



SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH
ASSOCIATES

Linkages Between TAA, One-Stop Career Center Partners, and Economic Development Agencies

An Occasional Paper Prepared as Part of the
Evaluation of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program

Final Report
July 2009

Prepared for:

The U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training
Administration
Office of Policy Development
Evaluation and Research
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20210

DOL Contract No.
AK-13690000430
SPR Project No. 1147

1330 Broadway, Suite 1426
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 763-1499
Fax: (510) 763-1599
www.spra.com

Prepared by:
Kate Dunham
Social Policy Research Associates

in Conjunction with Research Team Members from:
Social Policy Research Associates
and
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

This page is deliberately
left blank

CONTENTS

LINKAGES BETWEEN TAA, ONE-STOP CAREER CENTER PARTNERS, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.....	1
Introduction	1
Extent of Linkages with Other Workforce Programs	3
Linkages with the Employment Service	4
Linkages with State Unemployment Insurance Programs	5
Linkages with WIA Dislocated Worker Programs	5
Linkages with Other One-Stop Career Center Partners	9
Extent of Linkages with Economic Development Agencies.....	11
Employer-Based Training	13
Requiring Training in Demand Occupations	14
Factors that Support Linkages	15
Administrative Arrangements.....	15
State and Local Policy Initiatives Supporting Linkages	16
Workforce Development Coordinating Structures	17
Combined Management Information Systems.....	21
Challenges to Developing and Maintaining Linkages	22
Challenges Related to Linkages with Any Workforce Program	22
Challenges Specific to Developing Linkages between TAA and WIA	23
Conclusions.....	25
Appendix: List of Site Visits Conducted	27

This page is deliberately
left blank

LINKAGES BETWEEN TAA, ONE-STOP CAREER CENTER PARTNERS, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

In January of 2004, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) awarded Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) and its subcontractor Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) a contract for a national *Evaluation of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Program*. The evaluation consists of an implementation study, which is examining how the TAA program operates, and a net impact study, which is gauging how receiving program services affects participants' employment and other outcomes. This briefing paper, one in a series being produced as part of the implementation study, focuses on the linkages that the TAA program has established with its One-Stop Career Center partners and economic development agencies.

This paper is based on data drawn from site visits to 41 local One-Stop Career Centers where TAA services were being provided and the state-level offices of the 19 states in which those local offices are located (for a list, see the Appendix). Field staff conducted these site visits from mid-2005 through the summer of 2006. The site visits entailed interviews with state and local TAA program administrators, representatives from One-Stop Career Center partner programs, fiscal and management information system (MIS) staff, One-Stop Career Center directors, and case managers.

After a brief introduction, the paper will examine the extent to which the TAA program is linked with other workforce development programs and economic development efforts and agencies. It will then discuss a number of key factors that support the development and maintenance of linkages between TAA and workforce and economic development partners, followed by an examination of some key challenges to linkages and the implications of linkages for the TAA program.

Introduction

It has long been recognized that the expansion of international trade harms some firms and individuals even though it may be beneficial to the economy as a whole. The concept of “injury from trade” first appeared formally in U.S. government policy as part of the Trade Agreements program of the 1930s. In the 1940s, “escape clause” provisions in U.S. trade laws and in the

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade further formalized and refined this concept. These provisions allowed trade barriers to be created if trade-related injuries could be demonstrated clearly. Thus, they surrendered some of the potential gains from trade and made extensive trade liberalization more difficult.

TAA represents an alternative strategy. Rather than blocking or reversing trade liberalization, TAA seeks to compensate workers and firms that have suffered trade-related injuries and to provide them with services that help them adjust to changes in market circumstances. Such a program was first instituted in the United States as part of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which offered financial payments and other adjustment services to affected workers. However, strict eligibility requirements kept take-up rates low. In subsequent years, ensuing legislation and amendments—including the Trade Act of 1974 and the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act (1988), among others—expanded eligibility guidelines and changed the program’s orientation from financial compensation to adjustment through training and reemployment services.

The Trade Act of 2002, which amended the program most recently, was enacted just before this evaluation commenced and constitutes the backdrop for the study.¹ This legislation and DOL’s accompanying guidance changed the TAA program in several notable ways:

- The number of workers eligible to receive trade benefits was expanded by opening access to some “upstream” suppliers of components to primary certified firms and to “downstream” firms performing finishing operations.
- Collaboration among programs and partner organizations in the One-Stop delivery systems was promoted.
- New benefits were offered to trade-affected workers, including:
 - A Health Coverage Tax Credit (HCTC) to partially cover health insurance costs, and
 - Alternative TAA (ATAA) to provide payments to older TAA participants who become re-employed at wages lower than their previous job’s wages and who do not pursue training.
- Fiscal integrity and performance accountability were promoted.
- The program’s focus on achieving “rapid, suitable and long-term employment for adversely affected workers”² was intensified by emphasizing early intervention services, improved assessment and reemployment services, and enhanced benefits during training.

¹ The TAA program has been amended yet again, in the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act of 2009 (TGAAA), a part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. TGAAA expands TAA eligibility to service workers, relaxes deadlines for enrollment in training, and increases income support, among other notable changes. TGAAA was enacted well after data collection for this study occurred and is not referenced further.

With respect to promoting collaboration among partners, the Trade Act of 2002 provided new support for efforts that had already begun at least as far back as the development of the One-Stop delivery systems during the 1990s and the passage of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) in 1998. The WIA legislation in particular had a strong impact on TAA as it made the TAA program a mandatory One-Stop Career Center partner and identified One-Stop Career Centers as the locus of state and local workforce investment systems. The Trade Act of 2002 built upon these efforts by requiring that core and intensive services, as defined by WIA, be made available to workers whenever a petition for TAA was filed. Further, in its operating instructions for implementing the Act, DOL declared that, in order to “encourage coordination among programs” and thereby “better serve workers and promote efficiencies in the workforce system,”³ One-Stop Career Centers should be the main point of participant intake and delivery of TAA benefits and services.

In addition to promoting linkages with other workforce development partners in the One-Stop delivery system, the Trade Act of 2002 also strengthened the TAA program’s emphasis on working with employers by authorizing employer-based training and relaxing restrictions on the use of on-the-job training (OJT). These changes are in keeping with DOL’s emphasis on promoting a “demand-driven” workforce investment system.

The pages that follow describe the progress that the TAA program has made in fostering strong relationships with other One-Stop delivery system partners and employers. As will be discussed, much has thus far been accomplished, though substantial challenges remain.

Extent of Linkages with Other Workforce Programs

The TAA program has very tight restrictions on the use of program funding to cover non-training costs.⁴ Consequently, even were it not for the legislative and other Federal guidance promoting system coordination, the TAA program in most states would have needed to develop very strong linkages with certain other workforce development programs to overcome the TAA program’s funding limitations and effectively deliver services.

² DOL Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) No. 11-02 (October 10, 2002), page 2.

³ TEGL 11-02, page 3.

⁴ Only 15 percent of a state’s TAA funding can be spent on administration. Administrative funding must be used to cover the cost of all non-training expenses (exclusive of stipends), including all staffing costs, even those related to case management, assistance in developing training plans and filling out required paperwork, and placement services. WIA also severely limits what its funded programs can charge to administrative activities; however, direct service activities, such as case management, assessment, and placement, are considered program activities under WIA rather than administrative expenses.

In keeping with this underlying structural limitation, site-visit data reveal that TAA's One-Stop delivery system partner programs supervise and fund—partly or completely—state or local staff who provide services to TAA participants. These workforce development partners also provide additional services needed by TAA participants, such as support services or adult basic education. However, the strength of these linkages varies greatly by partner, state, and local office.

This section of the paper will explore the extent of linkages between TAA and other workforce development programs and organizations, including the Employment Service (ES), Unemployment Insurance (UI), WIA Dislocated Worker (DW) programs, adult education, community colleges, Vocational Rehabilitation (VR), and veterans' workforce services.

Linkages with the Employment Service

TAA typically has very extensive linkages with ES. The linkages between TAA and ES exist at both the state and local levels, but are usually particularly strong at the local level. The main reason for these strong local-level linkages is that, in 13 of the 19 states visited for this study, local ES staff, typically funded largely by Wagner-Peyser but also partly with TAA administrative funds, administer much or all of the TAA program at the local level. Although staff from other programs, most commonly the WIA DW program, also provide some services to TAA participants in these states, local ES staff, supervised by local ES managers, typically have primary responsibility for the program at the local level and assist TAA participants with completing and submitting all paperwork required for receiving training. They also often assist participants with completing some requirements associated with their receiving Trade Readjustment Allowances (TRA), such as applying for and renewing waivers.⁵ Usually these ES staff provide Wagner-Peyser services⁶ to other customers when TAA activity is slow.

Although the TAA program often has strong overall linkages with ES, not all ES staff are as strongly involved in the partnership. For example, in Oregon, only certain ES staff are trained in how to administer the TAA program, while other ES staff receive little or no training or information on TAA. One reason for this specialization is the complexity of the TAA program;

⁵ TRA represents income support available to TAA participants who have exhausted their UI benefits, and is of two types, basic TRA and additional TRA. Workers can typically receive TRA for up to 26 weeks following their exhaustion of UI benefits, and additional TRA for the subsequent 52 weeks (and longer if the worker received remedial training). To receive basic TRA, the worker must be participating in approved training or have received a waiver from the training participation requirement. Waivers may be issued for a six-month period, but must be reviewed every 30 days. To receive additional TRA, the worker must be participating in approved training; i.e., no waivers from the training requirement can be granted.

⁶ Wagner-Peyser services typically consist of assisting customers with the use of the state's electronic job-matching system and providing them with job search assistance and local labor market information.

state TAA staff said they tried cross-training all ES staff to enable them to provide TAA services, but found that the TAA program was too complicated for this generalist approach to be successful.

Nonetheless, ES staff who are not the primary local staff administering TAA services almost always can provide TAA participants with core services, as all of the states visited except Maine require TAA participants to register with ES to receive TRA. These core services typically consist of assisting TAA participants with use of the state's electronic job-matching system and providing them with job search assistance and local labor market information.

Besides their extensive linkages at the local level, TAA and ES are also commonly linked at the state level. For example, in nine of the states visited State Workforce Agencies (SWA) house TAA and ES, as well as WIA and other workforce investment programs. Furthermore, often ES and TAA are in the same unit within the agency, and staff for both programs report to the same manager. In the remaining half of the states, ES and TAA are typically still administered by the same agency, but WIA is separate, or sometimes UI and the TRA portion of the TAA program are.

Linkages with State Unemployment Insurance Programs

In addition to its well-developed connections with ES, TAA has strong connections with state Unemployment Insurance (UI) programs. In every state visited, the TRA portion of the TAA program is administered by the staff of the state's UI agency. Often, TRA is administered by staff from a "special programs" unit of UI. States have chosen this organizational arrangement because of the similarities between TRA and UI.

This close connection, however, is usually only between the TRA portion of the TAA program and UI, since the non-TRA portions of the program (training, waiver approval, etc.) are often separated from TRA and are administered elsewhere, which can create distant or even strained relationships.

Linkages with WIA Dislocated Worker Programs

Although linkages between WIA DW programs and TAA are less developed than between TAA and ES, they have become much stronger in the several years leading up to this project's data collection. Beginning with the development of One-Stop delivery systems and the passage of WIA in the 1990s, and spurred by DOL guidance⁷ and the passage of the Trade Act of 2002, linkages between the TAA and WIA DW programs have been steadily increasing, particularly at the local level, although there is a great deal of variation by state.

⁷ See TEGL 21-00 (May 2, 2001).

Connections at the State Level

Eleven of the states visited administer the WIA DW and TAA programs within the same state division or department; in these cases, the programs share the same supervisor and their managers often hold regular meetings. In Michigan, the linkages between the WIA DW program and TAA are particularly close, as the same state staff work on both the TAA and WIA programs.

By contrast, in the remaining states the TAA program is administered in a separate agency from the WIA DW program. In these states, the TAA and WIA DW programs continue to operate quite separately, and, in at least one of these states, staff reported some coordination problems between the two.

Local Provision of Services

Although ES staff play a dominant role in the local provision of TAA services in most states, WIA DW program staff play at least some role in providing services to TAA participants in all of the states visited. WIA staff's role ranges from being very modest (in four states) to dominant (in five states), with the latter group including Kentucky, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Texas. In Kentucky, Illinois and Texas, the state has also shifted much of the responsibility for the TAA program to the organizations that administer local workforce investment areas (LWIAs). These LWIAs have passed on the responsibility for providing TAA services to the organizations they contract with to provide WIA DW services.

While in most states and local offices the role of WIA DW programs in serving TAA participants is extensive enough to require formal co-enrollment for some or many clients, a few respondents noted that the WIA program sometimes provides only core services (such as initial or basic assessments) to TAA customers who do not require formal enrollment. Respondents in at least one local office also mentioned that WIA provides workshops on topics (such as interviewing) that are also considered activities that do not require formal WIA enrollment.

To receive more than these limited core services, however, TAA participants must be formally co-enrolled in WIA. All but one of the states visited have a policy of encouraging the co-enrollment of TAA participants in WIA, and nine of the 19 states require it. However, despite state encouragement, co-enrollment rates in the states and local offices visited were mixed, with estimates ranging from less than 10 percent up to 100 percent. These state policies, as well as figures on the extent of co-enrollment, are reported in Exhibit 1.

**Exhibit 1:
Co-Enrollment with WIA Dislocated Worker Programs**

Data Collected from Site Visits Conducted 2005–2006

	Percent Co-Enrolled	State Policy on Co-Enrollment with WIA			
		State	First Local Office	Second Local Office	
Alabama	69.0%	Requires	No data	100%	Currently little
California	22.2%	Requires, but does not enforce	20%-50%	100%	100%
Georgia	34.7%	Substantial commitment	50% FY 05	No data	No data
Illinois	24.0%	Participates in DOL pilot project requiring 100% co-enrollment	43% (includes waivers)	100% (in training)	100% (in training)
Indiana	36.1%	Strongly encourages; requiring local areas to develop co-enrollment plans	8%-30%	100%	35%
Kentucky	50.4%	Participates in DOL pilot project requiring 100% co-enrollment	100% (includes waivers)	100% (in training)	100% (in training)
Maine	36.1%	Encourages	60%	No data	No data
Maryland	6.5%	No policy	Limited	No data	No data
Massachusetts	2.8%	Requires co-enrollment in at least one program	90%	100%	Not Visited
Michigan	68.5%	Encourages	53%	33%	Under 10%
Missouri	21.5%	Participates in DOL pilot project requiring 100% co-enrollment	65% (includes waivers)	90%	95%
New Jersey	6.5%	Participates in DOL pilot project requiring 100% co-enrollment	No data	No data	No data
North Carolina	17.2%	Encourages; mandated local offices to set up referral agreements between TAA and WIA	23%	43%	Less than 3%
Ohio	7.7%	Encourages; has state pilot project to increase	Limited	No data	No data
Oregon	76.4%	Encourages	Varies widely	85%-95%	85%-95%
Pennsylvania	0.1%	Participates in DOL pilot project requiring 100% co-enrollment	55% (includes waivers)	61%	75%
Tennessee	7.9%	Requires, but does not enforce	Varies widely	98%	99%
Texas	38.4%	Participates in DOL pilot project requiring 100% co-enrollment	95%	100%	100%
Washington	16.2%	Strongly encourages	67%	20%	20%

Note: Data on Percent Co-Enrolled shown in the second column are drawn from the FY 2004 Trade Act Participant Report (TAPR). Co-enrollment rates based on data collected from site visits conducted 2005–2006 are shown in the final three columns and do not include TAA participants on waivers, unless specifically noted.

WIA typically provides a wide variety of services to co-enrolled TAA participants, depending on the state, LWIA, and local One-Stop Career Center office. One of the most common services provided by WIA for TAA participants is assessment. The types of assessments provided by WIA range from informal assessments involving only a conversation between the staff member and the participant, to multi-day processes involving the application of several assessment instruments. The aim of WIA-provided assessments also varies; in most offices, they are geared towards helping participants choose a training program or provider, while in others they assess barriers or help participants choose whether or not to pursue training.

Other services provided by WIA to TAA participants include support services, case management, workshops, and job placement and follow-up services. In at least three states (Kentucky, Illinois, and Texas), WIA staff also assist TAA participants with completing required TAA paperwork (such as that involved in approving training and issuing and renewing waivers).

State and local respondents gave a number of reasons for co-enrolling TAA participants in WIA. One of the most common reasons was to comply with state and DOL policies encouraging or requiring co-enrollment. Another reason cited—reflecting more directly the benefits that co-enrollment could bring—was the belief that co-enrollment would lead to better and more comprehensive services for TAA participants. For example, several respondents noted that they co-enroll participants in WIA who need more support services or training funds than TAA can offer, while respondents in another local office reported that they co-enroll those participants who need extra help finding a job after training. A temporary lack of TAA funding was another reason for co-enrollment that was cited, and others mentioned that co-enrolling participants was necessary for those served by a dual enrollment National Emergency Grant (NEG).

The timing of the co-enrollment of TAA participants in WIA DW programs also varied by state and local office. Most commonly, the co-enrollment of TAA participants in the WIA DW program occurred shortly after participants indicated an interest in training. By contrast, only a few local offices typically co-enroll either earlier than this or much later—that is, either before the participant decides to enroll in training or, at the other extreme, near the conclusion of a training program so that WIA can help with placement and follow-up services.

Since serving co-enrolled participants involves both greater complexity and shared accountability, co-enrollment partnerships have often resulted in changes in the way line staff work together. Examples of such changes include pairing a WIA case manager with an ES/TAA staff person, and appointing a WIA staff person in each One-Stop Career Center to take charge of coordinating services for co-enrolled participants.

Linkages with Other One-Stop Career Center Partners

Although linkages between TAA and other One-Stop Career Center partners—such as adult education (WIA Title II recipients), community colleges, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Veterans’ Employment and Training programs—are not as strong as with ES, UI, or WIA, they are critical to providing certain groups of TAA participants with the services they need to be successful. Linkages between each of these partners and TAA are discussed below.

Extent of Linkages with Community and Technical Colleges

Other than ES, UI, and WIA, TAA has the most extensive linkages with community and technical colleges. These institutions are linked to the TAA program in three primary ways: (1) as the primary provider of vocational or occupational training to TAA participants; (2) as a partner in local One-Stop delivery systems; and (3) as a provider of remedial education services for TAA participants.

Community and technical colleges are most commonly linked to the TAA program in the first of these ways. In nearly all of the states visited, respondents said that the most common provider of occupational training for TAA participants is the local community or technical college. In fact, in some rural areas, community and technical colleges are nearly the only local training provider and, consequently, provide the vast majority of training for TAA participants. As part of their role as training provider, many community colleges also offer their students placement services, usually via a campus career center, and access to college career counselors.

In some areas, especially where the local community college provides nearly all training for TAA participants, local TAA staff sometimes develop a particularly close relationship with the college. In such cases, local college staff may become so knowledgeable about TAA and have such strong linkages with local TAA staff that they routinely complete certain required TAA forms on behalf of their customers. These college staff members, usually located in the college’s financial aid office, often also regularly notify TAA staff about participants’ attendance problems. In addition, when participants lack a clear idea of what career objective or training program they should pursue, the college’s counselors may provide participants with assistance in choosing a training program.

In areas where the local community college has a particularly close relationship with the local One-Stop delivery system, TAA and WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker program representatives may also work with the college to develop short-term vocational programs targeted particularly to TAA and WIA participants. For example, in Spokane, Washington, the TAA manager is working with the local community college to establish a Vocational English-as-a-Second Language (VESL) training course specifically for TAA participants.

Another way that the TAA program and community and technical colleges are linked is through their partnerships in local One-Stop delivery systems. Since they typically receive funding from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, community and technical colleges are often required One-Stop Career Center partners. Consequently, there is often some systematic interaction between the TAA program and community college staff related to the partnership function. For example, local colleges sometimes locate their staff at One-Stop Career Centers or even provide classes on-site. When they do so, TAA and college staff have more opportunities to interact, which deepens relationships between the two programs.

A final way that community and technical colleges are linked to the TAA program is that the colleges are sometimes providers of adult education services to One-Stop Career Center customers. This linkage is discussed in the next section.

Extent of Linkages with Adult Education (WIA Title II Providers)

Another set of organizations with moderately extensive linkages with TAA is made up of adult education providers (recipients of WIA Title II funding). These adult education providers—local school districts, nonprofits, and sometimes community colleges—are required One-Stop Career Center partners. As such, there is often at least the basic measure of coordination that One-Stop Career Center partnerships bring. These relationships are deepened at some One-Stop Career Centers where local adult education providers have located staff on-site or even offer on-site classes in Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Equivalency Diploma (GED), and English-as-a-Second Language (ESL). For example, Baltimore Community College in Baltimore, Maryland, offers remedial classes and services on-site at One-Stop Career Centers.

Beyond this basic type of connection, stronger linkages between TAA and adult education providers often come about because a substantial minority of TAA participants need ABE, GED preparation, or ESL to be successful in completing occupational training and finding employment. Although precise statistics are hard to come by, estimates from TAA respondents of the size of this population range from a low of about 10 percent in some local offices to a high of 80 percent in other local offices. This remedial education is typically provided by an adult education provider, either separately prior to enrollment in occupational training or as a part of a participant's broader training plan. In One-Stop Career Centers where adult education staff provide remedial education to TAA participants on-site, the linkages between TAA and adult education are likely to be particularly strong. Sometimes, too, TAA programs partner with local adult education providers to administer basic skills assessment tests to TAA participants prior to the beginning of training to determine whether remedial education is necessary. This is the case, for example, with the TAA program in Elizabethtown, Kentucky.

Extent of Linkages with Vocational Rehabilitation

TAA programs typically have limited involvement with Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) programs. In fact, with one exception, respondents all reported minimal co-enrollment rates between these programs. They gave several reasons for this. First, they noted that typically few TAA participants also qualify for VR (although they pointed out that this varies by layoff). Second, respondents mentioned that VR programs often have very limited funding and this often generates a long waiting list for services among those eligible. In Maine, for example, TAA respondents pointed to a six-month to one-year waiting list for VR services. Finally, despite being a mandatory One-Stop Career Center partner, VR is often not well integrated into local One-Stop Career Centers. For example, VR staff are often not co-located at One-Stop Career Centers or are available only limited hours. Consequently, TAA staff at these One-Stop Career Centers have only limited opportunities for interacting or developing relationships with VR staff.

Extent of Linkages with Veteran's Employment and Training Services

Finally, TAA programs also have some linkages with veterans' workforce services, primarily programs funded by DOL's Veterans' Employment and Training Service. These services include job search assistance and training for qualified veterans. Typically, if TAA participants are eligible, they are co-enrolled in a veterans' program and receive services from Local Veterans' Employment Representatives (LVER) or Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program (DVOP) specialists.

Some states have become very aggressive in ensuring that eligible TAA participants receive services from veterans' programs. For example, Kentucky requires that all eligible veterans be co-enrolled and receive training from the veterans' state grant program rather than TAA. However, in most states and local offices, linkages with veterans' workforce services are fairly limited for several reasons. First, as with VR, relatively few TAA participants are eligible for veterans' workforce services, although this again varies by layoff. In addition, many DVOP and LVER staff serve multiple One-Stop Career Centers and, consequently, are on-site for relatively few hours, limiting the potential for interaction between TAA staff and veterans' services staff.

Extent of Linkages with Economic Development Agencies

Generally, the TAA program does not have the staffing or resources, particularly at the local level, to have direct linkages with economic development efforts. Instead, it generally relies on its major partners for these linkages, particularly those partners that also provide services to TAA participants, usually ES or WIA. Consequently, the better these partner programs are linked with economic development, the more the TAA program is also linked.

Although the evaluation did not explore the nature of the relationships that ES and WIA have established with economic development agencies, other research has shown that these efforts vary extensively by state and local office or LWIA. In addition, past research also indicates that some Local Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs) have developed extensive linkages with local economic development partners.⁸ For example, a number of local areas have invited representatives from local economic development agencies to join their LWIBs. In addition, some local ES and WIA programs have begun working with local economic development agencies to better identify and access new local employment opportunities, particularly in emerging and high growth areas.

In addition to this connection via the activities of local ES and WIA programs, many TAA programs are also indirectly connected to economic development via Rapid Response programs. Although Rapid Response initiatives are typically not directly managed by TAA, TAA staff are usually involved in all Rapid Response efforts that involve layoffs due to the impact of foreign trade.

There are a number of ways in which Rapid Response programs are linked to economic development. One common linkage is for states to include representatives from economic development agencies on their Rapid Response teams—or at least inform those agencies of impending layoffs or closings. In addition, states also have aversion programs as part of their Rapid Response efforts. These programs assist employers in averting layoffs or closings by providing funding for buyout feasibility studies or incumbent worker training, and through loans and tax relief. For example, in Maine, staff from the Tri-County Workforce Investment Board connect interested firms with the New England Trade Adjustment Assistance Center (NETAAC), a non-profit organization located in Lowell, Massachusetts, that administers a diagnostic survey for affected firms and uses the information to assist companies in becoming more profitable. NETAAC also conducts skill assessments to facilitate the movement of employees from untenable or unprofitable roles within a company to other positions.

Another way that some state and local Rapid Response programs are connected to economic development is through their efforts to immediately connect laid-off workers with growing companies in the same area that are looking for employees. For example, Massachusetts's Rapid Response staff has become very aggressive in developing relationships with the human resources departments of growing firms so that they can market newly laid-off workers to them. Similarly, in Texas, LWIAs try to involve their job developers in Rapid Response efforts so that those staff can be well prepared to market laid-off workers to businesses with hiring needs.

⁸ See Social Policy Research Associates, *Business as Partner and Customer under WIA: A Study of Innovative Practices* (June 2004), prepared for DOL, as part of SPR's *National Evaluation of the Implementation of WIA*.

In addition to the indirect connection between the TAA program and economic development via LWIA or Rapid Response efforts, certain TAA training practices are also related to economic development efforts. These practices are discussed in the remainder of this section, beginning with TAA's use of employer-based training and followed by the requirement that TAA training be in occupations with strong local demand.

Employer-Based Training

TAA can be better connected with employer needs and economic development through the use of employer-based training (EBT), which may include on-the-job training (OJT) and customized training. Prior to the Trade Act of 2002, the TAA program had already prioritized the use of OJT. The Act then attempted to make EBT an even more viable option for TAA participants by specifically allowing customized training and removing the requirement that employers must employ OJT recipients for at least 26 weeks after completion of training.

Despite these changes, the use of EBT still appears to be very limited. Based on TAPR results from July 1999 through June 2003, the use of OJT appears to have declined slightly following enactment of the Trade Act of 2002 (see Exhibit 2, below). Furthermore, during the site visits, states and local offices reported only a handful of participants in OJT and no respondents said they had provided customized training for TAA participants.

Respondents provided a number of reasons for the low use of EBT. A common reason is that employers are not interested in EBT due to the cost, the amount of paperwork required, and the fact that they often have enough applicants who already have the right skills. Similarly, some respondents said that TAA participants are also not interested in OJT because they cannot receive TRA while in OJT. Another common reason for the low use of EBT is that TAA staff are too busy to nurture the relationships with employers that are needed to develop OJT slots. In addition, staff do not know how to set up and monitor OJT contracts. (To remedy the lack of knowledge around OJT contracts, Ohio and Pennsylvania are working to train TAA staff on how to develop and monitor OJT contracts). Lastly, a few respondents offered other reasons for the limited use of OJT, among them that some staff have found it hard to set up OJT contracts prior to program deadlines, that OJT is often too short to meet state training guidelines, that the selection of workers who are suitable for OJT programs excludes the many low-skilled TAA participants, that unions have objected to OJT contracts, and that the retention of OJT participants has been disappointingly low.

**Exhibit 2:
TAA Program's Use of OJT, 1999-2003**

	Of All TAA Exiters:	
	Number who received OJT	Percentage who received OJT
7/99 to 6/00	1,223	5.31%
7/00 to 6/01	957	4.24
7/01 to 6/02	870	3.23
7/02 to 6/03	1,063	2.73

Source: DOL Trade Act Participant Report.

Although current usage is still low, OJT has increased slightly in some states as co-enrollment with WIA DW programs has increased. Respondents attributed these small increases to the fact that WIA programs typically have much more experience with OJT and often have designated staff who conduct outreach to employers and know how to write and monitor OJT contracts. However, in many states, WIA makes little use of OJT, so co-enrollment is unlikely to make a difference.

Requiring Training in Demand Occupations

Another way that TAA programs can ensure that they are meeting the needs of growing industries and fostering economic development is to require that TAA participants only enroll in training for occupations that are in demand in the local labor market. In fact, the Trade Act of 2002 includes the requirement that there be "...a reasonable expectation of employment following completion of ...training,"⁹ mimicking a requirement in place in WIA DW programs.¹⁰ For example, in Baltimore, Maryland, where TAA services are provided by the local WIA operator, five major growth clusters have been identified for the city and all training for either WIA or TAA participants must be within one of those clusters.¹¹

When WIA and TAA have differing policies in this area, problems can result. At one local office, for example, WIA's strict requirement that participants choose training only in occupations in demand combined with TAA's policy of making exceptions creates a barrier to

⁹ 19 USC 2296 (a)(1)(C).

¹⁰ WIA Sec. 134 (d)(4)(A)(iii).

¹¹ These clusters are information technology, health care and bioscience, construction, business services, and hospitality and tourism.

co-enrollment. If a TAA participant wants to enter a training program in a non-demand occupation, the TAA program will approve the training if the customer obtains a letter from an employer stating that the participant will be hired on completion. However, because the local WIA program does not make exceptions to allowing training only in demand occupations, the TAA participant cannot be co-enrolled in WIA.

Factors that Support Linkages

As discussed in a previous section, the TAA program has well-developed linkages with a number of other workforce investment programs, but the extent of these linkages varies by program, state, local area, and even One-Stop Career Center. This wide variation can be correlated with the presence or absence of one or more key factors that support linkages. These factors include certain types of administrative arrangements, particular state or local policy initiatives, structures coordinating workforce development, and combined workforce development management information systems (MIS). Each of these factors is explored in detail in the following section.

Administrative Arrangements for TAA

The ways in which states and local areas choose to administer the TAA program has a profound effect on the linkages established between TAA and other workforce programs. For example, the decision by a state concerning where to locate the TAA program at the state level has important consequences for the TAA program's relationships with other workforce programs. When a state chooses to locate the TAA program within the same agency as ES, UI, and WIA, relations between those programs are typically closer than if the programs are located in different agencies. Alternatively, when TAA is in an agency separate from that of some of its key partners, formal interagency structures or agreements can be developed to ensure coordination between programs. For example, in Oregon, where TAA is administered by the Oregon Employment Department (along with ES and UI) but WIA is administered by the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development, the WIA and TAA programs completed an interagency memorandum of understanding in 1999. In addition, to ensure that partner programs work well together, the state has a Workforce Policy Cabinet that includes the heads of all major workforce development agencies.

However, just because a state locates the TAA program in the same agency as that of other workforce programs or forges interagency agreements does not guarantee that those programs will be well coordinated. Instead, in several states where all of the major workforce programs—TAA, TRA, UI, ES and WIA—are located in the same agency, numerous state and local respondents reported that those programs still do not work together well. Further, unless the

same staff administers partner programs, there is typically still a need for formal coordinating structures or arrangements even within the same agencies. For example, in Michigan, to ensure coordination between WIA, TAA and ES, the state placed all of those programs under the same supervisor, and this supervisor has instituted regular meetings of the programs' managers.

At the local level, the administrative arrangement that has the strongest effect on linkages with TAA is the decision about which partner program will provide services to local TAA participants. For example, as discussed above, ES staff provide local TAA services in 13 of the 19 states visited. In these states, the relationship between ES and TAA is typically very close, particularly in those offices where the same staff provide both TAA and ES services. In those situations, the provision of ES and TAA services is seamless to the customer. Similarly, in the five states where WIA staff play a dominant role in providing local TAA services, linkages between TAA and WIA are also very close.

Finally, a few states (Kentucky, Illinois, Michigan, and Texas) leave the decision about how to provide local TAA services to LWIAs. In these states, LWIAs receive allocations from the state for TAA and can contract with whichever local provider they deem most suitable. This administrative structure, relatively recent and still not widespread, carries with it the potential for very tight linkages between TAA and WIA. LWIAs can choose to have the same local organization that provides TAA services also provide WIA or other partner program services, making possible a truly seamless integration of services at the local level.¹²

State and Local Policy Initiatives Supporting Linkages

State or local policy initiatives designed to promote coordination or integration have major implications for linkages between TAA and other workforce programs. At the sites visited, two such policy initiatives were common: (1) those requiring or supporting better integration in local One-Stop delivery systems, and (2) those requiring or encouraging co-enrollment, particularly between TAA and WIA DW programs.

Virtually every state has carried out policy initiatives aimed at strengthening the integration of all workforce programs—including TAA—through local One-Stop delivery systems. For example, Pennsylvania undertook a large-scale integration effort involving a number of policy initiatives, including implementing a TAA cross-training program, establishing a quality review process that examined integration, developing a more integrated MIS, and establishing a staff credentialing program allowing for more flexible job descriptions to accommodate increased integration. To take another example, Washington has issued several policy initiatives related to overall

integration, including upgrading the state's shared MIS, implementing a cross-training program, and requiring that One-Stop Career Centers develop cross-functional teams as part of the state's GMAP process.¹³

Related to these overall integration efforts, the majority of states also have policies encouraging or requiring co-enrollment, particularly between TAA and WIA DW programs. As was previously described in Exhibit 1, nine states require co-enrollment, and all but one of the remaining 10 at least encourage it. Six states—Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Texas—also decided to participate in the DOL WIA and TAA Co-enrollment Pilot Project. The pilot project, which was conducted in the fall of 2005 through the end of 2006, required that participating states agree to enroll all TAA participants in the WIA DW program and provided the states with technical assistance to facilitate co-enrollment. In a separate effort, Ohio has also implemented its own pilot project involving increased co-enrollment in two of its LWIAs.

Besides these overall co-enrollment policies, a number of states have also implemented smaller-scale policies aimed at making co-enrollment easier. For example, to help ensure that locals are seriously implementing co-enrollment, Indiana is requiring its LWIAs to develop formal co-enrollment plans. Washington is also revising its TAA manual to make TAA procedures overall more like those of WIA. Other examples of state policies that assist co-enrollment include: (1) requiring TAA participants to choose training programs on the WIA eligible training provider list, (2) requiring participants to choose training programs only for occupations in demand, (3) requiring that WIA DW programs and TAA use the same forms for attendance sheets or training plans, and (4) allowing local areas to set the same training expenditure caps for TAA as for WIA.

Workforce Development Coordinating Structures

Creating workforce development coordinating structures is another way that states and local areas facilitate linkages between TAA and other workforce development programs. These structures can exist at the state level, the local level, or both; they serve as institutionalized channels allowing programs to communicate and work together on a regular basis, thus deepening their linkages. State-level structures, such as coordinating bodies and agreements, have already been discussed in the section on administrative structures above. Three other

¹² Michigan also allows LWIAs control over how local Wagner-Peyser services are provided, as long as the chosen provider is a public agency with merit-based staffing, such as a city, county or school district.

¹³ GMAP, or Government Management Accountability and Performance, represents a state initiative to have state agencies measure and improve their performance and achieve demonstrable results.

structures promoting coordination will be discussed in this section: local One-Stop delivery systems, state-local coordinating bodies, and Rapid Response.

One-Stop Delivery Systems

When operating as it should, the local One-Stop delivery system links separately funded workforce programs and allows them to coordinate service delivery. The One-Stop delivery system was codified as Federal law and policy by WIA, which designated 17 Federal programs, including TAA, as required One-Stop Career Center partners.¹⁴ As required by DOL in TEGL 11-02, local TAA services are delivered out of One-Stop Career Centers; therefore, the One-Stop delivery system serves as an important means for linking TAA with its partners.¹⁵

Since WIA gave states and locals substantial flexibility in designing their One-Stop delivery systems to meet local needs, they differ markedly by state and even by local area. One way in which these systems vary is in the level of coordination between partners. For example, in some One-Stop delivery systems, partners continue to operate their programs quite separately, while in others partners have developed seamlessly integrated service delivery systems. These latter types of One-Stop delivery systems play a critical role in supporting increased and deeper linkages between TAA and other workforce programs.

One way that programs develop stronger linkages via local One-Stop delivery systems is by co-locating TAA and partner staff at local One-Stop Career Centers. Currently, the vast majority of staff who provide local TAA services are co-located at One-Stop Career Centers that also have staff from other workforce development programs, such as ES or WIA. By contrast, co-location with staff from adult education, VR, and veterans' workforce programs is somewhat less common. Respondents noted that co-location improved linkages by helping partners get to know each other better, which in turn makes information-sharing, referrals, and co-enrollment easier, and provides opportunities for integrated service delivery. By contrast, in the few offices where

¹⁴ Other required partners include: WIA Title I.B programs, Job Corps, WIA Native American programs, WIA migrant and seasonal farmworker programs, Veterans' workforce programs, Wagner-Peyser Act programs, Adult education and literacy activities authorized under WIA Title II, programs authorized under Parts A and B of the Rehabilitation Act (Vocational Rehabilitation), welfare-to-work programs, Senior community service employment activities under Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, postsecondary vocational education activities under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Community Services Block Grant employment and training programs, employment and training programs carried out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and state unemployment compensation programs. See Workforce Investment Act, Final Rules, 20 CFR Part 662.200, Federal Register, August 11, 2000.

¹⁵ At least some local services are provided out of One-Stop Career Centers in all of the states visited, but in some states, certain services, such as contacting potentially eligible workers and determining eligibility, have been centralized and are handled out of centralized call centers, typically operated by the state's UI agency.

TAA staff are not co-located with staff from other programs, respondents noted the difficulties TAA staff have in coordinating services.

However, co-location by itself does not guarantee strong coordination between programs. In a few sites, for example, individual workforce programs and staff are located in the same building but seldom communicate and still run their programs very separately. The import of this fact is clear: co-located One-Stop Career Center partners need to develop ways of linking and working together.

One way they do so is to ensure that there is regular communication, both formal and informal, between staff of different programs. To create opportunities for regular informal communication, One-Stop Career Centers often locate line staff from different programs near each other and encourage staff to work together. Similarly, to provide occasions for formal communication, staff from different programs—both line staff and managers—will hold regular meetings. For example, in Baltimore, Maryland, the local One-Stop Career Centers hold weekly staff meetings, while at the Sheffield CareerLink in Alabama, co-located partner program managers hold regular meetings to discuss center management. In addition to these more general meetings, One-Stop Career Centers sometimes also hold more formal cross-training sessions for staff. For example, in May 2003, all staff at the Millinocket East One-Stop Career Center in Maine went through an extensive cross-training process.

Going one step further, co-location of staff at One-Stop Career Centers also provides programs with opportunities to develop coordinated service delivery systems. Many One-Stop Career Centers, such as the ones in the Kent/Allegan Workforce Investment Area in Michigan, have shared reception and intake for all of their programs. At other One-Stop Career Centers, programs share delivery of core services, such as basic workshops or initial assessments. In addition, as discussed above, many states and local offices also co-enroll TAA participants in partner programs, particularly ES and WIA DW programs. For co-enrolled participants, the staff of partner programs are jointly accountable for participant outcomes, typically provide participants with substantial services, and work together to ensure that participants' needs are met but that services are not duplicated. In several areas, staff working with co-enrolled participants are paired or the One-Stop Career Center holds joint meetings of case managers.

Beyond this basic kind of coordinated service, co-location and co-enrollment can also lead to truly integrated and seamless services. For example, in the Gulf Coast LWIA in Texas, staff from ES, WIA, and TAA are organized into functional teams: Employment Counselors, Personal Service Specialists, Financial Aid Specialists, Resource Room Specialists, and Receptionists/Greeters. In Pennsylvania, several local areas have integrated One-Stop Career

Centers; for example, in the Lehigh Valley area, all staff take turns serving customers “deli-style,” while in the Westmoreland-Fayette area individual staff serve all customers whose names start with certain letters of the alphabet, regardless of program.

There are three limitations to the local One-Stop delivery system’s ability to strengthen linkages between the TAA program and other workforce development systems. First, since TAA has direct control over few or no local staff and typically no local managers, its involvement in local One-Stop delivery systems is usually heavily reliant on the involvement of the partner that provides or supervises local TAA services, usually ES or WIA. Second, due primarily to the uneven nature of trade-related layoff activity as well as state decisions about how to administer local TAA services, not all One-Stop Career Centers offer TAA services. For example, in Oregon, local TAA staff are concentrated in only a few One-Stop Career Centers, while, in New Jersey, TAA staff are based at the state level but travel around to One-Stop Career Centers as needed. One-Stop Career Centers that do not offer TAA services or have TAA staff, as in these cases, cannot very well serve as structures in which to develop linkages between TAA and other partners. Third, since UI has almost universally withdrawn from involvement in local One-Stop Career Centers, the TRA portion of the TAA program (operated by UI) is also no longer present in the One-Stop Career Center. As a result, well-integrated One-Stop delivery systems can only assist in strengthening linkages with the parts of the TAA program not involved with dispensing TRA benefits, rather than with the TAA program overall.

State-Local Coordination Efforts

State-local coordination bodies or state-wide cross-training efforts represent other mechanisms used to help create and strengthen linkages between TAA and partner programs. One common type of state-local coordination body consists of groups of LWIA directors who meet with state workforce development staff—including TAA staff—on a regular basis to discuss policy issues. These groups serve as formal, institutionalized ways for LWIA managers to communicate with state TAA staff. According to state respondents, the TAA program is increasingly on the agenda at these types of meetings, as LWIAs, and the WIA programs that they are directly responsible for, are becoming more directly involved with TAA.

Another common type of state-local coordinating effort is temporary committees or workgroups, made up of local representatives and state officials, that are designed to accomplish a particular task. These groups also often provide opportunities for local WIA staff to work with state TAA staff. For example, Kentucky set up a work group related to transitioning control of TAA from ES to LWIAs, while Ohio has created a state-local work team to come up with ways to better integrate TAA into local One-Stop delivery systems.

State-wide cross-training programs are also used to foster better linkages between TAA and its partners. These efforts are similar to the cross-training described earlier in this paper that takes place at One-Stop Career Centers but are carried out on a much wider scale. While in some states these cross-training efforts have been aimed at staff from all workforce programs, others have particularly focused on educating ES or WIA DW staff about the TAA program. For example, in preparation for giving LWIAs control of the TAA program at the local level, Illinois held a number of training sessions specifically on the TAA program for WIA staff.

Coordinated Rapid Response

A third structure that helps to develop linkages between the TAA program and other workforce programs is coordinated Rapid Response. In most states, Rapid Response is a team effort staffed by representatives from key workforce development partners at both the state and local levels. These teams usually involve designated Rapid Response staff, as well as representatives from ES, UI, the WIA DW program, and local One-Stop Career Centers. TAA staff are also usually involved if a layoff is TAA-certified, or even if trade is only suspected to be involved. Sometimes representatives from adult education, economic development, VR, veterans' workforce services, and community colleges are also involved. The involvement of such a broad group of workforce development partners makes Rapid Response efforts another structure through which the TAA program can develop linkages with its partners.¹⁶

Combined Management Information Systems

Another factor that typically supports the development of strong linkages between the TAA program and other workforce development partners is a combined state MIS. During the data collection for this study, eight states reported that they used combined MISs for all workforce development programs. Having a shared MIS makes it easier for TAA staff to work with other partner staff, particularly regarding co-enrolled participants. Sometimes these integrated systems have space for client case notes and allow staff from partner programs to view them. For example, in Illinois, partner staff have access to partner MIS modules on a read-only basis to allow staff to see what services have been provided to co-enrolled participants.

Some integrated systems also keep track of which participants are co-enrolled and allow staff to run detailed co-enrollment reports. For example, the Pennsylvania system enables staff to run reports showing co-enrollment by type of participant and WIA enrollment status.

¹⁶ For more information on how Rapid Response supports the TAA program, see the companion paper *TAA and Rapid Response*, also produced as part of the Occasional Paper series.

In states where there is no combined workforce MIS, staff at the local level sometimes devise ways to improvise the features of a shared MIS so that they can work together better. For example, at the Sunnyvale Connect! Job Seeker Center in California, local TAA staff enter information about co-enrolled TAA participants into the state's WIA MIS so that WIA staff can view the information and keep up-to-date on the participant's progress.

Challenges to Developing and Maintaining Linkages

Despite the existence of the many factors described above that support the development of linkages between TAA and other workforce development programs, there are a number of remaining challenges. While some of these challenges are related to the development of linkages between TAA and all workforce development partners, others are specific to linkages with WIA. Both of these types of challenges are discussed in the following section.

Challenges Related to Linkages with Any Workforce Program

Challenges that relate to developing and maintaining linkages between TAA and all other workforce and economic development programs have three underlying causes: very limited TAA staffing resources at the local level, lack of local support and infrastructure for linkages, and difficulties related to linkages between programs with different rules and regulations.

Lack of Local TAA Staffing

One of the major challenges to developing and maintaining linkages between TAA and other workforce development partners is that TAA has so little administrative funding to pay for staffing, particularly at the local level. For this reason, as discussed above, most staff who provide local-level TAA services are line staff whose time is either partly or completely funded by other programs, which limits their availability to reach out to potential partners as a representative of the TAA program.

The absence of TAA program managers at the local level also hinders the TAA program's ability to develop strong linkages. Often linkages with partners are initiated or developed by local managers. But because TAA has almost no dedicated local managers, decisions about whether to develop linkages are typically in the hands of local ES or WIA managers, who are likely to focus much more on the needs of their own programs than on those of TAA. Consequently, if reaching out to economic development efforts is a major local ES or WIA priority, and that program provides local TAA services, then TAA may develop good linkages in those areas, but only as a byproduct of the partner program's efforts.

Lack of Infrastructure in the State or Local Area for Linkages

TAA programs face heavy challenges in trying to effectively reach out and coordinate service delivery with other programs when the state or local infrastructure that would support linkages is not in place. As discussed in the previous section, several such factors are critical. At the state level, these factors include formal coordinating structures (such as regular meetings or interagency coordination bodies), coordinated Rapid Response efforts, and a unified MIS; at the local level, they include a well-functioning, integrated One-Stop delivery system.

Dealing with Different Program Rules and Regulations

Finally, another set of challenges the TAA program faces in developing linkages relates to the complex nature of the program and the differences between it and other workforce programs. For example, several respondents noted how difficult it is to have partners fully understand the complex eligibility requirements and deadlines of the TAA program. This complexity makes it very difficult for states and local offices to carry out effective cross-training. This challenge is further complicated by the fact that TAA activity is typically spread unevenly around the state, so some partner program staff may have little exposure to the TAA program.

Conversely, TAA staff sometimes have difficulties understanding their partner programs' different rules and requirements. For example, when TAA is working with co-enrolled WIA participants, TAA staff have to become familiar with WIA requirements such as the eligible training provider list, demand occupations requirements, training caps, and performance measures. Several respondents noted that this information can be difficult to master for staff not working with these requirements every day.

Another challenge related to program differences is the fact that local TAA programs may not serve the same geographic areas as their partners. Although TAA service boundaries are the same as those for ES in the many states where ES staff provide local TAA services, LWIA boundaries—which delineate WIA service areas—are often different from ES boundaries. Consequently, sometimes even partner staff at the same One-Stop Career Center may not be able to serve all of the same participants. This often causes confusion for both co-located staff and co-enrolled participants.

Challenges Specific to Developing Linkages between TAA and WIA

In addition to the general challenges of developing linkages between TAA and other workforce and economic development partners, there are a few challenges that are specific to developing linkages between TAA and WIA. These challenges arise from two sources: the difficulty of coordinating a state-run program (TAA) with a locally-driven program (WIA), and issues related to WIA's performance measures.

In states where TAA is very state-driven, it can be very challenging for the TAA program to develop strong linkages with local WIA programs. One major reason for this is that policy decisions for TAA and WIA are made at different levels, so there is often little direct staff discussion between the partners regarding these policies before they are implemented. WIA policy is often made at the LWIA level, where there is little or no TAA representation. And even when TAA is represented—typically by a local ES manager—that TAA representative often does not have the authority to speak for the TAA program and may or may not clearly understand TAA issues. Conversely, when TAA policy decisions are made at the state level, there is almost never an opportunity for review or discussions of such decisions by local WIA staff prior to implementation.

Furthermore, TAA state staff almost never have the time to develop the close relationships with all LWIAs or WIA DW program providers that lead to especially strong linkages. Consequently, LWIAs often have very different levels of understanding and buy-in related to linkages with the TAA program. This has certainly been true in the uneven implementation of the DOL WIA and TAA Co-enrollment Pilot Project, discussed earlier. In addition, limited opportunities for interaction between state TAA staff and local WIA staff mean that local staff sometimes do not clearly understand state TAA policies and do not feel that TAA staff are responsive to questions.

Another major challenge to linkages between TAA and WIA DW programs is related to WIA's high-stakes performance measures. Due to the setting of both local and state performance standards for WIA programs and the tying of incentives and sanctions to those standards, achievement of performance goals is very important to local and state WIA program managers. Consequently, many WIA programs have been very resistant to co-enrolling TAA customers who they feel will hurt their chances of achieving high performance. Numerous WIA respondents said that they often will not agree to co-enroll TAA participants because of performance concerns, particularly the concern that TAA participants will not be able to achieve WIA's earnings change performance measure goals. However, the national TAA office has begun to emphasize performance much more strongly¹⁷ and the earnings-change WIA measure has been replaced by a simple post-program earnings measure; both of these steps should serve to lessen the performance concerns raised by WIA respondents.¹⁸

¹⁷ For example, TEGL 32-04, issued in 2005, made clear that TAA programs were expected to focus on achieving high performance.

¹⁸ Under the Common Measures implemented in Program Year 2006, WIA DW programs will be measured on participants' earnings in the second and third quarter after exit, rather than the difference between earnings in the second and third quarters prior to participation as compared to the second and third quarters after exit.

Conclusions

In many states and local One-Stop Career Centers, the TAA program has developed strong and extensive linkages with certain workforce development programs, particularly ES, UI, and the WIA DW program. Due to both state and Federal encouragement, linkages between TAA and the WIA DW program, in particular, appear to be increasing around the country. These linkages are in evidence at the state level as well as at local One-Stop Career Centers and in state-local efforts such as Rapid Response.

These strong and—in the case of WIA—growing linkages are likely to have an important effect on the TAA program. The hope is that by better coordinating service delivery between TAA, WIA, ES, and UI, services to TAA participants will improve and participants will be able to receive all of the services and supports they need to succeed. The net impact analysis associated with the National TAA Evaluation should provide some insight into the impact of this increased coordination on participant outcomes.

Despite the evidence of strong collaboration between TAA and ES, UI, and WIA, the linkages between the TAA program and some other workforce development programs, particularly VR and veterans' workforce services, are relatively weak. However, it may be that these weaker linkages are appropriate given that only a few TAA participants need or are eligible for the services these partners provide.

By contrast, negative implications for TAA participants are much more likely to arise from the lack of strong linkages between the TAA program and local economic development efforts, coupled with the limited usage of demand-focused practices such as EBT or clear policies requiring training in demand occupations. Without stronger linkages with economic development efforts and a clearer focus on the demand side of the labor market, the TAA program is unlikely to be as effective as it could be in assisting participants with finding long-term employment.

Fortunately, because of the growing emphasis of WIA programs on forging partnerships with employers and local economic development efforts, the TAA program may be able to simultaneously improve its connections to local employers and economic development efforts simply by developing stronger linkages with WIA DW programs. This will likely help the TAA program to be more effective in meeting the needs of TAA participants and possibly improve the program's performance.

This paper has identified a number of important factors that contribute to the TAA program's ability to develop strong linkages with its One-Stop partners. Beyond the extensive Federal guidance that has been issued promoting the coordination of services, these include formal

administrative arrangements that bring partners together, state and local-level initiatives that strongly promote coordination, the One-Stop delivery system itself (including the co-location of partners), and a consolidated MIS that enables partners to track participants' progress. Factors impeding stronger linkages, by contrast, include the TAA program's limited staffing, constraints on the use of funds for non-training services, and program rules and requirements that are not aligned across the partners.

Appendix: List of Site Visits Conducted

The site visits on which the findings in this paper are based were conducted in 2005 and 2006. Site visits completed as of the writing of this paper are shown in Exhibit A-1; included for each state is the estimated percentage of all TAA participants nationwide that are represented by that state. Additional site visits are planned in the evaluation's subsequent years.

**Exhibit A-1:
States and Local Offices Visited**

State Office	Estimated Percent of TAA Participants	Local Offices
Alabama	3.5%	Opelika, Sheffield, Tuscaloosa
California	5.6%	Huntington Park, Sunnyvale, Santa Rosa
Georgia	3.9%	Rome
Illinois	3.7%	Arlington, North Aurora
Indiana	2.4%	Auburn, Gary
Kentucky	2.5%	Elizabethtown, Richmond, Somerset/Russell Springs
Maine	1.0%	Bangor, East Millinocket
Maryland	0.4%	Baltimore, Hagerstown
Massachusetts	1.8%	Holyoke
Michigan	3.6%	Allegan, Livingstone, Troy
Missouri	2.2%	Chillicothe, St. Joseph
New Jersey	2.1%	Middlesex
North Carolina	9.4%	Aberdeen, Asheboro, Wilson
Ohio	4.0%	Columbiana, Dayton
Oregon	2.0%	Lane, Portland West
Pennsylvania	6.7%	Lawrence, Montgomery, York
Tennessee	4.1%	Knoxville, Mid-South
Texas	7.0%	Conroe, Richardson
Washington	2.2%	Spokane, Vancouver