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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of welfare reform on charitable organizations in Utah. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed, along with administrative and published data. All charitable welfare organizations in Utah were surveyed, with the exception of bishops of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). However, other LDS data were collected. Respondents to the initial questionnaire were sent additional surveys, designed to measure the impact of the implementation of time limits on their organizational capacity. Respondents to the surveys represent approximately one-ninth of the welfare charitable leaders and organizations in Utah.

Major findings include:

I. Description of the Charitable Welfare Sector in Utah:

A. The charitable sector consists of three segments: social service nonprofit organizations, the welfare activities of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and religious congregations not affiliated with the LDS faith.

B. Using standard comparative measures, the LDS welfare subsector was found to approximate two-thirds of the charitable welfare activities in the state of Utah.

C. As is the case of other states, religious organizations provide the vast majority of charitable welfare services in Utah. Typically, religious affiliation (or non-affiliation) is not a factor in granting assistance.

D. The charitable welfare sector in Utah represents a variety of organizations that form a strong collaborative partnership to assist those in need. These organizations know the services and expertise of one another and freely refer petitioners across religious, nonprofit, and government agency lines. These organizations also provide support (financial, volunteer, and goods) to one another.

E. Religious leaders reported knowing far less about changes in welfare policy than do leaders of social service nonprofit organizations.

F. Social service nonprofit organizations maintain better records of characteristics of those served and types of services rendered, than do religious organizations.

G. Members of religious congregations render substantial spontaneous assistance to others in the congregation who are in need, frequently without direction from or direct knowledge of the clergy.

II. Variety and Extent of Services Rendered by Charitable Organizations in Utah:

A. The charitable welfare sector serves vast numbers of people in Utah, far more than can be accounted for by those on welfare, eligible for welfare, or living at or below the poverty level. Survey respondents reported rendering service to over 788,000 people a year. While many families are served multiple times, it
must be recalled that this figure reflects the report of only one-ninth of charitable welfare organizations.

B. Charitable organizations provide a wide range of services to those in need. Over half of the charitable organizations surveyed provide the following: services to homeless individuals and families, monetary assistance, transportation, food, clothing. Over one-third of the charitable organizations surveyed provide the following: housing, medical/dental/prescription assistance; over 20% of the charitable organizations surveyed provide the following: education, childcare, employment assistance; and 10-19% of the surveyed charitable organizations provide the following: substance abuse assistance, domestic violence/abuse assistance, legal services.

III. Persons and Households Assisted by the Charitable Sector:

A. The majority of the households served are families with one or two working adults and children.

B. Over 30% of the families receiving charitable aid are reported as not receiving government assistance. Some of these families are eligible for such assistance and not receiving it.

C. Middle class families receive charitable welfare services, most likely a result of job displacements, downsizing, and underemployment, combined with the low wage structure, high birthrate and the record high bankruptcy rate. Middle class petitioners are reported by charitable leaders as a relatively new development.

D. Most of the households receiving charitable welfare assistance are headed by adults between 18-64 years of age, with children at home, and are Caucasian.

E. The situations of those seeking assistance are reportedly more complex and desperate than has been seen in the recent past. In addition, increasing numbers of working families with children are being served by charitable organizations.

F. Charitable leaders report the following concerns for those seeking help: housing, limited resources of their organizations, available assistance inadequate to meet needs, spiritual needs of families, and welfare policy seen as disadvantaging charitable organizations.

G. Surveyed religious leaders reported difficulty with discerning who should receive assistance. They expressed the fear of distributing limited funds to those who might be scamming the congregation. Leaders of social service nonprofits reported no such concerns.

IV. Capacity Concerns of the Charitable Welfare Sector:

A. Social service nonprofit organizations report increases in requests for services in the wake of welfare reform and the imposition of time limits, while religious leaders report no significant changes in numbers of services requested.
B. Nearly all of the charitable organizations surveyed refer petitioners to other organizations. Usually (92%) referrals are made because the service requested is not provided.

C. Two-thirds of the social service nonprofits surveyed can absorb only 10% or less more requests for services; for 40% of the nonprofits, funding has decreased in the past few years.

D. Over 50% of the funding for social service nonprofit organizations is from government sources.

E. With regard to increases in requests for services beyond their current capacity, the strategy of most nonprofits would be to seek additional funding and increase staff to cope with the demand; some ration their services.

V. **Findings from Charitable Organizations after the Implementation of Time Limits in Utah:**

A. After time limits were implemented, services requested of charitable organizations began to focus on education, clothing, food, and help with domestic violence and abuse. Six months later, charitable leaders reported that medical/dental/prescription services, foster care, education and housing were the most requested services.

B. Charitable organizations reported increases in funds and services expended in the aftermath of time limits.

C. Charitable leaders reported changes in those requesting assistance: people with more complex problems and desperation; increasing numbers of immigrants and working single mothers; increasing numbers of people living together without being married; more seniors; more under 18 requesting rental assistance; more people no longer receiving TANF; more children affected.

D. Charitable organizations reported operating at close to capacity level.

VI. **Major Issues Raised by These Findings:**

A. Most of the charitable welfare sector in Utah is comprised of religious organizations. This finding raises important issues, especially in light of federal actions designed to provide funding for religious efforts.

1. Religious leaders reported knowing less about welfare policy than do social service nonprofit leaders. This may have dire consequences as some people, with their life-time limits expiring, likely approach religious organizations for assistance. Since many clergy may not be aware of this provision of welfare reform, they may have a difficult time understanding the petitioners' situation.
2. While assistance is typically granted without regard to religious affiliation, religious leaders responding to the survey experience difficulty discerning those petitioners with legitimate needs from those trying to take advantage of the congregation.

3. Religious institutions that do not participate in the Charitable Choice provision of PRWORA, as is the case for most religious congregations in Utah, have every right to deny requests for assistance on any grounds whatsoever, yet are being relied on by governments to render assistance.

4. Some petitioners may be afraid of an obligation (real or perceived) to attend worship services, or may be afraid to be disloyal to their own religious upbringing by seeking assistance from another religious source.

5. Many mothers on welfare have a history of being sexually abused. They may have difficulty approaching religious leaders (predominantly male) for assistance. In addition, anyone whose lifestyle does not conform to the espoused values of the religion, may be at added risk for denial of their request, and thus reluctant to petition for assistance.

6. Some single mothers with little transportation, scant knowledge of community resources, lack of government help, fear of negative judgment, but with a need to house and feed their children, may be forced back into abusive situations. This raises a painful possibility that as government assistance becomes less accessible, economic circumstances may force mothers to place themselves and their children at risk. What is needed is a targeted effort to address the fears of any who might ask religious organizations for help.

B. Over the past decade, government funds for those in need have been increasingly dispersed to social service nonprofit organizations. If President Bush’s agenda prevails, the dispersion of public funds will extend to religious institutions, as well.

1. While dispersing of welfare funding for services through charitable welfare organizations has many advantages, the large numbers of referrals reported by charitable leaders mark an inefficiency that many of those in need can ill afford. Going from place to place for help, when one is limited by income and transportation, and is likely working at a low hourly wage, may place undue burdens on receiving assistance for which one is eligible.

2. The public funds designated to help those in need include taxes paid by the working poor. It appears to be an added burden for those individuals to receive services for which they are eligible, but which are paid for, in part, by their own labors.

C. Members of the middle class are seeking charitable welfare assistance, along with their low-income counterparts. Corporate and organizational restructuring, together with accompanying underemployment, has had dire economic impact on tens of millions of middle class Americans whose predicament, along with that of the working poor, is not reflected in the unemployment rate or in other major economic indicators.
1. While the strength of Utah’s economy, as well as that of most of the rest of the nation, has been lauded, it is clear that the economy is strong for a few people, but not for all in the middle class, and certainly not for the working poor.

2. The consequences of middle class families competing with low-income families for limited charitable financial resources need to be examined fully.

D. Thousands of Utahns who are employed are seeking charitable aid, which highlights issues of inadequate wages, unstable employment, high costs of living, high housing costs, and other economic difficulties.

E. Religious organizations, like many social service nonprofits, assist those who never come to the attention of government agencies. Much is to be learned from charitable sources regarding poverty, the circumstances of the working poor, and the shrinking middle class. Public policy makers must harvest this knowledge.

VII. **Recommended Changes in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 Based on this Research.** Many of the concerns of charitable leaders with regards to PRWORA can be addressed with the following changes to the law. It is expected that the following will be addressed in the current PRWORA reauthorization efforts.¹

A. PRWORA should create policies which would assist families into family-sustaining employment.

B. PRWORA is a welfare-to-work program that must be keyed to the unemployment rate or to the employment to population ratio. Citizens find themselves time-limited off of the welfare rolls when they live in areas of high unemployment.

C. PRWORA must mandate tracking of what happens to those who leave the welfare rolls. In transitioning from an entitlement program to a welfare-to-work program with short life-time limits, many people left the rolls and their status is unknown. To gain an understanding of the impact of welfare policy changes, the tracking of those who leave the rolls should be mandated.

D. PRWORA must mandate programmatic and support involvement of all government levels. Those working their way off welfare, or who may be sanctioned off assistance, need the full inclusion of government attention, including their local government, to receive needed help, especially given time limits.

E. PRWORA’s method of calculating the 20% extensions needs to be changed. Currently it provides for an increasingly shrinking pool of welfare recipients eligible for those extensions. In 1996, 20% of the 12,955 Utahns on the rolls numbered 2,591; in 2000 with 8,254 on the rolls, the extensions could number 1,650—a difference in assisting over 900 families. Given the shortness of the time limits and the lack of consideration for the unemployment rate, it would have been far wiser to

¹ For current information regarding the PRWORA reauthorization issues, see [www.welfareinfo.org/roundup.htm](http://www.welfareinfo.org/roundup.htm).
have the 20% calculated on a base of the first year of welfare reform implementation, or the year with the highest case number.

F. PRWORA pays insufficient attention to the needs of children. As a welfare-to-work program, TANF focuses on the value of work, rather than on what may be in the best interest of children in poor families. This must be remedied. The reported increased requests for foster care and abuse/domestic violence services raise the unwelcomed possibility of more children at risk due to welfare reform.

G. PRWORA uses time limits to unravel a long-standing safety net. Given the increased administrative complexity of TANF, combined with short life-time limits, those citizens most vulnerable are placed even more at risk. This issue can be addressed in part by lengthening the life-time limits requirements.
INTRODUCTION

*I would hire a convicted felon any day, before I would hire someone who has been on welfare.*
--Business owner in northern Virginia

This report presents findings of the University of Utah Center for Public Policy and Administration’s (CPPA) study of the impact of welfare reform on the charitable sector in Utah. The term *charitable organizations* refers to all nongovernmental faith-based and nonfaith-based organizations rendering direct service to those in need. Religious institutions and congregations, as well as community-based nonprofit organizations, are included. Commissioned and funded by the Utah Department of Workforce Services, this study is a key component of CPPA’s Welfare Reform Initiative, established in 1998. This initiative has produced a number of research reports and public policy events.

It is notable that the Welfare Reform Initiative was instigated at the request of a prominent Utah religious leader who expressed concern with regard to the capacity of charitable organizations to meet the needs of the poor in the wake of federal welfare reform legislation. This 1996 welfare-to-work legislation decreased government responsibility while increasing involvement of religious and nonprofit organizations with service provision to those in need. A committee of university researchers and community leaders who assembled to conceptualize and assist our efforts, framed CPPA’s Welfare Reform Initiative. This multi-year project includes information dissemination, partnership-building, public policy forums, empirical research, and report production and distribution.

The Welfare Reform Initiative in its entirety has been made possible by broad-based charitable and government agency funding: The Catholic Diocese of Salt Lake, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) Charities and LDS Humanitarian Service, Holy Cross Ministries, Intermountain Health Care Foundation, Intermountain Health Care Mission Services, Salt Lake County Government, Thrasher Research Fund, Utah Association of Counties, Utah Department of Human Services, Utah Department of Workforce Services, and the Utah Division of Indian Affairs.

Using qualitative and quantitative methods, this study assesses the capacity of faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations to meet the needs of TANF-eligible families.
Findings from the qualitative phase of the research have been published previously and are referenced throughout this report.\(^3\)

As the goal of this study is to present an analysis of the capacity of the charitable sector in Utah, we were determined to present a description of the capacity of the entire charitable sector as a whole. Early in our efforts, we found that various organizations in the charitable sector—religious and nonfaith-based—have significant collaborative relationships that provide support for their common goals to assist those in need. Unfortunately, the goal of presenting a single portrayal proved to be unrealistic, as the differences between religious congregations and social service nonprofits merited separate descriptions and to some extent, separate data analyses. The determination to present at least the religious welfare sector as a whole was compromised by the inability to collect LDS congregational survey data. Obviously the LDS Church welfare sector in Utah could not be ignored; thus a separate discussion and description is unavoidable. It is important, then, to recognize that the separate descriptions, while necessary, may convey mis-impresions in that the descriptions do not take into account the collaborative partnerships and mutual support (including resource sharing) found among charitable organizations in their work.

\(^2\) See Appendix A for complete list of all welfare reform reports. They are available on the CPPA website: www.cppa.utah.edu/wri.

\(^3\) The qualitative research findings are discussed in full and reported in Laurie N. DiPadova, *Utah's Charitable Organizations Face Welfare Reform: Concerns of Charitable Leaders*. Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah. January 2000. This report is available at www.cppa.utah.edu/wri/charitleaders.pdf.
I. WELFARE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES

Compassion is the work of a nation, not just a government.
—President George W. Bush, 29 January 2001

Efforts by government agencies, charitable organizations, and individuals to assist those in need are a matter of utmost importance in every society. A society is judged by how it treats its most vulnerable and needy members. For centuries, religious and other charitable organizations in the United States have taken responsibility for assisting those in need. This tradition is heightened by current welfare reform issues. After the Great Depression of the 1930s, the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a solid government responsibility for those in need with the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program. This program, later renamed the Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) program, defined assistance to poor families as an entitlement, and the poor underclass as a societal responsibility.

After it was instituted, AFDC was for decades under political attack for fostering dependency and providing disincentives to productive citizenship and responsibility, all at a cost to taxpayers. It was also criticized for failure to foster a responsible work ethic, as recipients were actually penalized for attaining employment.

Concern also centered on generations being raised fatherless, without knowing the value of work, and being content to “live on the dole”, thus perpetuating welfare in some families over time. This was seen as especially detrimental to children in welfare families. Additionally, debates focused on whether government welfare in fact was providing incentives for out of wedlock births.

While to some extent the poor have always been blamed for their situations, the institution of government welfare heightened these blaming ideological arguments as justifications for the view that being poor is a quasi-criminal condition that merits social

---

4 As one current example, see Niebuhr, 2000, for a description of various religions' responses.
5 For a current expression of this argument, see the 1995 work by Francis Fukuyama, Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. New York: The Free Press.
6 The historic distinctions in the early part of the 19th century between paupers (the able-bodied poor) and the impotent poor (those in circumstances beyond their control) find currency in today's discussions. See Katz, 1989.
punishment. Such blaming ideology continues to this day,⁸ even though children and the elderly currently comprise the majority of Americans considered poor.

At the same time, AFDC was criticized for not redressing the real issues of poverty in the United States (Gans, 1995), and for perpetuating the underclass and the growing income inequalities in the United States (Mishel, Bernstein, and Schmitt, 1999) while corporations and business firms received ample "welfare" of their own from government sources at taxpayer expense.⁹ As families on AFDC were primarily women heads of households with children at home, and the majority of welfare recipients are children,¹⁰ welfare debates also addressed the socio-economic value of child-rearing in our society. These and other political debates highlight the myriad issues involved in helping those in need.

The calls for a welfare-to-work program¹¹ finally won. Politicians who used to argue that child welfare issues demand that mothers should stay home to raise their children and leave the workplace to men, now concurrently argue that poor mothers need to work; these same child welfare concerns are not applied to children born in poverty.

On August 22, 1996, President Bill Clinton signed into law the most significant welfare reform legislation in three generations, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). This legislation has the potential to impact charitable organizations more than any Congressional action in recent memory. Congress acknowledged that the Act left gaps in service provision and made clear its intent that the charitable sector would be expected to assume a greater role in meeting the needs of the poor.

While the Act itself does not state that poverty reduction is a goal of PRWORA, it prompted trepidation and dismay from those who feared the dissolution of the "safety net" and the concomitant uncertainties facing America's poor. At the much-publicized signing of the Act,

---


⁹ An excellent popular media account of the dynamics of corporate welfare is found in Donald Bartlett and James Steele, "What Corporate Welfare Costs" in Time, issues throughout November 1998.


President Clinton acknowledged that it was not perfect. Promising to amend it in the future, he nonetheless hailed the reform as the "end to welfare as we know it."

PRWORA devolves to the states major responsibility for assistance to families with dependent children and imposes limitations on the receipt of various types of public assistance. Time limits and the welfare-to-work provisions increased substantially the complexity of implementing TANF over administering AFDC. These administrative complexities require increased resources and training of case managers; otherwise, families in need may be more vulnerable and at risk due to inevitable managerial implementation challenges. Thus the safety net is unraveled not only by policy, but also by administration of the policy.

Replacing the entitlement provisions for financial assistance with time-limited, work-based assistance, coupled with possible but inadvertent administrative mismanagement of a more complex policy, the new program is expected to compel the poor increasingly to turn to religious and community social service organizations for help. This increased responsibility presents new pressures for nonprofit organizations and their leaders (Alexander, 1999) who fear the dissolution of the "safety net" and the concomitant uncertainties facing America's poor.

The Act was met with wide acclaim from many Americans who were frustrated with the traditional welfare system. Headlines in the news media have reported the apparent success of the sweeping 1996 welfare reform legislation, adding to the popularity of the enormous body of this policy. Nationwide, welfare recipients are leaving the welfare rolls in record numbers, including in Utah. Indeed, cases of single mothers on welfare, successfully entering the workforce, are being heralded—and are to be applauded.

Welfare-to-work mandates are continuing in the new presidential administration of 2001. President George W. Bush openly endorses the expanded role of charitable institutions to provide welfare services for those in need. He advocates a heightened role for social service

12 One sign of the difficulties in implementing the more complex policy may be found in jurisdictions simply paying the poor to relocate to other states. See Nieves, 2001. On a local note, Captain Scott Atkinson of the Salt Lake City Police Department confirmed that while the department keeps no records tracking the incidence of people being sent to Salt Lake City by other cities for the purpose of getting aid, it is clear from his experience that this happens on occasion (interview July 9, 2001).

13 For full discussions of research related to the complexity of administrative issues with TANF, see Bryner, 1999; Gais, Nathan, Lurie, and Kaplan, 2000; and Nathan and Gais, 1998. As a personal note, I want to be clear that I am not, in any way, disparaging the public administrators who work hard to implement TANF; I have found them to be conscientious and competent in every respect. In truth, however, criticisms of administrative matters are grounded in organizational systems and in policies that make such administration immensely challenging, calling forth the proverbial wisdom of Solomon. As a faculty member in a distinguished Masters of Public Administration program, I can attest to the inherent difficulties of preparing students for such responsibilities.
provision by religious organizations,\textsuperscript{14} including increased government funding to those organizations. The President has established a White House Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, headed by social scientist John Dilulio, Jr., which is directed to support and oversee religious and community-based efforts to assist those in need.\textsuperscript{15} Nationally, religious leaders are seeming to fall on both sides of the efforts of this new office;\textsuperscript{16} some are concerned for the autonomy of religious institutions and protecting the religious freedom of welfare recipients, while other leaders are anxious to secure any funding to assist those in need.\textsuperscript{17}

If proposed legislation is enacted, religious groups will be able to compete for government funding, as do nonfaith-based nonprofits, to address social ills. It appears at this time that religious groups receiving government assistance would be able to maintain the ability to consider religious affiliation in hiring employees, but would not be able to impose requirements of religious practices on employees.\textsuperscript{18}

It is important to note that as the news media widely reported welfare reform to be a success, and politicians capitalized on the heightened role of charitable organizations in social policy, Utah’s charitable leaders were not convinced. While charitable organizations would like

\textsuperscript{14} While success stories abound, to date there is little empirical research demonstrating the long-term effectiveness of religious programs. See Laurie Goldstein, “Church-Based Projects Lack Data on Results” in \textit{The New York Times}, April 24, 2001.


\textsuperscript{18} Concerns that public funds would support religious discrimination in hiring are raised by Americans United for Separation of Church and State. At this time, the faith-based initiative legislation is still being debated in the Congress and has support from the U.S. Conference of Mayors. See Allen and Kovaleski, 2001 and the Associated Press report in \textit{The New York Times}, June 25, 2001 available at www.nytimes.com/aponline/national/AP-Bush.html. Adding fuel to the controversy, on July 10, 2001, the Washington Post reported that the Salvation Army has agreed to lobby for passage of the faith-based initiative, in exchange from assurances from the White House that the Salvation Army would be protected from federal nondiscrimination hiring requirements. See Milbank, 2001.
nothing more than to help all in need, many leaders voiced alarm at what their institutions are currently experiencing, even during exceptionally strong economic times for the state. Even those leaders who agreed with the welfare-to-work emphasis, expressed deep concern about the ability of the charitable sector to take up where government is backing off (DiPadova, 2000). Their concerns were echoed by officials of county governments in Utah (Weathers and Walsh, 2000).

The majority of Utah’s religious leaders report disinterest in seeking government assistance to support their efforts to help those in need (DiPadova, 2000). At the same time, the survey research reported herein supports the view that public policy makers would be well advised to gather information on the experiences of leaders of religious organizations, as well as social service nonprofit leaders. These people lead organizations that directly address poverty issues. Charitable organizations serve individuals and families before they request government assistance, while they are receiving government assistance, and after they leave government assistance. These organizations also meet the needs of the vast array of those who do not qualify for such assistance or will not ask for it. Thus, charitable organizations have unique perspectives that could be used to enhance the efforts of government to frame workable policies to address social needs.

---

19 A June 5, 2001 report released by the Barna Research Group's annual survey of giving to nonprofit organizations finds that giving to nonprofit organizations and churches declined by 6% from 1999 and 9% from 1998. See www.barna.org.
21 Many churches in Utah, including the LDS Church, traditionally neither seek nor accept government funds.
22 For a superb analysis of appropriate effective roles for government welfare and charitable welfare in helping families in need, see Mangum, 2000.
II. ECONOMIC CONTEXT AND PROVISIONS OF WELFARE REFORM

This past year, the congregation has had several families from middle income brackets request help.

—Congregational Leader

Like welfare caseloads across the nation, the welfare caseload in Utah has dropped dramatically since the implementation of welfare reform programs. Utah has seen a drop from almost 12,955 cases at the end of 1996\(^\text{23}\) to a caseload of 8,254 as of the end of 2000.\(^\text{24}\)

**Economic Context:** In order to consider properly the provisions of welfare reform, and its implementation in Utah, it is necessary briefly to discuss relevant national and Utah data which provide an employment and economic context for those entering the workforce. Utah’s economy has been regarded as vigorous over the past ten years. While for most of 2000, Utah's overall unemployment rate averaged 3.1%, in 2001 it has climbed. January saw a jump to 3.5% and in April, the rate was reported as 3.9%.\(^\text{25}\) In 1998-1999, the state's poverty rate averaged 7.3%, the second lowest in the United States.\(^\text{26}\) Other estimates indicate that nearly 180,000 individuals of the state's 2.1 million population are living in poverty, including some 90,000 children.\(^\text{27}\)

Utah’s per capita income in 1999 was $23,288, or 18.4% below the national average of $28,542.\(^\text{28}\) The wage rates in Utah have been steady at approximately 16% below the national average, while housing costs along the Wasatch Front, where the vast majority of the state's population resides, are well above the national average.\(^\text{29}\)

\(^{23}\) According to DWS reports, Utah's welfare averaged over 18,000 throughout 1993.

\(^{24}\) While good economic times and the availability of jobs are often credited for people leaving the welfare rolls, research nationally suggests that state welfare policies of sanctioning people off of the rolls account for most of the decrease. See Walters, 1999. In contrast, DWS reports indicate that over the past year approximately 30-40% of the cases closed each month have been due to the fact that earned income is too high; 6-9% of the cases are closed due to non-participation in an employment plan; and approximately 5-7% of the cases are closed each month due to time limits and loss of extension eligibility.


\(^{27}\) According to Utah Children, Measures of Child Well-Being in Utah, 2001, in 1997 children in the state were living at or below the poverty level numbered 89,867, representing an increase from 73,381 children in 1995.

\(^{28}\) Utah’s median household income is 45,257, 114% above the national average. Due to Utah’s large family size (3.06 as compared with the national average of 2.61), the per capita income figure is considered to be a more realistic indicator of economic well-being. See Verma, Mangum, and Cookson, 2001.

\(^{29}\) See National Low Income Housing Coalition's Out of Reach report, September 2000, finding that 42% of Utah's tenants are unable to afford rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Utah. See www.nlihc.org/pubs/index.htm. Nationally, HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo issued a report finding that in
In spite of Utah’s generally lauded strong economy, citizens in record numbers sought bankruptcy during the first three months of 2001, most of them seeking relief due to personal financial crises (Oberbeck, 2001b). This record is part of a troubling trend: “Utah’s economy grew steadily over the past decade and logic suggests the number of bankruptcies should drop when the economy is sound. Yet with the exception of 1993, 1994, and 1995, bankruptcies in Utah increased steadily” (Oberbeck, 2001a).

Nationally, in spite of a record-breaking booming economy over the decade of the 1990s, Americans are poorer; their net worth has fallen for the first time since 1945. Troubling personal economic trends center on three variables: the personal savings rate, consumer debt, and bankruptcies. The personal savings rate is at the lowest in over 50 years. Consumer debt and bankruptcies have been at their highest in the 1990s. Over 1.3 million Americans filed for bankruptcy in 1999 alone and consumer credit is a major growth industry in the United States (Manning, 2000).

Spawning the acceleration of these trends over the past two decades has been, no doubt, the restructuring of corporations and other organizations, ushering in the New Economy while severing literally tens of millions of middle-class Americans from their jobs and benefits. In addition to these downsized employees, millions of others have become underemployed due to job displacements, or accepted lower wages in their current reconfigured positions. American workers affected by these dynamics are not reflected in the unemployment rate, or in the employment-to-population ratio. Their plight remains hidden from any major economic indicators.

1999, 5.4 million low income families were paying more than half of their income for housing, a rise of 12 percent since 1991. See Molotsky 2000.

In 2000, Utah ranked second among the 50 states in bankruptcy filings; Tennessee ranked first. Coinciding with the increase in bankruptcies is the oft-relayed phrase in the media that many Americans are but two paychecks away from losing their homes.

Americans’ net worth fell an additional 4% in the first quarter of 2001. In addition, for the first time since 1996, growth in personal income has dropped below the 2% mark. See Leonhardt, 2001.


Downs (1995) and Stein (1998) present evidence that many corporations that have engaged in downsizing are not fiscally better off.

See Kletzer (2000), along with two excellent internet sources for current information: The Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco weekly online newsletter at www.frbsf.org/econrsrch/wklyltr and The Industry Standard Layoff Tracker at www.thestandard.com/trackers/layoff/. Some companies recognize the economic impact of layoffs on communities and have fared better by avoiding layoff actions. See Ansberg, 2001, “…even many of those whose business has softened are holding on to their workers, both out of loyalty to their communities and employees and out of fear that they will be left without much needed talent when the economy strengthens” (page A-1).
The middle class is shrinking. In part as a result, a reported 43 million Americans have no health insurance; for some, this situation marks financial catastrophe waiting to happen. Corporate restructuring, coupled with aggressive credit card marketing by financial institutions, and federal tax policies since 1977, have fostered the growth of the income gap (Shapiro and Greenstein, 1999).

A by-product of corporate mergers and acquisitions is layoffs for senior and middle managers, as well as other staff, as these positions are eliminated from the new organizational structures. As indicated above, organizational restructuring, downsizing, and so forth have prevailed in corporate America for decades. In Utah, for example, in technology-related companies alone from January 1994 through January 2001, 264 such mergers and acquisitions were initiated (nine of which have since been withdrawn). Affected managers and other employees must find employment elsewhere. Many become underemployed at lower wages.

While it is beyond the scope of this report to explore fully these trends, the following is clear: the middle-class has been in increasing economic trouble (Sullivan, Warren, and Westbrook, 2000; Wolman and Colamosca, 1997). "Family income has fallen in the 1990s, a period when jobs have become less secure and less likely to offer health and pension benefits...the net worth of the middle-class family has also fallen" (Wolman and Colamosca, 1997: 5). It is not surprising that researchers concur that bankruptcy afflicts the middle-class consumer. Personal bankruptcies are now carrying less social stigma, prompting in part Congress to pass the bankruptcy reform bill, designed to make bankruptcies more problematic for consumers to obtain.

Middle-class families fall into the lower class through unemployment, health emergencies, and divorce. During hard times, these families use their available credit-card limits for living expenses: food, rent, mortgage, medical bills, as well as for debt payments (Sullivan, Warren, and Westbrook, 2000). Credit card debt, combined with refinanced home

35 Among the proposals by Kletzer and Litan, 2001, is that wage insurance be provided for displaced workers, along with subsidies for health insurance.


37 This according to a Harvard Business School report, funded by the Utah Department of Community and Economic Development, Division of Technology. See Graham, Hawkins, and Reading, 2001.

mortgages\textsuperscript{39} may be the "welfare" option of first resort for the middle class. When making debt payments becomes untenable, families reluctantly turn to charity for help. It is little wonder that charitable leaders in Utah report seeing more middle-class families requesting assistance (DiPadova, 2000), raising the specter of "Middle-Class Welfare" in this nation.\textsuperscript{40} Those among the middle class are more likely to seek help from the charitable sector, rather than from government, as they do not qualify for welfare assistance.\textsuperscript{41}

As can be seen, economic hard times are not the exclusive arena of the lower class; increasing numbers of middle class Americans are similarly afflicted. However, welfare reform issues are directed primarily at the lower class, and it is to this group of citizens that welfare reform is aimed.

**Provisions of Welfare Reform:** Within the national economic and labor context described, welfare reform legislation was passed. Briefly, there are five key differences between the old welfare system (AFDC) and the new welfare system under PRWORA. First, the federal financial commitment to welfare programs has been reduced and block-granted to the states. While primary responsibility is devolved to the states, the federal government maintains some regulatory involvement. Second, welfare assistance is no longer an entitlement to the poor, as it was under AFDC. Now AFDC is replaced by Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), as welfare programs have become work-based; thus TANF is not an entitlement program.

The third key difference between AFDC and TANF is that now families in need have a 60-month federal lifetime limit on the receipt of financial assistance, with the states empowered to choose lower limits. The 60-month limit was adopted by 28 states; the 22 other states have a range of 12-48 month limits.\textsuperscript{42} Utah has adopted a 36-month limit, which began to close cases on December 31, 1999. At that time, cases closed due to time-limits numbered 143 families.

\textsuperscript{39}In the 1980's Americans held mortgages, on the average, on approximately 35\% of the value of their homes; currently that figure has risen to 45\%, without the concomitant reduction in consumer debt. See Leonhardt, 2001.

\textsuperscript{40}This is not to be confused with Glassman's (2000) arguments regarding the growing welfare state for the rich in high-tech industrial capitalist societies.

\textsuperscript{41}The implications of the middle-class competing with lower class for limited charitable assistance have not been fully explored. In contrast with government assistance, charitable assistance may provide more confidentiality and perhaps less embarrassment for many middle-class petitioners. Clearly those from the middle class seeking assistance do so with more resources and less stigma than do those from the lower classes. Further, middle class families are more stable geographically and perhaps more likely to a "church home" than perhaps many lower class families, especially those who are homeless.

\textsuperscript{42}Note that New York State is the only state whose Constitution mandates care for the poor; thus after New York's federal assistance expires, the State is bound constitutionally to care for those in need. In addition, the state of Michigan has opted to assume responsibility for the poor after the federal limits expire.
including 412 children. Thereafter, on a monthly basis, cases are closed due to time limits, resulting in an additional 247 families having their cases closed due to time limits by September 31, 2000.

The law permits 20% of the caseload to be exempted from the life-time limits due to hardship, e.g., where specified medical conditions or domestic violence exist, where the parent is under age 19, or where other special conditions are demonstrated. In Utah, families may be extended on a month-to-month basis. However, it is not known whether 20% will be sufficient over time, especially as the total caseload comes to be increasingly dominated by families experiencing more difficult situations.\(^4^3\)

Fourth, for the first time in the history of our nation’s welfare programs, the economy is a major factor in welfare assistance. The presumption is that many will leave welfare for secure family-sustaining jobs.\(^4^4\) Reflecting this welfare-to-work\(^4^5\) emphasis, Utah’s state agency responsible for administering TANF funds and other assistance programs for the poor is the Department of Workforce Services (DWS). The DWS mission is two-fold: to assist workers in finding jobs, and to administer the Family Employment Program (FEP), Utah’s TANF program. At the time TANF was implemented, Utah’s economy had been showing exceptional strength and growth; such growth was expected to continue until 2002, the year of the winter Olympic games, and also the end of the four-year Interstate 15 highway reconstruction (currently the most significant highway project in the nation).\(^4^6\) Indeed, as noted above, Utah welfare recipients are now leaving welfare for work in record numbers and the number of cases on the welfare rolls has dramatically decreased. Unfortunately, available evidence indicates that in

\(^4^3\) An important exception to time limits is provided for Native American reservations. If the unemployment rate is over 50%, then the time-limit provision of PRWORA does not apply. In Utah, both the Navajo nation and the Utes have unemployment rates in excess of 50%. However, the Ute reservation is a “checkerboard” reservation, rather than being an uninterrupted stretch of land, as is the case with the Navajo. In the case of checkerboard reservations, federal law requires that the unemployment rate for “Indian country”—that is, including non-Indians in surrounding counties—be over 50%. Thus, even though Ute records show their unemployment rate to be 77%, they remain subject to the time limit provisions because unemployment for non-Indians in the area is less than 10%. Hence, as of this writing, negotiations are taking place between Ute leaders and Utah state officials. See Romboy, 2000.


\(^4^5\) AFDC supported studies in pursuit of a college degree. TANF does not and instead supports direct job training and skill development. Many researchers point to the attainment of higher education as key to individuals' addressing the growing income gap. See Gramlich and Long (1996).

\(^4^6\) However, as indicated above, as of this writing, Utah's economy is showing signs of a slowdown.
Utah, as in the rest of the nation,\textsuperscript{47} the vast majority of those who leave welfare rolls for employment are joining the ranks of the working poor\textsuperscript{48} (Coon, Geo-Jaja, and Mangum, 2000).

Finally, and significantly for this research, there is clear expectation in the law—expressed by Congress—that charitable organizations would fill in the gaps of social service provision. The Charitable Choice section of PRWORA allows religious institutions to apply for government grants to provide welfare assistance; however, like their counterparts nationwide, most religious leaders in Utah were unaware of this clause and those who were made aware of it, shunned its use (DiPadova, 2000; Moore and Williams, 1999). While the Charitable Choice provision may constitute a “model of change” for cooperation between church and state (Sider and Unruh, 1999: 49), some legal scholars question its constitutionality (see Weaver, 1997). Also some have expressed concern that this relationship may in fact advance a great long-term detriment to the poor. Governments by law cannot discriminate on the basis of race, religion, and so forth, but these same anti-discrimination laws do not apply to charitable organizations (Van Biema, 1995). If charitable responsibility for the poor is accelerated as government responsibility lessens, the inevitable “gap” in services to the underclass that afflict even the best of programs may widen considerably, negatively impinging on more families and children. How these issues are addressed by the newly formed White House Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives remains to be seen.

Currently, what these new welfare changes mean is that as the role of governments to assist those in need decreases, the pressure on charitable organizations to fill this role increases. It is important to note that this is not the case due to an edict, shall we say, of government policy makers; this is the case precisely because of the long-honored role of religious and social service nonprofit efforts in our society. In modern society, both in the United States and abroad, charitable organizations have maintained a tradition of rendering direct assistance to those in need for hundreds of years. Many of these organizations do so with great effort and sacrifice by staff and volunteers. For the most part they are not resource-rich institutions; they rely on the good graces of contributors and funders. Many of these

\textsuperscript{47}A number of state reports are available which confirm the results in Utah studies. For example, see the Center for the Study of Women in Society at the University of Oregon report titled \textit{Oregon Families Who Left TANF or Food Stamps: A Study of Economic and Family Well-Being 1998-2000}, available at http://csws.uoregon.edu. See also Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau, \textit{An Evaluation of the Wisconsin Works (W-2) Program: Department of Workforce Development, April 2001}. Available at www.legis.state.wi.us/lab/Reports/01-7full.pdf.

\textsuperscript{48}A snapshot of the working poor in Utah can be found in the northwest quadrant of the Salt Lake Valley. Here families speak 20 different languages. Two-thirds of the individuals are employed, 28% of them making less than $15,000 a year. 18% of households (26% of households with children) report difficulty in obtaining enough food for their families. See Office of Public Health Assessment, 2000.
organizations struggled to meet unmet needs during the past half-century of the federal welfare entitlement program. Now they face a major policy effect, and many local leaders are caught unawares.

As this study examines the impact of welfare reform on charitable institutions in Utah, we now turn to a description of those institutions.
III. TYPES OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS STUDIED

Church members should be taking care of each other’s needs, rather than the government doing it.
--Congregational Leader

By charitable organizations we refer to all nongovernmental organizations (faith-based and nonfaith-based) rendering direct service to those in need. Included are religious institutions and congregations as well as community-based nonprofit organizations. The charitable sector represents a widely diverse group of organizations that differ along a myriad of variables, including approaches, interests, resources, and primary missions.

In this research we examine the capacity of three types of charitable organizations, as follows. The first category consists of social service non-profit organizations, such as the Traveler’s Aid Society. This category includes those affiliated with religious organizations but whose primary role is the delivery of social services, such as Catholic Community Services. Leaders of these organizations tend to be very aware of public policy changes that affect them; they often have a paid staff and volunteers who follow legislative activities and engage in advocacy efforts, as well as provide needed services. Their funding is from a variety of sources; they tend to keep accurate records of types of services provided and to whom. For these organizations, social service delivery is their fundamental defining priority.

The second category consists of religious congregations headed by professional clergy. For these organizations, religious purposes are their major endeavor; clergy are full-time and have recognized education and credentials. Welfare and social policy are not their prime function. While large denominations may have welfare policy experts and advocates working at the multi-congregational level, such as a diocese, for the most part, congregational clergy have limited knowledge in the area of welfare policy.

Congregational leaders want to help others and wish for their congregational members to help, as well. Some clergy feel that their congregations have a responsibility to take care of the poor. These clergy tend to favor minimal government involvement. Other clergy take the position that more referrals to government programs and nonprofit organizations are needed. For the most part, they keep few records regarding assistance rendered. In fact, some leaders point out that congregations give significant help, emerging spontaneously from members, and that in these instances, the clergy actually would know little about what is happening. Yet they worry that their capacity will not meet all the need. These clergy work to attract funds for their operations and other purposes.
Some leaders of smaller congregations, usually not affiliated with a strong centralized denomination, applaud the work-based aspects of welfare reform. They feel that religious congregations are responsible for aiding the poor and that the government should not be involved. Many religious leaders share the basic philosophy that, although they appreciate the help government gives to those in need, “we have a responsibility to take this on.”

The third category consists of congregations (or wards) of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). Like the second category, religious purposes are their major endeavor. However, unlike the second category, these congregations are headed by part-time lay-leaders, or bishops, whose primary responsibilities are their own families and career endeavors. Bishops hold full-time jobs elsewhere.

LDS bishops are welfare agents, and are assisted by the ward Relief Society Presidents. They are part of a church-wide welfare program the policies of which are administered by the Church Welfare Services Department. Bishops are considered responsible for the temporal well-being of all individuals and families living in the ward, or geographic boundaries, regardless of religious affiliation. Welfare policy advises bishops to seek out those in need, give those receiving assistance the opportunity to work, and keep needs and assistance in strictest confidence.

Like their counterparts in the second category, some LDS bishops feel that they should take care of the poor and favor minimal government involvement; other bishops, however, take the position that more referrals to government programs and nonprofit organizations are needed. Like other religious congregational leaders, bishops point out that considerable help is offered among members of the congregation, both informally and through the visiting teaching program of the Relief Society and the home teaching program of the priesthood quorums. Thus, bishops do not track much of the assistance being rendered.

Unlike other religious leaders, LDS bishops do not concern themselves with fundraising and with resource limitations when it comes to serving those in need. The LDS Church, a centralized religious institution, collects offerings from congregational members to distribute worldwide, through the bishops, according to need. Local bishops also rely on a strong network

---

50 The Relief Society is the women’s organization of the LDS Church and has a long-standing welfare service role.
51 According to bishops’ regional welfare training materials from a local LDS stake: “Assistance should be given according to need, and work should be assigned according to ability...When recipients are encouraged to work energetically and willingly for the help they receive, they can hold their heads high. Only then can they really feel good about the temporary help they receive.”
of LDS Church welfare resources, such as Bishops’ Storehouses, canneries, Deseret Industries, and so forth. The resource of concern to LDS bishops is their time required to assess and respond to the needs of families and individuals requesting assistance.

Three distinct types of charitable organizations have been described, each with their own unique responses to welfare reform. All of these leaders enjoy various levels of discretion regarding whom they will render service to, with religious leaders having the maximum discretion as their services are not tied to government funding. It is clear that as these leaders are feeling the impact of policy change, their concerns are mounting. We now turn to the research itself, beginning with the methodology used for this study.
III. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the capacity of charitable institutions in Utah to meet the needs of TANF-eligible families and others in need. Data were collected in three phases. The first phase involved the collection of qualitative data and instrument refinement through interviews and focus groups. The focus groups with leaders of charitable organizations were conducted in each of the five DWS regions of the state: in Brigham City, Heber, Parowan, Price, and Salt Lake City.\textsuperscript{53} In addition, eight clergy were interviewed, including six LDS bishops. The second phase used a survey instrument to collect organizational capacity data prior to the implementation of financial assistance time limits. Phase three used two follow-up surveys to trace changes in impact three and six months after the implementation of time limits in Utah. Findings from the first phase, the qualitative research, have been reported previously and are referenced throughout this report (DiPadova, 2000). This report concerns itself primarily with the results of the quantitative data collection.

In this research, every effort has been made to present the capacity to assist those in need of Utah’s charitable sector as a whole. Researchers did not wish to single out any charitable organization, or group of charitable organizations, for special attention. Instead we made every effort to reflect accurately the information detailed by charitable leaders and to avoid comparisons of charitable organizations with each other; hence, appropriate descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. However, as the research progressed, it became clear that, among the types of organizations within the charitable sector, described previously, there are considerable differences, and that those differences in turn inhibit collection of the same data and reporting of those data across all organizations. Hence, the findings are reported from all of the surveys, or only from the social service nonprofit surveys, or comparisons made between religious organizations and social service nonprofit organizations, as appropriate and helpful to our understanding.

PHASE 1 – INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

Six focus groups of leaders of charitable organizations were conducted. Every effort was made to have a diversity of charitable organizations represented. One group was held in each of the five DWS regions with a second focus group held in the Central Region. Altogether

\textsuperscript{53} Due to the magnitude of charitable organizations in Salt Lake and Tooele counties (the DWS Central Region), two focus groups were conducted in Salt Lake City.
62 individuals were invited and 46 people attended. Each session was well attended with the exception of one region; in that case, those who did not attend were interviewed by telephone.

Participants were invited to the focus groups by telephone and a follow up confirmation letter was sent, along with a version of the Urban Institute survey instrument, which had been used for congregational and nonprofit research in the Washington, D.C. area. The survey was modified slightly and presented to participants in draft form. Participants were invited to bring suggestions for modifications to the meeting.

Each meeting followed a standard agenda and procedure. After the project team members and participants introduced themselves, the purpose of the meeting was outlined. Confidentiality governing both the discussions and any written input was stressed, as was the voluntary nature of their participation. The purpose of the Welfare Reform Initiative was described and reactions regarding the project and/or welfare reform were invited. Charitable leaders informed the researchers of pertinent information relating to their organizations, serving the poor, and welfare issues.

Next, input on the draft survey was solicited. Researchers asked participants to provide any lists of organizations that should be included in the sample database.

Any questions raised regarding the details of welfare reform policy were answered when possible. Also, each participant was provided with a copy of a summary handout based on the Foundation Report: The Charitable Sector and Welfare Reform in Utah, April 1999, by Shirley Weathers, which was produced by the Center for Public Policy and Administration. As a result of the structure of the focus groups, the sessions were both informative for the participants as well as for the researchers.

Regarding the survey, some faith-based organizational leaders reported that congregations often do not collect the information requested. A religious congregation’s main purpose is to attend to the spiritual needs of its members. As a result, the demographics of the people served, and extent of services provided, are not routinely recorded. This is in contrast to the practices of most nonprofit organizations. In general, nonprofit organizations reported that the survey was reasonable, although specific suggestions for improvement were made.

---


55 Researchers used the focus groups to refine the survey instrument for quantitative data collection. Specifically, participants were asked to suggest any changes to the survey, including unclear or confusing wording, whether any questions should be omitted, and whether any questions needed to be added.

56 This report is found at www.cppa.utah.edu/wri/ found_report.pdf. Copies of this report were provided to focus group participants.
The charitable leaders in the focus groups and interviews volunteered critical information regarding the impact of welfare policy on the poor and on their organizations. Again, these results are detailed in the January 2000 CPPA report titled: *Utah's Charitable Organizations Face Welfare Reform: Concerns of Charitable Leaders.*

**PHASE 2 – INITIAL CAPACITY SURVEY**

Responses to the survey during the focus groups made it clear that all charitable leaders did not relate to the one instrument; thus separate instruments were developed for the quantitative data gathering for three distinct categories of charitable institutions, described at length above. To recall, the first category consists of social service nonprofit organizations, such as Traveler’s Aid Society. This category also includes those affiliated with religious organizations but whose primary role is the delivery of social services, such as Catholic Community Services. These were coded as nonprofits because structurally they are more similar to a nonprofit organization than to religious congregations. The second category consists of religious congregations headed by professional clergy. The third category consists of congregations (or wards) of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). The three instruments permitted tailoring of items and language to the various organizations being studied; however, researchers maintained important overlap among the three versions, allowing for consistency in data collection.

The surveys contain questions regarding types of social services provided; service capacity: waiting lists and so forth; collaborations with other organizations; funding for programs and services; characteristics of clientele; increases or decreases in demand experienced; and strategies planned if demands outstrip capacity.

Originally, it was intended that each of the surveys would be sent to a statewide sample of 1,000 religious leaders, nonprofit officials and LDS bishops. Researchers planned to conduct a random sample of the total 4,518 charitable organizations in Utah, including the 3,749 LDS congregations. Any survey to local LDS bishops, however, must be approved by the Church's research department. Our request was denied due to concerns that bishops receiving the survey would be hesitant to answer questions for an outside research group regarding matters of a confidential nature. Also considered was the fact that bishops are called for approximately five years; at any given time, 40% of the LDS bishops sample may be in office for less than two years.

---

57 Published by the Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah. January 2000. This report is found at [www.cppa.utah.edu/wri/charitleaders.pdf](http://www.cppa.utah.edu/wri/charitleaders.pdf).
years. As a result, many bishops would not be able to respond with accuracy to the questions. Publicly available administrative and program data from the LDS Church were then gathered. The findings reported in this study regarding the LDS welfare sector reflect these and other data.

Based on the original research design, a random sample of nonprofits and religious organizations was generated from the database of organizations, which is described in more detail below. After the LDS Church decided not to participate in the survey, two options were considered. The first was to send surveys to all organizations in the database and the second was to cut the sample size from the original 1000. It was determined in consultation with DWS to expand the sample to include the entire population in the database. Thus, researchers surveyed all charitable organizations in the state, with the exception of LDS congregations.

The following sections describe the development of the database, the survey distribution, and the response rate.

**Database Development**

A database of both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations was created. The goal was to include only Utah organizations that provided services to families or individuals that are eligible for or who receive TANF/FEP or who may become eligible for that type of government financial assistance. Nonprofit organizations that are focused on specific diseases were excluded, as were organizations that provide services exclusively to people with disabilities. Some organizations may have been included in error because researchers decided to risk erring on the side of being overly inclusive rather than risk excluding an appropriate organization. Also, Associations of Governments were included since they often provide services that are similar to services provided by nonprofit organizations.

Sources of names of organizations that were used to build the database include in part:

- Utah Nonprofits Directory;
- Department of Workforce Services web page list of service providers;
- Community Resources Directory;
- Utah Food Bank;

---

58 At the time of the design of this study, there were 3,749 LDS congregations; as of March 1, 2001, there are 3,903 such congregations (see page 44).
59 Although a random sample was generated, it was not used. The process used for generating it will not be summarized here but is available upon request.
60 Associations of Governments (AOGs) are multi-county planning districts of two or more counties in Utah. The purpose of the AOGs is to facilitate regional and statewide planning and integration, reduce
Coalition of Religious Communities;
lists from Utah religious organizations including the Catholic Diocese, Presbyterian Church USA, and Episcopal Church of Utah;
the Internet;
the Yellow Pages;
attendees from previous Welfare Reform Initiative events; and
lists of organizations provided by focus group participants.

Organizations were coded either as religious or nonprofit organizations. The database contained 771 organizations: 454 religious organizations and 317 nonprofit organizations.

Survey Distribution and Response Rate

A cover letter, survey, and prepaid response envelope were mailed in two separate batches in November 1999. To allow tracking of responses from individual organizations, the prepaid response envelopes were numbered. When a response was received, the number was used to determine who submitted it and this was registered in the sample database. Whether the respondent desired to receive a copy of the survey results (as offered in the last question) was noted and the name and address voluntarily provided were used to update the sample database. Then the survey itself was assigned a sequential number based on the order in which it was received. The envelope was then separated from the survey so that no one else could identify who had submitted the survey. The last question on the surveys invited respondents to provide their name and address so that they could be informed of the study’s results; those who complied were identifiable to researchers.

To increase the response rate, a second copy of the survey was mailed to all non-respondents approximately one month after the initial survey was sent. The tracking of returned surveys discussed above allowed the follow-up surveys to non-respondents to be performed easily.

Of the 768 surveys mailed to eligible organizations, the overall response rate was 28.9% (222 surveys). Of the total returned, 132 were from religious organizations (59.45%) and 90 were from nonprofit organizations (40.54%). Of the ones from nonprofit organizations, 16 were religious affiliates.

duplication of local government efforts, and provide and operate services or facilities that are more efficiently provided on a district-wide basis. Seven AOGs exist in Utah.

See Appendix B for the cover letters and surveys.
Table 1: Initial Survey Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th># Surveys Mailed</th>
<th># Surveys Returned w/ Usable Data</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Surveys Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the surveys were returned, three nonprofit organizations that submitted surveys were excluded because it was determined that these organizations did not meet the criteria established for inclusion in the database and the analysis.

Responses to open-ended questions were typed into Microsoft Word. The rest of the responses were input into an SPSS database. All input was double-checked for accuracy.

PHASE 3 – POST-IMPLEMENTATION SURVEYS

The third phase of the study collected data after the imposition of time limits. Items in follow-up surveys\(^\text{62}\) were designed to measure over time any impact of the imposition of time limits on charitable organizations. All organizations that responded to the first survey were sent post-implementation follow-up surveys.

Two follow-up surveys were conducted, each of which looked at different time-frames. The first survey asked respondents to compare January-March of 2000 with January-March of 1999 and with October-December of 1999. The second follow-up survey asked respondents to compare January-June of 2000 with January-June of 1999 and July-December of 1999.

Like the initial survey, the follow-up surveys contained questions regarding types of social services provided, service capacity, waiting lists, collaborations with other organizations, funding for programs and services, characteristics of clientele, increases or decreases in demand experienced, and strategies planned if demands outstrip capacity.

Only organizations that responded to the initial survey were asked to complete the post-implementation surveys. Of the 222 organizations that responded to the first survey, 213 were traceable. These 213 organizations were sent the two post-implementation surveys. The same method that was used to track respondents on the initial survey was used for the post-implementation surveys. Also, survey responses were entered using the same method used previously.

\(^{62}\) See Appendix C for the follow-up surveys.
The first post-implementation survey was mailed in mid-April 2000. Of the 213 surveys mailed, the overall response rate of usable surveys was 23% (49 surveys). Of the total returned, 25 were from religious organizations (51%) and 24 were from nonprofit organizations (49%).

Table 2: First Post-Implementation Survey Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th># Surveys Mailed</th>
<th># Surveys Returned w/ Usable Data</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Surveys Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second post-implementation survey was mailed in mid-July 2000 and any nonrespondents were mailed a follow-up survey as a reminder in early-August. Of the 213 surveys mailed, the overall response rate of usable surveys was 32.4% (69 surveys). Of the total returned, 39 were from religious organizations (56.5%) and 30 were from nonprofit organizations (43.5%).

Table 3: Second Post-Implementation Survey Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th># Surveys Mailed</th>
<th># Surveys Returned w/ Usable Data</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Surveys Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response rates were higher for the second post-implementation survey (32.4% overall) than for the first post-implementation survey (23% overall). This is probably due to three reasons. First, the first post-implementation survey asked organizations to look at three-month periods. For some organizations, this may have been too short of a period for them to have tracked information or observed any patterns in requests. Second, a reminder mailing (or second mailing) of surveys was not completed for the first post-implementation survey. It was decided that given the time frames it would not be useful given that researchers would be sending out another survey. Finally, given that time limits had been in effect for six months, for the second post-implementation survey, organizations may have felt that they had more information with which to respond.
As we compare the responses from the two post-implementation surveys, it is important to note that 37% of the combined respondents answered both surveys, while 67% answered either one or the other, but not both. For nonprofit organizations, 32% responded to both, while 40% of religious organizations responded to both. This lack of consistency in the organizations that responded to both surveys may account for some of the incongruities in the findings from the two surveys.
V. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

You have dignity and self-esteem...life is easier without having to ask for help.

It's scary when welfare is all there is left, and now there is nothing.

This section presents research findings and discussion. We begin with describing the capacity and scope of the LDS welfare sector, estimating its proportion of the entire Utah charitable welfare sector. With that estimate, the results of our surveys of the balance of the charitable sector in Utah can be better interpreted.

CAPACITY AND SCOPE OF LDS WELFARE SECTOR

Researchers were unable to obtain permission to survey a sample of LDS bishops in Utah, as originally planned; thus we here describe findings regarding the capacity and scope of the LDS welfare sector, drawing on administrative data, published sources, and interviews.\(^{63}\)

Not surprisingly, the largest charitable organization in the state of Utah is The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Utah is the world headquarters of the LDS Church, recently identified by the National Council of Churches as the fifth-largest denomination in the United States. The considerable resources of the LDS Church have been generally publicized,\(^{64}\) and the vast extent of the LDS Church welfare programs is widely acknowledged. Approximately 76% of the population of Utah,\(^{65}\) or 1,604,700 individuals, are affiliated with the LDS Church. This represents an increase from 1,458,350 in 1994.

LDS Wards

As noted previously, every LDS bishop serves as a welfare agent. Bishops, as congregational leaders, are charged with responsibility for the welfare of all who live within the geographical ward boundary, regardless of their religious affiliation (or non-affiliation). Welfare assistance is rendered entirely at their discretion. Welfare assistance is not limited to LDS members; assistance may be given to others regardless of religious affiliation.

\(^{63}\) We appreciate the efforts of officials in the Church Welfare Services Department for assisting researchers with relevant data.

\(^{64}\) As an example, see Richard Ostling’s *Mormon America: The power and the promise*, published in 1999 by Harper.

\(^{65}\) Precise figures vary with regards to the proportion of the population of Utah to be LDS. The range is from less than 50% in Salt Lake City, to nearly 100% in some small town and rural areas.
Information available from the LDS Church Welfare Services Department reveals that as of March 1, 2001, there were 3,903 LDS congregations in Utah, representing an increase from 3,239 since 1994. Bishops are supported by the following structure: 22 Bishops' Storehouses (where people can "shop", using a bishop's order instead of money, for food and other necessities); 24 Deseret Industries outlets (where used clothing and furniture is refurbished and available for purchase to the general public); 13 family service agencies, and 19 employment centers.\footnote{For a full description of the development of LDS welfare services, see Garth L. Mangum and Bruce D. Bluwell, \textit{The Mormons’ War on Poverty}. Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 1993. See also the LDS Church Welfare handbook, \textit{Providing in the Lord's Way: A Leader's Guide to Welfare}. Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. 1990.}

\textbf{Welfare Square}

Welfare Square, located in a city block at 700 South and 800 West in Salt Lake City, is a facility with agencies and services that supplement the welfare efforts of LDS bishops. It includes an employment center, a bishops’ storehouse, bakery, Family Support Services Center, grain storage, cannery, dairy, and a Deseret Industries Store; similar services are available in other areas of Utah. It serves those of any faith who seek assistance, with or without referral, as authorized by an LDS bishop.\footnote{Authorization may be obtained from a local congregational bishop or from one of the two bishops located at Welfare Square.} Table 1 represents data from the LDS Welfare Square facility for 1999 and 2000, indicating the following levels of service to individuals and families.\footnote{I am indebted to Bishop Mark Blackham, one of the two bishops at Welfare Square, for this information, provided in February of 2001.}

As can be seen, in 1999, the two bishops at Welfare Square conducted 12,589 interviews of individuals and families\footnote{As can be seen, in 1999, the two bishops at Welfare Square conducted 12,589 interviews of individuals and families seeking assistance. In contrast, in 2000–after the imposition of time limits—the bishops conducted 10,980 interviews, representing a decrease of 12.8% seeking assistance from the bishops at Welfare Square. All of these cases were either referred to other sources for help—such as to the Community Action Program, or assisted directly with food, bus fare, gasoline, lodging, etc. These figures do not include the assistance of LDS Employment Services, also located at Welfare Square. Of special note is the fact that the number of children served in these cases in 2000 numbered 11,677, representing a 2.7% increase over the number of children served in 1999. The total number of people assisted in 2000 was 19,180, representing a decrease in those served of 8%. Welfare Square officials report that while they are not seeing any increase in} seeking assistance. In contrast, in 2000–after the imposition of time limits—the bishops conducted 10,980 interviews, representing a decrease of 12.8% seeking assistance from the bishops at Welfare Square. All of these cases were either referred to other sources for help—such as to the Community Action Program, or assisted directly with food, bus fare, gasoline, lodging, etc. These figures do not include the assistance of LDS Employment Services, also located at Welfare Square.

Of special note is the fact that the number of children served in these cases in 2000 numbered 11,677, representing a 2.7% increase over the number of children served in 1999. The total number of people assisted in 2000 was 19,180, representing a decrease in those served of 8%. Welfare Square officials report that while they are not seeing any increase in
Table 4: Summary of Services Provided by Bishops at Welfare Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews conducted of those</td>
<td>12,589</td>
<td>10,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requesting assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; percentage LDS</td>
<td>5,510 (43.8%)</td>
<td>5,111 (46.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; percentage – Other faiths</td>
<td>7,079 (56.2%)</td>
<td>5,869 (53.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received direct assistance</td>
<td>9,484 (75.3%)</td>
<td>7,503 (68.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; percentage LDS</td>
<td>4,012 (42.3%)</td>
<td>3,403 (45.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; percentage – Other faiths</td>
<td>5,472 (57.7%)</td>
<td>4,100 (54.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children served</td>
<td>11,369</td>
<td>11,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase in number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number served (adult and</td>
<td>20,853</td>
<td>19,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage decrease in those served</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

requests after implementation of time limits, they are seeing an increase in requests from families with children.

LDS Inner City Project

In 1997, under the direction of Elder Alexander B. Morrison, Utah North Area President, the LDS Church’s Salt Lake Inner City Humanitarian Pilot Project was initiated. The target area in Salt Lake City was identified using 1990 U.S. Census data regarding: income level, unemployment rate, single heads of households, elementary school statistics, educational level, and so forth. Sixty-two LDS congregations were defined as target congregations for this project. About 50% of the people living within these ward boundaries are of the LDS faith. Four hundred humanitarian mentors—LDS members from affluent congregations—have been assigned to these congregations to work with families in need. Mentors are called to this assignment for 12-18 months. To date these mentors have contributed over 500,000 volunteer hours. As of June 1999, between 3,000-4,000 people were being assisted; 50 automobiles had been donated; and 300 expert specialists had provided over 5,000 hours of professional service, this time valued at $100/hour to over 1,000 families (Mangum and Salevurakis, 2000).

Conclusion: The LDS Church, representing approximately 75% of the state's population, is the largest charitable organization in Utah and is known in part for its vast fiscal and volunteer/organizational resources. In analyzing the relative proportion of Utah's charitable capacity in Utah, the standard variables of membership and resources were employed. Our

---

69 Families with children included two-parent families and single-parent families.
conservative calculation of the LDS Church welfare capacity is that it represents two-thirds of the total charitable capacity in Utah. This welfare subsector was found to represent a substantial contribution to the capacity of all organizations—charitable as well as governmental—to assist those in need.

INITIAL CAPACITY SURVEY

As we discuss the findings of the capacity survey and the post-implementation surveys, we note that the LDS Church is considered as representing two-thirds of Utah's charitable welfare capacity. This is the nonsurveyed welfare subsector.

The following discussions report the results from the surveyed welfare subsector. It is important to note that the surveyed subsector represents one-third of the total charitable welfare sector in Utah: all 768 charitable organizations not affiliated with the LDS Church. As indicated above, of the total initial surveys returned, 132 were from religious organizations (59.5%) and 90 were from nonprofit organizations (40.5%), representing a response rate of 28.9%. Thus the following represent the responses of 29% of one-third of Utah's charitable sector.

1. Knowledge of Welfare Policy: Charitable leaders were asked to indicate their level of knowledge regarding recent changes in welfare policy. As is evident from Table 5 below, approximately twice as many leaders of social service nonprofit organizations (designated with an S) indicated knowing quite a bit about policy changes than leaders of religious organizations (designated with an R). Additionally, nearly one-third of religious leaders who responded indicated that they know very little about welfare policy changes, as compared with 22% of the social service nonprofit leaders who responded.

Table 5: Charitable Leaders' Relative Knowledge of Welfare Policy Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>S (%)</th>
<th>R (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing or very little:</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some:</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot or quite a bit:</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings provide evidence that leaders of social service nonprofits often are more cognizant of welfare policies than are religious leaders. As discussed above, the primary purpose of religious organizations are deemed as spiritual in nature; their funding sources are not associated with public policy. In contrast, the primary purpose of social service nonprofit organizations is to fulfill a social service mission for which they are funded. In contrast to
religious organizations, the survival of social service nonprofit organizations often depends in part on their ability to be aware of—and respond to—policy changes.

2. Requests Increasing or Decreasing: Charitable leaders were asked whether, over the past year, requests for services were decreasing or increasing. The different responses mirror their differences as organizations. Religious clergy, in focus groups, surveys, and interviews, reported that requests for services were about the same; the one exception is information regarding services rendered by the two bishops at Welfare Square showing a decrease of 12.8% in 2000, as compared with 1999. In contrast, reports in the media highlight dramatic increases in requests by social service nonprofit organizations; these findings are supported by respondents to our surveys who predicted an increase for 2000.

The discrepancy between religious organizations and social service nonprofits is not unexpected. Welfare services rendered by religious and other social service nonprofit organizations respond to poverty conditions in general, and not only to government policy. The faith-based charitable social net is substantial and may not be affected greatly by changes in government welfare policy. In contrast, social service nonprofits with funding tied to government programs are likely to be directly affected by government social welfare policy. This dynamic might change for those religious organizations that choose to participate in the Charitable Choice provision of PRWORA.

3. Number of Individuals Served: Charitable organizations were asked to report how many individuals to whom they had directly provided service during the past year. Respondents indicated that they had directly assisted 788,565 individuals in need, representing a mean of 3552.09 people per organization in the past year. The range was 12 - 201,000. Undoubtedly, the exceptionally large number of individuals assisted is a reflection of assisting people multiple times (as in serving meals), as well as some individuals being assisted by multiple organizations. Even so, when we remember that these raw numbers are from only 29% of one-third of the charitable welfare sector in Utah, these results are impressive. Obviously, charitable organizations are assisting many more people than those who are cycling on and off government welfare rolls.

Charitable organizations report that the elderly account for approximately 165,600 of the people assisted. In addition, the following demographic descriptions of individuals assisted were provided by social service nonprofit respondents: 4% are African American; 4% are
Asian/Pacific Islanders; 68% are Caucasian; 20% are Hispanic; 9% are Native American.\textsuperscript{70} Twenty-three percent are under 5 years of age; 24% are between 5-17 years of age; 60% are between 18-64 years of age; 21% are over 65 years of age.\textsuperscript{71} Forty-three percent are male, while 57% are female. As the qualitative research showed that most religious organizations do not track demographic data for those they assist, religious organizations were not asked these questions in the survey.

In comparison, according to a 1999 study by the Social Research Institute of the University of Utah's Graduate School of Social Work, the demographic characteristics of long-term welfare recipients in Utah included the following: 73% are Caucasian and 96% are female.\textsuperscript{72} The differences between the welfare population and the nonprofit data above indicates that charitable institutions serve a broader population of the poor than does the cash assistance welfare program.

4. Types of Households Served: When looking at households with and without children, charitable organizations estimated serving the following numbers of various types of households in the past year. These data emphasize the presence of children in families served by the charitable sector.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Households with/without Children}
\begin{tabular}{lll}

Two-parent with children: & 24,429 (37\%) & with 24,984 children at home \\
Single-parent with children: & 18,953 (28\%) & with 12,181 children at home \\
Two-adult with no children: & 3,146 (5\%) & \\
Single-adult with no children: & 15,343 (23\%) & \\
Unknown household type: & 4,827 (7\%) & \\
\hline
TOTAL households: & 66,698 with 37,165 children at home & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Some of these figures appear inconsistent—that is to say, reporting just under 19,000 single-parent households with 12,000 children at home. This discrepancy may be a function of several factors. One factor may be the fact that these data regarding numbers of children are not tracked sufficiently by the organizations. Another factor may be that some respondents

\textsuperscript{70} Percentages will not sum to 100 because individuals may be recorded in more than one category.  
\textsuperscript{71} The stated percentages are the means of percentages reported by charitable leaders, and thus the sum is often not 100%.  
perhaps interpreted the question to include one child to be implicit in the category, and their responses indicated additional children. Further, some parents (for instance, the elderly) have children away from home.

Of note, however, is the preponderance of households with children at home—43,382 households, or 65% of the total households reported. Furthermore, translating the households data above into the minimum number of individuals served, the total number of individuals is 131,438, of which 37,165, or 28%, were reported to be children.

It is important here to point out that this figure of a minimum of 131,438 individuals calculated in these households is certainly a more manageable and realistic figure than the 788,565 individuals reported above as being assisted during the past year. Again, when we remember that these raw numbers are from 29% of one-third of the charitable sector in Utah, these results are still consequential.

5. Employment Status of Those Served: In contrast to the popular notion that people in need do not work for a living, charitable organizations reported serving the following types of households with regard to employment in the past year.

Table 7: Households Served and Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two or more employed adults:</td>
<td>15,126</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One employed adult:</td>
<td>14,830</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No employed adult:</td>
<td>16,912</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown employment status:</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL households:</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,844</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data reveal that 29,956 households, representing 56% of the total, have at least one employed adult in the family, and 15,126 households—28% of the total that need assistance—have two or more employed adults in the family. The fact that adults are employed and yet are not able to draw sufficient income for their families is a significant factor with broad implications. Utah’s lower wage scales and high percentage of low-end service jobs certainly play a role. From these data, we can see that willingness to work is not the issue for many families seeking help.

The relationship between poverty and employment is more fully explored by Coon, Geo-Jaja, and Mangum (2000) in their Utah research on individuals who have come off of the welfare rolls into employment. This research found that the vast majority of those in Utah who left
welfare for employment from 1994 to 1997 joined the ranks of the working poor. In other words, they left "welfare poverty for working poverty" (Coon, Geo-Jaja, and Mangum, 2000: 12).

6. Households Receiving Government Assistance: Clearly, the charitable sector serves many more people, in sheer numbers, than those on government assistance. As reported above, households on welfare cash assistance dropped from 18,000 in 1993 to over 8,000 in 2000; in contrast, households served by charitable organizations conservatively number tens of thousands above the caseload figure. Charitable organizations as a whole reported serving households receiving government assistance to the following extent in the past year.

| Receiving government assistance: | 13,719 (30%) |
| Eligible for but not receiving government assistance: | 5,688 (13%) |
| Not eligible for government assistance: | 10,743 (24%) |
| Unknown: | 14,963 (33%) |
| TOTAL households: | 45,113 |

As we can see from these figures, only 13,719, or 30% of the households, are receiving government assistance. Thirteen percent of the households—5,688—are considered eligible but are not receiving assistance. Nearly a quarter of the households—10,743—are not eligible and for a third of the households, their eligibility is unknown. Social service nonprofit organizations reported that households receiving government assistance represented 38% of their client base in the past year. Additionally, there are likely some families receiving government welfare assistance that do not seek help from charitable organizations.

---

73 Government assistance as a category is broader than TANF, and includes a number of services in addition to TANF cash assistance. These services include food stamps, Medicaid, child care services, and others. Researchers purposely framed survey questions in terms of "government assistance" rather than TANF because information from the focus groups suggested that many respondents to the survey might not distinguish between what kind of government assistance people requesting help are obtaining. As it is, respondents reported that they did not know whether 33% of the households assisted are receiving government assistance. Therefore, our analysis takes into account the fact that "government assistance" includes TANF as well as other services.

74 There is evidence that some families coming off of financial assistance may not realize that they qualify for other government services. While on welfare, recipients have help from a caseworker in arranging for other services, including food stamps. Once they leave TANF, they no longer have this help in making arrangements. See Zedlewski and Brauner, 2000.
7. **Types of Assistance Provided by Charitable Organizations:** Charitable leaders were asked to report the types of services directly rendered by their organization or provided in cooperation with others. As can be seen from the list below, these organizations provide a vast array of services to those in need; these services are of varying types requiring a range of expertise.

Nearly two-thirds of the organizations reported that they provide services to homeless individuals and families. Over half of the organizations reported providing monetary assistance, transportation, food and clothing. Housing and medical/dental/prescriptions were provided by over one-third of the organizations. Over a quarter of the organizations provided education. Over one-fifth of the organizations provided child-care and employment assistance. Finally, ten to twenty percent of the organizations provided substance abuse assistance, assistance to victims of domestic violence/abuse and legal services. A third of the organizations reported providing other services than those noted here.

**Table 9: Services Provided by Charitable Organizations**

Over one-half of charitable organizations provide:

- Services to homeless individuals and families: 64.9%
- Monetary assistance: 57.7%
- Transportation: 53.2%
- Food: 52.3%
- Clothing: 50.5%

Over one-third of charitable organizations provide:

- Housing: 37.8%
- Medical/Dental/Prescriptions: 36.5%

Over one-fifth of charitable organizations provide:

- Education: 28.8%
- Child Care: 22.5%
- Employment Assistance: 20.3%

Over one-tenth of charitable organizations provide:

- Substance Abuse Assistance: 19.8%
- Domestic Violence/Abuse: 17.6%
- Legal Services: 10.8%
In providing help, charitable organizations often collaborate with one another and with government agencies, indicating a strong network of organizations that know each others’ expertise and capacities. Nearly all (98.6%) of the respondents indicated that they refer people to other organizations for assistance: over one-third refer to clergy/religious leaders, over ninety percent refer to nonprofit organizations, and nearly eighty percent refer to government agencies. Charitable leaders listed a variety of shelters, churches, state/local/county government agencies, and social service nonprofit organizations to which they refer people for assistance. Overwhelmingly, the primary reason is that their organization does not offer the requested service (91.9%). This suggests a major inefficiency for those seeking assistance. That is to say, they apparently need to transport themselves from one organization to another to receive the services they need. This task may be daunting to those with limited resources. Also, 32.9% of the respondents also reported that their reason for referrals was that their organization’s service capacity is full.

8. Service Capacity of Nonprofits: Nonprofit leaders were asked how much of an increase in requests for services their organizations are able to absorb. The majority (66%) indicated that their organizations could absorb only 10% or less. Nineteen percent indicated that they could absorb an additional 20% of current requests for assistance, while only 14% could absorb more than 20% of current requests. In fact, over the past three years, nearly 40% indicated that their funding had decreased. In response to this decrease, these organizations reduced their full-and part-time staff, increased their use of volunteers, reduced hours and services, and increased collaborations with other groups for referral purposes. Nearly one-third reported a negative cash-flow from the previous fiscal year, while just over 10% broke even. For the nonprofits who responded to our survey, the total operating budgets for social service programs and services for the current fiscal year was over $74,000,000.00.

Funding for social service nonprofit organizations in Utah comes primarily from four sources (percentages listed are means of the percentages of funds): fees for services (27.4% of funds), federal government grants (26.4% of funds), individual donors and members (25.1% of funds), and state government contracts and grants (23.8% of funds). Other funding sources, in descending order, include: foundations, private corporations, local governments, United Way, and endowments. It is important to note that governmental sources provide over half of the funding for these social service nonprofits. One implication of this fact is that nonprofit social service organizations are more closely tied to governmental welfare programs than are religious congregations, in general.
9. Strategies for the Future: Looking at the upcoming year, 35% of the charitable leaders foresee an increase in demand for food and cash, 25% anticipate an increase in demand for housing, and 14% predict an increase in demand for medical and dental assistance. Twenty-three percent of the charitable leaders are planning for an increase in demand for all services.

When asked what their strategies would be in the event of increases in requests for services beyond what they can presently absorb, respondents were evenly divided on the options of raising more funds and increasing staff (31.5% and 32.0% respectively). Approximately a quarter reported that they would have to reduce services (24.3%), while only 26.1% indicated that they would be able to expand services. Note that respondents were able to give more than one answer.

GREATEST CONCERN REGARDING THE IMPACT OF WELFARE REFORM ON INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES

*That they have little chance of surviving without some assistance and that what assistance is available is woefully inadequate. The difficulties in negotiating the regulations of government agencies are tremendous. The shortage of adequate housing for low-income families, low wages, and nearly non-existent medical and dental services are an embarrassment and a crime.*

—Congregational Leader

The last item on the survey was an open-ended question, asking respondents to share their greatest concern regarding the impact of welfare reform on the families and individuals who come to them for assistance. While approximately one-fifth, or 48, of charitable leaders surveyed choose not to respond to this question, written answers were received from 174, or nearly 80% of the respondents. Of the written responses, six reported that they had no concerns about the impact of welfare reform and 168 expressed some concern. Their comments are instructive and add considerably to our understanding.

Of the 168 responses expressing concerns, nearly two-thirds expressed concerns in three areas: lack of affordable housing; limited resources of charitable organizations; and ability to give only inadequate assistance.
Lack of Affordable Housing. This issue was the most dominant concern indicated by respondents, and reflects considerable experience and current research regarding the lack of affordable housing in Utah. Comments included: “People need affordable housing; families in need cannot afford high rents”; “Rent assistance is needed–families are threatened with eviction and in many cases with very cruel notices from landlords”; “High cost of housing–saving enough for security deposit and first & last months’ rent is virtually impossible for these folk”; “My greatest concern is that the community increases the availability of affordable housing for the poor”.

Their Organization has Limited Resources. The second most dominant theme from our respondents is the realization that the resources of their respective organizations are limited. As they put it: "We have very limited funds available to assist in rent and utility bills. Many we see have already been turned down by other agencies"; "That I don't have enough services to offer them, especially in the medical/dental area"; "That the church will not be able to help. The majority of those that ask, usually come here after all other areas have turned them away"; "The inability to serve those who need it the most"; "I need to comment that those requesting help from us were declined because we are running out of money. When our funds were depleted, we had to turn down several requests, and then began to receive fewer requests"; "I worry about availability of services, poor policies, and lack of cooperation among agencies". As can be seen, expressed concerns are heightened because they see people who have been turned down elsewhere.

Available Assistance is Inadequate. A related dominant theme expressed is the realization that fundamentally all available assistance is inadequate. “Assistance is often a stop-gap measure. We need good-paying entry-level jobs”; “They should receive increased help from government agencies. Health care is a major concern”; "Government agencies actually block us from providing assistance"; “I am concerned that the poor will expect the private sector to support them in at least the same manner that the public sector has–which is impossible. Charitable dollars cannot/will not take the place of tax dollars”; "Government is relying on private nonprofits to provide services--in many communities, nonprofit services are inadequate". Many report that the cases coming to them now are more complex.

75 Wages are sometimes too low to afford housing, as full-time workers are often reported to be living in cars or in homeless shelters. In 1998, research of 30 cities by the U.S. Conference of Mayors found that 20% of those in homeless shelters are full-time wage earners. See www.nationalhomeless.org/jobs.html.
A number of charitable leaders also expressed concerns about the following key areas: sufficient food for those in need ("I am concerned about their ability to obtain sufficient food for their families"); employment and wages ("We need living wages for those who work!") and medical/health insurance ("We see people with health problems and no health insurance").

Also frequently noted as two areas of prime concern were long-term assistance and spiritual needs. It’s important to note that religious leaders were not the only ones to express concern for people’s spiritual well-being—other nonprofit leaders indicated this concern, as well.

**Long-term Assistance.** Here we see concerns that people receive long-term preparation for life, and not merely short-term assistance. As these leaders pointed out: "I am concerned that people develop the long-term ability to get off of welfare and stay off"; "Most of our clients are working but at minimum wage jobs. Welfare reform has not impacted our services at all. However, we are concerned about individuals with very low reading skills. It will take literally years (at least) to improve their reading enough to get a better paying job"; "What we are able to provide is very temporal. We may help with food, but there is nothing provided to change the long-term situation."

**Spiritual Needs.** The precise meaning of the phrase ‘spiritual needs’ widely varies, of course. However, the phrase was used by charitable leaders to refer to more lasting conditions, such as low self-esteem, difficulty taking responsibility, and so forth. As they put it: "Their spiritual condition is #1. Their lack of ability or desire to plan ahead and take responsibility for their own needs and problems is a great hindrance to them"; "Their spiritual needs, as expressed in poor self-image and no work ethic. They lack basic skills and motivation, including education. They have a destructive family life due to dependencies on drugs, etc."; "Their general state of hopelessness. Most of the people we see in this capacity are people that have been needy for quite some time."

**Discernment:** One of the dilemmas reported by religious leaders in distributing limited resources for assistance to those in need is the problem of determining whose needs are truly legitimate. Charitable leaders, especially leaders of religious congregations, face this problem squarely as they are often not bound by funding mandates to serve those in a specified category. Religious leaders must act on solely their own discernment and it is difficult. Our respondents expressed a strong mixture of compassion and skepticism towards those who request assistance. Many religious leaders expressed strong feelings regarding the plight of the
poor, the deficiencies inherent in the welfare-to-work government welfare system, and concerns about our responsibility as members of society to help one another. One leader wrote: "How did they get where they are? Who failed them and how can we make it right?" On the other hand, several spoke of their fear that the church is "being swindled." One pastor reported: "I have been the pastor of a center city, urban church in California. My first assessment is to determine if the person is a 'pro' trying to hustle me. In our setting they almost always are 'pros'".

**Welfare Policy:** Finally, charitable leaders also expressed concerns about the welfare policy changes: "I am concerned that Workforce Services has creamed off the best clients while those who remain are taken off cash grants, are going to come to our shelter, and there won't be room"; "We have seen a 26% increase in single mothers in poverty since welfare reform began"; "That many women who are close to getting their lives together will have to go back to batterers for financial security." One leader could not control feelings of disgust for the policymakers: "Welfare reform was brought about by people who do not see the big picture and are filled with greed and fear. The low wage earners and poor people are the people who suffer most, and most of those people are children."

**CONCLUSION:** Utah's charitable sector capacity as a whole consists of three parts: the LDS Church welfare sector as representing two-thirds of the capacity, with the other one-third capacity represented by over 750 social service nonprofit organizations and religious congregations. Social service nonprofits report significantly greater knowledge of welfare policy changes than do religious leaders, and they keep better demographic records of the characteristics of those to whom service is rendered than do religious organizations. These findings may reflect the fact that approximately half of the funding for nonprofits comes from government sources; government sources require strict accountability, including collection of specific client characteristics.

Government funding to help the poverty population is administered only in part through government channels; government also funds assistance through nonprofits. This funding pattern is being extended further to include religious institutions through the White House Office on Faith-Based Initiatives. Thus government assistance as a whole is less accessible to the public. That is to say, while citizens in need may access government funds indirectly through nonprofit organizations, this dispersion of service provision places those seeking help in the position of having to search for the help they need—which is forthcoming ultimately from the
government. Often these people have limited resources for transportation, and are working on an hourly wage.

While religious organizations, including the LDS Church, report little or no increase in requests for services since the institution of welfare reform, nonprofits report dramatic increases in requests for services. Nonprofits typically provide a targeted set of services to a targeted population, while religious organizations tend to serve a wide range of needs for a broader population. Increases in requests are anticipated in the areas of food, cash, and housing; most nonprofits plan to seek more funding and increase staff to meet the demands, while some report the need to ration out services to people who ask for help.

Charitable organizations reported serving 788,565 individuals in the past year. This report is striking considering that these are raw numbers from 29% of the surveyed subsector. Obviously numerous people are being assisted numerous times; however, what is clear is that the charitable sector is providing service at an enormous level.

Most of the households served by charitable organizations have children at home, have at least one employed adult, and slightly over 30% are not known to be receiving government assistance.

The population served by the charitable sector is far broader than the TANF population. In addition to those living in poverty, middle class families are seeking charitable help.

Most of the charitable organizations provide services to homeless individuals and families, monetary assistance, transportation, food, and clothing; only a few charitable organizations provide substance abuse assistance, domestic violence/abuse assistance, and legal services.

Under AFDC, as an entitlement, citizens in need went to the government for assistance; they were entitled to this assistance because they met certain eligibility criteria. Under PRWORA, citizens can still go to government, but receiving available help often requires that work-related participation requirements be met. Many turn to charity to supplement their aid. As was the case under AFDC, some approach charity as the first option and do not approach government services at all.

In Utah the vast majority of charitable help is from religious institutions. The evidence indicates that religious organizations in Utah provide service on an humanitarian basis without regard to religious affiliation or activity.

As generous as these institutions are, this raises troubling issues. First, it is important to recognize that any religious organization that is not obtaining government funding for service provision (as is the case with the vast majority of such organizations in Utah) may legitimately
restrict its assistance for any reason. As the comments from surveyed congregational leaders reflected, there is at times great difficulty in discerning to whom help should be given.

Some petitioners for help may not be comfortable going to religious sources for a variety of reasons. Many women in need may have had difficulty with male authority figures, especially given the exceptionally high incidence of abuse from men in their lives. Most of the clergy in the United States are male, and Utah is no exception. Further, religious institutions frequently advance specific lifestyles that potential petitioners may not embrace. Hence single mothers with children may be hesitant to place themselves in a situation of inviting a judgmental response. In addition, some may be afraid of an obligation (real or perceived) to attend worship services, or may be afraid to be disloyal to their own religious upbringing by seeking assistance from another religious source.

Obviously no one would wish for a mother to return to an abusive situation with a husband or boyfriend. However, for single mothers with little transportation, scant knowledge of community resources, lack of government help, fear of negative judgment, but with a need to house and feed their children, there are few other options. This entire issue raises a painful possibility that as government assistance becomes less accessible, as we have discussed, economic circumstances may force mothers to place themselves at risk in abusive situations. Thus while the charitable sector is of impressive size in Utah, and while people go to great lengths to help those in need, what may be missing is a targeted effort to address the fears of those most at risk to ask religious organizations for help. It follows, then, that an analysis of the barriers of those seeking help from faith-based institutions would be appropriate for religious leaders and for public policy-makers to consider. 

---

POST-IMPLEMENTATION SURVEYS

The three-year life time limits on TANF cash assistance in Utah began to expire on December 31, 1999. In order to examine the extent to which families coming off of welfare might impact charitable organizations, researchers administered two post-implementation surveys. The first post-implementation survey compares services for the first three months of 2000, with the first three months of 1999 and with the last three months of 1999. The second post-implementation survey compares services for the first six months of 2000, with the first half (January through June) of 1999 and with the last half (July through December) of 1999.

While the response rate for both of the post-implementation surveys are respectable, the numbers of responses for each question may vary and sometimes are low. Hence, researchers are reluctant to draw strong conclusions based on these data. That being said, we can detect early indications of trends. Many of these early indications are slight; some are moderate, and a few may be designated as strong. In this discussion we can begin to see some patterns of the changing needs and situations of those seeking help.


More women are losing their children because of lack of funding and we see people losing their jobs and now having no benefits.

--Charitable Leader

A summary of charitable organizations’ responses to questions follow. All findings refer to comparisons on the first three months of 2000 (January through March) with the first three months of 1999 (January through March) and the last three months of 1999 (October through December).

1. Changes in Funds and Services Expended: A moderate number of organizations reported increases in funds and services expended in the aftermath of the imposition of time-limits. Comparing the total amount of funds and services expended for social services for the first three months of 1999, with the first three months of 2000, 83.6% indicated that there had been no increases, while 16.3% indicated that they had experienced increases. These organizations also compared the total amount of funds and services expended for social services for the last three months of 1999, with the first three months of 2000. Of the respondents, 81.3% indicated that there had been no increases, while 18.8% indicated that they had experienced increases.
We can safely say that the charitable sector experienced slight to moderate increases when compared to the previous year, with religious congregations reporting nearly identical responses as social service nonprofits in our sample.

2. Changes in Numbers of Referrals: Organizations compared the total numbers of referrals they were making to other organizations for the last three months of 1999, with the first three months of 2000. Of the respondents, 70% of nonprofits indicated that there had been no changes in the numbers of referrals. While 30% indicated that they had experienced changes, they were evenly divided on an increase in referrals and a decrease in referrals. In contrast, the vast majority (96%) of religious congregations reported no change. Thus we conclude that on the balance, there was little change in the number of referrals in the time frames specified.

3. Changes in Characteristics of People Served: The characteristics of people served by charitable organizations changed slightly with the implementation of time limits. By characteristics we are referring to age, marital status, employment status, ethnicity, receiving government assistance, immigrant status, etc. Looking at the first three months of 1999 as compared with the first three months of 2000, almost 90% of social service nonprofits indicated that they had noticed no changes, while 10% did see changes in who was coming to them for assistance. The comparison with the last quarter of 1999 yielded approximately the same result. Social service nonprofit organizations were more likely to note changes than were religious congregations. When comparing the first three months and the last three months of 1999 with the first three months of 2000, 96% of religious organizations reported no change, while 4% indicated some changes were apparent. The changes noted included: assistance being rendered to those outside the congregation (for religious organization), situations of people needing help are more complex, more immigrants, more single mothers, and more children.

4. Changes in Household Types: With regard to households types, organizations were asked if, during the first three months of 2000, they had seen a change in requests for assistance from people who live in various household types. Slightly more charitable organizations experienced a decline in requests from two-parent families with children, while experiencing moderate increases in requests from single-parent families with
children. Furthermore, slight increases were noted in requests from single-adult and two-adult families with no children.

With regard to employment, while charitable organizations report a slight decrease in requests from families with two or more employed adults, these organizations experienced a moderate increase in requests from families with one employed adult, and with no employed adult.

Finally, with regard to families receiving government assistance, charitable organizations report a moderate increase in requests from families on government assistance, from families eligible but not receiving government assistance, and in a nearly equal proportion from families not eligible for government assistance.

It should be noted, however, that by far the largest response designated is unknown for the household type or direction of increase/decrease with regard to that particular category. In addition, almost all religious leaders marked “unknown” in regards to unemployment and receipt of government assistance, as religious organizations seldom track this information. Responses are detailed on Table 10 below.

### Table 10: Changes in Requests from Various Household Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>No Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent w/children</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent w/children</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults with no children</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single adults with no children</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more employed adults</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One employed adult</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No employed adults</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving government assist.</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for GA but not receiving</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents volunteered written comments to clarify the presentation of their experience with regards to the situations of people seeking assistance. Comments included the following: "We see many more clients need financial assistance than need housing assistance"; "We are seeing more families of immigrant status"; "We see more singles looking for help"; "More families are looking for food, child care, and legal assistance."

These data reflect changes for the first three months of implementation of time-limits. While the vast majority of respondents did not know the specified characteristics of those seeking help, what is evident are early indications of shifts in the types of households seeking assistance.

5. Changes in Services Requested: While reporting little to moderate changes in funds and services expended and in referrals for the time frames specified in 2000 over 1999, these leaders did report increases in specific services requested. These shifts are important as they may point to the changing needs of those who are seeking assistance.

With regard to specific services provided by charitable organizations, respondents were asked to indicate if they had seen changes in requests for services during the first three months of 2000, as compared with the first three months of 1999 and with the last three months of 1999, and to indicate the percentage of increase. There were 148 indications of change, 97% (143) indicated increases while 3% (5) indicated decreases. The breakdown by time-frame is shown by the Table 11 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January-March 1999</th>
<th>October-December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses regarding the means of the increased percentages of changes in requests for specified services are detailed in Tables 12 and 13 below. We examine first changes in requests for services in January-March 2000 as compared with the first three months of 1999.
Table 12: Mean Percentage Increases in Services Requested of Charitable Organizations
January-March 2000 Compared to January-March 1999

In Rank Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>MEAN PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Food</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment Help</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transportation</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monetary Assistance</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Medical, Dental, and Prescription</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All Services</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Education</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clothing</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Legal Services</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Housing</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Abuse/Domestic Violence</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Child Care</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Foster Care</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unspecified Other: 34.3%

TOTAL of mean percentage increases: 282.6%

As is evident from these data, most of the increases in requests for services are reported in the areas of food, employment help, transportation, and monetary assistance, reflecting the need for basic assistance as well as, perhaps, the heightened concern for time-limits and the need to secure a job. The least amount of increase reported is child care, substance abuse assistance, and foster care.

As time limits were closing in during the last quarter of 1999, it is useful now to examine the responses whereby organizations compared their January-March 2000 requests with those they had received from October-December of 1999. Table 13 summarizes the increases in services requested of charitable organizations, comparing the first quarter of 2000 with the last quarter of 1999.
Table 13: Mean Percentage Increases in Services Requested of Charitable Organizations
January-March 2000 Compared to October-December 1999

In Rank Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>MEAN PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>PREV RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Food</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monetary Assistance</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Services</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clothing</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Abuse/Domestic Violence</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transportation</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Child Care</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legal Services</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Medical, Dental, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employment Help</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Foster Care</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Other:</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL of mean percentage increases: 177.0%

From these data, we can see shifts in requests as time-limits loom closer during the last months of 1999. While food is still ranked as the most requested service increase, employment help and transportation have dropped in the rankings. All services, education, monetary assistance, and clothing join food among the top of the list. The shift in ranking for abuse/domestic violence services from 10th to 5th, is indeed a troubling finding, signaling perhaps an increased desperation on the part of those facing increased economic pressures. For women on TANF, termination from assistance is certainly an economic emergency, and some may return to their abusers.

Respondents were asked also to indicate areas of decrease in requests for services. Comparing the first three months of 1999 with the first three months of 2000, very minor decreases were noted in requests for transportation, clothing, and food. When examining reported decreases for the first three months of 2000 as compared with the last three months of 1999, minor decreases were noted in transportation and childcare.
6. **Greatest Concerns:** Concluding the first post-implementation survey, respondents were asked in an open-ended question to share their greatest concern regarding the implementation of time limits on individuals and families coming to them for help. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents described their concerns, categorized below. A number of respondents expressed concerns in the following five categories:

1. **Housing:** "Housing is a huge problem because of high rents and low incomes." "We are very concerned about families maintaining their housing without cash assistance."

2. **Shortness of time-limits:** "Three years lifetime limit may not always be sufficient time to achieve financial stability and permanent self-reliance." "Families will not have enough time to become stable, find housing, and become employed before being forced to leave FEP due to time limits." "There are multiple problems in these families' lives, and it takes longer to help them improve their situations."

3. **Low paying jobs:** "All of our families are employed. All of them are below the median income. We serve families that are 30%-50% of median income." "We are concerned about working poor families remaining in low paying jobs rather than having the opportunities for education that would propel them out of poverty."

4. **Can offer only one-time help:** "We are worried that requests go unanswered due to our limited resources."

5. **Welfare of children:** "We do not need any more kids at risk for any reason. This law is short-sighted and quite frankly ‘sucks’." "Legal children of undocumented aliens have special health care needs that are not being met. This is a travesty." "When families lose their financial assistance, they lose their housing and their children. This marks the break up of poor families and children are the ones suffering."

One respondent took the opportunity to list overarching concerns: people lack necessary skills for self-sufficiency; lack of food; that the economy will suffer a downturn; educational needs not being met; the emotional components of welfare not being addressed; families lacking in social skills; people not being treated like human beings; some are simply unable to change their situation; resources for those who cannot work are taken by those who will not work; needy and desperate people might abuse the system, giving false information in the hopes of getting more help from churches.
Summary: Looking at the first three months of 2000, after time limits were first imposed on December 31, 1999, and comparing with the first and last quarters of 1999, overall increases in requests for assistance netted no dramatic change. While a moderate number of organizations reported increases in funds and services rendered, slight changes were reported in the characteristics of clients requesting assistance. Charitable leaders reported slightly more requests from single mothers, from immigrants, and that the situations of people asking for help were notably more complex.

In addition, requests for assistance from two parent families decreased slightly, while requests from one-parent families increased slightly; requests decreased slightly from families with two employed adults while increasing moderately from families with one or no employed adult; and requests also increased from those on government assistance.

As predicted by respondents to the initial survey, increases in requests for food, cash, and housing were noted. However, by the end of 1999, requests for education, clothing, and assistance with abuse/domestic violence situations outpaced requests for housing assistance. The rise in requests for assistance with domestic violence/abuse, from 10th rank in comparison with January-March 1999 to 5th rank in comparison with October-December 1999, as the December 31 deadline loomed, is important to highlight. This indeed is a troubling finding, as it, coupled with the rise in requests from single mothers, may possibly reflect an increasing incidence of women returning to abusive situations as they see no other help available.

Charitable leaders, in their written comments, expressed concerns regarding housing, the shortness of TANF time limits, the prevalence of low-paying jobs that do not cover expenses for families, and the well-being of children. These leaders also expressed frustration over their ability to provide only short-term assistance while these families had long-term needs.


We are seeing approximately 30% more working poor clients.
---Charitable Leader

In order to enlarge our understanding of the impact of the implementation of time limits, we now turn to the findings of the second post-implementation survey. The time limits in Utah began to expire on December 31, 1999. The first post-implementation survey examined the extent of any impact on charitable organizations during the first three months after the
implementation of time-limits in Utah. We now turn to the second post-implementation survey findings to ascertain any impact during the first six months after the implementation of time limits. A summary of charitable organizations’ responses to questions follow.

1. Changes in Number of Requests for Services: A moderate number of organizations in the sample reported increases in requests for services in the aftermath of the imposition of time-limits. No change in requests for services was reported by 71% of the 63 respondents, while 24% reported an increase in requests, and 5% reported a decrease. This follows the pattern of results reported from the first post-implementation survey. See Table 14 below.

![Table 14: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Changes in Number of Requests over Previous Year](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the first post-implementation survey responses of religious congregations were nearly identical to the responses of social service nonprofits in our sample, the same cannot be said of this second survey. Looking at the six months comparison, religious organizations reported “no change” more frequently than did social service nonprofit organizations at the rate of 86% to 52% respectively. Also, while 37% of the social service nonprofits reported an increase in requests for services, only 14% of the religious organizations reported increases. Interestingly, no religious organizations reported a decrease in requests for services, while 11% of the social service nonprofits reported a decrease.

While an overall trend in the charitable sector towards increased requests for services is clear, increases in requests are much more apparent for social service nonprofits than for religious organizations.
2. Changes in Funds and Services Expended: To examine further the dynamic of changes in demands for services, organizations were asked if the total amount of funds and services expended for social services during the first six months of 2000 had increased or decreased over each of the 1999 half-year periods. **January-June 2000 Compared with January-June 1999:** Comparing with January - June of 1999, 41.6% of the organizations reported no change in the January-June of 2000 time period. Reporting increases in funds and services expended were 48.3% of the organizations, while 10% reported that such expenditures decreased.

Of the organizations in the sample reporting an increase, 51.7% reported the increase to be slight: 10% or under. Another 27.6% reported somewhat moderate increases of 11-20%; 13.8% reported moderate increases of 21-30%; and 3.5% indicated only that there had been an increase with no percentage designated. An average of the increases over the first half of 1999 seem to be in the moderate range for all respondents.

Of the six organizations in our sample reporting decreases, most indicated that the decreases were slight, again 10% or less, while a third of the sample indicated the decreases in the somewhat moderate range of 11-20%. The decreases in funds and services over the first half of 1999 appear to be slight.

**January -June 2000 Compared with July-December 1999:** Turning now to comparisons in expenditures for funds and services between the second half of 1999 and January-June of 2000, 50.9% of the organizations reported no change. This represents an increase in those reporting no change by approximately 8% over the comparison with the January-June 1999 time period. Reporting increases in funds and services expended were 40.4% of the organizations, a respective drop of approximately 8%, while 8.8% reported that such expenditures decreased.

Of the organizations in the sample reporting an increase, 52.2% reported the increase to be slight: 10% or under. Another 30.4% reported somewhat moderate increases of 11-20%; 13.0% reported moderate increases of 21-30%; and 4.3% reported higher increases. Mirroring the comparisons with the first six months of 1999, an average of the increases over the second half of 1999 seems to be in the somewhat moderate range.

Of the few organizations in our sample reporting decreases, most indicated that the decreases were slight, again 10% or less. Like the first half of 1999, the decreases in funds and services over the second half of 1999 appear to be slight.
These data confirm that, for the vast majority of Utah's charitable organizations, there is some increase in requests for services, and in expenditures of funds for social services, when comparing with the post-time limit implementation period of January-June 2000 with either the pre-time limit implementation period of January-June 1999 or July-December 1999. The increases are moderate and may be early indications of trends, especially for social service nonprofit organizations.

3. Changes in Numbers of Referrals: Organizations compared the total numbers of referrals they were making to other organizations for the first six months of 1999, with the first six months of 2000. As we see in Table 15 below, of the respondents, 72.6% indicated that there had been no changes in the numbers of referrals while 25.8% indicated that they had experienced increases in referrals. A decrease in referrals was reported by 1.6%. For the second half of 1999, the situation is nearly identical. While 72.1% reported no change, 26.2% reported increases in requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Changes in Number of Referrals over Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-June 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked to describe changes in referrals, respondents wrote: "We are making mostly referrals because our own funds are being expended for individual families known to us"; "We are involved in many formal collaborations which make an increase in referrals possible"; "Gasoline, utility bills, and rent assistance have increased to which we refer others"; "I now know more places to refer people to"; "More families are looking for day care and services for youth, especially mentally challenged youth"; "Referrals are usually given for medical and child care problems."
4. Changes in the Characteristics of People Served: We begin to see some noticeable changes in the characteristics of people served by charitable organizations with the imposition of time limits, in this second post-implementation survey.

January-June 2000 Compared with January-June 1999: Looking at the first six months of 1999 as compared with the first six months of 2000, when asked if they had noticed any changes in the characteristics of people seeking assistance (such as: age, marital status, employment status, ethnicity, immigrant status, receiving government assistance, etc.), 72.1% of respondents indicated that they had noticed no changes, while 27.9% did see changes in who was coming to them for assistance. This is in sharp contrast to the first post-implementation survey findings where 91.2% reported no changes when comparing with the first quarter of 1999. In the second survey, religious organizations reported no changes 25% more than was reported by social service nonprofit organizations.

When asked what changes in the characteristics of people coming to them for help, charitable leaders indicated the following: "clients have many more problems and require more case management"; "clients no longer receiving TANF are applying for all services"; "increases in persons aged 18 and under requesting rental assistance"; "more working single mothers and more Hispanics"; "people are more desperate"; "more families are living together without being married and thus are denied help from the LDS Church"; "more adults, more seniors"; "more single unemployed males"; "people more brazen in their stories of need."

January-June 2000 Compared with July-December 1999: Looking at the last six months of 1999 as compared with the first six months of 2000, 78.9% of charitable leaders reported no changes, while 21.1% indicated some changes were apparent. These figures are more in line with the data from comparisons with the first half of 1999 and again, they are in sharp contrast to the first post-implementation survey findings where 91.2% reported no changes when comparing with the first quarter of 1999.

When asked what changes they saw in the characteristics of people coming to them for help, organizations' responses generally reflected the noted changes for the first six months of 1999, but reiterated that there were more immigrants and more single mothers seeking help.

5. Changes in Household Types: With regard to household types, organizations were asked if, during the first six months of 2000, they had seen a change in requests for
assistance from people who live in various household types. While most of the organizations in our sample do not track this information (66.7%), of the remaining 33% that do, most of them indicate an increase in requests from all listed categories of households. Two-parent households with children, and two adult households with no children have the same increase as households with one or no employed adult. Again, the highest increase is the category of single parent with children. Notably, only 2.2% of responses reported a decrease in people seen from any category of households.

With regard to employment, again, most of the organizations (76.2%) do not track this information. Nearly equal numbers of charitable leaders (6.7%) report an increase and decrease in requests from families with two or more employed adults. Under one-fifth (17.8%) of the organizations experienced an increase in requests from families with one employed adult, as well as with no employed adult, while 2.2% reported a decrease in requests from households with one employed adult.

Finally, with regard to families receiving government assistance, charitable organizations report some increases in requests from families on government assistance, from families eligible but not receiving government assistance, and from families not eligible for government assistance. Again, for the vast majority of the organizations (68.9%), this information is not tracked. Notable is the fact that respondents reported a decrease in only one of these categories: nearly 6.7% of organizations reported fewer receiving requests from families on government assistance. In the context of the other findings, this figure may result from families leaving TANF due to time-limits and thus are no longer considered to be on government assistance. Responses are detailed in Table 16 below.

### Table 16: Changes in Requests from Various Household Categories during first six months of 2000, as compared with the previous year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent w/children</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent w/children</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults with no children</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single adults with no children</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information not tracked 66.7%*
Table 16 (continued): Changes in Requests from Various Household Categories during first six months of 2000, as compared with the previous year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two or more employed adults</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One employed adult</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No employed adults</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not tracked</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving government assist.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for GA but not receiving</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not tracked</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is evident from these data are early indications of increases in certain types of households seeking assistance. These early indications include increases in requests from all household types; increases in requests from households with one employed adult as well as no employed adult; and increases in requests from households regardless of whether they are receiving government assistance or are eligible for same. Two changes are of most interest. First is the slight decrease in those seeking help who are receiving government assistance, and second is the increase in single parents requesting assistance. Both of these may be a reflection of time limits and households needing additional assistance since they are no longer on the welfare rolls.

6. Changes in Services Requested: Here we examine changes in requests for services since the imposition of time limits. As is recalled from Table 14, a sizable majority of organizations, 71%, indicated no change, while 24% reported an increase in requests and 5% reported an actual decrease. Thus, 29% of respondents reported a change in requests for services.

To investigate this further, respondents were asked to indicate by services requested and by time frame (January-June 1999 and July-December 1999) increases or decreases in requests, and by what percentage. In terms of requests for specified services, the total number of change indications were 195; of these, 180 (92.3%) indicated an increase in requests for specified services, while 15 (7.7%) indicated a decrease in requests for specified services. See Table 17 for distribution of change indications from those respondents reporting a change.
Table 17: Indications of Change by Timeframe as Compared with January-June 2000.

Total Change of Service Request Responses=195

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January-June 1999</th>
<th>July-December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is evident from the table above, when changes in requests for services are reported, the predominant direction of change is toward increases, while there are a few decreases in requests reported. Additionally, as compared with the first half of 2000, there seems to be a decreasing trend towards increases, however slight.

Looking now only at the increases, it is useful to examine the percentage of increase experienced by charitable organizations in 2000 over the previous two time frames in 1999. Tables 18 and 19 report the mean percentage of increases in requests by specified services for each of the two timeframes.

Table 18: Mean Percentage Increases in Services Requested of Charitable Organizations Compared to January-June 1999

In Rank Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>MEAN PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Medical, Dental, and Prescription</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foster Care</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monetary Assistance</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Legal Services</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transportation</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Food</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employment Help</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clothing</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Child Care</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Abuse/Domestic Violence</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER SERVICES LISTED: Helping Hispanics with immigration, learning English, and family counseling; mental health services; family counseling; personal counseling.
As indicated by this table, by far the highest increase in services reported is in the medical, dental, and prescription area. The reported mean percentage is over 15% above the second ranked service, education. Foster care ranks third.

This is the first appearance in any of the post-implementation surveys of the medical, dental, prescription services as top ranked. This possibly may reflect the impression by the poor that less medical assistance was available to them, as well as their increased desperation to ensure care for their children as parental ability to support them is compromised. Education has consistently been designated as near the top of the rankings, indicating perhaps the need to prepare for work or advancement.

The appearance of foster care as third ranked is an important development; in the first post-implementation survey it was consistently ranked last.

It is useful now to examine the responses whereby organizations compared their January-June 2000 requests with requests they had received from July-December of 1999 when time limits were approaching (see Table 19).

From these data, we can see shifts in requests as time-limits loom closer during the last months of 1999. The most prominent service from the first half of 1999, medical care, has fallen from its top rank to #7, while foster care maintains in the top three. These findings contrast sharply with the first post-implementation survey results, and may reflect the increasing sense of desperation as parents coming off of time limits try to arrange for their children through foster care.

Increases in requests for services were not the only changes that charitable organizations reported. A few organizations also indicated decreases in requests for services during the first half of 2000, as compared with the first half of 1999 and with the last half of 1999. For nonprofits approximately half of the 13 services listed in the survey were identified as decreasing. For religious organizations, only two of 13 services were identified as decreasing.
Table 19: Mean Percentage Increases in Services Requested of Charitable Organizations Compared to July-December 1999

In Rank Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>MEAN PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>PREV RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Education</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foster Care</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Housing</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Food</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monetary Assistance</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Medical, Dental, and Binding</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clothing</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employment Help</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Child Care</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legal Services</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Abuse/Domestic Violence</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER SERVICES LISTED: Helping Hispanics with immigration, learning English, and family counseling; mental health services; family counseling; personal counseling.

As time limits loom, requests for educational services have risen steadily and topped the list during the last half of the year. This finding may reflect an urgency on the part of those in need to receive training so that they can improve their employment opportunities.

7. Capacity to Absorb More Requests for Services: Respondents were asked to indicate how much of an increase in requests for services their organization would be able to absorb. As expected, the vast majority, 67.9%, has the capacity only to absorb an increase of ten percent or less; over half of which indicate that they can absorb no increase at all. Only 12.5% can absorb an increase in requests over 21%. Apparently, most charitable organizations in our sample already have reached close to their capacity to render assistance to those in need.
8. Greatest Concern for Families in Need: Concluding the second post-implementation survey, respondents were asked in an open-ended question to share their greatest concern regarding the implementation of time limits on individuals and families coming to them for help. Sixty-one percent of the respondents described their concerns, detailed below.

A number of respondents expressed concerns in the following six categories:


2. Low paying jobs and employment: “The economy is good right now and many who have few skills are able to find employment." "Even those jobs being filled by former welfare recipients do not provide a living wage. The common mantra is to get a person a job and then the employers will train them and move them up. I don't see that happening"; "Clients are being forced into taking low-paying jobs which provide just enough income to drop them from government programs, yet they are still impoverished and in need of services."

3. Housing: “The problem we face is the economic dynamics related to affordable housing and how the economy is making housing less affordable”; "Many of the families who have lost cash assistance are covering their housing costs and other basic necessities with their food stamp cash out. This is a waiver from USDA, which is due to expire in December of 2000. There is great concern about an increased risk of homelessness for these families.”

4. Services: “There is too much lack of coordination of services among providers.”

5. Time-limits: While social service nonprofit organizational leaders tended to express concern about time-limits, none expressed support for time limits ("Time limits are insufficient to achieve stability"). When endorsements for time limits have been expressed, they have come from some religious leaders ("I have no real concern. The woman in our congregation who has consistently received such help has entered a government funded training program to give her skills to support herself and family. For the first time in her life she is beginning to believe in herself. She is finding the confidence to move out of an abusive relationship. These things are all very positive"). Another religious leader wrote: "I approve of time limits. This will help get people off of `welfare’ and into the workforce. I am concerned that some programs support women and children in the absence of husbands and fathers! This
pays people for maintaining illicit relationships! We need programs to assist intact families."

6. Can offer limited help: "I am concerned that people will go hungry, be malnourished and/or lose their housing." A congregational leader noted: “Greatest concern being a responsible steward is helping people in need and not being taken advantage of.”

Summary: The second post-implementation survey examined the extent of any impact of welfare reform on the first six months after time limits were imposed. The picture from the first six months of 2000 as compared with 1999 show that charitable organizations are seeing some increases in requests for services, in expenditures of funds and services, and in referrals. Between twenty and thirty percent of respondents report some change in clients asking for help, noting more single mothers and more immigrants seeking help. Slight increases were reported in requests from all household types, single parents with children, families with one or no employed adult, and a decrease of those on government assistance.

In terms of types of services requested, it is here that we see two important developments. The first is a surprising increase in requests for medical, dental, and prescription assistance, reflecting perhaps the inability to access medical help, whether through loss of medicaid or private health insurance is not known. While families are on TANF, their case workers assist them in arranging for other government services for which they are eligible, such as medicaid and food stamps. Once families leave the welfare rolls, they often have no one to connect them to other assistance.

The second is a dramatic increase in requests for foster care services, which may signal escalating concerns of parents over taking care of their children. This reinforces the suspicion that parents may fear losing their children due to poverty reasons and that this dynamic may be exacerbated by welfare reform. These findings contrast sharply with the first post-implementation survey results, where foster care ranked last.

---

77 According to Taylor and Barusch (2000) Social Research Institute report, nearly 20% of their sample of Utah welfare recipients reported that their children had gone to live with someone else. Twelve percent of those respondents reported that their children left the home because they could not afford to care for the child, while 18% reported that their children were removed by the Division of Child Protective Services. At the same time, data from the Utah Department of Human Services point out that the number of youth in foster care has dropped from December 1997 to December 2000.
VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The children of our low-income clients are being taken away by DCFS and put in foster care, mostly because the families cannot afford to support their children.

---Charitable Leader

This study presents results of extensive research on the capacity of the charitable welfare sector in Utah. Data from focus groups, interviews, and surveys were examined, as well as administrative data. The qualitative findings are reported in the CPPA report, *Utah’s Charitable Organizations Face Welfare Reform: Concerns of Charitable Leaders* (DiPadova, 2000). The findings reported below reflect the information received during that study.

A summary of the findings of this research is as follows, beginning with the findings of the initial capacity survey and then with findings from the post-implementation surveys.

INITIAL CAPACITY STUDY

Composition of the charitable welfare sector: The charitable welfare sector in Utah consists of religious congregations and social service nonprofit organizations. The LDS welfare sector was found to account for two-thirds of the capacity, with other religious congregations and social service nonprofits providing the balance. All available evidence points to welfare services by the religious subsector being rendered on an humanitarian basis without respect to the religious affiliation (or non-affiliation) of recipients. However, the fact that well over two-thirds of the charitable capacity in Utah is faith-based may hinder accessibility to those services by those who, for a variety of reasons, fear or do not know how to approach clergy for help, or who are not religiously affiliated.

- Different types of data were available from each subsector grouping: the LDS Church provided primarily administrative data and nonprofit organizations tracked details of recipients and services, which were reported to us. Religious organizations as a whole keep fewer records of services than do social service nonprofit organizations.
- Social service nonprofits report a greater knowledge of welfare reform than do religious congregational leaders; thus the charitable welfare sector in Utah is administered primarily by congregational leaders who reportedly know markedly less about welfare policy than do leaders of social service nonprofit organizations.
• Religious organizations reported little or no increase in requests for services, while social service nonprofits reported increases, reflecting both the targeted responsibilities of nonprofits and the wide range of people served by the religious welfare sector.

• The charitable sector provides numerous services in striking quantities. While it is clear that many are served numerous times, the sheer volume of service provided is impressive.

• The sheer numbers served by the charitable sector suggest that a far greater array of people is being assisted than those who are or have been on government assistance. At the same time, many religious leaders reported increasing services to middle class families, while reporting no change in the number of requests overall. While the reasons for this volume and the extent of assistance rendered to middle class families is not fully known, these data certainly suggest that charitable organizations assist others than those considered poor.

  Characteristics of those served: Charitable leaders report assisting a wide range of families, including those who never approach the government for help, families who are receiving government assistance, and families before and after receiving government help.

  • Nearly two-thirds of those receiving services from the charitable sector have children living at home.
  • Nearly 28% of those receiving services from the charitable sector have two working adults and children.
  • Those households receiving services with employed adults outnumber those not employed by a margin of 2 to 1.
  • Most households served are not receiving government assistance; over 5,000 of these households are reported as being eligible for the those services.
  • Charitable leaders reported that the circumstances of those coming for help tended to be more complex and required more time and resources to address than in the past.
  • Middle class families are seeking charitable assistance.

  Contrary to the popular notions regarding those who seek help, the characteristics of most of those served include families consisting of working adults, who are not on government assistance, and who have children at home.

  Services provided by the charitable welfare sector: The charitable sector provides a wide array of services to those in need.
• Over half of the charitable organizations surveyed provide services to homeless individuals and families, monetary assistance, transportation, food or clothing.

• Education, employment, and child care—key services related to finding and holding down jobs—are provided by less than 30% of the organizations surveyed.

• Many charitable organizations report that often they do not provide services requested and refer applicants to other service providers. Applicants with few resources may have difficulty getting from place to place seeking help.

**Service capacity:** The capacity of charitable organizations to serve those in need must be considered in the context that leaders and others in these organizations want to help people.

• While congregational leaders emphasized the informal assistance rendered to others through church members as an ever increasing resource, they did express financial concerns about their capacity to help increasing numbers of people, and were making preparations.

• Congregational leaders also expressed considerable difficulty with discerning legitimate needs when help was requested.

• Social service nonprofit organizations reported that over half of their funding comes from government sources. When governments cut funding, these nonprofits cannot increase services without additional sources of monetary support.

• Possible strategies for nonprofits include raising more funds and decreasing services to those in need.

• Most congregational leaders expressed no interest in obtaining government support for their program through the Charitable Choice provision of PRWORA.

**Strategies for the Future:** Charitable leaders were asked to indicate what actions they would take if demand for services were to substantially increase. The strategies reported were:

• One-third of charitable organizations would raise more funds;

• One-third of charitable leaders would increase staff;

• One-quarter of charitable leaders would reduce services; and

• One-quarter of charitable leaders would expand services.
Major concerns: Charitable leaders expressed concerns with regard to the impact of welfare reform on families in need. Over two-thirds of respondents reported the following concerns:

- lack of affordable housing;
- charitable organizations’ limited resources to help people; and
- inadequacy of available assistance to those in need.

In addition, the following concerns were frequently noted by charitable leaders:

- The need for long-term assistance to help people;
- Spiritual needs of recipients;
- The challenges of exercising discernment in whether to provide services; and
- Government welfare policy.

Anticipated areas of increased requests for services: Charitable leaders were asked to indicate what services would likely see an increase in requests, after the implementation of time limits. Leaders reported that they expected to see more requests for the following, in rank order:

- Food
- Cash
- Housing
- All services.

Issues Raised by the Findings: Three fundamental issues which merit further study and discussion are raised by these findings.

- It is clear that religious organizations may be the last resort for many families in need. Yet religious leaders and other clergy report knowing little about welfare policy. Therefore, many may be under the misimpression that the welfare system is fundamentally unchanged. For over six decades, these leaders have known that most petitioners for help could go to government sources. Now that religious organizations may be the last resort, they need to fully understand the policies and the consequences of turning people away. Government agencies have the responsibility of educating clergy as to their heightened role.
• The challenges that are faced by those in need of approaching faith-based charitable organizations are not fully understood. In Utah, faith-based welfare services are the most ubiquitous among charitable services. When government services cut back, or redirected in some ways, religious organizations may be the last resort for those seeking help. At the same time, as has been pointed out, religious and other such private organizations that do not receive government funding have every right to deny anyone who petitions for help, and for any reason.

• Social service nonprofit organizations report that over half of their funding comes from government sources. Theoretically, this represents public funds that in the past were used by welfare agencies to assist clients. Currently, those funds are dispersed to social service nonprofit organizations to assist clients. In addition, the vast majority of these nonprofits report that they frequently make referrals because they do not provide the services requested, or they are at capacity.

While the stated purpose of such contracting out is to enhance the quality of service provision, it is important to consider the issue from the perspective of the applicant, who with limited resources is trying to figure out where to go to receive what services. Now s/he cannot receive them from a central government welfare office, but presumably must travel to various locations.78

The implications of these issues merit further study and include: knowledge of case workers and nonprofit leaders regarding the location of the nearest providers, continuity of services, and transportation costs.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM SURVEYS ADMINISTERED AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TIME LIMITS**

The thirty-six months lifetime limits in Utah began to be imposed on December 31, 1999. This research reports the findings of two surveys designed to measure the impact of time limits on charitable organizations in Utah. While the findings of the initial survey demonstrates that the charitable sector serves a vast number of people in Utah, and thus the impact of time-limits would be cushioned (especially among the religious subsector), we see with these surveys

---

78 While government assistance is typically not dispensed at one central agency location, the fact remains that contracting through social service nonprofits represents further dispersion of government-funded services. See Ehrenreich (2001) for real life examples of those with little resources trying to obtain help.
slight changes in types of services requested, reflecting the altering concerns of people living in poverty.

**First Post-Implementation Survey:** The first post-implementation survey examined impact on the charitable sector of the first three months after the limits were imposed (January-March 2000) with the first three months of 1999 and the last three months of 1999. In terms of capacity changes, the following were noted:

- Requests for assistance in the first three months of 2000 over 1999 netted no dramatic change.
- Most organizations reported no change in expenditures of funds, while some reported increases in expenditures.
- Most organizations reported no change in referrals.
- Most organizations reported no change in the characteristics of people served.

Looking at the first three months of 2000, minor increases in services requested were noted, comparing with requests in early 1999 and late 1999:

- More requests for monetary assistance, education, clothing, abuse/domestic violence services, housing, and child care.
- Food continued to be ranked first
- Foster care continued to be ranked last.

Little change was noted in the characteristics of clients served; over 90% of respondents reported no change. Those who reported a change noted:

- Slightly fewer requests from two-parent families with children.
- Moderately more requests from single-parent families with children.
- Moderately more requests from families with one or no employed adult.
- Moderately more requests from families on and/or eligible for government assistance.
- Situations of clients were noted to be increasingly complex.
Comparing the first three months of 2000 with the first and last parts of 1999, charitable leaders expressed concerns with regard to welfare reform and families in need. The major concerns were:

- Housing
- Shortness of time limits
- Low-paying jobs available to the poor
- Their organizations can offer only one-time help
- Welfare of children

Second Post-Implementation Survey: The second post-implementation survey examined the impact of time limits on the charitable sector for the first six months of 2000, as compared with the first six months of 1999 and the last six months of 1999. The findings of this survey show subtle shifts in types of services requested, reflecting the altering circumstances of people living in poverty.

- Moderate increases in requests for assistance were reported for the first six months of 2000 over 1999.
- Over a third of nonprofit organizations noted an increase while under 15% of religious organizations reported an increase.
- Nearly half of the organizations reported increases in funds expended, even with the very moderate increases in requests for services; over half of the organizations reported no change. While inflation may possibly be a factor, it has been very low. Thus, this increase most likely reflects reports of more complex problems among their clients.
- Most organizations reported no change in referrals.

Slight changes were noted in the characteristics of clients served, with over 25% of the respondents reporting changes:

- More requests from one-parent families.
- More requests from families with one or no employed adult.
- Slightly more requests from families not eligible for government assistance.
- The situations of clients were noted to be increasingly complex.
Changes in services requested in January-June 2000 over January-June 1999 include the following:

- More requests for medical/dental/prescription services, ranking first in increases in services requested.
- More requests for education, ranking second.
- More requests for foster care, ranking third.

Comparing shifts in services requested in first half of 2000 to the first half of 1999 and to the last half of 1999, we find:

- More requests for education, foster care, housing.
- Education, rather than food, ranked first.
- Foster care was ranked second.

Table 20 below details the major shifts in requests for services, as reported by respondents in our study.

As noted earlier, charitable leaders anticipated that they would find food, cash, and housing as the most requested services during the following year. As can be seen from Table 20, and from the previous discussions of the post-implementation surveys, education, foster care, and medical needs join food, cash, and housing as the most needed services. Increases were also reported for domestic violence and for employment help.

Table 20: CHANGES IN REQUESTS FOR SERVICES

Major Changes in Rankings of Increases in Services Requested of Charitable Organizations Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>SIX MONTHS COMPARING JANUARY – JUNE 2000 TO:</th>
<th>THREE MONTHS COMPARING JANUARY - MARCH 2000 TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Dental, and Prescription</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse/Domestic Violence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several important post-implementation developments are apparent, as we look at increases in requests for:

- medical/dental/prescription services, which may possibly suggest difficulty in accessing medical assistance;
- foster care, perhaps reflecting increased concerns of parents over taking care of their children; and
- help with abuse/domestic violence. Though reports of increases were temporary, these reports still fuel concerns that women are going back to abusive relationships.

Regarding the issue of how much of an increase in requests for services can be absorbed:

- Two-thirds of respondents reported the capacity to absorb only 10% or less, with half of the respondents reporting they can absorb no more increases; and
- Less than 15% of the charitable organizations reported that they can absorb an increase of over 20%.

When comparing the first six months of 2000 with the first and last halves of 1999, charitable leaders expressed concerns with regard to welfare reform and families in need. The major concerns were, in ranked order:

- Welfare of children;
- Low-paying jobs and employment;
- Housing;
- Lack of coordination of services among providers, government and nongovernment;
- Time-limits; and
- Their ability to provide only limited help.

**Additional Issues Raised by the Findings:** Several fundamental issues which merit further study and discussion are raised by these findings. In addition to the previous issues raised, the following are apparent:

- Charitable organizations are seeing some increases in requests for services, in expenditures of funds and services, and in referrals. The impact of time limits and other economic pressures on people seeking assistance needs to be fully researched.
• In terms of types of services requested, we find a surprising increase in requests for medical, dental, and prescription assistance. The impact of being removed from the welfare rolls on the accessibility of other government services for which one is eligible, needs to be fully addressed.

• We also find an increase in requests related to domestic violence and abuse, the reasons for which must be fully delineated and addressed by policymakers.

• We also find an increase in requests for foster care services, which may signal escalating concerns of parents over taking care of their children. This needs to be fully explored.
VII. CONCLUSION

People forget that welfare is about children.
---Charitable Leader

This research examines the impact of welfare reform on charitable organizations in Utah. The entire charitable sector was found to administer a wide array of critical services to a sizable portion of Utah's population, including families with both parents employed and middle-class families.

This study finds the charitable welfare sector in Utah to be divided into three subparts: the LDS welfare subsector; other religious congregations; and non faith-based social service nonprofit organizations. The LDS welfare subsector, from which researchers were not able to collect congregational survey data, was estimated to account for approximately two-thirds of Utah's charitable welfare capacity. Charitable organizations in Utah were found to collaborate fully with one another, making frequent referrals across organizations and granting support in a myriad of ways.

Welfare policies in retreat from government's decades-old responsibility of assisting those in need, intensify reliance of citizens on charitable organizations. Thus, the consequential nature of the efforts of charitable organizations is even more pronounced and the capacity of these organizations to respond to increasing numbers of requests for services is an important issue. By and large, the surveyed charitable organizations reported limited capacity to expand their services without additional funding support.

Given the striking numbers of people served by the charitable sector, it is highly implausible that the vast use of charitable services is solely a function of welfare reform. A wide variety of people seek charitable help; their differences defy stereotyping and cannot be easily categorized. In addition to low-income families, people on welfare, the working poor, and immigrant groups, those seeking assistance are also reported to come from lower-middle and middle-income families.

Charitable leaders report shifting trends in requests for services, in the wake of time limit implementation. These shifts supply preliminary indications that people in need may be more subjected to domestic violence and perhaps to the prospect of losing their children than originally anticipated. In addition, they have increasing medical, educational and employment needs.
The work of the charitable sector is as substantial as it is laudable. For the most part, charitable organizations have been making substantial contributions to those in need for generations—long before the 1996 federal welfare reform legislation. The expertise and knowledge of charitable leaders in assisting those in need from all circumstances could be useful information in framing and examining public welfare policy. However, their expertise is seldom harvested in a systematic fashion by government policy makers.

Demands on charitable organizations seem to be a function of far more pervasive economic shifts rather than welfare reform alone. This is evidenced in part by the large numbers of individuals and families assisted by charitable organizations and by the high percentages of families filing for bankruptcy in Utah over the past decade. As sudden unemployment due to corporate downsizing or divorce has driven up debt, some families seek out food pantries as one way to try to make ends meet. Thus we have some reports that charitable organizations are increasingly assisting those from the middle-class economic strata of our society; indeed, we may be witnessing the rise of “middle-class welfare.”

While middle class welfare is not measured by any of the major economic indicators, it makes sense that charitable organizations would be the first sector in our society to detect this phenomenon. Embarrassed by their plight, middle class families do not talk openly about their personal economic straits, and instead quietly approach charity for help after all other recourses are exhausted—including their debt limits.

Notable also is the fact that charitable organizations assist many who are eligible for government assistance but who do not apply for help. As a case in point, charitable leaders reported that some TANF-eligible young mothers with infants, facing a three-year lifetime limit for assistance, opt not to seek government help at this time. Instead, they decide to wait until the child is older, eating more, and thus more expensive to care for. Some women became TANF-eligible when they left physically and emotionally abusive husbands/boyfriends, seeking their safety and the safety of their children. As they reach their time limits, they may be placed in a financial crisis and some will return to their husbands/boyfriends so their children can eat. In the process they will endanger their own and their children’s safety.

There is a distinct difference between a family being off of the welfare rolls, and being self-sufficient. It is clear that many leave the welfare rolls to join the ranks of the working poor, with few opportunities to make a family-sustaining income. These families, too, are assisted by charitable organizations. Many individuals and families in Utah served by charitable organizations are working full time at non-family sustaining wages. Having a minimum wage job while providing for small children, with predictable difficulties in child care and transportation,
coupled with costly housing, does not lead to self-sufficiency. While TANF provides for job-training, the program does not encourage higher education attainment, long recognized as important to one’s future earnings potential and considered key to closing the income gap.

The implications of increased responsibility given to the charitable sector by government needs to be fully explored. For those social service nonprofits under government contract to provide specific welfare services, the consequences of citizens’ looking for services in scattered locations are yet to be investigated. Although fine scholarly work has been done on the intricacies of the contracting relationship, accountability, and the issue of when private contractors legally become agents of the government, it is not clear that these intricacies are fully understood.

As is typical in other states, the majority of the Utah’s charitable welfare sector is religiously based. All indications point to substantial services being rendered eagerly and willingly. As Larry Crenshaw, Director of Planning and Administration of the LDS Church’s Welfare Services Department, pointed out in a 2001 interview, historically Utah has been an unusually generous community, eager to assist others. While this has been the case of the LDS tradition, he suggested that it has been especially true of other religious and community traditions. In fact, Father Terence Moore, addressing CPPA’s Public Policy Forum in Salt Lake City on March 12, 1999, pointed out that: “Our common faith traditions call us to practice social justice. We must ask, where is the justice and equity when we build up large budget surpluses in a thriving economy and dole out the scraps from our tables with ever increasing stinginess?” Elder Alexander B. Morrison (2000), in an address at Brigham Young University, pointed out that: “The responsibility to care for the poor and needy lies at the very heart of the Christian gospel...In addition to refraining from evil, true disciples of the Master wear out their lives in the service of others.”

However, it must be remembered that in the final analysis, many charitable institutions have a right to turn away anyone who seeks help, on any basis unrelated to need, while governments do not have such discretion. This is especially the case with religious institutions not participating in charitable choice funding programs or in other government funding programs. Strong efforts must be made to apprise clergy of the differences between the prior government entitlement welfare system as compared with TANF and its lifetime limits. Additionally, diligent care needs to be taken to assure that help is rendered to those who may not be comfortable going to religious organizations for help.

So, what do charitable organizations bring to the discussion of social welfare policy? These organizations bring a focus on the plight of individuals, as distinct and unique in their
In contrast, government programs must group and categorize people, in accord with the explicit requirement that government institutions treat everyone impartially under the law and bound by principles of equity, fairness, and nondiscrimination.\(^79\)

Unfortunately, in public policy making, efforts to treat everyone the same lend themselves to categorization. It is necessary to categorize people for eligibility, for example, as is the case for welfare services. Such categorization can foster a failure to view people in need as diverse, and may encourage negative stigmatization,\(^80\) resulting in the "social construction of difference...whereby we mistake socially constructed categories for natural distinctions" (Katz, 1989:5-6).

Thus, an important value that charitable leaders bring to the discussion table is the tendency to see the diversity among citizens in need, because categorization is not part of their organizational service mandate. As we conclude this report, a number of questions prompted by the concerns of charitable leaders, and reflecting their focus on the uniqueness of individuals, clearly merit further investigation, only a few of which are mentioned here:

- What happens to children of TANF-families who lose their eligibility? To what extent are they more vulnerable to being taken from their parents?
- Over the long-term, will the 20 percent extension be sufficient to care for those needing additional assistance?
- Due to a lack of options, is TANF forcing women back into abusive situations, and if so, to what extent?
- What is the impact of being hired into a job, and then being fired—out of no fault of one's own—due to shifting economic forces? How does this affect one's future ability to become self-sufficient?
- What services are appropriate and reasonable for nonprofits and for religious institutions to provide?\(^81\) What is the role of government in service provision?
- What are the implications of reliance on a largely religious-based charitable sector for the provision of traditionally-designated government services, such as on-going

\(^{79}\) In other words, equity and nondiscrimination require that those who fail a professional licensing exam should not be given special consideration because of any circumstances, including wealth, family status, or so forth.

\(^{80}\) Hence our society decries mothers not staying home to care for their children, but mandates that mothers in low-income families go to work, thus consigning their children to nonparental care. This suggests that children of poor families are inherently less worthy of their mother's care than are children of affluent families. This paradox is a consequence of negative social stigma and an expression of an inability or unwillingness to identify with the poor, a failure to see them as peers in our community.

\(^{81}\) See Mangum 2000.
financial assistance and other services requiring the skill and training of professional service providers?

- If charitable organizations exercise their discretion and refuse service to a single mother with children, and that mother has already used up her time limits, where can she and her children turn?

- How can agencies remedy clients' not being enrolled in other government services for which they are eligible after they leave the welfare rolls?

- What are the differences between the circumstances and needs of middle class petitioners seeking assistance, compared with lower-class applicants? What are the implications of these differences and do they compete for the same resources?

Fundamentally, the issues of assisting others are multiple and complex. In our society these issues are compounded by the dynamics of the New Economy which have produced large rewards for some but much less for others, jeopardizing the growth of the middle class while making low wage earners far more vulnerable than in recent decades. While charitable welfare efforts, coupled with government programs, address some primarily short-term needs, the fact is that attention by all sectors: business, government, and charitable, must focus on stability and growth for American families. It is instructive to remember that the majority of the people to whom welfare assistance (charitable as well as governmental) is rendered—or denied—are children, and it is in the hands of our children that the future of our society is entrusted.
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APPENDIX B

Initial Survey and Cover Letters

The following are the cover letters and surveys mailed to nonprofit and religious organizations. Since a second letter and survey was sent to nonrespondents both letters are included but only one copy of the survey since it was identical.

The following outlines in order the documents that follow.

Religious Organizations
   - Cover letter dated November 30, 1999
   - Follow-up cover letter dated January 25, 2000
   - Survey dated December 15, 1999

Nonprofit Organizations
   - Cover letter dated November 30, 1999
   - Follow-up cover letter dated January 25, 2000
   - Survey response date of December 15, 1999
November 30, 1999

Dear Congregational Leader:

As you know, government assistance for the poor is becoming less available, and those in need often turn to organizations, such as yours, for help. Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of religious organizations and other charitable organizations to serve those in need. To that end, we are seeking your help, as we look at ways in which organizations such as yours have been—and will be--impacted by recent welfare reform legislation.

The outcomes of this research will also help you. The findings may be used to improve your congregations' ability to plan for the future, perhaps attract increased resources, and participate more fully in the public policy arena. The outcomes are expected to impact public policy decisions.

We would like you to complete the attached survey for your organization. Please be as accurate and thorough as possible. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey, and ask that you do so by December 15, 1999.

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence, so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your congregation for participating. The benefits to your community of your participating are significant. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on religious and other charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided.

A word of reminder about this project will provide additional background on this effort. The University of Utah's Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. The Welfare Reform Initiative is designed to assist the charitable sector in its expanded social service role as a result of welfare reform by collecting information and disseminating the results to all interested parties. In addition, the Center is hosting public events that will provide partnership-building opportunities for charitable organizations and public agencies. Our efforts to date have been sponsored by religious, humanitarian, and government organizations.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Sara McCormick or myself at 801-581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie N. DiPadova, Ph.D.
Deputy Director
January 25, 2000

Dear Congregational Leader:

The enclosed survey was mailed to you in December and we have not received your response. We would very much like to obtain information on your organization and therefore we are sending you the survey again.

**Why should you take the time to complete this survey?** Government assistance for the poor is becoming less available, and those in need often turn to churches, such as yours, for help. Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. **To that end, we are seeking your help as we look at ways in which churches such as yours have been–and will be–impacted by recent welfare reform legislation.**

**The outcomes of this research will also help you.** The findings may be used to improve your congregations' ability to plan for the future, perhaps attract increased resources, and participate more fully in the public policy arena. The outcomes are expected to impact public policy decisions.

Please complete the attached survey for your congregation as accurately and thoroughly as possible. **We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey, and ask that you do so by February 11, 2000.**

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. The benefits to your community of your participating are significant. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will evaluate the impact of welfare reform on the charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah's Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. This survey is just one piece of this project.

If you have already responded to this survey, we apologize for sending it to you again. We are trying to avoid any duplication.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie DiPadova, Ph.D. or myself at 801-581-6491.

Sincerely,

Sara McCormick
Program Specialist
A SURVEY OF CHARITABLE SOCIAL SERVICE CAPACITY IN UTAH

Please return survey by December 15, 1999

PLEASE NOTE: Completion of the survey is voluntary; survey responses are held in strictest confidence. We are grateful for your responding to our survey as thoroughly and accurately as possible. If a question we ask is not applicable to your congregation, simply leave it BLANK. Please return completed survey in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363 Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489. Thank you very much.

1. Type of organization: (Please check one)
   a. _____Religious Congregation       b._____ Other (specify) ______________________________
   Size of Congregation __________

2. In what year did you start serving as leader of this congregation? ________________________

3. How much do you know about the changes that have been made in state and national welfare policies and programs since 1996? (Please circle one)

   1  2  3  4  5
   Nothing  Very little Some Quite a bit A lot

4. Compared to 1998, have the requests for welfare assistance in your congregation increased or decreased in 1999, and by what percent:

   Increased ________%  Decreased ________%  Remained about the same ______

   If the requests for welfare assistance have increased, have you: (Check all that apply)

   a. _____encouraged an increase in offerings?  e. ___restricted/reduced services?
   b._____increased member involvement?  f. ___not applicable.
   c. _____expanded services?
   d._____made more referrals?  g. ____other (please specify):
   _______________________________________________________________________

5. How often do you refer those requesting assistance to agencies outside your congregation for help?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Never  Seldom Sometimes Often Always

   If you do refer people to non-congregation agencies, to which agencies do you most often refer people? ___________________________________________________________________
6. Other than members of your congregation, who else did you provide welfare assistance to during 1999? (Please check all that apply)

   a. Non-members of congregation living in area  
   b. Homeless individuals and families  
   c. Transients (people passing through the area)  
   d. Other (specify):

7. To minimize the time it takes you to respond, we are using this timesaving chart.  
   Please indicate whether during 1999, your congregation either directly provided or cooperated with others in providing any of the following services to congregation members or other people in the community. Place a check mark by ALL that apply.

   Count any of the following: operation of a program or facility; commodity donations; financial support; volunteer time by members; use of your building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Directly Provided this Service</th>
<th>Cooperated with Other Agencies within your Faith</th>
<th>Cooperated with Organizations of Other Religions</th>
<th>Cooperated with Community Organizations</th>
<th>Cooperated with Government Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABUSE/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE:</td>
<td>provide or find safe haven,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>treatment programs, counseling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE:</td>
<td>day care, pre-school, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING:</td>
<td>donate or purchase for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individuals/families, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION:</td>
<td>literacy classes, tutor,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assist with tuition or school fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT HELP:</td>
<td>mentor, job training, placement, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD:</td>
<td>soup kitchen, pantry, food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER CARE:</td>
<td>temporary placement of children outside their own homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING:</td>
<td>temporary, permanent,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overnight shelter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES:</td>
<td>provide and/or pay for legal assistance, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL, DENTAL AND</td>
<td>provide or pay for services, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESCRIPTION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONETARY ASSISTANCE:</td>
<td>cash, commodities, vouchers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pay bills, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES:</td>
<td>treatment program, counseling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION:</td>
<td>assist or pay for transportation needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER:</td>
<td>(please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER:</td>
<td>(please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. For all welfare services in Question 7 that you marked *Directly Provided This Service*, estimate the total number of people your congregation served in a typical month during 1999: ________

9. Of the total number served as noted in Question 8, estimate how many people live in the following kinds of households. For sections A, B and C below, fit everyone served into one of the categories in each section, i.e. the sum of each section should equal the total number served.

**A. Family**
- Two-parent households with children at home
  - Total number of children
- Single-parent households with children at home
  - Total number of children
- Two-adult households with no children at home
- Single adult households with no children at home
- Unknown

**B. Employment**
- Households with two or more employed adults
- Households with one employed adult
- Households with no employed adults
- Unknown

**C. Government Assistance**
- Households receiving government assistance
- Households eligible for but NOT RECEIVING government assistance
- Households not eligible for government assistance
- Unknown

**D. Other** – How many people that you served fit in the following categories? (Please note, these will not sum to the total number served)
- Elderly or infirm adults
- Native Americans
- Immigrants

10. Of the people requesting welfare assistance, what changes, if any, have you noticed in the past year, e.g., age, marital status, employment status, ethnicity, immigrant status, etc.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

11. About how many hours a week do you spend counseling or working directly with people who need welfare assistance? ________ hours per week

What percentage of your total counseling time as congregational leader does this equal? ____ %

Has the time you spent helping people who need welfare assistance increased or decreased in 1999 as compared to 1998? By what percent?

Increased ________ %  Decreased ________ %  Remained about the same ______
12. Review again the services listed in Question 7. For which services would you predict a *decreased need* in your congregation over the next year? ____________________________________________

13. For which services listed in Question 7 would you predict an *increased need* in your congregation over the next year? ____________________________________________

14. If the requests for welfare assistance in your congregation were to substantially increase *in the future*, would you: (please check all that apply)

   a. _____ make more assignments to provide additional service
   b. _____ restrict/reduce services
   c. _____ be able to collect more fast offerings
   d. _____ be able to expand services
   e. _____ make referrals to other agencies within your faith
   f. _____ other (please specify): ____________________________________________

**GENERAL:** Your responses to the following questions will help us tell the whole story when we complete this report.

15. What is your greatest concern for most of the individuals and families who come to you for welfare assistance?

16. Do you want a copy of the survey results? If YES, please complete the following.

   The information requested below is optional and will only be used to keep you informed of the outcomes of this research and other relevant projects at the Center for Public Policy and Administration. Our research findings will not identify any organization or person by name.

   **Name of Person Completing This Survey:** ____________________________________________

   **Name of Congregation:** __________________________________________________________

   **Street Address:** _________________________________________________________________

   **City:** ___________________________ **State:** ___________ **Zip:** _______________________

   **Phone:** _______________________ **Fax:** ___________ **e-mail address** ____________________

   Please return in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363 Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489
Dear Charitable Organization Leader:

As you know, government assistance for the poor is becoming less available, and those in need often turn to organizations, such as yours, for help. Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. To that end, we are seeking your help, as we look at ways in which organizations such as yours have been—and will be—impacted by recent welfare reform legislation.

The outcomes of this research will also help you. They can be used to improve your organizations' ability to plan for the future, perhaps attract increased resources, and participate more fully in the public policy arena. The outcomes are expected to impact public policy decisions.

We would like you to complete the attached survey for your organization. Please be as accurate and thorough as possible. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey, and ask that you do so by December 15, 1999.

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence, so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. The benefits to your community of your participating are significant. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided.

A word of reminder about this project will provide additional background on this effort. The University of Utah's Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. The Welfare Reform Initiative is designed to assist the charitable sector in its expanded social service role as a result of welfare reform by collecting information and disseminating the results to all interested parties. In addition, the Center is hosting public events that will provide partnership-building opportunities for charitable organizations and public agencies. Our efforts to date have been sponsored by religious, humanitarian, and government organizations.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Sara McCormick or myself at 801-581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie N. DiPadova, Ph.D.
Deputy Director
Dear Charitable Organization Leader:

The enclosed survey was mailed to you in December and we have not received your response. We would very much like to obtain information on your organization and therefore we are sending you the survey again.

**Why should you take the time to complete this survey?** Government assistance for the poor is becoming less available, and those in need often turn to organizations, such as yours, for help. Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. **To that end, we are seeking your help as we look at ways in which organizations such as yours have been—and will be—impacted by recent welfare reform legislation.**

**The outcomes of this research will also help you.** The findings may be used to improve your organizations’ ability to plan for the future, perhaps attract increased resources, and participate more fully in the public policy arena. The outcomes are expected to impact public policy decisions.

Please complete the attached survey for your congregation as accurately and thoroughly as possible. **We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey, and ask that you do so by February 11, 2000.**

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. The benefits to your community of your participating are significant. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will evaluate the impact of welfare reform on the charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah's Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. This survey is just one piece of this project.

If you have already responded to this survey, we apologize for sending it to you again. We are trying to avoid any duplication.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie DiPadova, Ph.D. or myself at 801-581-6491.

Sincerely,

Sara McCormick
Program Specialist
A SURVEY OF CHARITABLE SOCIAL SERVICE CAPACITY IN UTAH

Please return survey by December 15, 1999

PLEASE NOTE: Completion of the survey is voluntary; survey responses are held in strictest confidence. We are grateful for your responding to our survey as thoroughly and accurately as possible. If a question we ask is not applicable to your organization, simply leave it blank. Please return completed survey in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363 Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489. Thank you very much.

1. How much do you know about the changes that have been made in state and national welfare policies and programs since 1996? Circle one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please estimate how many of your clients are eligible for – or are receiving – Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) / Family Employment Program (FEP), the financial assistance program that replaced AFDC. __________

   What percentage of your client base is this? ________%

   Please estimate the number of your clients who stopped receiving TANF/FEP financial assistance within the past year. ______________

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR ORGANIZATION:

3. Please indicate type of organization: (check only one)

   a. _____ Nonprofit service provider (secular)  c. _____ Other (specify):
   b. _____ Nonprofit service provider (religious-affiliate) ______________________________

   Years in Operation: __________________________ Incorporated: Circle YES or NO

   Tax-Exempt Status with the IRS: Circle YES or NO

4. How many paid full-time employees do you currently have? ____  Paid part-time employees? _______

5. Total number of different volunteers in 1998 _______ Is this an estimate or an actual count? _____

SERVICES AND PROGRAMS:

6. Are services provided to: (please check all that apply)

   a. _____ Low income individuals/families  c. _____ All those in need  e. _____ Other (specify)
   b. _____ Homeless individuals and families  d. _____ Referred parties ______________________

7. Do programs operate out of more than one delivery site? Circle YES or NO

   If yes, how many? _________
To minimize the time it takes you to respond to this survey, we are using this timesaving chart. Please indicate whether your organization provides the following services: (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Directly provides services (please complete all three columns below as appropriate)</th>
<th>Provides space to an outside group</th>
<th>Provides money to an outside group</th>
<th>Provides volunteer s to an outside group</th>
<th>Provides goods or supplies to an outside group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program is offered</td>
<td>A fee is charged for this service</td>
<td>There is a waiting list for this service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABUSE/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: provide or find safe haven, treatment programs, counsel, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE: day care, pre-school, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING: donate or purchase for individuals/families, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: literacy classes, tutor, assist with tuition or school fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT HELP: mentor, job training, placement, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD: soup kitchen, pantry, food donations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER CARE: temporary placement of children outside their own homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING: temporary, permanent, overnight shelter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES: provide and/or pay for legal assistance, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL, DENTAL AND PRESCRIPTION: provide or pay for services, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONETARY ASSISTANCE: cash, commodities, vouchers, pay bills, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES: treatment program, counseling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION: assisting or paying for transportation needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. For what types of services listed in Question 8 do you predict an increase in demand in the coming year?

______________________________________________________________________________________

10. For what types of services listed in Question 8 do you predict a decrease in demand in the coming year?
______________________________________________________________________________________

11. Do you refer those in need to other sources of help? Yes____ No____

If Yes: To whom do you most frequently refer people? (Please check all that apply)

a. ___ Clergy/religious leaders
b. ___ Other nonprofit organizations
c. ___ Government agencies
d. ___ Other ____________________________________________

Why do you refer people elsewhere? (Please check all that apply)

a. ___ Organization does not provide some requested services.
b. ___ Organization’s service capacity is full.
c. ___ Other (specify) ________________________________________

If No: People were not referred elsewhere because: (Please check all that apply)

a. ___ We do not know where people can be referred to for the services requested.
b. ___ Other (specify) ________________________________________

12. If a fee is charged for any service, how are these fees determined? (Please check all that apply)

a. ____ Flat fee c. ____Other (specify)__________________________
b. ____ Sliding scale d. ____Not applicable (Please go directly to Question 15)

13. When did your organization begin charging fees for any of its services or programs? (Check only one)

a. ____ Less than one year ago c. ____ From five to ten years ago e. ____ Unknown
b. ____ From one to five years ago d. ____ More than ten years ago

14. Why did your organization begin charging fees? (Please check all that apply)

a. ____ Decreased contributions d. ____ Increased operating costs f. Other (specify)
b. ____ Decreased government funding e. ____ Increased demand __________________
c. ____ Wanted to expand type of services offered

INFORMATION ABOUT THE PEOPLE SERVED:

15. Estimate what percentage of your service and program clients are:

b. Asian/Pacific Islander: ______% b. Between 5-17 years: ______% b. Female: _____%
c. Caucasian: ______% c. Between 18-64 years: ______%
d. Hispanic: ______% d. Over 65 years old: ______%
e. Native American: ______% e. Other group (specify): ______%
16. Total number of individuals served in all programs:
   a. In your last fiscal or budget year: ______
   b. In your fiscal or budget year prior to this: ______
   c. Are these estimates or actual counts? ______________________

17. Of the total number served in your last fiscal or budget year, estimate how many people live in the following kinds of households. For sections A, B and C below, fit everyone served into one of the categories in each section, i.e. the sum of each section should equal the total number served.

A. Family
   ______ Two-parent households with children at home
          ______ Total number of children
   ______ Single-parent households with children at home
          ______ Total number of children
   ______ Two-adult households with no children at home
   ______ Single adult households with no children at home
   ______ Unknown

B. Employment
   ______ Households with two or more employed adults
   ______ Households with one employed adult
   ______ Households with no employed adults
   ______ Unknown

C. Government Assistance
   ______ Households receiving government assistance
   ______ Households eligible for but NOT RECEIVING government assistance
   ______ Households not eligible for government assistance
   ______ Unknown

18. Of the people requesting welfare assistance, what changes, if any, have you noticed in the past year, e.g., age, marital status, employment status, ethnicity, immigrant status, etc.

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

SERVICE CAPACITY:

19. If the requests for services has increased over the past three years, have you:  (Check all that apply)
   a. ____ Raised additional funds  e. ____ Expanded facilities
   b. ____ Increased staff/volunteers  f. ____ Made more referrals
   c. ____ Expanded services  g. ____ Other (please specify): ________________
   d. ____ Restricted/reduced services

20. How much of an increase in requests for services is your organization presently able to absorb?
   ______ None ______ 10% ______ 20% ______ 30% ______ 50% ______ Other

If the demand for services from your organization increases in the future beyond what you indicated above, would you:  (Please check all that apply)
   a. ____ Be able to raise funds to serve more clients  e. ____ None of the above
   b. ____ Expand services  f. ____ Other (specify)
   c. ____ Have the staff/volunteers to provide additional services
   d. ____ Restrict/reduce services
21. Comparing your current fiscal or budget year to your previous one, do you predict the number of people requesting services will increase or decrease and by what percent, or remain about the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Remain about the same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>________%</td>
<td>________%</td>
<td>________%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Please estimate the number of other services delivered in a typical month: (Complete for all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Number per Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ___ children cared for per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ___ individuals clothed per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ___ individuals counseled per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ___ shelter housing beds occupied per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ___ patients/clients seen per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ___ individuals provided with groceries per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ___ individuals served meals per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. ___ individuals taught per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. ___ other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. In the future, if the resources available to your organization were to decrease, would you consider: (Please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ___ Reducing full-time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ___ Reducing part-time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ___ Increasing the use of volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ___ Reducing hours services are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ___ Reducing services available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ___ Collaborating with other groups for referral purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ___ Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Over the past three years, if the amount of available resources has decreased, what actions have you taken: (Please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>Taking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ___ Reduced full-time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ___ Reduced part-time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ___ Increased the use of volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ___ Reduced hours services are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ___ Reduced services available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ___ Collaborated with other groups for referral purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ___ Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

25. Total projected operating budget for social service programs and services (as identified in Question 8) in current fiscal year:

$___________________

For the current year, is this amount increasing or decreasing over past years and by what percentage, or is it remaining about the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Remain about the same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>________%</td>
<td>________%</td>
<td>________%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Total actual expenses for same programs and services in previous fiscal year: $_______________

27. At the end of your previous fiscal year, did you have a positive or negative cash flow? ______________ How much? $ __________

28. Please estimate what percentage of your program and service funding/income comes from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Individual donors or members</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Private corporations</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Foundations</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. United Way</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Endowments</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Fees-for-services</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Local government</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. State government</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Federal government</td>
<td>______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other (specify)</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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29. Approximate the value of in-kind donations received in your previous fiscal year (food, clothing, etc., not including volunteer hours): $___________

GENERAL: Your responses to the following questions will help us tell the whole story when we complete this report.

30. Please tell us anything else we may need to know about your organization’s capacity and the community it serves:

31. What is your greatest concern regarding the impact of welfare reform on the individuals and families who come to you for help?

32. Do you want a copy of survey results? If YES, please complete the following.

The information requested below is optional and will only be used to keep you informed of the outcomes of this research and other relevant projects at the Center for Public Policy and Administration. Our research findings will not identify any organization or person by name.

Name of Person Completing This Survey: ___________________________ Title: ______________________________

Information About Your Organization:

Organization Name: ________________________________

Organization Head: ___________________________ Title: ______________________________

Street Address: ________________________________

City: ________________________________ State: _____________ Zip: ________________________________

Phone: ________________________________ Fax: ________________________________

Email address: ___________________________ Organization’s website: ________________________________

Please return in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy & Administration
University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363
Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489
APPENDIX C

Post Implementation Surveys and Cover Letters

The following are post-implementation surveys and cover letters mailed separately to both nonprofit and religious organizations. For the second post-implementation survey, a second letter and survey was sent to nonrespondents both letters are included but only one copy of the survey since it was identical except the return date.

The following outlines in order the documents that follow.

First Post-implementation

Religious Organizations
- Cover letter dated April 17, 2001
- Survey with response date of May 5, 2000

Nonprofit Organizations
- Cover letter dated April 17, 2001
- Survey with response date of May 5, 2001

Second Post-implementation

Religious Organizations
- Cover letter dated July 18, 2001
- Follow-up cover letter dated August 8, 2001
- Survey with response date of August 18, 2001

Nonprofit Organizations
- Cover letter dated July 18, 2001
- Follow-up cover letter dated August 8, 2001
- Survey with response date of August 18, 2001
Dear Congregational Leader,

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the survey sent to you by the Center for Public Policy and Administration last winter. We appreciate the valuable information provided by you and other organization leaders.

Government assistance for the poor is becoming less available, and those in need often turn to churches for help. Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of religious congregations to serve those in need. As part of the TANF program, time limits on financial assistance began to be imposed in Utah on December 31, 1999. Part of our study of charitable social service capacity in Utah is to assess the impact of time limits on congregations such as yours. The enclosed survey is designed as a follow-up to the initial survey. A second follow-up survey will also be sent in June 2000.

Please complete the attached survey for your congregation as accurately and thoroughly as possible, focusing on the past three months since the implementation of time limits. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey, and ask that you do so by May 5, 2000.

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your congregation for participating. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the religious and other charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah’s Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. Religious, humanitarian, and government organizations have sponsored our efforts. This survey is just one piece of this project.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie DiPadova at 801-585-1771 or Hillary Diamond at 801-581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie DiPadova, Ph.D.
Policy Fellow
A SURVEY OF CHARITABLE SOCIAL SERVICE CAPACITY IN UTAH

**Return survey by May 5, 2000**

PLEASE NOTE: Completion of the survey is voluntary; survey responses are held in strictest confidence. We are grateful for your responding to our survey as thoroughly and accurately as possible. *If a question we ask is not applicable to your organization, simply leave it blank.* Please return completed survey in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363 Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489. Thank you very much.

As you know, as part of the TANF program, on December 31, 1999 time limits on financial assistance began to be imposed in Utah. The following questions are designed to help us understand if this policy is having an impact on your congregation:

1. Since January 1, 2000, have the characteristics of people coming to you for welfare assistance CHANGED from January-March of 1999 e.g., age, marital status, employment status, ethnicity, immigrant status, receiving governmental assistance, etc?
   ___ No.                      ___Yes.  If so, how? __________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

   From October-December of 1999?
   ___ No.                      ___Yes.  If so, how? __________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. Since January 1, 2000, has the total amount of funds and services expended by your congregation for social services INCREASED from January-March of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, by how many? ____________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

   From October-December of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, by how many? ____________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

3. Since January 1, 2000, have the numbers of referrals you are making to organizations outside your congregation CHANGED from January-March of 1999?
   ___ No.                      ___Yes.  If so, how? __________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

   From October-December of 1999?
   ___ No.                      ___Yes.  If so, how? __________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

4. Over the past few months, have you noticed a change in the number of people served from the following kinds of households? If so, please indicate an INCREASE with an I and a DECREASE with a D.

   A. Family
   __________ Two-parent households with children at home
   __________ Total number of children
   __________ Single-parent households with children at home
   __________ Total number of children
   __________ Two-adult households with no children at home
   __________ Single adult households with no children at home
   __________ Unknown
Question 4 continued. Mark I for INCREASE or D for DECREASE.

B. Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with two or more employed adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one employed adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no employed adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Government Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households receiving government assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households eligible for but NOT RECEIVING government assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households not eligible for government assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Since January 1, 2000, have you noticed a change in requests for any of the following services? If so, please indicate by *what percentage* in the appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>DECREASE from January-March 1999</th>
<th>INCREASE from January-March 1999</th>
<th>DECREASE from October-December 1999</th>
<th>INCREASE from October-December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABUSE/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide or find safe haven, treatment programs, counsel, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day care, pre-school, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donate or purchase for individuals/families, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy classes, tutor, assist with tuition or school fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT HELP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor, job training, placement, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soap kitchen, pantry, food donations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER CARE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary placement of children outside their own homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary, permanent, overnight shelter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide and/or pay for legal assistance, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL, DENTAL AND PRESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>provide or pay for services, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONETARY ASSISTANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cash, commodities, vouchers, pay bills, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment program, counseling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting or paying for transportation needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL: Your responses to the following question will help us tell the whole story when we complete this report.

6. What is your greatest concern regarding the implementation of time limits on the individuals and families who come to you for help?

7. Do you want a copy of survey results? If YES, please complete the following.

The information requested below is optional and will only be used to keep you informed of the outcomes of this research and other relevant projects at the Center for Public Policy and Administration. Our research findings will not identify any organization or person by name.

Name of Person Completing This Survey: ___________________________ Title:________________

Information About Your Organization:

Organization Name: ________________________________________________________________

Organization Head: ___________________________ Title: ________________________________

Street Address: ________________________________________________________________

City: ___________________________ State: _____________ Zip:________________

Phone: ___________________________ Fax: _________________________________________

Email address: ___________________________ Organization’s website: ________________________

Please return in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy & Administration University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363 Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489
April 17, 2000

Dear Charitable Organization Leader,

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the survey sent to you by the Center for Public Policy and Administration last winter. We appreciate the valuable information provided by you and other organization leaders.

Government assistance for the poor is becoming less available, and those in need often turn to charitable organizations for help. Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. As part of the TANF program, time limits on financial assistance began to be imposed in Utah on December 31, 1999. Part of our study of charitable social service capacity in Utah is to assess the impact of time limits on organizations such as yours. The enclosed survey is designed as a follow-up to the initial survey. A second follow-up survey will also be sent in June 2000.

Please complete the attached survey for your organization as accurately and thoroughly as possible, focusing on the past three months since the implementation of time limits. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey, and ask that you do so by April 30, 2000.

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah’s Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. This survey is just one piece of this project.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie DiPadova at 801-585-1771 or Hillary Diamond at 801-581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie DiPadova, Ph.D.
Policy Fellow
As you know, as part of the TANF program, on December 31, 1999 time limits on financial assistance began to be imposed in Utah. The following questions are designed to help us understand if this policy is having an impact on your organization:

1. Since January 1, 2000, have the characteristics of clients coming to your organization for assistance CHANGED from the first quarter (January-March) of 1999 e.g., age, marital status, employment status, ethnicity, immigrant status, receiving governmental assistance, etc?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, how? ______________________________________________________________________

   From the last quarter (October-December) of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, how? ______________________________________________________________________

2. Since January 1, 2000, has the total amount of funds and services expended by your organization for social service programs INCREASED from the first quarter (January-March) of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, by how many? __________________________

   From the last quarter (October-December) of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, by how many? __________________________

3. Since January 1, 2000, have the numbers of referrals you are making to other organizations CHANGED from the first quarter (January-March) of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, how? ______________________________________________________________________

   From the last quarter (October-December) of 1999?
   ___ No.                          ___Yes.   If so, how? ______________________________________________________________________

4. Over the past few months, have you noticed a change in the number of the following households? If so, please indicate an INCREASE with an I and a DECREASE with a D.

   A. Family
   _______ Two-parent households with children at home
   _______ Total number of children
   _______ Single-parent households with children at home
   _______ Total number of children
   _______ Two-adult households with no children at home
   _______ Single adult households with no children at home
   _______ Unknown
**Question 4 continued.** Mark I for INCREASE or D for DECREASE.

**B. Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Description</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with two or more employed adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one employed adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no employed adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Government Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Description</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households receiving government assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households eligible for but NOT RECEIVING government assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households not eligible for government assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Since January 1, 2000, have you noticed a change in requests for any of the following services? If so, please indicate by what percentage in the appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>DECREASE from January-March 1999</th>
<th>INCREASE from January-March 1999</th>
<th>DECREASE from October-December 1999</th>
<th>INCREASE from October-December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABUSE/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: provide or find safe haven, treatment programs, counsel, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE: day care, pre-school, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING: donate or purchase for individuals/families, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: literacy classes, tutor, assist with tuition or school fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT HELP: mentor, job training, placement, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD: soup kitchen, pantry, food donations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER CARE: temporary placement of children outside their own homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING: temporary, permanent, overnight shelter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES: provide and/or pay for legal assistance, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL, DENTAL AND PRESCRIPTION: provide or pay for services, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONETARY ASSISTANCE: cash, commodities, vouchers, pay bills, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES: treatment program, counseling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION: assisting or paying for transportation needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL: Your responses to the following question will help us tell the whole story when we complete this report.

6. What is your greatest concern regarding the implementation of time limits on the individuals and families who come to you for help?

8. Do you want a copy of survey results? If YES, please complete the following.

The information requested below is optional and will only be used to keep you informed of the outcomes of this research and other relevant projects at the Center for Public Policy and Administration. Our research findings will not identify any organization or person by name.

Name of Person Completing This Survey: __________________________ Title: __________________________

Information About Your Organization:

Organization Name: __________________________ Title: __________________________

Organization Head: __________________________ Title: __________________________

Street Address: __________________________

City: __________________________ State: __________________ Zip: __________________

Phone: __________________________ Fax: __________________________

Email address: __________________________ Organization’s website: __________________________

Please return in envelope provided, or to:
Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy & Administration
University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363
Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489
July 18, 2000

Dear Congregational Leader,

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the survey sent to you by the Center for Public Policy and Administration last winter. We appreciate the valuable information provided by you and other organization leaders.

Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. Part of our study is to assess the impact of TANF time limits—imposed in Utah on December 31, 1999—on congregations such as yours. The enclosed survey is designed as a follow-up to the initial survey as well as to the first post-implementation time limit survey you received in May of this year. This is the final survey we will be conducting in this study. Consequently, it is the last opportunity you have to tell us if and how your congregation and the people you serve have been impacted. We need your help to accurately determine demand for charitable services in Utah.

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the religious and other charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah’s Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. This survey is just one piece of this project.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie DiPadova at (801) 585-1771 or Sara McCormick at (801) 581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie DiPadova, Ph.D.
Policy Fellow
Dear Congregational Leader,

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the survey sent to you by the Center for Public Policy and Administration last winter. We appreciate the valuable information provided by you and other organization leaders. **We need your help, again—NOW!**

Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of religious congregations to serve those in need. Part of our study is to assess the impact of TANF time limits—implemented in Utah on December 31, 1999—on congregations such as yours. The enclosed survey is designed as a follow-up to the initial survey as well as to the first post-implementation time limit survey you received in May of this year. This is the final survey we will be conducting in this study. Consequently, it is the last opportunity you have to tell us if and how your congregation and the people who come to you have been impacted. We need your help to accurately determine demand for charitable services in Utah.

Please complete the attached survey for your congregation as accurately and thoroughly as possible, focusing on the six months since the implementation of time limits. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey. **Please return the survey by August 18, 2000.**

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your congregation for participating. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the religious and other charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah’s Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. Religious, humanitarian, and government organizations have sponsored our efforts. This survey is just one piece of this project.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie N. DiPadova at (801) 585-1771 or Sara McCormick at (801) 581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie N. DiPadova, Ph.D.
Policy Fellow
As you know, as part of the TANF program, on December 31, 1999 time limits on financial assistance began to be imposed in Utah. The following questions are designed to help us understand if this policy is having an impact on your congregation:

1. Has your congregation experienced a change in demand since the implementation of financial assistance (TANF) time limits?
   - ___ No change
   - ___ Increase
   - ___ Decrease

2. Since January 1, 2000, have you noticed a change in requests for any of the following services? If so, please indicate by what percentage in the appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE DECREASE from January-June 1999</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE INCREASE from January-June 1999</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE DECREASE from July-December 1999</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE INCREASE from July-December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuse/Domestic Violence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Help:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Dental and Prescription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How much of an increase in requests for services is your congregation presently able to absorb?

None ____ 1-10% ____ 11–20% ____ 21-30% ____ Other _____%

4. Since January 1, 2000, have the characteristics of people coming to your congregation for welfare assistance CHANGED from the first six months (January-June) of 1999 e.g., older or younger, more single or married, more employed or unemployed, changes in racial make up or immigration status, more receiving governmental assistance, etc?

___ No. ___ Yes. If so, how? ________________________________________________________________

From the last six months (July-December) of 1999?

___ No. ___ Yes. If so, how? ________________________________________________________________

5. Since January 1, 2000, has the total amount of funds and services expended by your congregation for social services INCREASED or DECREASED from the first six months (January-June) of 1999? Please check the appropriate range or specify other.

___ No Change ___ Increased by 1-10% ____ 11–20% ____ 21-30% ____ Other ____%

___ Decreased by 1-10% ____ 11–20% ____ 21-30% ____ Other ____%

From the last six months (July-December) of 1999?

___ No Change ___ Increased by 1-10% ____ 11–20% ____ 21-30% ____ Other ____%

___ Decreased by 1-10% ____ 11–20% ____ 21-30% ____ Other ____%

6. Since January 1, 2000, have the numbers of referrals you are making to organizations outside your congregation CHANGED from the first half (January-June) of 1999?

___ No. ___ Yes. If so, how? Increased _____ Decreased _____

From the last half (July-December) of 1999?

___ No. ___ Yes. If so, how? Increased _____ Decreased _____

Please describe any other changes in referrals. ________________________________________________

7. Over the past few months, has there been a change in the number of the following households served by your congregation? If so, please indicate whether there has been an INCREASE or DECREASE by marking in the appropriate column. If no change, simply leave the question blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent households with children at home</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in these households</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent households with children at home</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in these households</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-adult households with no children at home</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-adult households with no children at home</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ This information is not tracked by our congregation.
### Question 7 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Employment</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with two or more employed adults</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one employed adult</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no employed adults</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is not tracked by our congregation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Government Assistance</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households receiving government assistance</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households eligible for but NOT RECEIVING government assistance</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households not eligible for government assistance</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is not tracked by our congregation.

8. What is your greatest concern regarding the implementation of welfare time limits on the individuals and families who come to you for help?

---

9. Do you want a copy of survey results? If YES, please complete the following.
   The information requested below is optional and will only be used to keep you informed of the outcomes of this research and other relevant projects at the Center for Public Policy and Administration. Our research findings will not identify any congregation, organization or person by name.

Name of Person Completing This Survey: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Congregation Name: __________________________________________________________________________

Congregation Leader: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Street Address: ____________________________________________________________________________

City: __________________________________________ State: ___________ Zip: ________________________

Phone: ___________________________ Fax: ___________________________
Dear Charitable Organization Leader,

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the survey sent to you by the Center for Public Policy and Administration last winter. We appreciate the valuable information provided by you and other organization leaders.

Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. Part of our study is to assess the impact of TANF time limits—imposed in Utah on December 31, 1999—on organizations such as yours. The enclosed survey is designed as a follow-up to the initial survey as well as to the first post-implementation time limit survey you received in May of this year. This is the final survey we will be conducting in this study. Consequently, it is the last opportunity you have to tell us if and how your organization and the people you serve have been impacted. We need your help to accurately determine demand for charitable services in Utah.

Please complete the attached survey for your organization as accurately and thoroughly as possible, focusing on the six months since the implementation of time limits. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey.

Please return the survey by August 1, 2000.

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah’s Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. This survey is just one piece of this project.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie DiPadova at (801) 585-1771 or Sara McCormick at (801) 581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie DiPadova, Ph.D.
Policy Fellow
August 8, 2000

Dear Charitable Organization Leader,

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the survey sent to you by the Center for Public Policy and Administration last winter. We appreciate the valuable information provided by you and other organization leaders. **We need your help, again—NOW!**

Under the sponsorship of the Utah Department of Workforce Services, we are collecting information to examine the ability of charitable organizations to serve those in need. Part of our study is to assess the impact of TANF time limits—implemented in Utah on December 31, 1999—on organizations such as yours. The enclosed survey is designed as a follow-up to the initial survey as well as to the first post-implementation time limit survey you received in May of this year. This is the final survey we will be conducting in this study. Consequently, it is the last opportunity you have to tell us if and how your organization and the people you serve have been impacted. We need your help to accurately determine demand for charitable services in Utah.

Please complete the attached survey for your organization as accurately and thoroughly as possible, focusing on the six months since the implementation of time limits. We have enclosed a prepaid-return envelope for your convenience in returning the completed survey. **Please return the survey by August 18, 2000.**

We assure you that your participation in this effort is completely voluntary. Your responses will be held in strict confidence so as to minimize any possible risk to you or your organization for participating. As a result of what you and other charitable leaders tell us, we will determine the impact of welfare reform on the charitable organizations and their ability to meet increased needs as necessary. If you do not want to complete the survey, we ask that you return it uncompleted in the prepaid envelope provided. The University of Utah’s Center for Public Policy and Administration has embarked on a major research and partnership building initiative to study the impact of welfare reform on both faith-based and nonfaith-based charitable organizations. This survey is just one piece of this project.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions regarding this research, please feel free to contact Laurie N. DiPadova at (801) 585-1771 or Sara McCormick at (801) 581-6491.

Sincerely,

Laurie N. DiPadova, Ph.D.
Policy Fellow
As you know, as part of the TANF program, on December 31, 1999 time limits on financial assistance began to be imposed in Utah. The following questions are designed to help us understand if this policy is having an impact on your organization:

1. Has your organization experienced a change in demand since the implementation of financial assistance (TANF) time limits?

   ___ No change  ___ Increase  ___ Decrease

2. Since January 1, 2000, have you noticed a change in requests for any of the following services? If so, please indicate by what percentage in the appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE DECREASE from January-June 1999</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE INCREASE from January-June 1999</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE DECREASE from July-December 1999</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE INCREASE from July-December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABUSE/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide or find safe haven, treatment programs, counsel, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day care, pre-school, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donate or purchase for individuals/families, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy classes, tutor, assist with tuition or school fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT HELP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor, job training, placement, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soup kitchen, pantry, food donations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER CARE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary placement of children outside their own homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary, permanent, overnight shelter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide and/or pay for legal assistance, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL, DENTAL AND PRESCRIPTION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide or pay for services, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONETARY ASSISTANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cash, commodities, vouchers, pay bills, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment program, counseling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting or paying for transportation needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How much of an increase in requests for services is your organization presently able to absorb?

None___ 1-10% ___ 11-20% ___ 21-30% ___ Other ______%

4. Since January 1, 2000, have the characteristics of clients coming to your organization for assistance CHANGED from the first six months (January-June) of 1999 e.g., older or younger, more single or married, more employed or unemployed, changes in racial make up or immigration status, more receiving governmental assistance, etc?

___ No.  ___Yes.  If so, how? __________________________________________________________

From the last six months (July-December) of 1999?

___ No.  ___Yes.  If so, how? __________________________________________________________

5. Since January 1, 2000, has the total amount of funds and services expended by your organization for social service programs INCREASED or DECREASED from the first six months (January-June) of 1999? Please check the appropriate range or specify other.

___ No Change  ___ Increased by ___ Decreased by

1-10% ___ 11–20% ___ 21-30% ___ Other ___% 1-10% ___ 11–20% ___ 21-30% ___ Other ___%

From the last six months (July-December) of 1999?

___ No Change  ___ Increased by ___ Decreased by

1-10% ___ 11–20% ___ 21-30% ___ Other ___% 1-10% ___ 11–20% ___ 21-30% ___ Other ___%

6. Since January 1, 2000, have the numbers of referrals you are making to other organizations CHANGED from the first half (January-June) of 1999?

___ No.  ___Yes.  If so, how? Increased _____ Decreased _____

From the last half (July-December) of 1999?

___ No.  ___Yes.  If so, how? Increased _____ Decreased _____

Please describe any other changes in referrals. ______________________________________________________

7. Over the past few months, has there been a change in the number of the following households served by your organization? If so, please indicate whether there has been an INCREASE or DECREASE by marking in the appropriate column. If no change, simply leave question blank.

A. Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent households with children at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in these households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent households with children at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in these households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-adult households with no children at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-adult households with no children at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ This information is not tracked by our organization.
Question 7 continued.

**B. Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with two or more employed adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one employed adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no employed adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is not tracked by our organization.

**C. Government Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households receiving government assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households eligible for but NOT RECEIVING government assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households not eligible for government assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is not tracked by our organization.

8. What is your greatest concern regarding the implementation of time limits on the individuals and families who come to you for help?

9. Do you want a copy of survey results? If YES, please complete the following.

The information requested below is optional and will only be used to keep you informed of the outcomes of this research and other relevant projects at the Center for Public Policy and Administration. Our research findings will not identify any organization or person by name.

Name of Person Completing This Survey: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Organization Name: ____________________________________________________________

Organization Head: ____________________________________________________________ Title: ___________________________

Street Address: ________________________________________________________________

City: ___________________________ State: __________ Zip: _________________________

Phone: ___________________________ Fax: ___________________________

Please return in envelope provided, or to: Laurie N. DiPadova, Center for Public Policy & Administration
University of Utah, 1901 E. South Campus Dr., Room 2120, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9363
Phone: 801-581-6491; Fax: 801-585-5489
APPENDIX D

DISCUSSION POINTS

Religion and the Single Parent Family on Welfare

Bill Walsh
Walsh and Weathers Research & Policy Studies
January 1999

In debating PRWORA, Congress declared its intention that the charitable sector—particularly religious groups—would fill gaps left by federal withdrawal from providing assistance to the poor. It seems clear that changes in the Food Stamp program have already increased pressure on charitable providers of emergency food. The work focus of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF, and called the Family Employment Program in Utah) coupled with a strong economy account for a portion of the large numbers of single parent families with children leaving the welfare rolls in recent years becoming employed. However, there is a growing body of evidence that indicates that few of them are achieving self-sufficiency. They tend to be working at low-wage, often unstable jobs, lacking health coverage and struggling to pay childcare and other costs of employment, as well as high rent. Moreover, studies show that another large group of welfare “leavers” are not employed and not doing well. It is likely that much of the increase in requests for money and other kinds of help reported by charitable sector providers including religious organizations are related to this. When lifetime limits on financial assistance begin to affect vulnerable families, those in need of help can be expected to turn to churches and other charitable groups for ongoing, long-term assistance.

Anticipation of this scenario has given rise since before 1996 to questions about the capacity of the charitable sector to live up to Congress’ expectations and several studies, including the Welfare Reform Initiative, are seeking answers. However, another question may be of additional concern to religious group leaders: might the strong pro-family doctrinal tenet of most religious groups tend to drive a wedge between member mothers with children who find themselves divorced, such that they will not feel comfortable asking their church for even last resort help? This question may trigger others.

Although there seems to be something quite logical from a human nature perspective in this notion, collecting data on this issue is a first step to understanding its validity. A goal would be to get information on religious organization involvement with single parent assistance—to measure whether there may be either individual member and institutional barriers, or both, to single parents receiving help from churches to the extent that Congress seems to have intended. We respectfully submit the following questions for religious leaders as a starting place:

- Do organization officials systematically attempt to track both parents when a divorce occurs in a member family?
• Are children in such families offered any kind of special support?
• Are there programs to support the parents? For what purposes?
• Does your organization have a clear position on the payment of child support?
• When a female member gets separated or divorced, are there observable changes in her church status? Her attendance?
• If she has custody of children, are there observable changes in their participation?
• If either single parent or child participation in church increases in some cases, does there appear to be a consistent reason? If it decreases?
• Does the outward behavior of other members toward this new single parent family appear to change in any significant ways that may either bolster or discourage its participation?
• On occasions where such families have enrolled in welfare, does this appear to make any difference in either their attendance or other members’ behavior?
• Is there any kind of organizational outreach to encourage attendance by or provide help to single parents?
• If your religious organization has missionaries, are they instructed to approach single mothers with children any differently than other potential converts?
• Does the organization let it be known that they will help non-member single parent families?
• What is your opinion about Congress’ contention that churches can become the safety net for single parent families who exhaust their time limits on public assistance? For example, is your organization able at this point to financially support and offer encouragement to families who can no longer qualify for government assistance for indefinite period of time? Do church officials have the time to do this? If needs increased substantially, does the organization have the means to generate sufficient additional resources?
• In light of your organization’s religious doctrine regarding the family, is there any cause for concern that single, female parents may voluntarily withdraw from church activities and help?
• Would you briefly summarize your faith’s doctrine pertinent to this issue? Is there doctrine that specifically pertains to divorce or other types of family break-up?