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This is the third in a series of working papers designed to examine what has been learned since the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996, which is effective until fiscal year 2002. PRWORA ended Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the federal entitlement to assistance for eligible needy families with children, and created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. The goals of TANF are to: (1) provide support to poor families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; (2) promote job preparation, work, and marriage in order to reduce families’ receipt of government benefits; (3) prevent and reduce the incidence of nonmarital pregnancies; and (4) encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. Under the new law, states are allowed greater flexibility over the design and implementation of their welfare programs, but are required to impose work requirements and enforce a five-year limit on the receipt of federal assistance. PRWORA makes $16.8 billion available to states each year through 2002 to help them achieve TANF goals.

As the first working paper published in August 1999 indicated, welfare policies in the United States have changed profoundly since the passage of PRWORA. Foremost among the changes is the dramatic and continuing reduction in the number of individuals participating in the TANF program. In 1999, fewer than 2.5 million families were receiving cash assistance from TANF, a reduction of 51 percent from the caseload of five million families receiving AFDC in 1994. In 2000, the caseload continued to decline and now includes 2.18 million families. Changes in caseload come from movement into the workforce, departures due to sanctions or time limits, and reduced entries that reflect diversion programs as well as participants’ reluctance to conform to TANF mandates, particularly the work requirements. Starting in the mid 1990s, a strong economy and new state waiver programs had already stimulated declining enrollment in AFDC. PRWORA’s requirements, plus continued economic strength through the late 1990s, sustained these earlier trends. The softening economy of the past year is affecting this picture.

Caseload reductions of somewhat lesser but still significant magnitude have been experienced in the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs since PRWORA’s implementation. TANF participants and many TANF “leavers”—those individuals who have left or been diverted from the program—are still eligible for these benefits. However, participation in both the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs has been reduced, largely due to changes in immigrant eligibility under TANF. In addition, there have been problems administering TANF, and many individuals are not informed that they can apply for these benefits regardless of their TANF status. While PRWORA legislation is responsible for many results, other changes in immigration law, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits, and health programs continue to affect TANF recipients and low-income working families.

TANF, Medicaid, and Food Stamp reductions have produced substantial fiscal surpluses for most states, providing an opportunity to budget resources for new initiatives that can further advance the objectives of PRWORA. Of the $55 billion available in total funds from 1997 to 2000, only $3.18 billion remained unobligated. Although some states are
using federal funds to create new kinds of programs and others are saving funds for use in a recession, many have still not made substantial changes to their welfare programs. More recently, there is evidence of a decline in state surplus funds. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reports that in FY 2000, 12 states exceeded their FY 2000 allotment and used their surpluses to finance their TANF expenditures.

In a period when most states were collecting greatly increased revenue from income and other taxes, fiscal adjustments to ensure that TANF revenues have been properly applied are critical to sustaining levels of funding that will allow states to advance the goals of welfare reform. TANF funds present an unprecedented opportunity for program development and the creation of interventions for the most vulnerable participants. Indeed, supplantation—using TANF funds to substitute for state funding—has increased during the past year. Researchers should be monitoring states’ use of these funds carefully.

PRWORA Reauthorization—What We Need to Know

The fact that PRWORA must be reauthorized by 2002 makes it important to inventory what has been learned from past and current research and what information has yet to be developed. Speakers at conferences on welfare program evaluation sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in May 2000 and 2001 catalogued salient questions related to reauthorization. These questions pertain to:

**State spending/supplantation**
- States uses of TANF surpluses
- States substituting federal funds for state funds—‘supplanting’ the state funds
- Distribution of TANF funds to states

**Caseload dynamics**
- Caseload numbers by state
- Reentry rates by state
- Effects of sanctions
- Effects of time limits
- Those left on the rolls
- Changes in Food Stamp and Medicaid programs

**Employment**
- Information on numbers of TANF recipients employed
- Hours and duration of work
- Retention rates
- Evidence of advancement in the workforce
- Barriers to employment (e.g. child care availability, transportation, health problems)
Income

- Earnings
- Information on shared household income
- Child support enforcement and direct payment of support to families

Family composition/formation

- Marriage rates and trends
- Family size
- Birthrates by age cohort/marital status

Special populations

- Adults not on the rolls and not working
- Adults who are working in low-income jobs
- Children
- Floundering families (some likely on the rolls and some likely neither employed nor receiving assistance)
- Fathers
- Hard-to-serve populations
- Housing assistance recipients
- Immigrants
- Native Americans
- Rural participants
- Urban participants

Ameliorating negative effects through interventions

- Training interventions
- Child care interventions
- Special programs for vulnerable populations (particularly for victims of domestic violence)

The effects of a serious recession

- Current increases in corporate downsizing and reduced productivity signal emerging problems

It is striking to note how many data sources and how many different research methods are needed to adequately answer these questions. Much of the information already exists in administrative data files or in surveys completed or underway. Federal and state policymakers need to examine the extensive sets of existing and forthcoming findings to improve outcomes for TANF participants and leavers.

To provide a broad overview of such key research findings, the Research Forum Web site (www.researchforum.org) has developed new key topic pages that draw upon existing research findings from studies reviewed and entered in its database. Key topics include:

- Caseload Dynamics of TANF, Medicaid, and Food Stamp programs
As indicated in the 2000 edition of this Research Forum publication, highly relevant research began to emerge in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s. Research findings most pertinent to PRWORA’s objectives include:

- Research and analytic studies during the 1980s indicating that: (1) modest investments led to modest improvements in employment, earnings, and reduced reliance on public assistance and (2) caseload dynamics were related to levels of education and employment experience. This research identified a cohort of individuals (about 50 percent of the caseload) who moved into the workforce in a relatively short time.

- Three controlled experiments—New Chance Demonstration, Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD), and Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) programs—illustrated the difficulties of improving education, employment, income, and childbearing outcomes for young mothers.

- Carefully designed studies that tracked children whose parents were participants in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program (now the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies) and in the New Chance Demonstration revealed the severity and prevalence of physical and developmental problems for children of teenage and other welfare mothers. These findings substantiated earlier analyses by Child Trends that detailed the problems of poor children, particularly those in low-income working families.

- More recent research from the waiver studies of the early 1990s documents increases in employment and reductions in caseloads at sites where time limits and sanctions were imposed, although the administration of and the rationale propelling time limits and sanctions are often problematic for staff and welfare participants. These findings on time limits were reinforced by the first policy brief from Welfare, Children, and Families: A Three-City Study: What Welfare Recipients Know About the New Rules and What They Have to Say About Them (July 2000) that highlighted the variations from place to place and the complexities of understanding the application of time limits.

- The effects of financial incentives when work is mandated have been impressive. Findings from the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and the Canada Self-Sufficiency Program (SSP), supported by earlier New Hope and New York Child
Assistance Program (NY CAP) findings, demonstrate that it is possible to improve employment and earnings while reducing poverty. The ambiguous findings of the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS), which was not so enriched in financial incentives, make the effect of financial incentives even more credible.

▶ “Leaver” studies, with their consistent theme of entry into low-wage jobs, emphasize the importance of increasing financial incentives. These studies also signal the need to address job retention and learn more about sanctioned populations.

▶ The welfare-to-work experiments and the Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) initiatives are beginning to produce important information on impacts from interventions designed to improve employment, retention, and advancement in the workplace. An ERA implementation report will be out late summer 2001; impact reports will be released in 2002. In addition, findings from the implementation phase of NEWWS should be used to inform our understanding about what vulnerable families need. Employment, earnings, and welfare impact findings for NEWWS subgroups have been released since last year. Similarly, the theoretical framework developed for ERA can mold policies concerned with retention and advancement.

▶ With regard to special populations, there are studies underway on Native Americans and rural and urban populations that need to be mined for emerging policy directions.

▶ A body of knowledge about child well-being has been developed that should be useful. MFIP and New Hope findings are particularly important for this. Contrasting this information with NEWWS’ impacts for children should encourage well-designed, generous interventions. Other child outcome studies will continue to publish findings over the next several years, providing more opportunities for cross-site comparisons. In addition, child welfare waiver studies and national studies of child care (such as the National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families) are designed to offer information on two vitally important programs serving children from low-income families—child welfare and child care subsidy programs.

**Recent and Emerging Findings**

During the past year, a number of studies have produced findings of importance to the reauthorization process.

▶ The Three-City Study, carefully designed to survey urban residents in low-income neighborhoods, has produced information about earnings, living arrangements, and family functioning for individuals who have entered employment from TANF; who have been sanctioned; who remain as TANF cases; and who have not received TANF or AFDC benefits in recent years.
The Project on Devolution and Urban Change is now beginning to release findings on the changing role of social service organizations under welfare reform as well as findings on the receipt of Food Stamps and Medicaid as transitional benefits among TANF leavers. Findings are soon to be released on the health status of single-parent TANF recipients and leavers, welfare-to-work services for the hard-to-serve, and strategies among the working poor.

The Jobs-Plus Public Housing Employment Initiative has identified strategies to target populations at risk and to amend current practices related to rent policies.

The University of Michigan’s Women’s Employment Study, rigorously designed and well-executed in terms of survey participation, is producing very specific information about barriers to employment that should provide program development criteria for interventions.

The SEEDCO evaluation of the Neighborhood Strategies Projects Works Program in New York City recently identified successful job placement and retention strategies for community-based organizations.

The Next Generation analyses at MDRC are providing clues about the importance of income strategies combined with service strategies to improve family and child outcomes.

Questions Still Unanswered

Despite the multitude of studies, some key areas remain to be addressed.

A great void in knowledge exists about the effects of PRWORA and Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) statutory changes on immigrants and their children. Given the significant increase in immigrant families in the United States, this dearth of information—particularly as it relates to children in immigrant families—is troubling. Very large numbers of immigrant families have either become ineligible for health and Food Stamp benefits or have become reluctant to apply for benefits that they or their children may be eligible to receive. The potential effects of reduced health care and inadequate nutrition need to be examined.

Still lacking is adequate information over time about the experience of individuals who have entered the workforce, usually with very low wages and limited benefits. Their income, job retention, and upper mobility histories could help inform public policy. Interventions designed to test the relative effects of particular benefits or combinations of benefits such as the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Food Stamps, Medicaid, state Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP), transportation, and housing can advance our strategies.
Recent increased emphasis on the goal of marriage promotion and family formation has exposed gaps in existing research on the issue. Studies on the effectiveness and outcomes of various marriage promotion strategies would provide much-needed information to help shape new policies.

More research is needed to examine the circumstances of individuals with multiple barriers to employment. Given the information emerging from the Michigan Women’s Employment Study and from the Three-City Study, interventions to test new approaches for vulnerable individuals are needed. These strategies are likely to require health, mental health, employment, child care, transportation, and other service interventions. The implementation of CASAWorks, designed to reach substance abusers, can help inform other efforts to assist individuals who are depressed, developmentally disabled, or physically or otherwise handicapped. Clearly, those at risk of sanctions and those who have left the caseload but are not working are populations requiring attention, as are those remaining on the roles but without work involvement—the “hard-to-serve.”

Recent findings on child outcomes indicate the need for a next generation of research focused on testing new and more intensive combinations of services for families, including wage supplements, high-quality child care, and health and nutrition benefits. Research focused on low-wage working families and on vulnerable parents can be designed to include embedded studies on the subjects’ children.

Research Methodology Issues

In addition to expanding the topical areas for research studies, a number of research methodology issues still require action. These include:

1. **Utilizing existing technological resources**

   The need to use existing information technology effectively has emerged as a critical issue to ensure that reliable data are available to support rigorous research. At a meeting recently hosted by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) and Rockefeller Institute, participants agreed that management information systems (MIS) are needed to support service delivery functions at the local level, including assessment, referral, tracking, and follow-up for outcomes. Such systems need to be designed so that data can be aggregated to provide the information necessary for planning and management at the state and local levels. A majority of participants suggested the need for an entity, possibly an independent institute, to encourage the development of new systems and to identify exemplary prototypes.

2. **Implementing interventions effectively**

   The importance of implementation research continues to be a critical issue. Too often, new models or policies are imperfectly developed, weakening or destroying the value of studies measuring their impact. Frequently, the capacity of front-line and
management staff is not sufficient to guarantee full implementation. Issues related to assessment, professional skill, and collaborative interagency relationships must be addressed to support effective implementation. The Research Forum, in conjunction with the Institute for Research on Poverty, has been working with a group of highly skilled researchers to examine the range of methods needed to assess program implementation. This process—which has been protracted—should produce a publication on research methods during the coming year.

3. Disseminating findings

During the past year, there has continued to be a healthy and heartening increase in forums designed to share research findings and interests. The Welfare Information Network (WIN) conducts quarterly meetings focused on research areas of particular interest; Annie E. Casey Foundation has worked with Isabel Sawhill and Douglas Besharov to provide briefings for Congressional staff. More recently, The Brookings Institution has instituted a set of important meetings focused on reauthorization issues. The Institute for Research on Poverty, the Joint Center for Poverty Research, The Urban Institute, the Center for Law and Social Policy, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Heritage Foundation, American Enterprise Institute, the National Association of Child Advocates, and the Center on Community Change have all been actively examining these issues as well. The audiences reached are primarily policymakers and researchers, but the capacity to reach grassroots organizations is increasingly developing.

4. Synthesizing findings

Given the volume of findings and publications, synthesizing information takes on ever more critical importance. During the past year, some exceptional initiatives have been developed. Earlier work on financial incentives and time limits has been completed. More recently, an initiative titled Next Generation was designed to provide a series of syntheses based on findings from a range of experiments focused on child outcomes.

5. Examining specific populations

Census data will provide an exceptionally rich set of information about low-income (and other) families. This resource should be mined to identify data that can inform the reauthorization process, particularly with regard to specific populations (e.g. immigrants, children, urban and rural low-income populations, and Native Americans).

6. Promoting the development of new controlled experiments

Researchers should continue to develop controlled experiments designed to measure the effects of carefully crafted interventions for vulnerable groups of low-income individuals and for low-income working families.

7. Including input from grassroots organizations and advocates

There is evidence of an interest on the part of advocates and grassroots groups to be included in the formulation, design, and presentation of research questions and findings. This interest has become apparent in the Research Forum’s work with advocate groups to determine how research findings might more effectively inform their work.
Conclusion

The past five years have witnessed cataclysmic changes in social welfare programs providing cash assistance. Unprecedented numbers of individuals have moved from the welfare rolls, many to employment, others to circumstances less desirable. For those still receiving cash assistance from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, differences also exist. Some are working while still receiving cash assistance; others are not. Research at the University of Michigan has focused on the characteristics of those working (whether on or off the rolls) as contrasted to those not employed (whether on or off the rolls). Those not working tend to experience multiple barriers to work, while those employed have limited barriers.

The attention paid under TANF to low-income workers compared to profoundly vulnerable individuals poses special challenges to the reauthorization process. On the one hand, states and localities need to be encouraged to support the working poor by enhancing income with benefits recognizing the value of work. These include the Earned Income Tax Credit and other wage supplements; Food Stamps and the Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); Medicaid and CHIP; transportation; and housing benefits.

On the other hand, states and localities need to be mainstreaming vulnerable individuals into a range of services that have not been particularly receptive to low-income populations. Clearly, the need for physical health, mental health, substance abuse, and developmental disability services can be demonstrated, based on what we have learned about individuals who have been sanctioned or who have remained dependent on public assistance or other social services without access to work.

Further, the needs of children in both low-income and vulnerable families need to be addressed. These children can benefit from high-quality early child care interventions as well as income and benefit supplements to their families. Of particular concern are the growing number of “child-only” cases where intensive interventions may be ever more important. Some of these children are from immigrant families and deserve special attention. Other immigrant children are not even eligible for the “child-only” designation. They may be our most at-risk children.

Finally, as the reauthorization process continues, issues related to staff and management capacity and information systems should be recognized.
APPENDIX

Monitoring and Supporting Welfare Research

Background

Information for this working paper is drawn from an interactive Web-based database (www.researchforum.org) created by staff at the Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism that became operational in October 1997. In the database, larger, multisite studies that meet preestablished criteria and whose summary descriptions have been reviewed by a principal investigator are categorized as reviewed projects. Smaller, single-site projects are categorized as unreviewed. Icons are used to indicate an income security focus, a family/child focus, a community focus, or a joint focus. In addition, a set of studies (both reviewed and unreviewed) are categorized as policy analysis projects.

Volume and Distribution of TANF Research Projects

The geographical distribution of active research projects in the Research Forum database roughly correlates with TANF caseloads (see Figure 1). Of the projects in the database in July 2001, 63 include California as a study site. Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin also have a high volume of research activity. Fewer research projects are being conducted in states that are smaller or have fewer TANF recipients. For instance, there are only 15 welfare reform studies in Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and Wyoming.

Of the 228 projects in the database, 183 study issues relate to income security; of these, 38 projects include analyses of child and family effects. Final findings exist for 80 of these evaluations; 76 have interim findings; 72 have no findings yet.

A subset of evaluations (some of which are embedded within income security or community evaluations) is focused on child and family outcomes. Eighteen of these evaluations have final findings; 31 have interim findings; 31 have no findings yet.

Another subset of evaluations (some of which are embedded within income security or child and family evaluations) is focused on community issues. Five of these evaluations have final findings; 12 have interim findings; 7 have no findings yet.

The database includes 48 policy studies; 23 have been completed; 25 are on-going.

The “Key Topics” section of the Research Forum’s Web site (www.researchforum.org/cfm/keytopics.cfm) contains income security studies that address the effects of time limits, sanctions, and work requirements, and the impacts of financial incentives, welfare-to-work strategies, and job retention strategies. This section also contains child and family research studies that measure child outcomes related to state welfare programs and others focused on child care, child welfare, and child support issues.
Federally Sponsored Research on Specific Groups

In the last three years, several federal agencies have launched research projects to measure the effects of welfare reform on different populations. These projects were designed to complement existing studies and further enhance the knowledge base. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), are responsible for coordinating the implementation of PRWORA. These agencies initiated a series of studies that are clustered around specific topics and populations relevant to welfare reform. To facilitate comparisons of findings across sites, the projects attempt to employ similar research questions and data collection methods. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Labor (DOL), Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and other federal agencies have also been engaged in research activities. Funding for many of the projects is drawn from the $5 million provided by Congress in 1998 to study welfare reform. States, localities, and private foundations are providing additional resources for these studies as well. Figure 2 shows the federally funded sites and studies.

The “Key Topics” section of the Research Forum’s Web site (www.researchforum.org/cfm/keytopics.cfm) contains a number of the federal studies that focus on populations of special interest. They include studies of TANF and Food Stamp leavers, immigrants, rural populations, and tribal groups. This section also contains information about special initiatives on transportation and housing—two critically important elements for welfare-to-work and employment retention programs.

Research Forum Web Site Projects

The Research Forum’s Web-based database contains descriptions of the 228 projects that are listed at the end of this report; 54 are reviewed; 174 are unreviewed.

Publications

The projects described above have produced a total of 671 publications in the last several years, 139 of them since August 2000, when the second edition of the Research Forum working paper was published. Approximately 75 additional reports are scheduled to be published in the coming year. In most instances, these published reports can be downloaded from the Web site of the sponsoring organization or by contacting the organization via e-mail.
## Figure 1: Projects in Research Forum Database, July 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Reviewed</th>
<th>Unreviewed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Projects in database added prior to July 2000 (47 reviewed, 128 unreviewed)
- Projects in database added since July 2000 as of July 2001 (7 reviewed, 46 unreviewed)
**Figure 2: States Studied in Recent Federally Funded Research Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Child Outcomes</th>
<th>Child Indicators</th>
<th>Welfare Leavers</th>
<th>Welfare-to-Work</th>
<th>Tribal Welfare-to-Work</th>
<th>Rural Welfare-to-Work</th>
<th>Employment Retention</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Food Stamp Leavers</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Outcomes</th>
<th>Child Indicators</th>
<th>Welfare Leavers</th>
<th>Welfare-to-Work</th>
<th>Tribal Welfare-to-Work</th>
<th>Rural Welfare-to-Work</th>
<th>Employment Retention</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Food Stamp Leavers</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One or more research projects examining one or more sites in that state.
Projects in the Research Forum Database and Publication Contact Information
(NOTE: Not all projects have publications available)

REVIEWED PROJECTS

A Better Chance (ABC) Evaluation
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

Alabama ASSETS Demonstration
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

Assessing the New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families
Contact: Urban Institute
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

Barriers to Employment and Family Functioning: Women's Employment Study
Contact: University of Michigan School of Social Work
www.ssw.umich.edu
(734) 764-3309 or sheldond@umich.edu

Big Cities Confront the New Politics of Child and Family Policy
Contact: Columbia School of Social Work
www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw
(212) 854-3058

Building Bridges: States Respond to Substance Abuse and Welfare Reform
Contact: National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University
http://www.casacolumbia.org/
(212) 841-5200

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Evaluation
Contact: Social Research Demonstration Corporation (SRDC)
www.srdc.org
(613) 237-4311 or srdc@istar.ca

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project (ESP) Evaluation
Contact: Social Research Demonstration Corporation (SRDC)
www.srdc.org
(613) 237-4311 or srdc@istar.ca

CASAWORKS for Families
Contact: Treatment Research Institute, Inc.
www.fresearch.org
(215) 399-0980

Cleveland Community Building Initiative (CCBI)
Contact: Center on Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University
povertycenter.cwru.edu
(216) 368-2335 or sem@po.cwru.edu

Confronting the New Politics of Child and Family Policy in the U.S.
Contact: Columbia School of Social Work
www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw
(212) 854-3058

Connecticut's Jobs First: Welfare Reform Evaluation Project
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Devolution, Welfare Reform, and Wellbeing Study: New York Social Indicators Survey
Contact: Columbia School of Social Work
www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw
(212) 854-3358

Examination of State Diversion Programs and Activities Under TANF
Contact: Center for Health Policy Research
www.gwumc.edu/ehpr
(202) 530-2368 or ihokam@gwumc.edu

Faces of Change: Welfare Reform in America
Contact: Alliance for Children and Families
www.Alliance1.org
(414) 359-1040 or tlengyel@Alliance1.org

Florida Family Transition Program (FTP) Evaluation
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study
Contact: Fragile Families Research Team
www.wws.princeton.edu/~crcw/projects.html
(609) 258-5894

Front-Line Management and Practice Study
Contact: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York at Albany
www.rockinst.org
(518) 443-5258 or cooperm@rockinst.org

GAIN Evaluation
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Growing Up in Poverty Project
Contact: Yale University
www.yale.edu
(203) 432-9931

Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP)
Contact: IHDP Research Group
(212) 678-3904

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or kellam@mathematica-mpr.com

Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan (LBP) Evaluation
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or kellam@mathematica-mpr.com
JOBS-PLUS Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

LEAP Evaluation
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Study (LAFANS)
Contact: RAND
www.rand.org
(310) 393-0411, ext. 7286 or Judy_Lewis@rand.org

Minnesota's Family Investment Program (MFIP) Evaluation
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Monitoring Child and Family Social Program Outcomes: Before and After Welfare Reform in Four States
Contact: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago
www.chapin.uchicago.edu
(773) 753-5900 or publications@chmail.spc.uchicago.edu

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms
Contact: U.S. General Accounting Office
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-6000 or info@gao.gov

Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program
Contact: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
www.hud.gov
(202) 708-3700 Ext. 5706

National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP)
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (formerly JOBS)
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW)
Contact: Research Triangle Institute
www.rti.org
(919) 541-6000 or crm@rti.org

New Chance Demonstration
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

New Hope Project
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

New York Child Assistance Program (NY CAP) Evaluation
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

NICHID Study of Early Child Care
Contact: National Institute of Child Health and Development
www.nichd.nih.gov
(301) 435-6946

North Dakota Training, Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM) Project Evaluation
Contact: Berkeley Planning Associates
www.bpacal.com
(510) 465-7884 or info@bpacal.com

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Postemployment Services Demonstration
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Prenatal and Infancy Home Visitation by Nurses
Contact: University of Colorado
www.colorado.edu
(303) 864-5206

Preschool Immunization Project Evaluation
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

Project on Devolution and Urban Change
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

State Capacity Study
Contact: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government,
State University of New York at Albany
www.rockinst.org
(518) 443-5258 or cooperrm@rockinst.org

State Policy Documentation Project
Contact: Center for Law and Social Policy
www.clasp.org
(202) 328-5140, ext. 0

Teenage Parent Demonstration Program
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Three States' Approaches Show Promise of Increasing Work Participation
Contact: U.S. General Accounting Office
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-6000 or info@gao.gov

To Strengthen Michigan's Families (TSMF) Evaluation
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project Evaluation
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Welfare Reform: States Early Experiences with Benefit Termination
Contact: U.S. General Accounting Office
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-6000 or info@gao.gov
Welfare, Children, and Families: A Three-City Study
Contact: Johns Hopkins University
www.jhu.edu
(410) 516-8920 or welfare@jhu.edu

UNREVIEWED PROJECTS

A Process Study of Iowa's Post-Employment Pilot Project
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Alameda County CalWORKs Needs Assessment
Contact: Public Health Institute
www.phi.org
(510) 649-1987

Analysis of Missouri Workforce Development System
“Program Leavers”
Contact: University of Missouri
www.missouri.edu
(573) 882-0063

Arizona TANF Cash Exit Study
Contact: Arizona Department of Economic Security
www.state.az.us
(602) 229-2766

Arkansas Transitional Employment Assistance (TEA) Program
Contact: Berkeley Planning Associates
www.bpacal.com
(510) 465-7884 or info@bpacal.com

Assessing Effective Welfare-to-Work Strategies for Domestic Violence Victims and Survivors in the Options/Opciones Project
Contact: Center for Impact Research
www.impactresearch.org
(773) 342-0630 or rlewin@impactresearch.org

Assessing Enhanced Transitional Employment (ETE) Programs
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Assessing the Effects of Welfare Reform on California's Most Precarious Families
Contact: Center for Social Services Research, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley
cssr.berkeley.edu
(510) 642-1899 or cssr@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Bridges to Work Demonstration
Contact: Public/Private Ventures
www.ppv.org
(215) 557-4495

Broken Promise: Welfare Reform Two Years Later
Contact: Equal Rights Advocates
www.equalrights.org
(415) 621-0672 or dng@equalrights.org

Budgetary and Spending Implications of a Food Stamp Outreach Program
Contact: ECONorthwest for the Oregon Center for Public Policy
www.ocpp.org
(503) 873-1201 or jlewis@ocpp.org

California Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Center for Social Services Research, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley
cssr.berkeley.edu
(510) 643-6556 or or cssr@uclink4.berkeley.edu

California Works Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Program Statewide Evaluation
Contact: RAND
www.rand.org
(310) 393-0411 or klerman@rand.org

California: Welfare Reform's Impact on Legal Immigrants’ Access to Health Care
Contact: Latino Issues Forum
www.lif.org
(415) 284-7226 or swerve@uclink4.berkeley.edu

CalWORKs Project
Contact: California Institute for Mental Health
www.cimh.org
(707) 677-0895 or dwehand1@humboldt1.com

Child Support and Data Analysis Project
Contact: Center for Law and Social Policy
www.clasp.org
(202) 328-5140 or vtuet@clasp.org

Child Well-Being Effects of Welfare Reform
Contact: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,
Administration for Children and Families
www.acf.dhhs.gov
ayaffe@acf.dhhs.gov

Children’s Sentinel Nutrition Assessment Program (C-SNAP)
Contact: Children's Sentinel Nutrition Assessment Program Research Team
www.dee2.bumc.bu.edu/csnappublic
(617) 414-3580 or anne.skalleky@bmc.org

Colorado Child Welfare Managed Care Study
Contact: Colorado Department of Human Services
www.edhs.state.co.us
(303) 866-4365

Colorado Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: Colorado Department of Human Services
www.edhs.state.co.us
(303) 866-4511 or art.trevethick@state.co.us

Comparing Recent Declines in Oregon's Cash Assistance Caseload with Trends in the Poverty Population
Contact: Oregon Center for Public Policy
www.ocpp.org
(503) 873-1201 or info@ocpp.org
Comprehensive Evaluation of Welfare Reform in New York State
Contact: New York State, Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance
www.dia.state.ny.us
(518) 474-9482

Connecticut Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Connecticut Department of Children and Families
www.state.ct.us/def
(860) 556-6528

Contra Costa and Alameda Counties (CA) “Leavers” Project
Contact: SPHERE Institute
(650) 275-2350 or gritz@sphereinstitute.org

Converting to Wisconsin Works: Where Did Families Go When AFDC Ended in Milwaukee?
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Cuyahoga County Post-TANF Tracking Project
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(212) 340-8849 or nandita_verma@mdrc.org

Delaware Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Delaware’s Department of Health and Social Services
www.state.de.us/dhhs
(302) 633-2601 or dhssinfo@state.de.us

District of Columbia “Leavers” Project
Contact: Urban Institute
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

District of Columbia Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: District of Columbia
www.washingtondc.gov
(202) 698-6424

Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Effects of Welfare Reform on Housing Assistance Recipients
Contact: Institute for Policy Studies, Johns Hopkins University
www.jhu.edu/~ips
(410) 516-6530

Effects of Welfare Reform on Special Populations
Contact: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families
www.acf.dhhs.gov
gwright@acf.dhhs.gov

Effects of Welfare-to-Work Programs in Illinois
Contact: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago
www.chapin.uchicago.edu
(773) 256-5137 or bobg@uchicago.edu

Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) Project
Contact: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

Evaluating CalWORKS in Los Angeles County
Contact: Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services
www.dpss.co.la.ca.us

Contact: University of Missouri
www.missouri.edu
(573) 882-0063 or ryan@econ.missouri.edu

Evaluation of the North Carolina Work First Program
Contact: MAXIMUS
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

Examining the Impact of Welfare Reform on Medi-Cal
Contact: Medi-Cal Policy Institute, National Committee for Quality Assurance
www.ncqa.org/Pages/Programs/HEDIS/medi-cal.htm
(202) 955-1728 or schuman@ncqa.org

Exiting Welfare: The Experiences of Families in Metro New Orleans
Contact: Southern University at New Orleans
www.suno.edu
(504) 286-5376 or tllindhorst@aol.com

Expanding Medicaid Enrollment Using Tax Data
Contact: New Mexico Human Services Department
www.state.nm.us/hsd
(505) 823-9324 or odonnell@unm.edu

Family Income Study
Contact: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Evergreen State College
www.wa.gov/wsipp
(360) 866-6000, ext. 6380

Family Preservation and Reunification Program Evaluation
Contact: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families
www.acf.dhhs.gov
(202) 690-5653

Family Well-Being and Welfare Reform in Iowa
Contact: Iowa State University
www.iastate.edu
(515) 294-8521 or cynthia@iastate.edu

Federal Funding Impact Study
Contact: United Way of Greater St. Louis
www.stl.unitedway.org
(314) 539-4079 or medaniell@stl.unitedway.org

Finding Common Ground in the Era of Welfare Reform
Contact: Center for Population and Family Health, Columbia University
www.cpmcnet.columbia.edu/dept/ph pimpfam
(212) 304-5232 or drr6@columbia.edu

Florida Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: State of Florida
www.state.fl.us
(850) 488-9444
Food Stamp Leavers in Illinois
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Food Stamp Leavers in South Carolina
Contact: South Carolina Department of Social Services,
Office of Program Reform, Evaluation, and Research
www.state.sc.us/dss
(803) 898-7461 or medelhoch@dss.state.sc.us

GAPS Initiative
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Georgia Welfare Reform Impact Assessment
Contact: Georgia Department of Human Resources
www.state.ga.us
(404) 651-3523 or pademf@panther.gsu.edu

Grandparents as Primary Caregivers for TANF Children
Contact: Clark Atlanta University, School of Social Work
www.cau.edu
(404) 880-6716 or mtmcdonald17@yahoo.com

Health and Well-Being in Oklahoma: A Long-Term Analysis
Contact: Oklahoma Department of Human Services
www.okdhs.org
(405) 521-4498 or kenneth.kickham@okdhs.org

Health Effects of Welfare Reform on Children with Chronic Illness
Contact: Boston Medical Center, Division of General Pediatrics
www.bmc.org
(617) 414-7911 or Lauren.Smith@bmc.org

Heron Valley: Poverty, Parenting, and Social Change in a Small, Rural Community
Contact: Binghamton University
www.binghamton.edu
(607) 589-4645 or Barbara.nikolovska@gte.net

Homeless Family Profile Survey
Contact: Clark Atlanta University, School of Social Work
www.cau.edu
(404) 880-6716 or midpass@bellsouth.net

Illegal Aliens: Extent of Welfare Benefits Received on Behalf of U.S. Citizen Children
Contact: U.S. General Accounting Office
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-7125

Illinois Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Westat, Inc.
www.westat.com
(301) 251-4286

Illinois Child Welfare Waiver Project: Services to Substance-Abusing Caretakers
Contact: University of Illinois at Chicago, Children and Family Research Center
cfrccwww.social.uic.edu
(217) 244-5224

Illinois Family Study
Contact: University Consortium on Welfare Reform
www.jcpr.org/consortium.html
(708) 491-3715 or dalewis@casbah.acns.nwu.edu

Illinois’ Study of Former TANF Clients
Contact: Illinois Department of Human Services
www.state.il.us/agency/dhs
(217) 785-0754

Illinois TANF Applicant Study
Contact: MAXIMUS
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

Illinois Youth Employment and Training Initiative
Contact: Illinois Department of Human Services
www.state.il.us/agency/dhs/Default.htm

Immigrant Women and Welfare Project
Contact: Equal Rights Advocates
www.equalrights.org
(415) 621-0672 or dng@equalrights.org

Impact of Welfare Reform on Families
Contact: Institute for Research on Poverty
www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 262-6358

Impact of Welfare Reform on Social Services Agencies in New York City
Contact: Hunter College School of Social Work
www.hunter.cuny.edu/soe/work
(212) 866-2429

Impact of Welfare Reform on Women Leaving TANF in Georgia
Contact: Georgia State University Applied Research Center
www.cspweb.gsu.edu
(404) 651-3523 or pademf@panther.gsu.edu

Impact Study of the New Hampshire Employment Program
Contact: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,
Administration for Children and Families
www.acf.dhhs.gov
lsternbach@acf.dhhs.gov

Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Implementing Welfare to Work in Michigan
Contact: Michigan Program on Poverty and Social Welfare at the University of Michigan
www.ssw.umich.edu/poverty
(734) 998-8514 or kseef@umich.edu

Implications of the Welfare Reform Law on Suburban Chicago Transit Demand
Contact: University of Illinois at Chicago, Urban Transportation Center
www.uic.edu/cupp/a/ute
(312) 996-4820 or vonu-pt@uic.edu

Indiana Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Institute for Applied Research
www.iarstl.org
(317) 232-4622

Iowa “Leavers” Project
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com
Kansas Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Kansas Division of Children and Family Services
www.state.ks.us
(785) 368-8159

Kentucky Welfare Reform Evaluation
Contact: University of Louisville
www.louisville.edu/cbpa/usi
(502) 564-0417

Leaving Welfare Behind: The Oklahoma TANF Leavers Report
Contact: Oklahoma Department of Human Services
www.okdhs.org
(405) 521-4498 or kenneth.kickham@okdhs.org

Leaving Welfare: Findings From a Survey of Former New York City Welfare Recipients
Contact: New York Office of Policy Program Analysis, Human Resources Division
www.state.ny.us

Lessons from Project Match’s Longitudinal Tracking Data
Contact: Erikson Institute
www.erikson.edu
(312) 755-2250 ext 2296

Contact: Work, Welfare, and Families
www.workwelfareandfamilies.org
(312) 986-4220 or wwf@workwelfareandfamilies.org

Los Angeles County Post-TANF Tracking Project
Contact: MDRC
www.mdrc.org
(213) 340-8849 or nandita_verma@mdrc.org

Los Angeles Welfare Reform Monitoring Project
Contact: Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness
www.lacehh.org
(213) 746-6511 or hn1674@handsnet.org

Maine Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Muskie Institute
www.muskie.usm.maine.edu
(202) 287-5011

Maryland Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: University of Maryland
www.umd.edu
(410) 706-5474

Maryland Child Welfare Waiver Project—Managed Care and Services to Substance-Abusing Caretakers
Contact: University of Maryland School of Social Work
www.umd.edu
(410) 767-7152

Maryland Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation
Contact: Maryland Department of Human Resources
www.dhr.state.md.us/dhr

Maximizing Job Opportunities for Welfare Recipients Through Expansion of Value-Added Industries in Economically Disadvantaged Rural Areas
Contact: Louisiana State University
www.lsu.edu
(504) 388-1731 or pmonroe@unix1.snec.lsu.edu

Medicaid Managed Care Study
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Medi-Cal Liaison Project
Contact: Medi-Cal Policy Institute, National Committee for Quality Assurance
www.ncqa.org/Pages/Programs/HEDIS/medi-cal.htm
(202) 955-1728 or schuman@ncqa.org

Michigan Assemblies Project
Contact: Groundwork for a Just World
(313) 822-2055

Michigan Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Michigan Family Independence Agency
www.mfia.mi.us
(517) 241-7521 or mehrenm@state.mi.us

Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) Longitudinal Study
Contact: Minnesota Department of Human Services
www.dhs.state.mn.us
(651) 215-9520 or leslie.crichton@state.mn.us

Mississippi Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Mississippi Department of Human Services
www.state.ms.us
(601) 359-4495

Missouri Welfare Reform Results Study
Contact: Missouri Department of Social Services
www.dss.state.mo.us
(573) 751-3060 or rkoon01@mail.state.mo.us

Monitoring the Impact of Welfare Reform on Immigrant Women, Infants, and Children: Access to Health Care, Health-Seeking Behaviors, and Health Outcomes
Contact: New York City Department of Health, Bureau of Maternity Services and Family Planning
cityweb.cn.ci.nyc.ny.us/html.doh
(212) 442-1744 or rthadani@dohlan.cn.ci.nyc.ny.us

Montana Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services
www.state.mt.us
(406) 444-5906

Montana Welfare Reform Evaluation Project: Implementation and Process and Outcome of the Families Achieving Independence in Montana (FAIM) Program
Contact: Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services
www.state.mt.us
(406) 444-1788 or lkpeck@state.mt.us

Multiple Impacts of Welfare Reform in Utah: Experiences of Former Long-term Welfare Recipients
Contact: University of Utah Graduate School of Social Work
www.socwk.utah.edu
(801) 585-3891 or mjtaylor@socwk.utah.edu

National Academy of Sciences Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs
Contact: National Academy of Sciences
www.nas.edu
(202) 334-3096 or sverploe@nas.edu
National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families
Contact: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University
www.nccp.org
(212) 304-7100 or nccp@columbia.edu

NCGP Child Care Research Partnership
Contact: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University
www.nccp.org
(212) 304-7100 or nccp@columbia.edu

Nebraska Employment First Program Evaluation
Contact: Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services
www.hhs.state.ne.us

Nebraska Welfare Reform Evaluation
Contact: Nebraska State Welfare Division
www.state.ne.us/indexw.htm
(702) 687-4770

New Hampshire Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services
www.state.nh.us/dhhs

New Immigrant Survey
Contact: RAND
www.rand.org
smith@rand.org

New Mexico Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: State of New Mexico
www.state.nm.us
(505) 827-8427

New Mexico TANF Longitudinal Study
Contact: MAXIMUS
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

New Visions Evaluation
Contact: Abt Associates, Inc.
www.abtassoc.com
(301) 913-0548

New York “Leavers” Project
Contact: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York at Albany
www.rockinst.org
(518) 474-9482

New York Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: New York State Department of Social Services
www.state.ny.us
(518) 474-9436

North Carolina Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: North Carolina Division of Social Services
www.state.nc.us

Ohio Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Human Services Research Institute
(503) 362-5682

Oregon Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Portland University Graduate School of Social Work
www.sw.pdx.edu
(503) 725-8018

Oregon Families Who Left TANF or Food Stamps
Contact: Center for the Study of Women in Society
csws.oregon.edu
(541) 346-8015 or csws@oregon.oregon.edu

Pennsylvania TANF Closed Case Telephone Survey
Contact: Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare
www.dpw.state.pa.us
(717) 783-7629 or charlesk@dpw.state.pa.us

Process Evaluation of the Free to Grow Pilot Program, Head Start Partnerships to Promote Substance-Free Communities
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology
Contact: Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology
(468) 707-3424

Quality Child Care in Portage County and W2
Contact: University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
www.uwsp.edu
(715) 346-4742 or oogunna@uwsp.edu

Reaching for Independence: Alaska Leavers Study
Contact: Institute for Circumpolar Health Studies
www.ichs.uaa.alaska.edu
(907) 786-6575 or anbls@uaa.alaska.edu

Retention Services in King County
Contact: Antioch University
www.antiochhl.edu
(206) 720-1737 or csorens@worldnet.att.net

Rural Impacts of Welfare Reform
Contact: University of Wisconsin
www.wisc.edu
(608) 263-9728 or mharvey@ssc.wisc.edu

Rural Welfare Reform Project: Does Welfare Reform Work in Rural America?
Contact: Ohio University
www.ohio.edu
(740) 593-1381 or tickamye@ohiou.edu

Rural Welfare to Work Strategies Project: Iowa
Contact: Iowa State University
www.iastate.edu
(515) 281-8629 or jbeck@dhs.state.ia.us

San Bernardino County (CA) TANF Recipients Study
Contact: MAXIMUS
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

San Mateo County “Leavers” Project
Contact: SPHERE Institute
(650) 558-3980 or gritz@sphereinstitute.org

South Carolina Family Independence Program Process Evaluation
Contact: Urban Institute
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

South Carolina Welfare and Food Stamp Leavers Study
Contact: MAXIMUS
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com
South Carolina: State Welfare Reform Evaluation Program
Contact: South Carolina Department of Social Services, Office of Program Reform, Evaluation and Research
www.state.sc.us/dss
(803) 898-7461 or medelhoch@dss.state.sc.us

State Tax Policy and Child Poverty in New Mexico
Contact: New Mexico Advocates for Children and Families
www.nmacef.org
(505) 244-9505

Study of Arizona Adults Leaving the Food Stamp Program
Contact: U.S. Department of Agriculture
www.usda.gov
tcarlin@ers.usda.gov

Study of Child Care Arrangements in New York City Neighborhoods
Contact: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
www.ksg.harvard.edu

Study of Screening and Assessment in TANF/WtW
Contact: Urban Institute
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

Substance Abuse Research Demonstration
Contact: Mount Sinai School of Medicine
(212) 659-8744 or jon.morgenstern@mssm.edu

Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients
Contact: South Carolina Department of Social Services, Office of Program Reform, Evaluation and Research
www.state.sc.us/dss
(803) 898-7461 or medelhoch@dss.state.sc.us

Survey of Program Dynamics
Contact: U.S. Census Bureau
www.sipp.census.gov/spd
(301) 457-3246 or sshipp@census.gov

Survey of the New Mexico Closed Case Recipients
Contact: Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of New Mexico
www.unm.edu/~lber
(505) 277-6626 or dbinfo@unm.edu

Survey of Welfare Recipients Employed or Sanctioned for Non-Compliance
Contact: Bureau for Business and Economic Research, University of Memphis
www.state.tn.us/humanserv
(615) 313-5652

Texas Achieving Change for Texans (ACT) Welfare Reform Waiver Evaluation
Contact: University of Texas at Austin
www.utexas.edu
(512) 438-3743 or r.gummerman@dhs.state.tx.us

Texas Child Care Utilization and Outcomes Study
Contact: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas
www.utexas.edu/lbj
(512) 936-3208 or charlotte.brantley@twc.state.tx.us

Texas Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: State of Texas
www.state.tx.us

Texas Families in Transition Study
Contact: Texas Department of Human Services
www.dhs.state.tx.us
(512) 438-4046

The Annie E. Casey Foundation Rebuilding Communities Initiative
Contact: Annie E. Casey Foundation
www.aecf.org
(301) 652-1558 or sgoodloe@burnesscommunications.com

The Changing Face of Welfare in the 1990s
Contact: Delaware Opportunities, Inc.
(609) 746-2165

The Growing Crisis Among Wisconsin’s Poorest Families: A Comparison of Welfare Caseload Declines and Trends in the State’s Poverty Population
Contact: Institute for Wisconsin’s Future
www.exeepc.com/~iwf
(414) 384-9094 or ifw@exeepc.com

The W-2 Job Path: An Assessment of the Employment Trajectory of W-2 Participants in Milwaukee
Contact: Institute for Wisconsin’s Future
www.exeepc.com/~iwf
(414) 384-9094 or ifw@exeepc.com

The Welfare in Transition Project: Consequences for Women, Families, and Communities
Contact: Radcliffe Public Policy Institute
www.radcliffe.edu/pubpol/index.html
(617) 496-3478 or mcdonald@radcliffe.edu

Tracking Closed Cases Under The TANF Program in Massachusetts
Contact: Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance
www.state.ma.us/eohhs/eohhs.htm
(617) 348-8526 or gloria_nagle@dta.state.ma.us

Tracking Participants and Families Affected by Welfare Reform in Florida
Contact: Florida State University
www.fsu.edu
(850) 644-6284

Understanding Families with Multiple Barriers to Self-Sufficiency
Contact: University of Utah Graduate School of Social Work
www.socwk.utah.edu
(801) 585-3891 or mjtaylor@socwk.utah.edu

Understanding the AFDC/TANF Child-Only Caseload
Contact: Lewin Group
www.lewin.com
(703) 269-5721
Virginia Closed-Case Study
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Walk a Mile Program
Contact: Northwest Institute for Children & Families
depts.washington.edu/nwicf
(206) 543-3027 or natasha@u.washington.edu

Washington Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Washington Children’s Administration
(360) 902-7936

Washington State Early Childhood Education Career Development Ladder
Contact: Economic Opportunity Institute
www.econop.org
(206) 633-6580 ext. 8 or nancy@eoionline.org

Washington State’s Families After Welfare
Contact: Washington Department of Social and Health Services
www.wa.gov/dshs
(360) 413-3058 or ahnj@dshs.wa.gov

Washington Work First Study
Contact: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Evergreen State College
www.wa.gov/wsipp/gweeks@esd.wa.gov

Welfare Graduates: College and Financial Independence
Contact: Jerome Levy Economics Institute
www.levy.org
(509) 623-4387 or Tkarier@ewu.edu

Welfare Reform Commission’s Longitudinal Database Study
Contact: Massachusetts Department of Revenue
www.state.ma.us/dor/dorpg.htm
(617) 577-7200

Welfare Reform, the Economic and Health Status of Immigrants, and the Organizations that Serve Them
Contact: Urban Institute
www.urban.org
(202) 467-8775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

Welfare Reform’s Impact on Food Stamp and Medicaid Participation
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Welfare to Work: Monitoring the Impact of Welfare on American Indian Families
Contact: George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University
www.gwbweb.wustl.edu
(314) 935-4878 or pandeys@gwbssw.wustl.edu

Welfare-to-Work Grants Program Evaluation
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

Welfare-to-Work, the Private Sector and Americorps*VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America)
Contact: Corporation for National Service
www.cns.gov
(215) 597-7012 or rkeast@cns.gov

West Virginia Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: State of West Virginia
www.state.mv.us
(304) 558-6444

Wisconsin “Leavers” Project
Contact: Institute for Research on Poverty
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 266-3035

Wisconsin Works (W-2) Program Evaluation
Contact: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development
www.dwd.state.wi.us
(608) 266-3035

Wisconsin Works Child Support Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Institute for Research on Poverty
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 266-3035

Work First New Jersey Evaluation
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

YouthBuild USA Welfare-to-Work Multi-Site Program
Contact: YouthBuild USA
www.youthbuild.org
(617) 741-1202 or awright@youthbuild.org

West Virginia Child Welfare Waiver Project
Contact: State of West Virginia
www.state.mv.us
(304) 558-6444

Wisconsin “Leavers” Project
Contact: Institute for Research on Poverty
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 266-3035

Wisconsin Works (W-2) Program Evaluation
Contact: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development
www.dwd.state.wi.us
(608) 266-3035

Wisconsin Works Child Support Waiver Demonstration
Contact: Institute for Research on Poverty
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 266-3035

Work First New Jersey Evaluation
Contact: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jallen@mathematica-mpr.com

YouthBuild USA Welfare-to-Work Multi-Site Program
Contact: YouthBuild USA
www.youthbuild.org
(617) 741-1202 or awright@youthbuild.org