Our Vision

We seek an America that grows its economy by investing in its people, so that every worker and every industry has the skills to compete and prosper.
Our Mission

• We **organize** broad-based coalitions seeking to raise the skills of America’s workers across a range of industries.

• We **advocate** for public policies that invest in what works, as informed by our members’ real-world expertise.

• And we **communicate** these goals to an American public seeking a vision for a strong U.S. economy that allows everyone to be part of its success.
Building Skills-Based SNAP E&T Programs

National Skills Coalition Webinar: Tools for Skills-Focused SNAP E&T Programs
April 30, 2015
SNAP E&T can serve a population that’s otherwise very hard to reach and serve
Flexible nature of the program allows States to integrate SNAP E&T with existing workforce development programs
States are leaving money on the table.
SNAP E&T Funding

“100 percent” Funds: E&T Formula Grants*

50/50 Funds: Administrative Reimbursements

50/50 Funds: Participant Reimbursements (“supportive services”)

States can maximize 50/50 funds through third-party partnerships with employers, CBOs, institutions, philanthropy, and others.

*States that agree to serve all childless adults in the state receive a proportionate share of $20 million in addition to the formula grant.
Third Party Partnerships
What is a Third-Party Partnership?

- Sometimes also referred to as third-party “match” programs or third-party reimbursement programs
- E&T services are provided by third parties, such as community colleges and community-based organizations
- Partners pay for services and get reimbursed 50% through Federal funding
Third-Party Reimbursement Models

State contracts with local employment and/or education provider to provide E&T services

FNS reimburses State for 50% allowable expenses

Provider uses non-federal funds to pay for allowable expenses, and submits a claim for reimbursement through the State

State passes reimbursement back to partner
Third-Party Reimbursement Models

**Benefits**

- Maximize dollars already being spent to serve SNAP recipients
- Expand the types of services available without added State expenditures
- Allow CBOs and colleges to expand capacity and serve more individuals
- Create a new funding stream to pay for much needed participant supports
- Help organizations administer program
- Ideally, begins to align programs and systems
- Increase employment and earning for SNAP recipients

**Challenges**

- Must establish in advance
- Can be administratively complex
- Must verify SNAP eligibility
- Anticipating service levels throughout the year
- Tracking non-federal funding sources
- Financing can be especially difficult for smaller CBOs
Thinking about E&T Differently

- One size fits all E&T programs don’t work
- Programs should center on what is best for the individual rather than what is best for the agency
- Individual strengths, weaknesses and barriers must drive strategies for self-sufficiency
- Case management and participant supports must be integrated into E&T programs to mitigate barriers to success
- Leverage expertise from multiple sources
Using Third Party Models to Better Serve SNAP Recipients

- Establish partnerships with agencies, CBOs, and colleges to leverage expertise and resources
- Develop comprehensive array of services
- Conduct consistent and meaningful assessments with targeted referrals
- Leverage community resources to provide participant supports
- Allow co-enrollment with multiple partners
Show Me the Money

- State, county, or city funds
- Donations from private firms or non-profits
- Foundation funds
- Social venture funds (e.g. Goodwill store revenues)
- In-kind donations (*government entities only)
- *Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
- State Need Grants
- State Worker Retraining Dollars
- State Opportunity Grants
- Tuition set-aside resources
- Other state training funds (ex-offender, homeless, non-custodial parents)
Contact Information

Rachel Gragg
Office of Employment and Training
Food and Nutrition Service, USDA
703-605-3213
rachel.gragg@fns.usda.gov
GAP Tuition Assistance Program

- Iowa Code Chapter 260l
- Created in 2011 by the Iowa Legislature
- Designed to address Iowa’s growing shortage of skilled workers with a focus on low skilled adults
- One of a package of new workforce programs
- First funded in Fiscal Year 2013
- $2.0 million annual appropriation from the Iowa Skilled Worker and Job Creation Fund
- Distributed to Iowa’s Community Colleges on a formula basis
- Delivered by Iowa’s fifteen Community Colleges
GAP Tuition Assistance Program

• The GAP Tuition Program was established to provide funding to Iowa community colleges for need-based tuition assistance to applicants for completion of non-credit, short term, certificate training programs for in-demand occupations.

• Eligibility for tuition assistance limited to persons earning incomes at or below 250% of the federal poverty level.

• A person is eligible for only one certificate program.
GAP Tuition Assistance Program

• Eligible costs:
  • Tuition
  • Direct training costs
  • Required books and equipment
  • Fees including but not limited to fees for industry testing services and background check testing services
GAP Tuition Assistance Program

- Eligible certificate programs
  - Not offered for credit, but is aligned with a certificate, diploma, or degree for credit
  - Offers a state, nationally or locally recognized certificate or credential
  - Offers preparation for a professional examination or licensure
  - Provides endorsement for an existing credential or license
  - Represents recognized skill standards defined by an industrial sector
GAP Tuition Assistance Program

- In FY14 3,279 individuals completed an application
  - 1,631 were approved and accepted into the program
  - 998 had completed the training, 167 had failed to complete and the remaining 466 were in training or waiting to participate in a program
- 191 approved certificate programs across the state
  - Certified Nursing Assistant programs were the most utilized with over 376 participants
  - Commercial drivers license were the next most utilized with 280 participants
  - Welding was third most with 197 participants
Pathways for Academic Career and Employment Program (PACE)

- Iowa Code Chapter 260H
- Created in 2011 by the Iowa Legislature
- Designed to address Iowa’s growing shortage of skilled workers with a focus on low skilled adults
- First funded in Fiscal Year 2014
- $5.0 million annual appropriation from the Iowa Skilled Worker and Job Creation Fund
- Distributed to Iowa’s Community Colleges on a formula basis
- Delivered by Iowa’s fifteen Community Colleges
PACE Program

• Established to provide funding to community colleges for the development of projects that will lead to gainful, in-state employment for members of target populations by providing them with both effective academic and employment training to ensure gainful employment and customized support services
PACE Program

• Program Characteristics
  • Target populations
  • Eligibility criteria for projects
  • Program component requirements
  • Pipeline program
  • Career pathways and bridge curriculum development program
• Pathway Navigators
• Regional Industry Sector Partnerships
PACE Program

- In FY14 3,355 individuals completed an application
- 2,311 were approved and accepted into the program
- 729 had completed the training, 101 had failed to complete and the remaining 1,481 were in training or waiting to participate in a program
- The statewide program completion rate was 88%
- The overall employment rate was 66%
IOWA SNAP E&T 50/50 Pilot

- We are in the first year of the pilot project
- Three community colleges participating the pilot
- Will be expanded to add additional community colleges and a CBO next year
- GAP and PACE program funding is fully reimbursable for SNAP E&T program services
- Individuals on SNAP assistance are deemed eligible for GAP tuition assistance
- Historically, 50% of our GAP participants have been on SNAP assistance
- The program requirements and eligibility guidelines are nearly identical for both programs
SNAP E&T Third-Party 50-50 Match:
The Example of WA’s BFET Program
“Third-Party Match” Program: match for 50 percent funds provided by service providers (e.g., community colleges, community agencies) rather than state; providers receive SNAP E&T reimbursement to expand their services
BFET Pilot Development

WCCDA Work & Earnings Group

White Center Community Development Association
(Annie E. Casey Foundation Making Connections Site)

Members formed core of...

Introduced idea of SNAP E&T 3rd Party Match to...

DSHS Region 4
(Seattle/King County)

SNAP E&T Pilot Planning Group

Program Development

Building Political Support

Champions for Pilot

BFET Pilot Business Plan

DSHS Leadership

BFET Pilot Approved
(Included in State SNAP E&T Plan for FFY 06)

LEGEND
CBO: Community-Based Organization
DSHS: Washington Department of Social & Health Services
DSHS CSO: DSHS Community Services Office
SBCTC: Washington State Board for Community & Technical Colleges
BFET Program Expansion (FFY 2006 - 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUALS SERVED</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>2,990</th>
<th>5,251</th>
<th>5,603</th>
<th>7,175</th>
<th>9,105</th>
<th>26,108</th>
<th>28,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLLEGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>$2.87</td>
<td>$6.23</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
<td>$17.1</td>
<td>$29.9</td>
<td>$29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BFET Participant Outcomes

## June 2010 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in Sample</td>
<td>14,000 served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training Completion Rate</td>
<td>70% - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Entered Employment Rate</td>
<td>57% one year post-BFET*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Hourly Wages</td>
<td>$10.20 - $10.63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## August 2013 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in Sample</td>
<td>Cohort of 21,400 (of 56,800 served)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training Completion Rate</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Entered Employment Rate</td>
<td>• One year post-BFET: 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two years post-BFET: 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 12,350 individuals received jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Hourly Wages</td>
<td>• One year post-BFET: $10.15 - $10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($10.50 - $11.44 for vocational education participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two years post-BFET: $10.42 - $11.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sub-cohort of BFET participants in Quarter 4, 2007, through Quarter 4, 2008, for which more comprehensive data is available.
Administrative Structure

**Legend**
- **CBO:** Community-Based Organization
- **DSHS:** Washington Department of Social & Health Services
- **DSHS CSO:** DSHS Community Services Office
- **FNS:** Food & Nutrition Service, U.S.D.A.
- **SBCTC:** Washington State Board for Community & Technical Colleges
BFET at the Community Colleges

**BFET FUNDS UTILIZED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR**

- Staff to administer the program and directly support BFET students
- Tuition, books, fees, supplies (typically for students in prof-tech programs)
- “Bridge” Funding – supporting students for first 1-2 quarters while they line up other sources of financial aid (e.g. Pell)
- College-based support services

**SOURCES OF MATCH**

- State-funded Opportunity Grants and State Need Grants (low-income student)
- State-funded Worker Retraining
- College foundation funds
- 3.5% tuition set aside
BFET at Community-Based Organizations

BFET FUNDS UTILIZED BY CBOS FOR

- Basic Skills/ESL Training
- Job Search/Job Readiness Training
- Vocational/Sector-Based Skills Training – Short-Term to Longer-Term
- Case Management/Career and College Navigation; Support Services

SOURCES OF MATCH

- Foundation, Corporate and Local Government Grants; Private Donations
- Social Enterprise Revenues
Stepping Up: State Developments in SNAP E&T Data

Rachel Zinn
WDQC Director

April 30, 2015

WorkforceDQC.org
WDQC Mission

- Advocate for inclusive, aligned, and market-relevant education and workforce data that can help our nation’s human capital policies meet the challenges of a changing economy.

- Promote federal and state reforms for data systems that provide useful information for policymakers, students and workers, business leaders and educators.
  - State Blueprint with 13 key features of a high-quality data infrastructure
  - Address federal legislation, funding and technical assistance
  - Policy agenda developed by broad coalition of national organizations, state leaders and technical experts across education/workforce spectrum
Funders

Apollo Education Group
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Joyce Foundation
Laura & John Arnold Foundation
Lumina Foundation
SNAP E&T Data

• Opportunity for states to assess data use

• Enhanced federal performance monitoring

• Three state case study topics
  • Data collection & case management
  • Tracking employment outcomes
  • Comprehensive data linkages
Data Collection & Case Management

- Virginia system links registration to case management for auto referrals
- Minnesota WF1 case management system includes 17 programs with common data definitions
- Texas system serves multiple programs, protects data security, includes data quality checks
Tracking Employment Outcomes

• Employment & earnings can be calculated using UI wage records

• Many states use wage records, but setting up data sharing can be challenging

• Washington & Texas have strong history of measuring SNAP E&T outcomes
State longitudinal data systems can show how programs work together to help people advance on career pathways.
Comprehensive Data Linkages

• Several states proposed SNAP E&T linkages but few are complete

• Florida & Virginia incorporate some SNAP E&T participant information into state data systems

• Data can be better utilized for program improvement and answering policy Qs about how to help people advance into family-sustaining jobs
Contact

Rachel Zinn, Director
rachelz@workforcedqc.org
202-223-8355, ext. 113
Stay Connected

• **Visit** our website.
• **Sign up** for our member email list.
• **Follow us on:**

![Social media icons](image-url)
Contact

• Brooke DeRenzis – brooked@nationalskillscoalition.org
• Rachel Gragg – rachel.gragg@fns.usda.gov
• David Kaz – dkaz@seattlejobsinit.com
• Steve Ovel – steve.ovel@kirkwood.edu
• Rachel Zinn – rachelz@workforcedqc.org