

## **WIA Discussion Key Issues/Differences**

### **Block Grant/Consolidation**

- House Bill--Consolidates WIA Adult, DW and WP into a single funding stream
- Senate Bill--Keeps separate funding streams, but allows for 100% transferability between Adult and DW

### **One Stop Infrastructure Funding**

- Current Law—Local Boards are required to develop MOUs that specify resource sharing and referral arrangements among one-stop partners.
- House Bill—Established new state-determined infrastructure funding mechanism. Governor, in consultation with State Board, determines proportionate amount that each one-stop partner program must contribute to support one-stop infrastructure.
- Senate Bill—Provides local areas with two options: 1) develop a funding mechanism, with agreement of local partners in the local MOU; or, 2) If no local agreement, state mechanism becomes mandatory. Sets limits on programs' contributions (WIA/WP—3%; other partners—1.5%, Voc Rehab--1.75-1.5%).
- Have states investigated whether one is preferable to another, is it a non issue? Have states found other ways to support the infrastructure costs outside of the core programs?

### **State Board Functions**

- Current law--Stipulates that the State Board "may assist" the Governor in development of a state plan, designation of local areas, prep of annual report, etc.
- House Bill--Adds function of developing and reviewing statewide policies affecting provision of integrated services. Policies include development of criteria for certification of one-stops and allocation of infrastructure funds
- Senate Bill--Similar to House but stops short of mandating that state boards certify one-stops. Adds function of determining policy for one-stop partner roles and contributions for costs for infrastructure costs

### **Local Area Designation**

- **Current Law**—Governor must designate local areas after taking into consideration a number of factors—Must approve a request for designation from any single jurisdiction with a population of 500,000 or more, a rural CEP program and local areas in RI. A jurisdiction of 200,000 pop. or more that was an SDA under JTPA could win 2-year designation if it performed successfully and sustained fiscal integrity. Includes grandfathering clause for single state areas as of 7/1/98.
- **House Bill**—Similar to current law, but drops automatic designation for local areas in RI. Adds new consideration for designating local area—efficiency in administration and provision of services. Designation can be denied for substandard performance in previous two years. Does not allow additional states to designate single state areas. Authorizes states to require local boards to prepare a single regional plan that incorporates elements of local plans and is submitted in lieu of separate plans.
- **Senate Bill**—Similar to current law, but after two years, designation is tied to successful performance on core indicators and maintenance of fiscal integrity. Eliminates temporary designation criteria and adds a provision granting automatic designation to any local area that performed successfully and sustained fiscal integrity in the previous 2 years. Adds new consideration for designating local area—efficiency in administration and provision of services. Allows states that were not single state local areas prior to WIA to be

designated as such but only if no local area (that meets the standard for designation) seeks designation as a separate local area. Allows regional planning, but does not specify that the regional plan should replace separate local plans.

### **Allotments**

- **House Bill**—Contains new formula for combined WIA Adult, DW and WP combined funding stream.
- **Senate Bill**—Same as current law.
- Given the ASU issue this year, do either of these proposals "solve" that? Should the formula weigh more current factors than under current law? Has any State "run the numbers" to see if they would be better off under one proposal over the other?

### **Training**

- **Current Law**—Training is provided through the use of Individual Training Accounts (ITAs).
- **House Bill**—Authorizes local boards to create "enhanced ITAs" that store funds from WIA and other programs.
- **Senate Bill**—Changes ITAs to Career Scholarships and requires local boards to coordinate those accounts with other funding sources.
- Do states have a preference on this issue? Is the "blending of funds" do-able under current OMB rules? What would states need to be doing to implement these revised provisions? (since blending funding is not the easiest task on the accountability end).

### **Planning Cycles**

- Current Law--5 years
- House Bill-2 years
- Senate Bill-4 years (review and amend every 2 years)

### **Youth Eligibility**

- **House Bill**--Keeps eligibility similar to current law, but adds a new priority--school dropouts. No more than 30 percent of funds may be used to provide services to in-school youth. Changes overall eligibility to 16-24 years old (current law is 14-21). Eligible out-of-school youth must be one or more of the following: school dropout; recipient of a secondary school diploma or GED who is basic skills deficient; court-involved youth attending an alternative school; youth in foster care or who have been in foster care. Eligible in-school youth must be low-income individuals and have one or more of the barriers as in current law.
- **Senate Bill**--Priority for school dropouts not included. Not more than 60 percent of funds may be used to provide services to in-school youth, unless Sec'y approves. Changes eligibility for out-of-school youth to 16-21 years old. Eligible youth must meet one of a broad list of criteria: school dropout; a recipient of a secondary school diploma or equivalent who is basic skills deficient, low-income and not attending any school; subject to the juvenile justice system or ordered by a court to alternative school, plus other criteria. Eligible in-school youth are 14-21 years old, low-income and have one or more barriers similar to those in current law.

### **TANF Program—Mandatory Partner**

- Both bills make TANF a mandatory partner in the one stop system, unless the Governor opts out
- What does it mean in terms of the Common Measures TEGL should this become law for instance?
- Are States likely to opt out?

### **Reporting Requirements**

- **Current Law--**In addition to core indicators and customer satisfaction measures, states must report on a complex array of additional information, such as performance for special populations.
- **House Bill--**Leaves state reporting requirements intact except lifts the exclusion for reporting information on self-service and information activities. Also adds requirement for states to ensure data are valid and reliable.
- **Senate Bill—**Similar to House. Adds new requirements to report on cost per participant, number of participants served, new special populations, amount of adult and dislocated worker funds spent on core, intensive, training and business services.