study's educational and national significance and the importance of the community college's participation. Each cover letter (Appendix C) was signed by David Pierce, President of the AACC. The cover letter carefully followed Dillman's (1978) recommended phraseology to increase response rates. In addition, a business reply envelope was included for ease of response.

After allowing two weeks for the return of the instruments, on April 18, 1994, a post card (Appendix C) addressing the first mailing was sent to the all nonrespondents. The purpose of this postcard was to thank those who had completed the research instrument for their participation, and to encourage others of the need for their support. Again, Dillman's recommended wording was followed as closely as possible in the preparation of the postcard. A second cover letter and research instrument was mailed to those community colleges requesting an additional copy, if they had misplaced the initial instrument.

Although Dillman (1978) recommends that the greatest response rates can be achieved when another complete follow-up package is mailed to participants by certified mail several weeks following the initial mailing, this component of Dillman's methodology was not followed for data collection in this study. Dillman's procedure was not followed because the cost associated with a certified mail campaign were beyond the budget limits of this research project

and the response rate achieved with the initial mailing and the follow-up postcard described above was satisfactory for the purposes of this study. A May 20, 1994 deadline for the receipt of completed research instruments would be established.

Statistical Procedures

The perceptions of the community college professionals are presented through the use of descriptive statistics. In some research studies, like questionnaire surveys, the entire analysis procedure may consist solely of calculating and interpreting descriptive statistics (Hamburg, 1970). The major types of research statistics are (1) measures of central tendency, (2) measures of variability, (3) measures of relationship, and (4) measures of relative position (Gay, 1987). Measures of central tendency are used to determine the typical or average score of a group of scores (the three most encountered indices of central tendency are the mean, the median, and the mode); measures of variability indicate how spread out a group of scores are (the most encountered measure of variability is the standard deviation); measures of relationship indicate to what degree two sets of scores are related; and measures of relative position describe a subject's performance compared to the performance of all other subjects (Mendenhall, 1971).

Since this study involved surveying the entire population of community colleges across the nation, the resulting data were measured in terms of central

tendencies (means) and variabilities (standard deviation) as derived from the cumulative scores given by the community college professionals on the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program questionnaire. In addition, the number of community colleges responding to the study and the percentage of total respondents were considered and included in the data analysis derived from the 33 Likert-type statements listed on the research instrument.

Following the May 20, 1994, deadline for the return of completed questionnaires from each of the community colleges, the data were initially entered into an IBM microcomputer using Borland's dBaseIII+ database software program. The entered data were then loaded onto SAS Institute's Statistical Analysis System, a statistical software program, for analysis of the data. These analyzed results are presented and interpreted by the researcher in Chapter IV, to which attention is now directed.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The organization of this chapter will begin with the reporting of the community colleges that participated in the research study and the response rate of each participating community college, followed by specific demographic information of the participating community colleges and a statistical summary of the responses to the Likert-type section of the research instrument.

Reporting and Response Rate

The research instrument, "The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program: A National Study," was mailed to 1,170 community colleges represented in the member listing from the American Association of Community Colleges. A statistically significant reporting and response rate was achieved from the community colleges asked to participate in the study. Two-hundred and seventy-seven completed instruments were received from the 1,170 community colleges that were initially mailed a research instrument. Community colleges from 45 states chose to participate and returned completed instruments. The five states that were not represented by at least one of their community colleges were: Delaware, Idaho, Louisiana, New Hampshire, and Vermont. According to Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges (1994), these states have

a combined total of only 30 community colleges. The 277 research instruments returned by the community college professionals yielded an overall response rate of 24 percent. The names of the 277 community colleges that returned the completed instrument are listed in Appendix A, "The Name and Location of Each Community College That Responded to the Research Instrument."

The number of completed research instruments returned each week by the community colleges that participated in the study are presented in Table 4, "Number of Research Instruments Returned Each Week by the Responding Community Colleges," below.

TABLE 4.

NUMBER OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS RETURNED EACH WEEK BY THE RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Response Rate to Research Instrument	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total Respondents
Week 1 (Apr 3 - Apr 9)	0	0%
Week 2 (Apr 10 - Apr 16)	23	8%
Week 3 (Apr 17 - Apr 23)	72	26%
Week 4 (Apr 24 - Apr 30)	66	24%
Week 5 (May 1 - May 7)	69	25%
Week 6 (May 8 - May 14)	47	17%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges was 277.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

The community colleges were allowed six full weeks to complete and return the instrument to the researcher. This includes the week of April 3rd through April 9th which was used to mail out the questionnaires. Seventy-five percent of the instruments were returned during weeks 3, 4, and 5. Having the response rate peak during these three weeks was ideal because the researcher had anticipated the rate of response to decline the last week (Week 6). The response rate did drop approximately 30 percent during week 6, which satisfied the researcher's thought that 6 weeks was sufficient time to receive the research instruments.

Demographic Information of the Community Colleges

Table 5, "The Geographical Setting of Each Responding Community College," presents demographic data that characterizes the geographical setting of the community colleges that responded to the study. Each community college professional who completed the instrument was asked to self-identify their college as an urban-based, suburban-based, or rural-based institution. Of the 277 colleges that responded to the study, 27 percent were urban-based institutions, 21 percent suburban-based, and 52 percent rural-based.

TABLE 5.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING OF EACH RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Community College Setting	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Urban	75	27%
Suburban	58	21%
Rural	144	52%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges was 277.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

The total enrollment figures (including non-credit) for the previous academic year, as reported by each responding community college, are presented in Table 6, "Total Student Enrollment (including non-credit courses) of Each Responding Community College." The college's total enrollment is subgrouped into five separate categories: less than 2,500; 2,500 - 7,499; 7,500 - 14,999; 15,000 - 24,999; 25,000 - 49,999; and over 50,000. The smallest enrollment reported by the responding community colleges was 220 students and the largest enrollment was 91,146 students.

As shown in Table 6, approximately one-third (32 percent) of all the community colleges that responded to the study had enrollment figures ranging from 2,500 to 7,499 students. This figure seems to correspond with the fact

that 52 percent of the community colleges that completed the research instrument were located in rural areas which characteristically have smaller enrollments than the larger suburban- and urban-based community colleges. Over 70 percent of all responding community colleges had total enrollment figures of less than 15,000 students.

TABLE 6.

TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT (INCLUDING NON-CREDIT COURSES) OF EACH RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Total Student Enrollment (including noncredit)	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
less than 2,500	52	19%
2,500 - 7,499	90	32%
7,500 - 14,999	57	21%
15,000 - 24,999	34	12%
25,000 - 50,000	30	11%
50,000 or more	14	5%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges was 277. The 14 respondents that had enrollment figures over 50,000 were either multi-campus community colleges, or were community college districts that include several community colleges campuses within that district.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

One-hundred and eighty-nine (69 percent) community colleges out of 274 community colleges responded that economic development was formally stated in their mission statement. Of the remaining community colleges, eighty-five (31 percent) community colleges indicated that economic development was not formally stated in their college's mission statement and three colleges failed to respond to the economic development question.

If the community college indicated that economic development was in their mission statement, economic development activities included serving the following distinct populations: Workforce Development for the Long-Term Unemployed; Workforce Development for Those Never Employed Individuals; Workforce Development for Temporarily Dislocated Workers; and Workforce Development to Improve the Skills of the Currently Employed. Sixty-one percent of the community colleges stated they offered workforce development programs for long-term unemployed individuals. This population would include students enrolled in the JOBS program. Seventy-three percent of the colleges offered programs for individuals never employed; 63 percent provided programs for temporary dislocated workers; and 85 percent of the community colleges offered value-added programs to improve the skills of currently employed individuals.

These four selected workforce development programs and the response rate of the 189 community colleges who stated that these programs were included in their mission statements are presented in Table 7, "Selected Workforce

Development Programs of Responding Community Colleges That Formally Stated Economic Development as a Priority in Their Mission Statements," below.

TABLE 7.

SELECTED WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES THAT FORMALLY STATED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AS A PRIORITY IN THEIR MISSION STATEMENTS

Workforce Development Programs Stated In The Mission Statement Of The Community College	College Response
Long-Term Unemployed (welfare recipients)	115
Never Employed Individuals (high school graduates/dropouts)	138
Temporary Dislocated Workers (short-term unemployed)	119
Improve Skills Of Currently Employed (value added)	161

Note: The "college response" represents the number of community colleges, of the 189 responding colleges, that offered these programs.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Each community college was asked to identify from a selected list, prepared by the researcher, the educational services and curricula currently offered at their college. Table 8, "Selected Educational Services and Curricula Areas Currently Offered at the Responding Community Colleges," identifies the educational services and curricula, and the number of individual community colleges that provided these services and curricula to their students.

TABLE 8.

SELECTED EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AND CURRICULA AREAS CURRENTLY OFFERED AT THE RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Educational Services Currently Offered at The Community College	College Response	Percent of Response
Vocational/Occupational/Technical Curriculum	265	96%
Adult Basic and Development/Remedial Education	252	91%
Job-Skills Training/Job-Readiness Activities	245	88%
Job Development/Placement	226	82%
Education For Individuals With Limited English Proficiency	215	78%
GED Preparation	207	75%
Supportive Services (child care, transportation)	192	69%
Small Business Entrepreneurship/Incubation Center	158	57%
Distance Learning To Deliver Literacy At The Worksite	99	36%
Alternative High School	70	25%
Other Services	64	23%

Note: The "college response" represents the number of community colleges, of the 277 responding colleges, that offered these services.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

As shown in Table 8, over 75 percent of the community colleges responding to this study offered GED preparation, adult basic and development education, education for individuals with limited English proficiency, job-skills training and job-readiness activities, job placement, and vocational, occupational, and technical curricula. In addition, 64 of these colleges listed 60 "other services"

that were not included in the list of services and curricula prepared by the researcher.

Each community college was asked if they were currently operating the following programs: The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program; the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA); and/or the U.S. Department of Labor, other than JTPA. The number of colleges operating these programs are summarized in Table 9, "Number of Community Colleges Operating Federal Government Assistance Programs," below.

TABLE 9.

NUMBER OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES OPERATING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Federal Government Assistance Program	College Response	Percent of Response
JOBS	144	52%
JTPA	219	79%
U.S. Department of Labor, other than JTPA	65	23%

Note: The "college response" represents the number of community colleges, of the 277 responding colleges, that operated federal assistance programs.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

One-hundred and forty-four community colleges, or 52 percent of responding community colleges, indicated they currently operated programs

under JOBS. Two-hundred and nineteen community colleges, or 79 percent, indicated they operated programs under JTPA. Sixty-five community colleges, or 23 percent, stated they were operating programs with assistance from the U.S. Department of Labor, other than JTPA.

A follow-up statement on the research questionnaire asked the community colleges who were currently operating a JOBS program at their college if their JOBS program had ever received an award from their local welfare agency, state or local government, and/or national association. Of the 207 community colleges that responded to this question, 40 community colleges, or 19 percent, indicated that they had received an award for their JOBS program and 167 colleges, or 81 percent, said they had not. If the community college had received an award for their JOBS program, they were asked to send the researcher additional information about their specific JOBS (welfare-to-work) program for inclusion in a future publication. Approximately 25 of the 40 community colleges, or 63 percent, sent additional information regarding their welfare-to-work program to the researcher.

Community colleges were asked to estimate the number of participants served through the respective JOBS programs delivered at their community college in fiscal year 1993. This information is presented in Table 10, "The Total Number of Participants Served Through Specific JOBS Programs at Responding Community Colleges." The number of JOBS participants are subgrouped into five separate categories: less than 50; 50 - 99; 100 - 249; 250

- 499; 500 - 1,000; and over 1,000. Approximately 50 percent of 153 community colleges reported the number of participants served through their JOBS programs to be between 50 and 249 students. Twelve of the larger, urban-based community colleges and multi-campus colleges indicated their number of JOBS participants to be greater than 1,000 students. The largest number of JOBS participants reported was 5,000 students.

TABLE 10.

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS SERVED THROUGH SPECIFIC JOBS PROGRAMS AT RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Total Number of JOBS Participants	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
less than 50	27	18%
50 - 99	37	24%
100 - 249	37	24%
250 - 499	29	19%
500 - 1,000	11	7%
1,000 or more	12	8%
Total JOBS Participants	58,701	100%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges is 153 which is higher than the number of colleges (144) that indicated they were operating JOBS programs, due to the respondents' inconsistencies when answering related questions on the research instrument.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

The approximate total funds for the JOBS program at each community college for fiscal year 1993 are presented in Table 11, "The Approximate Total Funds for JOBS Programs at Responding Community Colleges." Approximately 80 percent of the community colleges receiving funds from the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program indicated they received less than $250,000 for their individual welfare-to-work programs in fiscal year 1993. Thirty-three of the 153 community colleges, or 22 percent, that reported JOBS funds estimated total funds to be in excess of $250,000 and 20 of these colleges reported funds in excess of $500,000.

TABLE 11.

THE APPROXIMATE TOTAL FUNDS FOR JOBS PROGRAMS AT RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Approximate JOBS Funds for Fiscal Year 1993	Number of Responding Colleges	Percent of Responding Colleges
less than $100,000	86	56%
$100,000 - $249,999	34	22%
$250,000 - $499,999	13	9%
$500,000 and above	20	13%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges is 153 which is higher than the number of colleges (144) that indicated they were operating JOBS programs.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

A statement in the research instrument asked the community colleges if they were interested in playing a "more active role" in federal welfare reform through programs like the JOBS program. Of the 232 community colleges that responded to the statement, 224 of the colleges, or 97 percent, indicated they were interested in playing a more active role in welfare reform. Only 8 community colleges, or 3 percent, responded negatively to the statement.

To further assess their involvement in economic development, each community college was asked if they had an employee or employees who were currently members of a specific list of councils and chamber of commerce that was prepared by the researcher. The list of councils and chamber of commerce included local, area, and state affiliations. The list and the community college's responses are presented in Table 12, "Selected Councils and Chamber of Commerce Regularly Attended by the Responding Community Colleges." As indicated by Table 12, the majority of the community colleges were well-represented on the local chamber of commerce and the local and area councils. However, only a small percentage of the community colleges, approximately 5 to 10 percent, had employees on the state councils and state chamber of commerce.

TABLE 12.

SELECTED COUNCILS AND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REGULARLY ATTENDED BY THE RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Councils and Chamber of Commerce	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Local Private Industry Council	168	61%
State Private Industry Council	27	10%
Local Welfare Agency Council	87	31%
State Welfare Agency Council	15	5%
Local Chamber of Commerce	227	82%
State Chamber of Commerce	14	5%
Area Council on Literacy	180	65%
Area Economic Development Council	182	66%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges is 277.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development

The Likert-type research instrument statements regarding the perceptions of community college involvement in JOBS policy development are presented in Table 13, "Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development: Perceptions of Community College Professionals." The community college professionals indicated their perceptions with these statements on five-point

Likert scales. For statistical purposes, the five-point Likert-type statements were given numerical values as follows: (1) "Strongly Disagree", (2) "Disagree", (3) "Undecided or Unknown", (4) "Agree", and (5) "Strongly Agree."

TABLE 13.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN JOBS POLICY DEVELOPMENT: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Number of Responding Community Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
Current federal law **promotes** community college participation in JOBS	16 6%	54 21%	66 26%	97 37%	27 10%
The agency within my state that administers JOBS **promotes** community college participation	18 7%	52 20%	43 16%	101 39%	46 18%
The JOBS agency **within my state** has hosted training sessions to promote community college participation in JOBS, so that AFDC recipients can more easily pursue postsecondary education	28 11%	54 21%	76 29%	74 28%	28 11%
The state community college or coordinating agency **within my state** promotes community college participation in JOBS programs	14 6%	37 14%	55 21%	111 43%	41 16%
Community colleges are well represented on the **local advisory boards** that oversee JOBS programs	34 13%	64 25%	82 32%	52 20%	26 10%
Community colleges are well represented on my **statewide advisory boards** that oversee JOBS programs	26 10%	60 23%	127 50%	32 13%	11 4%
Sufficient **federal** funds are available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education	46 18%	91 35%	80 31%	33 13%	8 3%
Sufficient **state** funds are available to "match" federal JOBS funds to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education	51 20%	82 32%	92 35%	23 9%	10 4%

TABLE 13. (continued)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN JOBS POLICY DEVELOPMENT: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Number of Responding Community Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
Federal JOBS regulations provide sufficient **flexibility** for states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively	24 9%	80 31%	94 37%	49 19%	9 4%
There should be increased state/community college **control** over how federal JOBS funds are spent	11 4%	16 6%	59 23%	105 41%	67 26%
The criteria needed for **measuring the effective return on investment** of JOBS funds presently exist within my state's JOBS data collection system	16 6%	46 18%	141 55%	47 18%	7 3%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges was different for each statement, depending on if the respondent chose to answer it. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows: SD - Strongly Disagree, D - Disagree, U - Uncertain/Unknown, A -Agree, and SA - Strongly Agree.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Of those community colleges indicating a preference to the statement, "Current federal law promotes community college participation in JOBS," 47 percent of the colleges agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 27 percent who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty-six of the respondents were uncertain or unsure if current federal law promoted the participation of community colleges in the JOBS program.

Fifty-seven percent of the community college professionals agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 27 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that " The agency within my state that administers JOBS promotes community college participation." Sixteen percent of the respondents were undecided or unsure. Therefore approximately one-half of all respondents either disagreed or were unsure that their state agency that administers JOBS promoted community college participation. This response appears consistent with the research literature (Gold, 1990) presented in Chapter II, that community colleges still have a difficult time dealing with the agencies that administer state welfare programs.

Thirty-nine percent of the responding community colleges agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 31 percent of the respondents who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that "The JOBS agency within my state has hosted training sessions to promote community college participation in JOBS, so that AFDC recipients can more easily pursue postsecondary education." Twenty-nine percent were undecided or unsure; thus approximately 60 percent of all the respondents either disagreed or were uncertain that the JOBS agency within their state hosted training sessions to promote community college participation in JOBS.

Yet, community colleges want to participate in the JOBS program and the state community college or coordinating agencies were generally not perceived as presenting barriers. This was reflected by the responses to the statement,

"The state community college or coordinating agency within my state promotes community college participation in JOBS programs." Fifty-nine percent of all the responding community colleges agreed to strongly agreed with this statement compared to only 20 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed. Twenty-one percent were undecided or unsure that state community college or coordinating agencies promoted community college participation in JOBS.

Seventy percent of community colleges either disagreed to strongly disagreed or were uncertain with the statement that, "Community colleges are well represented on the local advisory boards that oversee JOBS programs." Only 30 percent agreed to strongly agreed with this statement. In addition, only 17 percent of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "Community colleges are well represented on my statewide advisory boards that oversee JOBS programs," compared to 83 percent of the colleges who either disagreed to strongly disagreed or were uncertain that they were well represented on their state advisory boards that oversee JOBS programs.

Furthermore, only 16 percent of community colleges agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "Sufficient federal funds are available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education." In comparison, an overwhelming 84 percent of community college either disagreed to strongly disagreed (53 percent) or were uncertain (31 percent) if sufficient funds were available through JOBS to offer to welfare recipients. Of those indicating a preference, only 13 percent agreed

to strongly agreed, compared to 87 percent who either disagreed to strongly disagreed or were uncertain, with the statement that, "Sufficient state funds are available to "match" federal JOBS funds to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education." Therefore only a small percentage, 13 to 16 percent, of all responding community colleges agreed there were sufficient federal JOBS and state "matching" funds to offer welfare recipients.

Forty percent of the responding community colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement that, "Federal JOBS regulations provide sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively." Only 23 percent of the colleges agreed to strongly agreed that there was sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges to effectively administer their JOBS programs. Thirty-seven percent were uncertain or unsure if federal JOBS regulations provided sufficient flexibility.

Of the federal JOBS and state "matching" funds that were available to offer to welfare recipients, 67 percent of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "There should be increased state/community college control over how federal JOBS funds are spent." Thirty-three percent of the community college professionals either disagreed to strongly disagreed or were uncertain that community colleges should have increased control over how JOBS funds are spent in their state.

Over one-half of the community college professionals, 55 percent, were either uncertain or unsure with the statement that, "The criteria needed for measuring the effective return on investment of JOBS funds (i.e., completion of educational requirements, successful job placement, percentage of JOBS program candidates actually served) presently exist within my state's JOBS data collection system." Twenty-four percent disagreed to strongly disagreed, compared to 21 percent of the respondents who agreed to strongly agreed with the statement.

Barriers to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs

The second section of the Likert-type statements queried community colleges professional's perceptions of the internal and external barriers that affect community college delivery of JOBS programs. These perceptions are presented in Table 14, "Internal and External Barriers to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs: Perceptions of Community College Professionals."

TABLE 14.

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DELIVERY OF JOBS PROGRAMS: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Number of Responding Community Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
Federal need-based **student aid is counted against welfare eligibility in my state** (i.e., if the AFDC recipient applies for and receives a Pell Grant, their monthly allotment under AFDC is reduced by the amount awarded by Pell)	51 21%	48 19%	87 35%	50 20%	13 5%
To my knowledge, **budget cuts** in my state have precluded my state from matching all of the federal funds available for JOBS programs	12 5%	28 11%	146 58%	47 18%	26 8%
There are insufficient funds within my state to **guarantee child care** for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college	11 4%	47 19%	67 26%	85 34%	44 17%
There are insufficient funds within my state to pay necessary **transportation** for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college	6 2%	50 20%	71 28%	90 35%	37 15%
The Health and Human Services' **"20-hour rule"** (20 required hours of participation in JOBS program activities per week) wastes resources and is biased against JOBS programs at my community college	24 10%	60 24%	80 31%	53 21%	35 14%
The lack of **common forms** for in-take for both the JOBS and JTPA programs prevents full integration of these programs at my community college	11 4%	46 18%	71 28%	80 32%	47 18%
The **lack of trained personnel and/or professional development** at my community college has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS	59 23%	100 39%	44 17%	37 15%	14 6%
The **lack of understanding by administrators at my community college of the rules and regulations of the JOBS program** has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS	47 18%	96 38%	34 13%	56 22%	22 9%

TABLE 14. (continued)

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DELIVERY OF JOBS PROGRAMS: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Number of Responding Community Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
The emphasis by the JOBS program in my state toward the most **short-term education** possible to promote the goal of immediate job placement is contrary to the kind of sequential educational programs that community college typically operate	8 3%	44 17%	36 14%	95 38%	71 28%
The state community college coordinating board or agency requires or encourages my community college to enroll JOBS participants in **"no credit" programs**, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom for regular college courses	55 22%	96 38%	82 32%	14 5%	7 3%
My community college has chosen to enroll JOBS participants in **"no credit" programs**, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom	77 31%	105 42%	54 22%	11 4%	2 1%
Adult literacy (which includes JOBS-sponsored adult basic education and GED training) is an activity that is a high priority at my community college	14 6%	45 18%	13 5%	84 33%	95 38%
My community college has simply chosen **not to participate** in the JOBS program	139 55%	72 29%	29 12%	9 3%	2 1%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges was different for each statement, depending on if the respondent chose to answer it. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows: SD - Strongly Disagree, D - Disagree, U - Uncertain/Unknown, A -Agree, and SA - Strongly Agree.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Sixty percent of the community college professionals either agreed to strongly agreed (25 percent) or were unsure (35 percent) with the statement that, "Federal need-based student aid is counted against welfare eligibility in my state (i.e., if the AFDC recipient applies for and receives a Pell Grant, their monthly allotment under AFDC is reduced by the amount awarded by Pell)." Only 40 percent of the respondents disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement. Thus the majority of the community colleges, 6 out of 10, believed or were unsure that federal student aid is counted against the welfare recipients.

Approximately one-quarter, 26 percent, of all responding community colleges agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "To my knowledge, budget cuts in my state have precluded my state from matching all of the federal funds available for JOBS programs." Only 16 percent of the colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement. The majority of the community colleges, 58 percent, were uncertain or unsure if budget cuts have precluded their states from matching all of the federal funds available for JOBS programs.

Further discussion of state funds indicated that 51 percent of the community colleges agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "There are insufficient funds within my state to guarantee child care for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college." Twenty-three percent of the respondents disagreed to strongly disagreed that there are insufficient state funds to guarantee child care for JOBS participants. Twenty-

six percent were uncertain or unsure if there were insufficient funds for child care. Consequently, 50 percent of the colleges also agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "There are insufficient funds within my state to pay necessary transportation for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college." Twenty-two percent disagreed to strongly disagreed, and 28 percent of the colleges were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

One-third of all respondents, 35 percent, agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "The Health and Human Services' "20-hour rule" (20 required hours of participation in JOBS program activities per week) wastes resources and is biased against JOBS programs at my community college." In similar fashion, 34 percent of community colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement. The remaining 31 percent of the respondents were uncertain or unsure with the statement regarding the "20-hour rule."

Fifty-two percent of community colleges agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "The lack of common forms for in-take for both the JOBS and JTPA programs prevents full integration of these programs at my community college." Of the remaining colleges that indicated a preference, 22 percent disagreed to strongly disagreed and 28 percent were uncertain with the statement.

Only 21 percent of all respondents agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "The lack of trained personnel and/or professional development at my community college has resulted in a lower level of institutional

participation by my college in JOBS." The majority of community colleges, 52 percent, disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement. Seventeen percent of colleges were uncertain or unsure that the lack of trained personnel and/or professional development at my community college has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS. In addition, 31 percent of the community colleges agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "The lack of understanding by administrators at my community college of the rules and regulations of the JOBS program has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS." Fifty-six percent of colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement and 13 percent were uncertain or unsure.

The majority of responding community colleges, 66 percent, agreed to strongly agreed with the statement, that "The emphasis by the JOBS program in my state toward the most short-term education possible to promote the goal of immediate job placement is contrary to the kind of sequential educational programs that community college typically operate." Only 20 percent of those indicating a preference disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The remaining 14 percent of respondents were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

Sixty percent of community colleges indicating a choice disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement that, "The state community college coordinating board or agency requires or encourages my community college to enroll JOBS

participants in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom for regular college courses." Only 8 percent of the colleges agreed to strongly agreed, and 32 percent were uncertain or unsure with the statement. Furthermore, 73 percent of colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed, compared to 5 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that, "My community college has chosen to enroll JOBS participants in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom." The remaining 22 percent were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

A majority of community colleges, 71 percent, agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "Adult literacy (which includes JOBS-sponsored adult basic education and GED training) is an activity that is a high priority at my community college." Twenty-four percent of the colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed and 5 percent were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

An overwhelming 84 percent of the responding community colleges disagreed to strongly disagreed, compared to only 4 percent of the respondents who agreed to strongly agreed, with the statement that, "My community college has simply chosen not to participate in the JOBS program." Twelve percent of the colleges were uncertain or unsure of their decision to participate in the JOBS program.

Communication and Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges

The third section of the Likert-type statements assessed the perceptions of the community college professionals regarding the level of (or lack of) communication and collaboration between the state agencies that oversee the JOBS programs in a particular state and the community colleges located within that state. These perceptions are presented in Table 15, "Communication and Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges Regarding the JOBS Program: Perceptions of Community College Professionals."

TABLE 15.

COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN STATE AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES REGARDING THE JOBS PROGRAM: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Number of Responding Community Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
My **state agencies** have shown little or no interest in organizing and implementing JOBS programs in my community college	58 23%	87 34%	49 19%	44 17%	18 7%
The map of the legally defined **service area for JOBS** does not match the state-assigned service area of my community college	32 13%	63 24%	99 38%	43 17%	20 8%
The map of the legally defined **service area for JTPA** does not match the legally defined service area for JOBS and my community college's state-assigned area	28 11%	67 26%	103 40%	39 15%	21 8%
The existing **fragmentation** (maps not matching) has lessened the ability of my community college to coordinate and develop effective programs that link education to transitional welfare	32 13%	66 26%	93 37%	42 16%	21 8%

TABLE 15. (continued)

COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN STATE AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES REGARDING THE JOBS PROGRAM: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Number of Responding Community Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
There exists a large amount of **fragmentation** (including lack of communication and "turf battles") between various state agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) in my state	16 6%	43 17%	72 28%	76 30%	47 19%
Task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the community college **meet on a regular basis** to integrate their activities, so that AFDC recipients can be better served through the JOBS program	39 15%	67 26%	49 19%	69 27%	34 13%
It would be a good thing for **program integration** if task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the local community college met on a regular basis	1 0%	2 1%	18 7%	113 44%	124 48%
The **Governor** in my state has taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs	15 6%	30 12%	105 41%	78 30%	28 11%
The **State legislators** in my state have taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs	11 4%	55 22%	107 42%	66 26%	16 6%

Note: The total number of responding community colleges was different for each statement, depending on if the respondent chose to answer it. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows: SD - Strongly Disagree, D - Disagree, U - Uncertain/Unknown, A -Agree, and SA - Strongly Agree.

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Only approximately one-half of the college professionals, 57 percent, disagreed to strongly disagreed, compared to 24 percent who agreed to strongly agreed, with the statement that, "My state agencies have shown little or no interest in organizing and implementing JOBS programs in my community college." Nineteen percent of the colleges were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

Twenty-five percent of the colleges agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 37 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that, "The map of the legally defined service area for JOBS does not match the state-assigned service area of my community college." The remaining colleges, 38 percent, were uncertain or unsure with the statement. In addition, 23 percent of respondents agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 37 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that, "The map of the legally defined service area for JTPA does not match the legally defined service area for JOBS and my community college's state-assigned area." Forty percent of the community colleges were uncertain or unsure.

In the same manner, 24 percent of the colleges agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 39 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that, "The existing fragmentation (maps not matching) has lessened the ability of my community college to coordinate and develop effective programs that link education to transitional welfare." The other 37 percent were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

Forty-nine percent of responding community colleges agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 23 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed, with the statement that, "There exists a large amount of fragmentation (including lack of communication and "turf battles") between various state agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) in my state."

Of the community colleges that indicated a preference to the statement, "Task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the community college meet on a regular basis to integrate their activities, so that AFDC recipients can be better served through the JOBS program," 40 percent of the colleges agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 41 percent who disagreed to strongly disagreed. The remaining colleges, 19 percent, were uncertain or unsure with the statement.

Yet, 92 percent of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed with the statement that, "It would be a good thing for program integration if task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the local community college met on a regular basis." Only 1 percent disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement and 7 percent were uncertain.

The majority of responding community colleges, 59 percent, either disagreed to strongly disagreed or were uncertain with the statement that, "The Governor in my state has taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-

work programs." Only 41 percent of respondents agreed to strongly agreed that their governor has taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs. Furthermore, 68 percent of community colleges either disagreed to strongly disagreed or were uncertain with the statement that, "The State legislators in my state have taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs." Only 32 percent of the college respondents agreed to strongly agreed that their state legislators had taken active roles in coordinating welfare-to-work programs in their state.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This research study was designed to examine the level of involvement of the nation's community colleges in the federally funded welfare-to-work program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program. Following a comprehensive review of the literature that included issues related to federally funded welfare programs, this study assessed community colleges professionals' attitudes and perceptions of the federally funded JOBS program. The literature review included issues related to the Family Support Act of 1988, the attempt of welfare reform to break the poverty cycle, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program, the states' participation in JOBS, barriers to effective community college delivery of JOBS services, the problems facing JOBS and postsecondary education, the coordination and collaboration between state agencies and community colleges, the community college, and source(s) of information relied upon for information on JOBS and related human resource issues.

The views of the community college professionals regarding five specific topics were solicited: (1) the level of community college participation in the JOBS program; (2) the existence of model JOBS programs to provide community college services to AFDC recipients; (3) the amount of community

college involvement in JOBS policy development; (4) the extent of barriers (internal and external) to effective community college delivery of JOBS programs; and, (5) the level of communication and collaboration between state agencies that oversee JOBS programs and the community colleges.

The 1,170 community colleges who were asked to respond to the research instrument, all located in the United States, were members of the American Association of Community Colleges as of April, 1994. Two-hundred and seventy-seven community colleges chose to participate in the study by returning completed research instruments to the researcher, a response rate of 24 percent.

Findings

The findings appropriate for each of the five specific research topics addressed in the study are provided in this section. They were developed through analysis of the self-reported demographic information and the attitudes and perceptions of the community college professionals responsible for administering the JOBS program at their respective community colleges.

Question 1: What is the level and extent of community college participation in the JOBS program?

Based upon the analysis of the data generated by the research instrument, this study found that there was significant commitment and participation by the responding community colleges in welfare-to-work programs, such as the Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program. Also, the data indicated that the community colleges were able, and willing, to provide the necessary educational and support services required by the federal assistance welfare programs to offer economic independence to welfare (AFDC) recipients through postsecondary education.

Nearly 70 percent, 189 out of 274, of the responding community colleges indicated that economic development was formally stated in their college's mission statement. Table 7 reflects that 115 out of 189 community colleges, 61 percent, indicated that workforce development programs for the long-term unemployed, which includes welfare recipients, were operating at their institution. Furthermore, 73 percent of the community colleges offered programs for those never previously employed individuals, which included both welfare recipients and high school dropouts. Therefore, almost 3 out of 4 community colleges that responded to the research instrument offered workforce development programs designed specifically for welfare-to-work individuals.

The responding community colleges were also asked to identify from a prepared list the educational services currently offered at their institution. As summarized in Table 8, 75 percent of all community colleges offered GED preparation at their college; 91 percent offered adult basic and developmental education; 78 percent offered education for individuals with limited English proficiency; 88 percent offered job-skills training and job-readiness activities; 82 percent offered job development and placement; and 96 percent of the colleges offered vocational, occupational, and technical curriculum.

These percentages are significant when considering that a state's JOBS program must include the following four services and/or activities (Federal Register, April 18, 1989): (1) any educational activity below the postsecondary level that the state agency determines to be appropriate to the participant's employment goal (including, but not limited to, high school education or GED preparation, basic and remedial education, and English as a second language), (2) job skills training including vocational training, (3) job readiness activities to prepare participants to enter the world of work, and (4) job development and job placement to solicit employment for participants.

In 1989, when NETWORK, "America's Two-Year College Employment Training and Literacy Consortium," conducted their national survey of two-year colleges, only 15 percent of these colleges (56 out of 384 responding colleges) offered federal government assistance programs funded through the JOBS program. The results from this research study has shown significant growth in

the number of community colleges operating JOBS programs. Fifty-two percent, 144 out of 277, of responding colleges currently operate JOBS programs at their institutions.

Question 2: What identifiable model programs exist to provide postsecondary educational services to AFDC recipients? Are there identifiable models appropriate to specific types of community college settings (rural, suburban and urban)?

A statement in the research instrument asked the community colleges if they believed their institution was operating a model welfare-to-work (JOBS) program. If so, they were asked to send additional information about their model program to the researcher. Of the 144 community colleges who indicated that they operate a JOBS program (Table 9), twenty-two community colleges, or 15 percent, sent the researcher information regarding their model welfare-to-work programs; however 40 community college professionals actually indicated on the research instrument that their institution had received an award for their JOBS program. Three examples of self-reported model programs sent to the researcher are described below.

The first program provided support services to public assistance (AFDC) recipients who wanted to earn a colleges degree or a certificate from a community college. This program was established in conjunction with the state

agency that oversees the welfare programs in the state. The welfare recipients were enrolled in career degree or certificate programs and were classified as full-time students expected to complete their studies in two years. During that time, the community college provided ongoing support services to help students meet their academic, personal, and career goals. When students reached the first semester of their studies, they typically began work with the career/employment specialists to find employment within their chosen field.

This first program was in contrast to the second and third, which were specific to only one area of training. The second example included vocational skills training programs that provided training in computer software, office communication, and office skills. The other example included a rural allied medical business occupations program that addressed the critical need for rural health care workers and the plight of economically disadvantaged individuals. This program trained disadvantaged individuals in rural areas for jobs in rural health care fields, both through class work as well as on-the-job training at medical centers.

Although each community college's model program differed in design, they were specifically built in unity to provide self-esteem, independence, and a hope for the future. There appeared to exist a common thread that ran through all of these model programs: to sincerely help welfare recipients who were experiencing economic or social transitions to remove barriers and develop

goals, skills and support systems that promoted success in education and employment without removing their dignity.

Question 3: What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development?

Of the community college professionals that indicated a preference to the statements in Table 13, a vast majority (84 percent) of the community colleges either disagreed or were uncertain that sufficient federal funds were available through JOBS to offer welfare recipients economic independence through postsecondary education. In the same manner, 87 percent of the colleges disagreed or were uncertain that sufficient state funds were available to "match" federal JOBS funds. Of the funds that were presumed available, 67 percent of the responding colleges agreed that there should be increased state and community college control over how these JOBS funds should be spent.

Regarding the issue of representation, only 30 percent of the community colleges agreed that their institution was well represented on their local advisory boards that oversee the JOBS programs. And only 17 percent of these colleges agreed that they were well represented on statewide advisory boards that oversee the JOBS programs.

Only 23 percent of the responding colleges agreed that the federal JOBS regulations provided sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges

to administer JOBS programs effectively. Thus, 3 out of 4 colleges disagreed or were uncertain that there was sufficient flexibility in federal JOBS regulations to effectively administer JOBS programs at their institutions.

Lastly, 55 percent of the community college professionals were either unaware or uncertain if a data collection system for JOBS currently existed in their state. Of the remaining 45 percent of respondents, only 21 percent agreed that the criteria needed for effectively measuring the return on investment of JOBS funds was actually being analyzed or had ever been assimilated in their state.

Question 4: What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding communication and collaboration between state agencies that oversee JOBS programs and community colleges?

Program integration is very important to the community colleges. The vast majority of the community colleges, 92 percent, agreed that it would be beneficial for program integration to organize task forces comprised of all the agencies dealing with JOBS and the local community colleges. Such task forces would meet on a regular basis to ensure productive and effective welfare program integration within the state.

Nearly one-half, 49 percent, of the community colleges responding to the study agreed to strongly agreed that there existed a large amount of

fragmentation, including communication and "turf battles" between various state agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs and community colleges. Thirty-nine percent of the responding colleges also agreed that the existing fragmentation had lessened the ability of their institutions to coordinate and develop effective programs that link postsecondary education to a welfare-to-work system.

Only 41 percent of the responding community colleges agreed that their governors had taken an active role in promoting and coordinating JOBS and other welfare programs in their state. Eighteen percent of the respondents believed that their Governor had not taken an active role in promoting the coordination of welfare-to-work programs such as JOBS. In the same manner, only 32 percent of the responding colleges agreed that their state legislators had taken an active role in coordinating and promoting welfare programs. Twenty-five percent of the institutions indicated their legislators did not promote or coordinate welfare programs, including JOBS, in their state.

Question 5: What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges of the barriers, both internal and external to the institution of effective community college delivery of JOBS services?

Fifty-one percent of the responding community colleges agreed that there were insufficient funds within their state to guarantee child care for welfare

recipients participating in the JOBS program at their colleges. Only 23 percent of the colleges believed there were sufficient state funds to guarantee child care for JOBS participants. In the same manner, 50 percent of the community college professionals agreed that there were insufficient funds within their state to pay the necessary transportation expenses for welfare recipients participating in the JOBS program at their institutions. Only a small number of respondents, 22 percent, believed there were sufficient state funds to pay the necessary transportation costs for the JOBS participants. Although one-half of all the responding colleges agreed their were insufficient state funds available for child care and transportation expenses, 58 percent of these community colleges were uncertain or unaware if cuts in their state budgets had actually precluded their state from matching the available funds available for JOBS programs within their state.

Twenty-five percent of the college professionals agreed that federal need-based financial aid was counted against welfare eligibility in their state (i.e., if a welfare recipient receives financial aid such as a Pell grant, their AFDC allotment would be reduced by the amount of the grant). Of the remaining colleges, 35 percent of them were uncertain or unsure and 40 percent disagreed that federal student aid was counted against welfare eligibility in their state.

Similarly, 35 percent of responding colleges agreed that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service's requirement of a minimum of 20 hours of

participation in JOBS program activities per week wasted resources and was biased against community colleges. Thirty percent of the colleges were uncertain or unaware if the 20 hours of participation wasted resources or was biased. Under JOBS, states must have, in general, a certain proportion of individuals whose participation in JOBS-related activities, as a group, averages at least 20 hours a week or the states will lose a portion of their federal funding. The DHHS developed this new 20-hour standard to reflect congressional intent that JOBS participants be engaged in activities in a meaningful manner rather than merely be registered for activities, as often happened under past programs (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

The majority of responding community colleges, 66 percent, agreed that the emphasis by the welfare agency in their state toward the most short-term education and/or training possible to promote immediate job placement was contrary to the sequential educational curricula that community colleges generally operate. Only 20 percent of the colleges disagreed with this statement concerning short-term education.

Seventy-three percent of the responding colleges disagreed with the statement that they encouraged or required JOBS participants to enroll in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom. Only 5 percent of the responding colleges agreed that they had chosen to enroll JOBS participants in "no credit" programs, denying them time spent in the classroom. Also, 60 percent of the institutions disagreed with

the statement that their state community college boards encouraged or required them to enroll JOBS participants in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom. Only a small percentage, 8 percent, of colleges agreed with the statement.

Over 60 percent of all community colleges disagreed with the statement that the lack of trained personnel and/or professional development at their institution had resulted in a lower level of participation by their college in JOBS. In addition, 56 percent of the respondents disagreed that the lack of understanding by their administrators of the rules and regulations of the JOBS program had resulted in lower levels of institutional participation by their institution in JOBS.

Conclusions

The most unpopular and controversial government program by far is welfare. Any effort that proposes to examine "welfare reform" and the federally funded assistance programs associated with it is faced with complexities and ambiguities. The concept of welfare reform is quite obscure and the criteria researched in this study cannot be fully descriptive of the basis for welfare reform. This study represents some important aspects of welfare reform and welfare-to-work programs, but there are undoubtedly others. The criteria for this research study was selected based upon its appearance in the literature and the researcher's interest in the participatory role of the community college

system in welfare reform. However, there are many more criteria that could have been selected for investigation that are important parts of welfare reform.

The Family Support Act of 1988 can be viewed as part of a broad attempt by Congress to make the entire U.S. population more productive. From this perspective, the key to the entire Family Support Act is the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program, the implementation of which will, over time, require all states to ensure that targeted groups of welfare (AFDC) recipients participate in job training and/or postsecondary education and move into the paid workforce (Vosler & Ozawa, 1988). The investigation of the involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program conducted by the researcher did provide some valuable insight, the conclusions of which are presented below.

In line with the shift in the social contract toward expecting all or most welfare recipients to seek training and employment and families to be economically self-sufficient, the findings of this study acknowledged some of the barriers to postsecondary education and training for welfare recipients. These barriers include the need for available assistance with expenses such as child care and transportation that participation in education and training entails. When 50 percent of the participating community colleges agreed there were insufficient funds for both child care and transportation for JOBS participants in their state, this fund barrier became a critical issue that should be addressed

by the states, the community colleges within that state, and the federal government.

Also, the progress in helping JOBS participants become self-sufficient can be slowed by states' limited spending on JOBS and budget shortfalls. As noted in the literature, more than one-third of the federal JOBS funds available to the states went unused in 1991 because many states did not plan to spend enough state money to obtain all of the federal matching funds available. Twenty-six percent of the community colleges responding to this study perceived that such fiscal problems can slow the influx of new participants into JOBS programs and limit the number of individuals who can become self-sufficient.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the state welfare agencies need to establish and widely disseminate specific and consistent regulations concerning federal need-based financial aid calculations for AFDC recipients. As long as there is a perception of significance variance between AFDC and federal student aid rules, determinations from welfare officer to welfare officer will vary, and the uncertainty and confusion characterized by the responding community colleges will remain. When 25 percent of community colleges agreed that federal student aid was still being counted against welfare eligibility and another 35 percent of the colleges were unsure, there exists a need for the federal government to better market community college involvement and understanding of the JOBS program. Entirely, it is without

reason that 60 percent of the community colleges agreed or were unsure if federal aid was biased against welfare recipients.

Of those community colleges professionals indicating preferences regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development, only 16 percent agreed compared to 53 percent who disagreed that there were sufficient federal funds available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through education. In comparison, only 13 percent of the colleges agreed, compared to 52 percent who disagreed that there were sufficient state funds to "match" the federal JOBS funds available for welfare recipients. This lack of understanding is further evidenced by the responses of community college professionals to questions related to JOBS objectives and JOBS program rules.

Only 23 percent of responding colleges agreed that JOBS regulations provided sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges to effectively administer JOBS programs. Yet according to the literature review, within the framework of the federal provisions, states possess the flexibility to design various aspects of their JOBS programs. Many decisions about the design and operation of JOBS programs are left to governors, state legislatures as well as state AFDC agencies. Furthermore, the individual states are allowed to decide who will be served and what types of activities and services will be emphasized for participants. It is significant when 77 percent of all responding institutions disagree or were uncertain if JOBS regulations provided adequate

flexibility for effective administration of JOBS programs by the colleges. It seems apparent that there exists a lack of understanding on behalf of the community college professionals regarding the FSA and specifically the JOBS program.

By reviewing the perceptions of the community colleges professionals, it was observed that the institutions want to be involved in developing and administering JOBS programs at their colleges. One-hundred and forty-four community colleges, or 52 percent of responding community colleges, indicated they currently operated programs under JOBS; and of the 232 community colleges that responded to the statement of playing a "more active role" in federal welfare reform through programs like the JOBS program, 224 of the colleges, or 97 percent, indicated that they were interested in becoming more involved in developing and administering JOBS programs. However only 30 percent of the colleges agreed that their institutions are well represented on the local advisory boards that oversee JOBS program; and similarly, only 17 percent of the colleges agree that they are well represented on statewide boards that oversee the JOBS programs. Until these community colleges actively participate in the recruitment of knowledgeable community college personnel to represent their institutions on these state and local boards, the percentage of community college participation will continue to be unacceptable and the colleges will remain isolated and ineffective in voicing their ideas and concerns regarding welfare-to-work programs.

Responding community colleges clearly did not favor forcing short-term education for JOBS participants in order to promote the goal of immediate job placement. Yet, as revealed in the literature review, the flexibility to approve long-term postsecondary education as a "training" program for AFDC recipients has rarely happened in practice, even though federal student aid could pick up most tuition costs. As a matter of policy, prior to FSA many state welfare agencies disallowed postsecondary education altogether; others provided little information about it, and tended to allow only short-term job - focused postsecondary education. However, there is nothing in the 1988 FSA to declare short-term programs preferable to longer programs, and nearly all the economic data concerning long-term self-sufficiency argues the precise opposite.

As reported in the findings, 49 percent of community colleges believed a large amount of fragmentation, including poor communication and "turf battles" existed within their state. In an effort to increase program integration, which was highly valued by the responding colleges, greater program coordination to serve JOBS participants is needed. The colleges should respond proactively to coordinate with such agencies as JTPA, state welfare, education and training, child care, and employment agencies. One significant finding was that the vast majority of community colleges offered all of the related educational services the FSA and JOBS was designed to promote. These include: GED preparation, education for individuals with limited English proficiency, job-skills training and job-readiness activities, and job development and placement. There needs to be

greater amounts of coordination and collaboration with these agencies that traditionally have been important providers of services to welfare-to-work participants. Therefore, the state agencies must affirmatively welcome the colleges' ideas and suggestions and be willing to relinquish some of their responsibilities associated with the JOBS program, if needed, in order to effectively coordinate the JOBS program and provide the necessary services to the JOBS participants.

Also, it is apparent that there is a need for state governments to become more active in coordinating and promoting the JOBS programs, as well as other welfare-to-work programs within their states. Seventy-five percent of all responding community colleges either agree or are uncertain that their governor and state legislators are actively promoting welfare programs and the need for postsecondary education for welfare recipients in their states.

In an effort to increase the knowledge and understanding of implementing successful model JOBS programs within the community college curriculum, the information received by the researcher on successful model JOBS programs should be available to all institutions to reflect specific AFDC-related characteristics. Such information should include: benefit amount, past welfare-to-work programs, organizational structure and required professional staff, geographical regions, economic factors such as employment and poverty rates, and percentage of disadvantaged populations in urban, suburban, or rural areas.

The researcher hopes the findings from this study can provide useful information for shaping future programs that help welfare recipients become more economically independent. He anticipates this research may indicate the importance of changes in the current welfare policies as well as changes in many welfare-dependent families. It is to be hoped that political pressures will not continue to create a denial of the former and an emphasis on the latter as has been true so often in the past.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings and conclusions of the study:

Recommendation 1.

There is a genuine need for improved communication and collaboration between welfare agencies, job-training agencies, and employment agencies directed at allocation of federal and state funds and improvement of training and postsecondary education for welfare recipients. This increase in communication and collaboration should be promoted at the state and local levels. At the state and local level, task forces comprised of individuals from all of the various agencies can informally integrate their ideas and activities so welfare recipients (JOBS participants) can be better served through welfare reform programs. The experience of programs regarding welfare, education, and job training and placement developed through the decades can be brought to

bear in an effort to address the special needs of welfare recipients in preparing them for the workforce. Also, there should be continued efforts to take advantage of the enormous resources and experience of postsecondary educational institutions to develop opportunities for this population.

Recommendation 2.

In the area of welfare reform policy, federal and state legislation needs to be further amended to formally define postsecondary education and career training as acceptable, if not preferable forms of job preparation and a viable alternative to immediate job placement. Such action would clear the way for establishing administrative regulations at the federal and state levels that define welfare students as a special category of welfare recipients, recognizing the cost-of-living standards for student financial aid and integrating financial aid with welfare payments. This would reward rather than punish welfare recipients, including AFDC women, for electing a longer-term investment in their futures. Inconsistent calculations and determinations of AFDC and federal student aid rules and practices can not be allowed to continue.

Welfare legislation should be amended to require that the states allow AFDC recipients the opportunity to fulfill their education and training requirement in a postsecondary institution, if they so choose, as long as satisfactory progress is being made by the student and the plan of study is consistent with the student's career goals. In addition, financial incentives should be available to

welfare recipients who achieve the educational goal of a high school diploma or General Educational Development diploma. In lieu of federal action in this regard, individual states should move on their own.

Recommendation 3.

Federal and state legislation action should adopt administrative regulations that encourage, not discourage, cooperative agreements between welfare, postsecondary education, and employment programs to recognize the special needs of welfare recipients. Federal and state law should promote the pooling of joint resources, and eliminate conflicting rules and regulations that negatively affect potential AFDC students. Perhaps reorganization and reorientation of the state welfare departments and comprehensive training of state social workers will be essential to the acceptance of more dedication and sympathetic approaches to postsecondary educational opportunities and training as an option to short-term job training and immediate job placement.

The state welfare departments and their staffs need to know more about what the demands are on welfare recipients in postsecondary education, and they should be more familiar with all sources of available support for these special students and possess a better knowledge base of postsecondary educational institutions. In turn, postsecondary educational institutions can be encouraged by effective actions of their state welfare departments to adopt

appropriate programs and remove unnecessary and unwanted barriers to welfare recipients.

Recommendation 4.

State government is where the action will be in the 1990s on a wide range of public policy issues, including welfare reform. And the primary question is not whether states should be involved but rather how. Unlike past efforts to reform welfare, the JOBS program implicitly rejected a Washington DC directed effort. Instead, governors and other state officials must be the key movers. No longer can state officials simply support or endorse the "ideas" of welfare-to-work programs (JOBS), they must put forward major initiatives of their own. It is highly likely that once a proactive state government proposes and implements positive and opportunistic changes in current welfare programs, and consequently begins to receive largely favorable reviews, politicians in other states will follow. For this reason, it is vital that effective community college participation in JOBS be directly discussed at meetings of the National Governor's Association, Education Commission of the States, and National Conference of State Legislators. The American Association of Community Colleges should take the lead, in tandem with NETWORK and the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges, to bring this about.

Recommendation 5.

If state and/or local advisory boards for welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) do not currently exist, then there should be a collaborative effort by the state and local governments and the community colleges to establish a system of local advisory boards to organize and oversee welfare programs such as the JOBS program. Perhaps the existing service delivery areas of JTPA and PICs could be employed for this purpose. In addition, community college should continue to increase their level of representation and implement their role as convener in local and state coalitions in order to help forge better linkages and understanding among state and local government and welfare agencies involved with the JOBS programs. No longer can community colleges afford to be voiceless.

Community colleges involvement on state advisory boards that oversee the JOBS programs and chamber of commerce should become an increasingly important administrative priority if the colleges want to continue to meet a significant portion of the education and training needs of JOBS participants. That only 17 percent of these colleges agreed that they were well represented on statewide advisory boards is unacceptable. The chief executive officers of community colleges should collaborate to effectively impact state level policy, in tandem with state community college system executive directors, and their local legislative delegations.

Recommendation 6.

Community colleges have emerged as key providers of workforce training in the United States. Given the fact that most new entrants to the American work force between 1990 and the year 2000 will be individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds and more than 80 percent of this growth in the work force will come from women, immigrants, and minority groups traditionally undeserved by the educational system (Stern, 1987), these populations will clearly need special services and assistance if they are to succeed in the workplace.

Community colleges have the expertise and the commitment to provide the kind of special attention that these new workers will need. As open-door institutions, community colleges should make a commitment to serve these disadvantaged students. If needed, the colleges must increase their training and educational programs, bring adult literacy programs to the communities, and offer classroom instruction during the day, at night, and on the weekend. In addition, careful examination of community college's mission statements should be considered. Those colleges that have not formally stated economic development in their mission statements need to do so. They should formally add adult literacy to their mission statements as well.

Furthermore, NETWORK should present seminars to regional and national meetings of the Association of Community College Trustees to promote the dissemination of mission statements and model programs for urban, suburban, and rural community colleges.

Community colleges are the key that will help unlock the nation's economic potential. But they must be in the right position and be prepared to help the nation meet its education and workforce requirements. These new entrants to the workforce can not be taken for granted, because there is little human capital to waste in the coming decade.

Recommendation 7.

The problem for many states is the lack of resources. Spending is up under JOBS, but many states are challenged to find enough matching funds to draw down their full federal allocation. It has become impossible for some states to provide educational and training services to welfare recipients at the current level of funding for the JOBS program.

There are specifications the federal government can take to respond to these concerns. One issue is federal waivers. The secretary of DHHS has the authority to give states federal approval to try innovative approaches to welfare and to improve the delivery of services. Under the law, the secretary can waive certain federal laws to allow states to try their own reform measures. The policy of the current administration has been to promote such waivers for effective state experimentation. Such policies should be continued.

To further encourage state innovation and experimentation, it is recommended that the federal government establish a registry of state waiver requests to facilitate information sharing among and between states. In

addition, federal appropriations should be enhanced to allow the states to meet the demand for education, training, and employment services, as well as support services for JOBS participants. Lastly, more incentives should be provided by the federal government to continue, expand, and improve the delivery of special services to welfare recipients and to experiment with new approaches.

Further Study

1. A study is needed to review the possibility that the Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program will expand the proportion of welfare recipients involved in employment-related activities across the nation and in each state. Administrators of the JOBS programs need to consider how to sustain performance of existing program elements or localities during expansion.

2. Additional research is needed to see if JOBS represents a shift from emphasizing immediate employment (short-term education) to longer-term program participation and outcomes (postsecondary educational opportunities). At the same time, research needs to be conducted to determine if the plans are in place to collect data on interim outcomes.

3. Further study is recommended to determine if there are competing demands for state resources devoted to JOBS within the state's welfare services budget or overall state appropriations. The study should reveal if AFDC case loads are rising, are state revenues declining, and/or do budget deficits

exist. Given these considerations, it would be worthwhile to ascertain if JOBS administrators have contingency plans for JOBS implementation. That state after state has returned unspent federal matching funds for JOBS, despite a severe recession, is a problem that deserves serious study.

4. A study should be made to determine what organizational structures and capacity exist at the state level to address the "back-burner" issues while they are still on the back-burner, and to ensure that all stages of JOBS implementation get appropriate attention when other priorities emerge.

5. A in-depth study of individual states is needed to determine what plans are currently in place to best match the appropriate indicators of JOBS program performance with the information needs of key state policy audiences (governors, legislators, state welfare agencies, and community college presidents). What outcomes or mixture of outcomes matter most to these key audiences and what forms of information do these policymakers use most effectively.

6. Additional studies are needed to review key issues related to the reporting of data for JOBS programs. A national data base that measures comparable JOBS programs across the United States is essential if there is to exist any truly effective nationwide coordination of education, training, and employment programs. The federal Office of Family Assistance, which oversees AFDC and JOBS within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, should work with the American Association of Community Colleges and NETWORK,

"America's Two-Year College Employment and Training Consortium," to establish a comprehensive data base.

7. A comparative study needs to be made regarding the perceptions of community college professionals whose institutions are involved with the JOBS program. The study should measure their perceptions as compared to those of respective state welfare agency administrators. Qualitative interviews in addition to pencil and paper questionnaires would be especially useful, as would focus groups.

8. A study needs to be made regarding the perceptions of community colleges that are not currently involved with the JOBS program. This study should address the reasons why these colleges choose not to implement a welfare-to-work program into their college curriculum to better the educational opportunities of welfare recipients within their service area, despite the apparent fact that most of these community colleges offer JOBS-related educational services (Table 8).

9. Research at the national, state, and local levels is needed to evaluate the overall impact provided by JOBS programs delivered through community colleges, especially when compared to the welfare-related programs provided by the state welfare agencies and their contractors. Systematic data should be compiled on the employment and recidivism rate of JOBS participants trained through postsecondary education compared to other types of training.

10. Further research needs to be conducted regarding the geographical location (urban, suburban, and rural) of the community colleges actively involved in the JOBS program. Comparative research will identify commonalities as well as differences for each geographical setting. For example, learning how the rural community college's JOBS programs different from the JOBS programs operated at urban-based community colleges would be most useful.

11. A study is needed to collect key data and information from identified community colleges who are operating innovative model programs in workforce development (welfare-to-work). This information should be included into a publication to be used as a reference or study guide for other community colleges interested in implementing a similar welfare-to-work program at their college.

Concluding Remarks: The Need for Welfare Reform

As reported in a study on the economy and the workplace, *Workforce 2000*, between now and the year 2000 a majority of all new jobs created will require some postsecondary education (Hudson Institute, 1987). One-third of all jobs will require college graduates. Right now that figure is only about 20 percent. Even if we go beyond the technical skills jobs, the least-skilled jobs will require a command of reading, computing, and thinking that was once necessary only for professionals. Minorities, women, and immigrants are going to comprise five-sixths of the net additions to the work force, yet our country has a poor

track record of serving these groups the kind of education and skill training they desperately need. We face the challenge in this country of upgrading by 45 percent the skills of twenty-five million American workers by the year 2000 if we are to remain competitive (Hudson Institute, 1987).

> As Workforce 2000 concludes, "Promoting world growth, boosting the service industry productivity, stimulating a more flexible work force, providing for the needs of working families with children, bringing minorities and welfare recipients into the work force, and improving the educational preparation of workers are among the most important, pressing items on the nation's agenda (Hudson Institute, 1987)."

Truly, our community colleges are turning and must continue to turn into lifelong learning institutions. Pat Cross refers to us as having changed from a shopping mall to a fitness center, which sells a process rather than a product, and that this is a lifelong process. Our nation's community colleges must continually strive to fulfill the promise of the Statue of Liberty, as George Vaughan has indicated:

> "Give us your young, and your not so young;
> Give us your capable, and your not so capable;
> Give us your minorities, and your homemakers;
> Give us your employed, your underemployed, your unemployed;
> Give us those in society who have too long lingered on the periphery of the American dream, And we will help them to become better students, better workers, better citizens, better people. (Hankin, 1990)"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackelsberg, M., Bartlett, R., & Buchele R. (Eds.). (1988). Women, welfare and education. Northampton: Smith College.

American Association of Community Colleges. (1993). Community colleges: A national profile. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Community Colleges. (1993). The workforce training imperative: Meeting the training needs of the nation. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1990). Productive America: Two-year colleges unite to improve productivity in the nation's workforce (ED 317 224). Washington, DC: Author.

Angel, D., & DeVault, M. (1991). Conceptualizing 2000: Proactive planning. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Bailis, L. (1991). Challenges and opportunities for coordination [Panel Presentation]. Proceedings of "Making the Connection: Coordinating Education and Training for a Skilled Workforce" (pp. 17-19). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Bellah, R. (1986). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. New York: Harper & Row.

Blank, S. (1992, Summer). JOBS as a two-generation intervention. Public Welfare, 50(3), 46-51.

Blaug, M. (1992). Financial aid today: An economic perspective. The College Board Review, 186-190.

Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1990). The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900-1985. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burtless, G. (1992, May). Public spending on the poor: Historical trends and economic limits. Paper presented at the conference on Poverty and Public Policy, Madison, WI.

Bush, M. (1988). Families in distress. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Caputo, R.K. (1989). Limits of welfare reform. Social Casework, 70, 85-95.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). A classification of institutions of higher education (1987 ed.). Princeton: Author.

Child Trends. (1989). Preliminary estimates of number and percent of women in each state eligible for/exempt from "JOBS," by age of youngest child. Washington, DC.

Children's Defense Fund. (1990). S.O.S. America! A Children's Defense Fund budget. Washington, DC: Author.

Chilman, C.S. (1992, September). Welfare reform or revision? The Family Support Act of 1988. Social Service Review, 349-373.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1989). The American community college (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

College Entrance Examination Board. (1984). College opportunity and public assistance programs. Washington, DC: Author.

Cranston, A. (1990). Work and family: Public policy issues for the 1990s. Families in Society, 71, 360-365.

Danziger, S. (1989). Overview. FOCUS 12 (Spring and Summer), 1-5. Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty.

Dawson, D. (1991). Challenges and opportunities for coordination [Comments]. Proceedings of "Making the Connection: Coordinating Education and Training for a Skilled Workforce" (p. 16). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Dickinson, N.S. (1986). Which welfare work strategies work? Social Work, 31, 266-272.

Dilcher, A.K. (1993). Learning that works: The provision of workplace education by community colleges. Washington, DC: The Southport Institute for Policy Analysis.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Downey, T.J. (1991). Selected issues relating to the AFDC and the JOBS programs. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 1-257.

Dumas, K. (1992, April). States bypassing Congress in reforming welfare. Congressional Quarterly, 950-953.

Dunkle, M.C. (1988). Higher education & lower expectations: The dilemma of funding college for AFDC recipients. In M. Ackelsberg, R. Bartlett, & R. Buchele (Eds.), Women, welfare and higher education (pp.129-130).

Edelman, M.W. (1987). Families in peril. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ehrenreich, B., & Stallard, K. (1982). The nouveau poor. Ms. Magazine (July-August), pp. 217-224.

Ellwood, D. T. (1986, January). Targeting "would-be" long-term recipients of AFDC. Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, Incorporated.

Federal Register, (1989, April 18), 54(73), 15638-15695.

Federal Register, (1988, October 13), 54(197), 42181-42230.

Frances, C., & Associates. (1990, January). Calculated from a special computer run projecting the labor force by race and gender. Office of Employment Projections, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Gabert, G. (1991). Community colleges in the 1990s. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Ganzglass, E., & McCart, L. (1990, April). Back to work: The challenge of welfare reform. Vocational Education Journal, 65(3), 16-18.

Gardner, J.W. (1968). No easy victories. New York: Harper & Row.

Gay, L.R. (1987). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (3rd ed.). Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.

Gittell, M., & Moore, J. (1989). Denying independence: Barriers to the education of women on AFDC. In S.L. Harlan & R.J. Steinberg (Eds.), Job training for women: The promise and limits of public policies. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gold, L.N. (1990). Campus roadblock: How federal policies make it difficult for adults to go to college. Washington, DC: Public Policy Advocates.

Goldman, B.S. (1989). Job search strategies for women on welfare. In S.L. Harlan & R.J. Steinberg (Eds.), Job Training for women: The promise and limits of public policies (pp. 389-413). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Greenberg, M. (1990). What's happening in JOBS: A review of initial state data. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Gueron, J., & Paley, E. (1991). From welfare to work. New York: Russell Sage.

Gueron, J. (1990). Work and welfare: Lessons on employment programs. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 4, 79-98.

Hagen, J.L., & Lurie, I. (1992, Summer). How 10 states implemented JOBS. Public Welfare, 50(3), 13-21.

Hamburg, M. (1970). Statistical Analysis for Decision Making. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Hankin, J.N. (November, 1990). Moving your institution into the 21st century. Vital Speeches of the Day. Mount Pleasant, SC: City News Publishing.

Harkavay, I., & Benson, L. (April, 1992). Universities, Schools, and the welfare state. Education Week.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education: Kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Howard, M.A. (1991, April). Fiscal survey of the states. Washington, DC: National Governor's Association and National Association of State Budget Officers.

Hudson Institute. (1988). Opportunity 2000. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Johnson, A.S. (1992, Spring). The states remain committed to JOBS. Public Welfare, 50(2), 20-21.

Johnston, W.B., & Packer, A.H. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.

Kane, R.D., & Frazee, P.E. (1988). Women in nontraditional vocational education. Arlington: RJ Associates.

Katsinas, S.G. (1993). Community colleges and workforce development in the new economy. Unpublished manuscript.

Katsinas, S.G., & Swender, H.J. (1992, June/July). Community colleges and JTPA: Involvement and opportunity. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 62(6), pp. 19-23.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Levitan, S.A. (1985). Programs in aid of the poor. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Levitan, S.A., Rein, M., & Marwick, D. (1982). Work and welfare go together. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Levy, F. (1979, Winter). The labor supply of female heads, or AFDC work incentives don't work too well. Journal of Human Resources, 14, 76-97.

Liem, R., & Rayman, P. (1982). Health and social costs of unemployment. American Psychologist, 37, 1116-1123.

Lively, K. (1992, August 12). Governors' panel urges 2-year colleges to strengthen job-training programs. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A21.

Lurie, I., & Sanger, M.B. (1991, March). The Family Support Act: Defining the social contract in New York. Social Services Review, 65, 43-67.

Magruder, D.R. (1988). Community college and business partnerships: A statewide model skills program. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 10(3), 239-249.

Maryland Department of Employment and Training. (1985). State plan and annual report. Baltimore: Author.

Mendenhall, W. (1971). Introduction to Probability and Statistics (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.

Moffitt, R. (1992, March). Incentive effects of the U.S. welfare system: A review. Journal of Economic Literature, 30, 1-61.

National Commission on Children. (1991). Beyond rhetoric: A new American agenda for children and families. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Governor's Association. (1993, August). The new welfare reform. National Governor's Association.

NETWORK. (1990, November). America's two-year college employment, training, and literacy consortium. Report on U.S. Department of Labor programs and funding through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Cleveland: Author.

NETWORK. (1990, November). America's two-year college employment, training, and literacy consortium. Results of the 1989-1990 NETWORK survey of two-year college involvement in employment, training, and literacy. Cleveland: Author.

Offner, P. (1992, Summer). JOBS: How are we doing? Where are we going? Public Welfare, 50(3), 8-11.

O'Neill, J. (1993, Summer). Can work and training programs reform welfare? Journal of Labor Research, 14(3), 265-281.

Palmer, A. (1992). Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 1-159.

Peskin, J., Topogna, J., & Marcotte, D. (1992, October). How the economy affects AFDC caseloads. Paper presented at the annual meetings of APPAM, Denver, CO.

Peterson's guide to two-year colleges (24th ed.). (1993). Princeton NJ: Peterson's Guides.

Public Law 100-485. The Family Support Act of 1988.

Reinhard, B. (1993). Community colleges a vital key to training tomorrow's work force. Journal of Career Planning and Employment, (Winter), 6-7.

Riccio, J., & Friedlander, D. (1992, Summer). GAIN and the prospect of JOBS's success. Public Welfare, 50(3), 22-32.

Ricketts, E. (1989, October). Making sense of the national debate on the underclass. Mimeograph.

Rosen, D.P. (1986). Poverty, welfare and educational opportunity: Redeeming a national resource.

Rosier, M.J. (1988). Survey research methods. In J.P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook (pp. 107-113). New York: Pergamon Press.

Rovner, J. (1989, May). Draft welfare regulations draw fire from states. Congressional Quarterly, 1191-1194.

Rovner, J. (1988, April). Senate finance endorses modified welfare bill. Congressional Quarterly, 1068-1074.

Sasaki, C. (1986, September). Off the dole, her career on a roll, Carol Sasaki leads Washington's welfare moms back to school. People, pp. 32-36.

Sawhill, I. (1988, September). Poverty in the U.S.: Why is it so persistent? Journal of Economic Literature, 26, 1073-1119.

Sherwood, K.E., & Long, D.A. (1991, Winter). JOBS implementation in an uncertain environment. Public Welfare, 50(1), 17-27.

Smith, B.E. (1991). Women of the rural South: Economic status and prospects. Lexington: Southeast Women's Employment Coalition.

Stein, S.G. (1985, April). Women, poverty, and welfare: Breaking the cycle. Report prepared for Women, Welfare, and Higher Education: A Policy Conference, Smith College.

Stern, J.D. (Ed.). (1987). The condition of education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Tate, R. (1988). Experimental studies. In J.P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook (pp. 93-100). New York: Pergamon Press.

Thurow, L. (1979). Vocational education as a strategy for eliminating poverty. Planning papers for the Vocational Education Study. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Turner, J., Barbaro, G., & Schlank, M. (1990, May). Head start and JOBS: Collaborative efforts help families become self-sufficient. Children Today, 19(3), 12-13.

Turner, J. (1990). Job opportunities and basic skills training (JOBS) program action transmittal (DHHS Transmittal No. JOBS-FSA-AT-90-16). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations. (1984). Public Welfare Title 45, Section 233.20 (a)(3)(iv)(B).

U.S. Congressional Budget Office. (1989). Staff working papers, work, and welfare: The Family Support Act of 1988. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (1990, September). Money income and poverty status in the United States (Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 168). Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Service. (1993, April). Administration for children and families: Welfare. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1991, September). Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program Information Memorandum (JOBS-ACF-IM-91-4). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1989). Aid to families with dependent children; Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program; child care and supportive services; conforming changes to existing regulations. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1977). The Work Incentive (WIN) Program and related experiences: A review of research with policy implications (R&D Monograph No. 49). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1991, September). Welfare to work: States begin JOBS, but fiscal and other problems may impede their progress (GAO/HRD-91-106). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. (1992). The green book, overview of entitlement programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vargyas, E.J., & Campbell, N.D. (1989, June). Comments on notice of proposed rulemaking to implement the Family Support Act. National Women's Law Center, p.16.

Vosler, N.R., & Ozawa, M.N. (1988). An analysis of two approaches to welfare-to-work. New England Journal of Human Services, 8(4), 15-21.

Waddell, G. (1990). Tips for training a world-class work force. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 60(4), 21-27.

Walker, D.A., & Burnhill, P.M. (1988). Survey studies, cross-sectional. In J.P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook (pp. 101-107). New York: Pergamon Press.

Workforce 2000:Work and workers for the 21st century. (1987). Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.

W.T. Grant Foundation. (1988). The forgotten half: Pathways to success for America's youth and young families. (ED 300 580). Washington, DC: Author.

Yglesias, K.D. (1987). Community Colleges and JTPA: Issues and Programs. Fountain Valley, CA: Coastline Community College.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

THE NAME AND LOCATION OF EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE THAT RESPONDED TO THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

THE NAME AND LOCATION OF EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
THAT RESPONDED TO THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Name of Community College	State
Number of Respondents N = 277	
Abraham Baldwin College	Georgia
Aiken Technical College	South Carolina
Alabama Aviation & Technical College	Alabama
Alamance Community College	North Carolina
Allegany Community College	Maryland
Alpena Community College	Michigan
Alvin Community College	Texas
Amarillo College	Texas
Andrew College	Georgia
Anson Community College	North Carolina
Aquinas College at Newton	Massachusetts
Arapahoe Community College	Colorado
Arizona Western College	Arizona
Austin Community College	Minnesota
Bainbridge College	Georgia
Barstow College	California
Barton County Community College	Kansas
Beaufort County Community College	North Carolina
Bevell State Community College	Alabama
Big Bend Community College	Washington
Bishop State Community College	Alabama
Blackhawk Technical College	Wisconsin
Blinn College	Texas
Bluefield State College	West Virginia
Blue Mountain Community College	Oregon
Blue Ridge Community College	Virginia
Brazosport College	Texas
Brevard Community College	Florida
Brookdale Community College	New Jersey
Broome Community College	New York
Bristol Community College	Massachusetts
Brunswick College	Georgia
Bucks County Community College	Pennsylvania
Burlington County College	New Jersey

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
Butler County Community College	Kansas
Camden County College	New Jersey
Cape Fear Community College	North Carolina
Carl Albert State College	Oklahoma
Carl Sandburg College	Illinois
Carteret Community College	North Carolina
Casper College	Wyoming
Cayuga Community College	New York
Cecil Community College	Maryland
Cedar Valley College	Texas
Central Carolina Technical College	South Carolina
Central Community College	Nebraska
Central Florida Community College	Florida
Central Ohio Technical College	Ohio
Central Piedmont Community College	North Carolina
Central Virginia Community College	Virginia
Central Wyoming College	Wyoming
Cerritos College	California
Chattanooga State Technical Community College	Tennessee
Chemeketa Community College	Oregon
Clackamas Community College	Oregon
Clark College	Washington
Clark State Community College	Ohio
Clatsop Community College	Oregon
Clinton Community College	Iowa
Coastal Carolina Community College	North Carolina
Coffeyville Community College	Kansas
College of DuPage	Illinois
College of Lake County	Illinois
College of The Albemarle	North Carolina
College of the Canyons	California
College of the Desert	California
Columbia Basin College	Washington
Columbia-Greene Community College	New York
Community College of Allegheny County	Pennsylvania
Community College of Denver	Colorado
Community College of Rhode Island	Rhode Island
Community College of Spokane	Washington
Copiah-Lincoln Community College	Mississippi

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
Corning Community College	New York
Cottey College	Missouri
Cowley County Community College	Kansas
Cuesta College	California
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College	Virginia
Dakota County Technical College	Minnesota
Dallas County Community College District	Texas
Danville Community College	Virginia
Darton College	Georgia
Dawson Community College	Montana
DeKalb College	Georgia
DeKalb Technical Institute	Georgia
Dixie College	Utah
Dyersburg State Community College	Tennessee
East Arkansas Community College	Arkansas
East Georgia College	Georgia
Eastern Iowa Community College District	Iowa
Eastern Shore Community College	Virginia
Eastern Wyoming College	Wyoming
Eastfield College	Texas
Edison Community College	Ohio
Elgin Community College	Illinois
Erie Community College	New York
Everett Community College	Washington
Fairmont Community College	West Virginia
Fashion Institute of Technology	New York
Faulkner State Community College	Alabama
Fayetteville Technical Community College	Arkansas
Fergus Falls Community College	Minnesota
Florida Community College at Jacksonville	Florida
Fort Berthold Community College	North Dakota
Fort Scott Community College	Kansas
Frontier Community College	Illinois
Fulton-Montgomery Community College	New York
Galveston College	Texas
Garrett Community College	Maryland
Gateway Technical College	Wisconsin
Germanna Community College	Virginia
Greenfield Community College	Massachusetts

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
Greenville Technical College	South Carolina
Harford Community College	Maryland
Harrisburg Area Community College	Pennsylvania
Hawkeye Community College	Iowa
Haywood Community College	North Carolina
Henderson Community College	Kentucky
Henry Ford Community College	Michigan
Highland Park Community College	Michigan
Hinds Community College	Mississippi
Hocking Technical College	Ohio
Holmes Community College	Mississippi
Houston Community College System	Texas
Howard Community College	Maryland
Hudson County Community College	New Jersey
Illinois Central College	Illinois
Indiana Vocational Technical College	Indiana
Iowa Valley Community College District	Iowa
Itawamba Community College	Mississippi
Ivy Tech State College	Indiana
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	Virginia
Jefferson College	Missouri
Jefferson Community College	Kentucky
Jefferson State Community College	Alabama
Jefferson Technical College	Ohio
John A. Logan College	Illinois
John M. Patterson State Technical College	Alabama
Johnson County Community College	Kansas
Kankakee Community College	Illinois
Kaskaskia College	Illinois
Kennebec Valley Technical College	Maine
Kirtland Community College	Michigan
Kishwaukee College	Illinois
La Guardia Community College	New York
Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College	Wisconsin
Lamar Community College	Colorado
Lane Community College	Oregon
Laredo Community College	Texas
Leeward Community College	Hawaii
Lenoir Community College	North Carolina

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
Lewis & Clark Community College	Illinois
Lincoln Trail College	Illinois
Luzerne County Community College	Pennsylvania
Manatee Community College	Florida
Marshall University Community College	West Virginia
Maui Community College	Hawaii
Miami-Dade Community College - North	Florida
Mid-Michigan Community College	Michigan
Mid-Plains Community College	Nebraska
Middle Georgia College	Georgia
Middlesex County College	New Jersey
Midlands Technical College	South Carolina
Miles Community College	Montana
MiraCosta College	California
Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College	Mississippi
Mitchell Community College	North Carolina
Modesto Junior College	California
Mohave Community College	Arizona
Monroe College	New York
Monroe Community College	New York
Montgomery Community College	North Carolina
Moraine Park Technical College	Wisconsin
Motlow State Community College	Tennessee
Mount Hood Community College	Oregon
Mount San Antonio College	California
Mount San Jacinto College	California
Mount Wachusett Community College	Massachusetts
Muskegon Community College	Michigan
Nash Community College	North Carolina
Nassau Community College	New York
Naugatuck Valley Community College	Connecticut
Navarro College	Texas
Neosho County Community College	Kansas
North Central Missouri College	Missouri
North Central Technical College	Ohio
North Central Technical College	Wisconsin
North Central Texas College	Texas
Northeast Community College	Nebraska
Northeast Iowa Community College	Iowa

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
Northeast Mississippi Community College	Mississippi
Northeast State Technical Community College	Tennessee
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College	Wisconsin
Northeastern Junior College	Colorado
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College	Oklahoma
Northern Nevada Community College	Nevada
Northern New Mexico Community College	New Mexico
Northern Wyoming Community College	Wyoming
Northland Pioneer College	Arizona
Northwest Iowa Community College	Iowa
Northwest Shoals Community College	Alabama
Northwestern Connecticut Community College	Connecticut
Norwalk Community Technical College	Connecticut
Oakland Community College	Michigan
Oakton Community College	Illinois
Okaloosa-Walton Community College	Florida
Otero Junior College	Colorado
Palm Beach Community College	Florida
Palomar Community College	California
Panola College	Texas
Paris Junior College	Texas
Parkland College	Illinois
Pellissippi State Technical Community College	Tennessee
Penn Valley Community College	Missouri
Piedmont Virginia Community College	Virginia
Pima Community College	Arizona
Portland Community College	Oregon
Pratt Community College	Kansas
Prince William Sound Community College	Alaska
Prestonsburg Community College	Kentucky
Quinsigamond Community College	Massachusetts
Richland College	Texas
Richland Community College	Illinois
Rio Grande Community College	Ohio
Rio Salado Community College	Arizona
Riverside Community College	California
Roane State Community College	Tennessee
Robeson Community College	North Carolina
Rochester Community College	Minnesota

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
Rogue Community College	Oregon
Sampson Community College	North Carolina
Saint Charles County Community College	Missouri
San Jacinto College - South	Texas
San Juan College	New Mexico
Sandhills Community College	North Carolina
Scottsdale Community College	Arizona
Shasta College	California
Shorter College	Arkansas
Snead State Community College	Alabama
South Plains College	Texas
South Suburban College	Illinois
Southeastern Community College	North Carolina
Southside Virginia Community College	Virginia
Southwestern Oregon Community College	Oregon
Sparks State Technical College	Alabama
State Technical Institute at Memphis	Tennessee
Surry Community College	North Carolina
Texas State Technical College	Texas
Treasure Valley Community College	Oregon
Tulsa Junior College	Oklahoma
Tyler Junior College	Texas
Umpqua Community College	Oregon
Vernon Regional Junior College	Texas
Victoria College	Texas
Virginia Highlands Community College	Virginia
Wake Technical Community College	North Carolina
Walla-Walla Community College	Washington
Wallace Community College	Alabama
Warren County Community College	New Jersey
Washington State Community College	Ohio
Waubonsee Community College	Illinois
Waukesha County Technical College	Wisconsin
Weatherford College	Texas
Wenatchee Valley College	Washington
Western Iowa Tech Community College	Iowa
Western Piedmont Community College	North Carolina
Wharton County Junior College	Texas
Whatcom Community College	Washington

APPENDIX A. (continued)

Name of Community College	State
William Rainey Harper College	Illinois
Wilson Tech Community College	North Carolina
Windward Community College	Hawaii
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College	Wisconsin
Wytheville Community College	Virginia
Yavapai College	Arizona
York Technical College	South Carolina

Source: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater

APPENDIX B

PRE-TEST EVALUATORS

Pre-test Evaluators

Ms. Yvonne Howard, Program Specialist, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington DC.

Dr. James McKenney, Director of Economic Development, American Association of Community Colleges, Washington DC.

Ms. Kathleen Oglesby, Director of System Innovation and Effectiveness, Illinois Community College Board, Springfield, Illinois.

Dr. David Pierce, President, American Association of Community Colleges, Washington DC.

Ms. Nancy Poppe, Vice President, NETWORK: America's Two-Year College Employment, Training and Literacy Consortium, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Herbert Swender, Dean of Instruction, Independence Community College, Independence, Kansas.

Mr. Robert Visdos, President, NETWORK: America's Two-Year College Employment, Training and Literacy Consortium, Cleveland, Ohio.

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE

AACC

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

February 25, 1994

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to ask for your participation in an important national study of community college participation in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program.

As you know, welfare reform along with crime and health care is one of the three most important issues to be addressed at the federal level this year. The Family Support Act of 1988, which created the JOBS program, marked a fundamental shift in welfare policy. This act was the result of a broad-based political consensus: That America's welfare system should foster long-term self-sufficiency by placing Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients directly into jobs or, alternatively, appropriate education and training. For the first time, AFDC recipients can use their JOBS benefits to obtain training at Postsecondary educational institutions, including community colleges.

The need for this research survey is readily apparent. We need good national data with which to inform the Congress about community college participation in welfare-to-work programs, to influence the welfare reform process. It is our view that the welfare-to-work, employment and training, and adult literacy systems all should be built around the nation's largest delivery system of formal education to adults, community colleges. Only in this way can we be assured that the system is structured to provide social mobility.

In as much as welfare reform is one of the top issues facing the Second Session of the 103rd Congress, federal officials are vitally concerned with good information for policy decision making. The enclosed questionnaire, "The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program: A National Study," was developed by Timm J. Bliss and Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas of the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education at Oklahoma State University. It assesses the participation of your community college in the JOBS program, and also serves as a vehicle to collect data on model JOBS programs at community colleges.

I heartily endorse this survey, and urge your cooperation and participation.

Sincerely,

Dave Pierce

David R. Pierce
President

POST CARD

April 15, 1994

Dear Colleague:

On April 4th, a questionnaire seeking your views on The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program was mailed to you. If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Your views and opinions are extremely valuable in making this nationwide survey of community college professionals truly representative.

If by chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, (405) 744-9825 and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Timm Bliss
Research Associate
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program:

A National Study

Introduction

The purpose of this survey is to measure your attitudes and perceptions of the federally funded welfare-to-work program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program. For this national study, we are interested in learning the views of community college professionals regarding five specific topics:

(1) What is the level of community college participation in the JOBS program?

(2) What identifiable model programs exist to provide community college services to AFDC recipients? Are there models appropriate to specific types of community college settings (rural, suburban and urban/inner city)?

(3) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development?

(4) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges of the barriers, both internal and external to the institution of effective community college delivery of JOBS services.

(5) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding communication and collaboration between state agencies that oversee JOBS programs and community colleges?

Demographics

1. Name of Community College _____

College Setting _____ Urban _____ Suburban _____ Rural

2. Full-time Equivalency (FTE-Student) _____

Total Enrollment (include noncredit) _____

3. Is economic development formally stated in the mission statement of your community college?

____ Yes ____ No

If yes, does it include the following:

____ **Workforce Development for the Long-Term Unemployed**
(includes welfare recipients)
____ **Workforce Development for Those Never Employed Individuals**
(high school graduates and high school dropouts)
____ **Workforce Development for Temporarily Dislocated Workers**
(employment and training programs for short-term unemployed)
____ **Workforce Development to Improve the Skills of the Currently Employed**
(value added to maintain/advance workforce competitiveness)

4. Please mark an X by those services currently offered by your community college:

____ GED Preparation
____ Adult Basic and Developmental/Remedial Education
____ Education for Individuals with Limited English Proficiency
____ Job-Skills Training/Job-Readiness Activities
____ Job Development/Placement
____ Small Business Entrepreneurship/Incubation Center
____ Distance Learning to Deliver Literacy at the Worksite
____ Alternative High School
____ Vocational/Occupational/Technical Curriculum
____ Supportive Services (child care, transportation)
____ Other, please describe

_____

5. Does your community college currently operate programs under:

____ JOBS
____ JTPA
____ U.S. Department of Labor, other than JTPA
____ Other Public Sector Programs
Describe _____

6. Name of person responsible for administering the JOBS program at your community college:

Name _____ Title _____

Address _____ Phone _____

7. Has your community college's JOBS program ever received an award from your state or local welfare agency, state or local government, and/or national association?

____ Yes ____ No

If Yes, describe

_____

_____

If you believe **that your community college is operating a model program in workforce development (welfare-to-work), could you please send us the information about your college's program(s) for inclusion in a publication titled, "Model Programs in Community College Workforce Development."**

8. Estimate the number of participants served through JOBS programs delivered at your community college in FY 1993.

____ JOBS participants

9. Approximate total JOBS funds for FY 1993

____ less than $100,000
____ $100,000 to $249,999
____ $250,000 to $499,999
____ $500,000 and above

10. Approximate total amount of private sector contracts for FY 1993

____ less than $100,000
____ $100,000 to $249,999
____ $250,000 to $499,999
____ $500,000 and above

11. Is your community college interested in playing a **more active role** in federal welfare reform through programs like the JOBS program?

____ Yes ____ No

12. Is an employee of your community college a member of one or more of the following:

____ Local Private Industry Council
____ Local Welfare Agency Council
____ Local Chamber of Commerce
____ Area Council on Literacy
____ State Private Industry Council
____ State Welfare Agency Council
____ State Chamber of Commerce
____ Area Economic Development Council

Please read each item carefully and place an X under the letter to indicate the response which most closely corresponds with your views.

Strongly Disagree (SD);
Disagree (D);
Undecided/Unknown (U);
Agree (A);
Strongly Agree (SA)

Perceptions of Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1.	*Current federal law **promotes** community college participation in JOBS*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
2.	*The agency within my state that administers JOBS **promotes** community college participation*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
3.	*The JOBS agency **within my state** has hosted training sessions to promote community college participation in JOBS, so that AFDC recipients can more easily pursue postsecondary education*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
4.	*The state community college or coordinating agency **within my state** promotes community college participation in JOBS programs*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
5.	*Community colleges are well represented on the **local advisory boards** that oversee JOBS programs*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
6.	*Community colleges are well represented on my **statewide advisory boards** that oversee JOBS programs*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
7.	*Sufficient **federal** funds are available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
8.	*Sufficient **state** funds are available to "match" federal JOBS funds to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
9.	*Federal JOBS regulations provide sufficient **flexibility** for states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/

	SD	D	U	A	SA
10. There should be increased state/community college **control** over how federal JOBS funds are spent	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
11. The criteria needed for **measuring the effective return on investment of JOBS funds** presently exist within my state's JOBS data collection system	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/

Barriers (internal & external) to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs

	SD	D	U	A	SA
12. Federal need-based **student aid is counted against welfare eligibility in my state** (i.e., if the AFDC recipient applies for and receives a Pell Grant, their monthly allotment under AFDC is reduced by the amount awarded by Pell)	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
13. To my knowledge, **budget cuts** in my state have precluded my state from matching all of the federal funds available for JOBS programs	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
14. There are insufficient funds within my state to **guarantee child care** for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
15. There are insufficient funds within my state to pay necessary **transportation** for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
16. The Health and Human Services' **"20-hour rule"** (20 required hours of participation in JOBS program activities per week) wastes resources and is biased against JOBS programs at my community college	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
17. The lack of **common forms** for in-take for both the JOBS and JTPA programs prevents full integration of these programs at my community college	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
18. The **lack of trained personnel and/or professional development** at my community college has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/
19. The **lack of understanding by administrators at my community college of the rules and regulations of the JOBS program** has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/	/_/

	SD	D	U	A	SA
20. *The emphasis by the JOBS program in my state toward the most **short-term education** possible to promote the goal of immediate job placement is contrary to the kind of sequential educational programs that community college typically operate*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
21. *The state community college coordinating board or agency requires or encourages my community college to enroll JOBS participants in **"no credit" programs**, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom for regular college courses*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
22. *My community college has chosen to enroll JOBS participants in **"no credit" programs**, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
23. ***Adult literacy** (which includes JOBS-sponsored adult basic education and GED training) is an activity that is a high priority at my community college*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
24. *My community college has simply chosen **not to participate** in the JOBS program*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/

Communication and Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges

	SD	D	U	A	SA
25. *My **state agencies** have shown little or no interest in organizing and implementing JOBS programs in my community college*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
26. *The map of the legally defined **service area for JOBS** does not match the state-assigned service area of my community college*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
27. *The map of the legally defined **service area for JTPA** does not match the legally defined service area for JOBS and my community college's state-assigned area*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
28. *The existing **fragmentation** (maps not matching) has lessened the ability of my community college to coordinate and develop effective programs that link education to transitional welfare*	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/

	SD	D	U	A	SA
29. *There exists a large amount of* ***fragmentation*** *(including lack of communication and "turf battles") between various state agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) in my state*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. *Task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the community college* ***meet on a regular basis*** *to integrate their activities, so that AFDC recipients can be better served through the JOBS program*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. *It would be a good thing for* ***program integration*** *if task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the local community college met on a regular basis*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. *The* ***Governor*** *in my state has taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. *The* ***State legislators*** *in my state have taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Results of this national study will be published in a future AACC publication.

You are very important to the success of this Study!

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the JOBS program in your two-year college, or any comments in general? If so, please use the back of this page for that purpose. Thank you for your assistance.

Please return this questionnaire, upon completion, in the provided envelope. If this envelope has been misplaced, please return to the following address:

Timm Bliss
Oklahoma State University
504 Agriculture Hall
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078

VITA

Timm James Bliss

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE INVOLVEMENT OF AMERICA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS (JOBS) TRAINING PROGRAM: A NATIONAL STUDY

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Morrison, Illinois, On May 21, 1961, the son of Bob and Skeet Bliss.

Education: Graduated from Tulia High School, Tulia, Texas in May 1979; received Bachelor of Science degree in Microbiology from Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas in May 1984; and a Master of Science degree in Agricultural Economics from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December 1989. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree with a major in Higher Education Administration at Oklahoma State University in July 1994.

Experience: Raised in the Texas Panhandle; employed at my father's feedlot during summers; employed by Monfort of Colorado, Greeley, Colorado as a quality control correspondent, 1984-1985; employed by Fort Dodge Laboratories, Amarillo, Texas as rabies project supervisor, 1985-1986; employed by Oklahoma State University, Department of Agricultural Economics as a graduate research assistant, 1987-1989; employed by Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service as an extension associate, 1989 to present.

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Date: 12-16-93 **IRB#:** ED-94-039

Proposal Title: COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS TRAINING (JOBS) PROGRAMS: A NATIONAL STUDY

Principal Investigator(s): Stephen G. Katsinas, Timm James Bliss

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

APPROVAL STATUS SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY FULL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD AT **NEXT** MEETING.
APPROVAL STATUS PERIOD VALID FOR ONE CALENDAR YEAR AFTER WHICH A **CONTINUATION** OR RENEWAL REQUEST IS REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR BOARD APPROVAL. **ANY** MODIFICATIONS TO APPROVED PROJECT MUST ALSO BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL.

Comments, Modifications/Conditions for Approval or Reasons for Deferral or Disapproval are as follows:

Signature: _____ Date: December 20, 1993
Chair of Institutional Review Board