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Abstract

INTERVIEWS AND CONVERSATIONS ABOUT LEAVING SERVICES (ICALS): A REVIEW OF RESOURCES AFTER TANF

Maria Cole, MPH

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2017

Supervising Professor: Rebecca Hegar

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) policy is designed to protect the nation’s most vulnerable families from severe hardship. The policy encourages moving people from “welfare to work” and improving child welfare. TANF, though, has remained largely unchanged since its adoption in 1996 despite persistent poverty nationwide and worsening poverty in the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area. Consequently, TANF has not effectively responded to poverty nor has it improved child welfare.

The researcher conducted a comprehensive literature review which identified employment barriers found to affect families leaving TANF services. Several studies illuminated that mental or behavioral health, substance abuse, race or ethnicity, having a child with a disability, health and access to health care, domestic abuse, educational opportunities, social support, regional or geographic location, food insecurity, and structural obstacles presented barriers to gaining and maintaining employment. A second literature review identified transitional services and programs that were available to families that left TANF; the researcher found three articles that discussed program outcomes from states that had implemented large-scale transitional services programs.
The researcher set out to conduct a strengths-and-needs assessment through focus groups and interviews to explore the services available and the gaps in services for families leaving TANF. The researcher collected qualitative interview data from families who had left the TANF program within the last 3 years (n = 5) and organizational members who played a role in providing services to this population (n = 8). Using Grounded Theory Methods (GTM), the researcher analyzes the qualitative data and proposes a framework for a transitional services program.

The respondents cited barriers such as job readiness, transportation, systemic or structural barriers, unreasonable requirements or statutes, and lack of financial resources as the most significant obstacles to delivering services. They also cited illness, childcare, transportation, being a single parent, and lack of stable housing as the strongest barriers to maintaining employment.

The researcher discusses the need to have transitional support services to help to stabilize families exiting TANF to achieve self-sufficiency. The researcher also illustrates and advocates the need to have comprehensive policies such as universal healthcare, childcare, and a reliable transportation system to support families leaving TANF.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Poverty issues in the United States have received increased attention over the last 20 years after the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) converted the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) federal assistance program to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) welfare block grant. TANF replaced the AFDC administration, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program, and the Emergency Assistance (EA) programs (U.S. House of Representatives, 1996). This consolidation process aimed to transition poor families from “welfare to work” and reduce the number of families who receive welfare (DeParle, 1994). Following this landmark legislative change, social welfare policies have received more public scrutiny. In the late 1990s, President Bill Clinton utilized this public attention to assert that national economic growth could be achieved by ending welfare dependence (DeParle, 1994). Since then, attitudes towards social welfare policies, specifically including the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) policy, have been inextricably linked to the current economic environment. For instance, during the recession of 2008, media outlets widely criticized TANF’s strict eligibility guidelines. After a period of economic recovery and growth, however, more recent media articles have called for fewer social programs in favor of more laissez-faire economic policies. This waxing and waning of perspectives on TANF have been utilized by opposing politicians to bolster their economic platforms by either praising or criticizing TANF policy.

Researchers Clawson and Trice (2000) analyzed the media portrayals of the poor in the 1990s and the subsequent decline in public support for social welfare programs. Their study affirmed similar findings from other media studies in that mass
media publications during this time period began to classify poor as either ‘deserving’ or “criminal, alcoholic, drug addict” (Clawson & Trice, 2000, p. 54). Many social scientists have described contemporary social welfare policies and programs’ ideological biases that reflect the pre-Colonial European punitive approaches towards people living in poverty (Duncan & Moore, 2003; Martin, 2012). Clawson and Trice (2000) also found that during periods of support for social welfare programs fewer African-American people were shown in news media, but during periods of opposition for social welfare programs African-Americans were overrepresented. The authors report that the portrayals of the poor helped to create and perpetuate negative stereotypes and inaccurate beliefs about the poor. Further, the media’s attention to individual factors that may contribute to poverty led to less support for welfare programs, hostility toward African-Americans, and apathy toward the poor (Clawson & Trice, 2000).

The sociopolitical climate surrounding TANF and potential reform efforts have significant implications for social work practice. PWORA’s shift to the reduction of welfare usage is reflected in the TANF policy. The current policy structure negates the systematic or programmatic factors that also contribute to poverty. The TANF policy objectives focus on decreasing the number of people receiving welfare, but neglect to include poverty reduction as a mechanism for families to achieve economic independence from welfare. Consequently, TANF policy focuses little on preventive programs and resources such as financial literacy classes, vocational training, or reducing barriers to employment for TANF participants. Moreover, once families stop receiving TANF benefits, the lack of transitional services and resources present significant challenges for families. Social work practice could benefit from research that explores not only how to best serve families in time of crises, but also how to care preventively for their needs. Additionally, following the steady depprofessionalization of social services delivery in many States’ Department of
Health and Human Services offices (Anderson & Gryzlak, 2002), social workers could be reengaged through competitive employment opportunities. Employing social workers in this capacity could enhance the opportunities of TANF eligible families by providing immediate access to professionals with enhanced case management, assessment, and referral skills.

Scholars have amassed a significant body of research that discusses outcomes for families after leaving TANF services. Families leaving TANF involuntarily are more likely to have encounters with child protection services (Beimers, 2011) and to experience increased stress and problem drinking (Mulia, Schmidt, Bond, Jacobs & Korcha, 2008), among other negative life experiences common to individuals living in poverty. These families typically struggle to meet their basic needs (Anderson, Halter, & Gryzlak, 2004) and often face mental health or substance abuse issues (Altman, 2008). Emerging bodies of research have begun to explore tertiary transitional services programs that could offer support to families once TANF benefits end.

For example, a transitional program employed in Kentucky used qualitative data analysis to demonstrate significant changes in physical and mental health, substance abuse, and barriers due to intimate partner violence for TANF leavers when compared to those who had not used the transitional program (Leukfeld, Carlton, Staton-Tindall & Delaney, 2012). Similarly, a program in Florida found that families that utilized their program experienced increased empowerment, social connections, and resourcefulness (Bronstein & McPhee, 2009). More research is needed to explore what components are necessary to build a transitional services program that could benefit local families. This thesis includes an investigation of desired services from Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex’s TANF leavers and organizations that provide services to this population to gather input about which services would be most beneficial to these families.
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Literature Review

In order to inform the research questions and guide data gathering, a literature review identified employment barriers found to affect families leaving TANF services. According to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996) TANF’s goals are:

- To provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes;
- To end the dependency of needy parents on government support by promoting job preparation, employment, and marriage;
- To prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock and teen pregnancies and births and to establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and

Although not explicitly stated, the employment solution implies that the core barrier for TANF eligible families is derived from unemployment. As the policy mentions teenage pregnancy and a need for family formation, the researcher first explored common familial barriers to employment. The search parameters included literature published from 2006 to 2017 and abstracted in the PsychINFO, Proquest – Sociology, Proquest – Political Science, Social Work Abstracts, PsycARTICLES, Family Studies Abstracts, Proquest – PAIS Index, and Social Services Abstracts databases. Search terms included truncated versions and combinations of the following words: return to work or employment, TANF, barriers, housing, health, child care, education, and substance use or abuse. Inclusion criteria consisted of scientific instruments used to
measure variables (i.e. general well-being scale, depression scale), theories used, and data analyzed. Fifty-one articles were identified. Policy analyses or reviews, commentaries, and papers that did not focus on TANF-leavers were excluded. Other articles cited include sources from the reference lists of these articles that were relevant in the discussion. Thirty-eight articles were included in the final literature review. These papers revealed several predominant barriers that are organized into broad content areas (see Figure 2-1) and discussed in further detail below. The revealed barriers differ from the assumed TANF barrier of ‘employment’. The barriers discussed below closely align with social work education’s review of the social determinants of health that can predict poverty conditions. The barriers are grouped based on a socioecological framework similar to that used by other researchers exploring this topic (Calasanti & Jebo, 2004; Schram & Soss, 2001). This information is summarized in Appendix A.

A second literature review identified transitional services and programs that were available to families that left TANF. The search parameters included years 2006 to 2017 abstracted within the PsychINFO, Proquest – Sociology, Proquest – Political Science, Social Services Abstracts, and Social Work Abstracts databases. Search terms included truncated versions and combinations of the following words: transitional services, TANF, return to work and Texas. Inclusion criteria consisted of specific services or deficiencies desired by families that left TANF, theories used, and data analyzed. This search identified 104 articles. A check for duplicates condensed the number to 88 abstracts that were reviewed. Policy analyses, post-secondary analyses, call to action reports, papers that did not focus on TANF-leavers, dissertations, and reviews or commentaries were excluded. Twenty-two articles were included in the final literature review. However, ten did not report outcomes for TANF-leavers, one was a policy review, one was an international article, and nine did not discuss a transitional services program and were
therefore excluded. The final review included two papers which are summarized in Appendix B.

Figure 2-1 Literature Review: Barriers to Employment

Health

Health barriers include articles that discuss issues related to health and healthcare access, mental health, domestic violence, substance abuse and having a child with a disability.
Mental Health

Individuals who struggle with mental health issues face significant barriers to employment that may also impact their parental responsibilities (Leukefeld et al., 2012). This may also present concerns related to their capacity to follow TANF’s strict regulations (Stromwall, 2001; Stromwall, 2002). TANF recipients reported more mental distress than the general population (Stromwall, 2002). Additionally, previous TANF recipients reported lower levels of depression than current TANF recipients (Sullivan & DeCoster, 2001).

Domestic Abuse

Low-income women are at increased risk for intimate partner violence which negatively impacts women’s mental health (Adams, Bybee, Tolman, Sullivan, & Kennedy, 2013). The authors found that job stability for TANF recipients partially predicted mental health. It is reasonable to conclude that job stability can help provide a woman an alternative to dependence on an unhealthy, unsafe relationship.

Substance Use or Abuse

A significant research base exists that discusses the unique issues that TANF recipients with substance use disorders (SUDs) endure. TANF recipients with SUDs reported significantly higher barriers to employment than TANF recipients without substance use disorders (Gutman et al., 2003; Meara, 2006; Montoya, 2001; Pilkinton, 2010; Pollack, 2002; Schoppelrey et al., 2005). Substance abuse may also impact employability (Morgenstern & Blanchard, 2006). TANF recipients with SUDs tend to earn less, have less work experience, and have poorer employment histories than other TANF recipients (Meara, 2006).
Health and Access to Health Care

Taylor and Barusch (2004) explain that physical health problems can impede TANF recipients’ abilities to gain or retain employment (Taylor & Barusch, 2004). People living in poverty often experience poorer health outcomes (Hayward, Hummer & Sasson, 2015) that may make it more difficult to leave TANF services due to the automatic enrollment into Medicaid health insurance included with TANF benefits. In California, this issue has led to an increase in child-only Medicaid cases across the CalWORKs program (California’s TANF program) (Speiglman et al., 2011). Additionally, Hildebrandt & Kelber (2012) found that health problems, marginalization, low education, and the welfare policy itself presented significant barriers for women seeking employment. Interestingly, Seccombe et al. (2007) report that, despite generous Medicaid expansion in Oregon, access to health care presents a significant barrier to employment, as many TANF-leavers experience difficulties accessing other medical care.

Child with a Disability

Numerous studies reported that having a child with a disability presents significant barriers to employment (Butler et al., 2008; Huang et al., 2012; Powell & Bauer, 2010). Huang et al. (2012) report that having a child with a disability impacts re-entry to the TANF program (Huang et al., 2012). Attending to child care needs, health, and close supervision needs for a child with a disability may impede a parent’s ability to gain steady work (Butler et al., 2008).

Other Social Determinants of Health

Other social determinants of health barriers included issues related to race or ethnicity, educational opportunities, social support, food insecurity, and regional or geographic location.
Race or Ethnicity

Ethnicity impacts an individual’s ability to gain employment (Garcia & Harris, 2001). According to Parisi et al. (2006), African-Americans encountered more personal barriers to employment, like child care and low education, and had fewer economic opportunities in their communities than their White counterparts. Racial and ethnic disparities are further exacerbated by TANF status.

Educational Opportunities

Many families view education as a vehicle for social mobility (Lee et al., 2008), but the lack of education can contribute to a complicated set of factors that make women ‘hard-to-employ’ (Blank, 2007). Low educational level, therefore, is a barrier to attaining higher education. Researchers Austin & McDermott (2003) found that single-parent, TANF recipients pursued higher education when they received access to child care and financial aid, familial and community support, and a variety of academic program selections.

Social Support

Researchers Anderson-Butler et al. (2004) found that support groups for long-term recipients of TANF led to enhanced parenting skills and improved self-esteem. Similarly, Brooks et al. (2001) found that job clubs helped to minimize TANF recipients perceived barriers to employment.

Food Insecurity

Although families are often eligible for the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) after they leave TANF, few enroll due to lack of knowledge or administrative problems, like missed referrals (Anderson, 2004). Missed referrals may occur when TANF case managers fail to notify participants of their SNAP program eligibility. Food insecurity occurs in both urban and rural environments (Molnar et al.,
In rural areas, knowledge about where to receive food and an individual's ability to obtain food may significantly impact ability to work (Wetherill & Gray, 2015). Urban areas may also experience shortages or lack access to healthy foods (Molnar et al., 2001; Gilbert et al., 2014).

**Regional or Geographic Location**

Dolan et al. (2008) report that rural TANF families experience unique barriers that include low education, decreased employment opportunities, and issues of access to transportation (Dolan et al., 2008). In their study, family support helped to augment post-welfare opportunities. Correspondingly, Hetling et al. (2005) found that urban TANF families were more likely to perceive long-term barriers to employment if they lived in a poor neighborhood. An extreme lack of resources within a neighborhood was related to employment barriers (Siegel et al., 2007).

**Structural Obstacles**

**Administration**

Navigating the social welfare system can include long forms, lengthy waits, and require social skills that may be absent in those seeking benefits. Marrone and colleagues (2005) discussed the difficulties that individuals with mental illness encounter within the welfare system. Specifically, they discuss the obstacles faced for people who attempt to utilize both mental health services and welfare benefits. The authors conclude that clients receiving TANF would benefit from cross-trained professionals at both agencies to simplify coordination and delivery of services. Similarly, Bell (2005) reported that caseworkers experience challenges providing services to TANF recipients due to the high administrative burden of the work and lack of coordination between agencies. Bell also reported that the TANF policy itself tends to focus on decreasing welfare usage but not helping TANF clients to achieve 'self-sufficiency'.
Simmons et al. (2001) criticized TANF’s strict ‘work-first’ policy that led Connecticut to impose harsh time limits and few training options for TANF recipients. The authors assert that more training and education opportunities combined with better laws to protect the poor and more supportive services will lead to decreased barriers to employment and self-sufficiency for TANF families.

**Meta-stressors**

Bowie and Dopwell (2013) explore the comprehensive ‘metastressors’ that impact minority, female, single parents. Meta-stressors refer to the magnitude of barriers to employment that this population often faces such as lack of education, discrimination in the workplace, and legal issues. They conclude that the intersection of race and gender oppression converge to present unique structural challenges for this population.

**Material hardship**

Livermore et al. (2015) explain that limited access to life’s basic necessities like food and housing present significant barriers to employment.
Research Questions

Although barriers to the population leaving TANF are well-defined, there is a lack of research to explain how these barriers impact social service delivery systems in Texas, and specifically the Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) metropolitan area communities. Despite about 980,000 families with children living in poverty in Texas ("Texas 2016," 2017), the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (2016) reported that the Texas TANF policy is more restrictive and harder to access than other states. The graph shows that the Texas TANF program serves approximately 4 out of 100 families living in poverty (Figure 2-1). To explain, the Office of Family Assistance (2017) reported that the United States had approximately 309,000 families that received TANF in December 2016 and about 291,000 families in March 2017. In those four months, the US decreased TANF caseloads by about 5.7 percent. Correspondingly, counties in the DFW area (Collin, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Hunt, Kaufman, Parker, Rockwall, Tarrant, Wise, and Grayson) provided TANF services to about 3,500 families in December 2016 and about 3,200 families in March 2017 ("Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Statistics," 2017). This DFW community trend reflects a decrease in families served at about twice the rate of the US trend or about 9.6
percent. Although the US as a whole is decreasing TANF rolls, the rapid decline in North Texas warrants academic research and review of the implications for these families.

This study aims to investigate which services may be necessary to include in a transitional services program for families leaving TANF in the Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) metropolitan area. The questions for this study are as follows:

- Which barriers influence DFW families’ ability to become self-sufficient?
- Which services and resources are necessary to help DFW families attain economic independence?

The researcher defines economic independence as having enough money to meet the family’s basic needs (e.g. utilities, food, and shelter) without the use of social welfare (e.g. housing assistance or food stamps). The researcher defines self-sufficient as not currently receiving assistance from a social welfare program and having been employed for more than three months or being currently enrolled in a higher education or training program for more than three months.

**Hypotheses**

The researcher hypothesizes that lack of childcare resources will provide the greatest barrier to employment, and will be revealed as a crucial resource for families’ economic independence.
Chapter 3

Methods

This study, IRB No. 2017-0776, was designed to perform an assessment using a community-based approach to conduct a strengths-and-needs assessment through focus groups and interviews (see Appendix N). The researcher used a common method to develop the assessment that included extrapolating questions from existing studies, exploring a resource inventory, and reviewing service statistics (Kettner, Moroney, & Martin, 2012). This thesis study used focus groups and interview data as well as a standardized instrument, the Perceived Employment Barrier Scale (PEBS), to explore the available services and the gaps in services for families leaving the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) welfare program.

Focus Group Input and Interviews

The researcher planned focus group meetings to formally solicit input from families who had left the TANF program (“TANF leavers”) within the last three years. The researcher planned to conduct in-depth interviews for participants unable to meet during focus group meeting times. During each meeting, the investigator solicited participant input about which services they benefitted from during their transitional period, or which services they would have benefitted from. The researcher developed the focus group questions (see Appendix E) based on the literature review results discussed in the previous section. Demographic surveys (see Appendix C) collected information pertaining to participant’s age, race, gender, income and education levels. Additionally, TANF leavers were asked to fill out the Perceived Employment Barriers Scale (see Appendix D) to rank their barriers.

Interviews were conducted with organizational members who played a role in providing services to this population. During the interviews, the investigator asked
organizational members to name strategies they have used to help these families and what barriers they had encountered (see Appendix I). Organizational member participants were asked to complete demographic surveys (see Appendix H) that collected their time in their role, credentials, and organizational mission. All conversations were audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis purposes.

Measures

Hong, Polanin, Key and Choi (2014) developed the Perceived Employment Barrier Scale (PEBS) to measure psychological self-sufficiency in low-income job seekers (see Appendix D). This scale is a validated scale that measures perceived barriers and support services. The scale does not utilize a composite score but instead utilizes exploratory factor analysis to show relationships among the variables. This scale captures an individual's perceived barriers to employment and their hopes for employment or vocation. The PEBS scale was utilized for this thesis study because it succinctly records individuals' barriers and information about their support services.

Recruitment

The researcher sought twenty focus groups participants and ten organizational members from partner agencies with the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) School of Social Work's field placement office in the DFW metro area such as: the Urban League of Greater Dallas and North Central Texas, Inc., Anthem Strong Families, Arlington Housing Authority, Catholic Charities - Diocese of Fort Worth, City of Dallas, Housing & Community Services, CitySquare, Day Resource Center for the Homeless, Housing Crisis Center, Mission Arlington, Strong Families Coalition of Greater Tarrant County and the Texas Hunger Initiative Dallas Regional Office. The researcher sent letters to the organizations (see Appendix L) requesting permission to hang flyers at the facility and to recruit participants during an on-site visit. Flyers (see Appendix K) were distributed to
locations that agreed to participate in the study. Interested individuals were screened for eligibility and participants were required to meet the following criteria:

- Be between the ages of 18-65 years old;
- Have discontinued TANF services within the last 3 years; and
- Speak English.

Organizational members met the following criteria:

- Have provided or overseen the distribution of services for individuals who recently stopped receiving TANF benefit; and
- Been engaged in role for at least 6 months.

Setting

Eligible participants received information about informed consent (see Appendix J) as well as an invitation to attend either a 90-minute focus group session (see Appendix F) or a 60-minute individual interview (see Appendix G). The researcher pursued funding through the Charles M. Koch foundation (see Appendix M) and the University of Texas at Arlington) for participant travel expenses in the form of a $25 stipend. As funding was not secured within a designated timeframe, participant recruitment proceeded without the use of stipends as incentives. Three interviews and one small focus group with two “TANF-leaver” participants were conducted. The researcher traveled to participant homes to collect their information. Eight interviews were conducted with organizational members. The researcher traveled to their agencies to conduct the interview.

Qualitative Data Analysis Plan

This study is grounded in critical theory. Similar to other theories influenced by Marxist ideologies, it opposes all forms of oppression and asserts that societal inequalities stem from the imbalance of power that oppression creates (Aidukaite, 2009). Critical theory, however, seeks not only to recognize structural oppression, but also to
challenge it (Houston, 2001). This theory requires that social scientists identify patterns affecting persons in need in society, develop a hypothesis, analyze it (or formulate a new hypothesis if needed), then expose the identified sources of oppression (Houston, 2001). Although previous studies have examined either organizational members’ perspective on barriers faced when providing services to this population (Bell, 2005) or TANF leavers’ barriers to achieving self-sufficiency (Adams, Bybee, Tolman, Sullivan, & Kennedy, 2013), few studies have examined the nexus between the two perspectives. There are potential differences between the organizational members’ perspectives – the group that controls access to resources – and the TANF leavers’ perspectives – the group that often lacks the power to make changes independently.

As such, the researcher analyzed the condition of families who leave TANF services in order to develop a better understanding of their current barriers and needed services. The researcher discusses the individual and structural barriers that impact this population and proposes a framework for a program that could help to diminish the impact of those obstacles. The qualitative data collected was analyzed using the Grounded Theory Methods (GTM). This inductive approach “allows the research to reveal the nature of individuals’ experiences and to understand what lies behind a phenomenon about which little is known” (Henderson & Cook, 2005, p. 2). GTM is characterized by six steps to analyze qualitative data:

1. Preparation;
2. Data Collection;
3. Analysis;
4. Memoing;
5. Sorting and theoretical outline; and
The purpose of the preparation stage is to minimize preconceptions and diminish the risk of researcher bias. Typically, researchers conduct a limited or short literature review at the beginning of the project. For this study, the researcher conducted a literature review, but excluded policy reviews and secondary analyses to reduce possible confirmation bias from possible common perspectives held by both researchers.

Next, the data collection stage is designed to perform intensive interviews, which may influence which questions are asked in subsequent interviews. This stage also prompts initial analysis and restructuring of questions asked so that analysis and data collection influence and inform each other. The researcher asked the prepared questions and also probed more about questions that had received very detailed responses from the first few participants. This process led to the researcher asking questions such as “which services are provided by employees and which ones are provided by contractors” in addition to the scripted questions.

Next, the purpose of the analysis stage is to code and to identify salient ideas and then to relate those ideas to other ideas. This process leads to the discovery of a “core variable” that becomes the focus of the research. The researcher closely followed this tenet of GTM and connected several conditions that lead to the development of key variables. Then, a selective coding process helped identify the major dimensions of the “core variable”.

Next, theoretical coding helped the researcher conceptualize how each code relates to each other code. Then, the researcher used ‘memoing’ to write out the ideas and code their relationships. These steps occurred concurrently.

Afterward, the researcher sorted and organized the memos into an outline of the theory. The last formal stage of writing involves the completed sorting of the collected data and reveals the themes derived from the research (LaRossa, 2005). The themes
guided the research question, its construction and the subsequent discussion. The researcher counted the emerging themes to determine the number of times that each theme appeared in the transcripts. The researcher began the discussion with the most salient topics and made recommendations based on the participants’ most heavily discussed topics.

Additionally, the TANF leavers’ PEBS scale ratings were analyzed and ranked according to the most difficult barrier indicated by the group. The demographic data was summarized using descriptive statistics. Remaining sociodemographic variables were summarized with counts and percentages.
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Results

The following section describes the participant information, PEBS reported barriers to employment, qualitative analysis, and the need for a transitional service program.

Participant Information

This study obtained data from eight organizational members (n = 8), and five TANF leavers (n = 5) completed an interview to discuss their perspectives on barriers to leaving TANF. A convenience sampling method yielded organizational members from the following agency types – two post-employment programs for county workforce solutions in Tarrant County, one state community health organization in a rural setting, one state community hospital in an urban Northeastern city, one community-based organization focused on supporting young mothers in a Midwestern city, one temporary overnight homeless shelter in Tarrant County, one private case management firm that works with families who have children with development disabilities and are at-risk of entering foster care in Dallas County, and one city housing authority in Dallas County. The employment agencies were recruited from UTA partner agencies that declined to participate but a snowball sampling approach led to additional organizational participants. The non-local agencies, the community hospital and community-based organization, were recruited from the researcher’s professional membership network with a national public health association. The homeless shelter member was recruited through a faculty member who suggested this site. The last two agencies resulted from the researcher’s professional membership network in the local chapter of the National Association of Social Workers organization.
The organizational members were 75 percent female, employed in their roles for an average of 10.8 years (SD ± 6.3 years), and 62 percent had a social work degree. Two organizational members held professional licenses in social work. The TANF-leavers averaged 32.4 years of age (SD ± 6.7 years), were all African-American single mothers with an average of 1.2 minor children. Their educational backgrounds ranged from having a high school diploma to having completed some graduate-level education; all participants earned less than $10,000 per year (see Table 1).

Barriers to Employment

The TANF-leaver group marked twelve barriers on the PEBS scale (see Figure 3-1). All TANF-leavers reported that illness, or temporary poor health, presented a barrier to employment and eighty percent indicated that illness was their strongest barrier to employment. They also noted transportation, childcare, being a single parent, food insecurity, and lack of stable housing as strong barriers to maintaining employment.

![TANF Leavers Reported Barriers to Employment](image)

Figure 3-1 TANF Leavers Reported Barriers to Employment
Qualitative Analysis

During the conversations, five organizational members named systemic barriers, such as programmatic financial resources, laws, bureaucratic administrative processes, unprofessional TANF case workers, stigma, and unreasonable requirements or statutes as the most persistent obstacles to delivering services and resources. These structural barriers emerged as the most interconnected and salient theme discussed among the participants. As such, the following model begins with the ever-present condition of structural barriers as it impacts TANF-leavers' barriers, context, consequences and potential programmatic solutions for economic independence after leaving services (see Figure 3-2).

Structural Barriers

This study shows that the barriers that influenced DFW families' ability to become self-sufficient included systemic barriers, such as limited financial resources, sanctions, bureaucracy, and unprofessional staff at social service agencies. Both organizational members and TANF-leavers encountered significant barriers to accessing vital resources. The overarching theme that characterized these barriers was also consistent in both respondent groups: stigma. An organizational member describes the ever-present condition of stigma as her chief barrier to delivering services in her community. She says, “The biggest barrier is getting [eligible participants] to come out and access our services if they really need it. A lot of times you have to fill out a lot of paperwork to get services and depending on the family situation whether it's shame or cultural barriers... then are they're not willing to go out and do this [for themselves].”

This phenomenon has also been recorded in other studies in that eligible recipients would elect go without their basic needs to avoid the negative perceptions from
themselves and others that are associated with accessing welfare services (Bronstein & McPhee, 2009).

Figure 3-2 Model for Analysis of TANF Leavers Reported Barriers to Employment

Structural barriers present the largest obstacle due to their pervasiveness and ability to impact several other barriers. Participants discussed the effects of stigma that sometimes culminated in discriminatory practices, such as hearing derogatory remarks from caseworkers and not receiving information about available community resources.
This stigma may stem from cultural perceptions about poverty resulting from a lack of effort or divine punishment for sin (Duncan & Moore, 2003).

One TANF-leaver cited lack of transportation as a critical barrier that made it more difficult to maintain her participation in the TANF program and find resources once TANF ended. Supportive state policies like efficient urban planning policies to ensure that low-income populations have access to reliable transportation may have negated her need for TANF (Clifton, 2004). A study has refuted the idea that transportation helps TANF recipients remain employed (Sanchez, Shen, & Peng, 2004), however, in areas that lack efficient public transportation, such as much of the DFW area, this topic is worth further review. In her instance, TANF bridged other policies that would have better served her while she was still employed.

**Administrative Barriers**

To a lesser degree, three organizational members also discussed individual barriers such as job readiness, education, lack of financial resources, health and childcare concerns. The two groups had no overlap between the themes that they discussed in this area. Organizational members discussed social determinants of health as difficult barriers to providing services to this population. In other words, this group perceived the client’s persistent conditions as major obstacles. These included factors like the client’s job readiness (e.g. interview skills, availability of professional documents, employed in capacities that matched client’s skills) which impacted their ability to gain and maintain employment. The TANF-leavers, however, overwhelming believed that their poor health (reported as ‘illness’ on the PEBS scale results) was their most difficult barrier to achieving self-sufficiency. Strikingly, this group stated that their temporary condition presented the strongest barrier to achieving self-sufficiency. The difference between the perspectives suggests that the two groups may problem-solve differently
due to their diverging views on the root cause of welfare dependency. Social workers and those from other disciplines should employ client-centered, strengths-based approaches to case management and counseling techniques when working with this population. Helping TANF-leavers to understand how social determinants of health may impact their short-term and long-term goals will likely aid in helping them to transition from crisis to more stable conditions.

Lack of Integrated Services

One reason that TANF-leavers did not achieve self-sufficiency involved the lack of integrated services. For instance, the lack of a referral for one TANF-leaver precipitated her family experiencing homelessness. She explained her difficulty in accessing no-cost transportation to travel to several different social services offices that did not communicate well with her or with one another. An organizational member lamented about the unrealistic expectations imposed on people while they are actively experiencing a crisis. He explains,

“We need a seamless system where the clinical care and the community services are connected so that it’s not a lot of hoops to jump through, not a lot of forms, but you go basically like one-stop shopping where if you need services in the community or in a clinical setting you can get them from one-stop shopping, under one roof.”

The process of completing an assortment of forms for each social service program and need, talking with or visiting several offices, changes in administrative personnel, long wait times, inconsistent and inaccurate communication, sanctions due to unrealistic expectations (e.g. homeless person receiving mailed forms and returning them within two to three business days), and the lack of integration between services emerged as common barriers to navigating the Texas TANF welfare system and delivering
services to families transitioning from services. One TANF-leaver relayed that she hoped to see complete integration of services within the system of social services programs. She explained that having one main caseworker would ease communication between agencies and decrease the likelihood of mistakes and errors that cause delays in service delivery. She says,

“What could have made it easier is if I had one case caseworker that I could actually go in and talk to and discuss my case with. Because every time I went in to talk about my case it was like I was sent to other case workers.”

Service integration has been shown to have positive effects on employment for populations with multiple barriers to employment (Stromwall, 2002). Intensive case management should be implemented for TANF families to integrate service delivery and assure clients the opportunities to access needed services with the least number of barriers possible. One TANF-leaver did report having a good, communicative relationship with a case manager

**Negative Outcomes**

For one TANF-leaver, her crisis began with an unanticipated illness that necessitated time away from work. She discloses,

“When I needed to go to the doctor the person that I was working for, he was always like, “OK you can go to the doctor tomorrow. I'll give you time off tomorrow,” but tomorrow never came. So when my body gave out and I had to sit there and let them take me [to the hospital] and let [my boss] know ’I'm in the hospital’ you know … he got really angry.”

She continued to explain that she was fired and lost her apartment, but when she went to the TANF office she was unable to have all of her needs addressed in one place.

Similarly, another TANF-leaver lost her job due to attending to her child’s health needs
and was unable to immediately receive the childcare services and housing resources that her family needed. Both TANF-leavers needed workplace leave policies that would have preserved their jobs while they attended to their health needs.

Another TANF-leaver narrated that she felt obligated not to disclose her relationships with supportive friends and family members due to her fear of being denied services. She expressed that she would like to see fewer restrictions for TANF eligibility. She said that although any support that she received was minimal, she feared that her sparse relational resources would bar her from TANF benefits. She explained that the program seemed geared towards moving people along but not helping people become self-sufficient. She continued to say that her pursuit of higher education was not supported through the available educational programs that placed people in low-income, unsustainable jobs.

Organizational members cited individual barriers as difficult obstacles to overcome in delivering services to patients. Most often this group mentioned the lack of “job readiness” as presenting a significant obstacle to gaining and maintaining employment. The organizational members defined “job readiness” as clients’ having interview skills, having polished professional documents, and knowing which types of jobs will best match their needs. For instance, one organization member that worked to provide workforce services for the State’s “hardest-to-serve” population, explained that clients without recent job experience, little education, and few marketable skills are expected to gain sustainable employment at the same rate as a recent divorcee with a decade’s worth of experience and a specialized skill. Many of these individuals, mostly women, lose their benefits due to the state’s requirement to gain employment within 90 days. Once the benefits end, access to employment services also ends. She elaborates,

1This organizational member defined “hardest to serve” clients as those who faced multiple barriers to employment and were identified by the State as at-risk for losing services.
“There are state requirements that [TANF recipients] have like four weeks to job search. What we know is that the average job seeker is taking three to four months in this market - with skills and experience and recent work experience... So to give somebody four weeks that maybe doesn't have a GED or hasn't worked in a while or is facing homelessness or [other] barriers, it seems a little inconsistent with what you're seeing in the market.”

Blank (2007) reported that women who neither work nor retain welfare comprise a significant portion of all low-income single mothers. The organization would require additional funding not linked to TANF to continue to provide employment services for those who face serious barriers to work. Several researchers also agree that providing supplemental programs to support employment among those with barriers to work best serves the client and reduces burden on the social services system (Blank, 2007; Darity & Hamilton, 2012; Leukefeld, Carlton, Staton-Tindall, & Delaney, 2012). Social workers should advocate for more humane policies that consider the magnitude of barriers that this population encounters.

Need for Transitional Services

This study revealed services and resources that are necessary to help DFW families attain economic independence such as emergency funds, job skills training, childcare, social support, comprehensive service delivery and continuing assessment. The organizational members and TANF-leaver groups only overlapped on four services that they deemed essential to a transitional services program – childcare services, money, education and social support. The organizational members’ group mentioned emergency funding five times, whereas the TANF-leaver group only mentioned it once. Likewise, childcare was mentioned four times in the organizational members group and twice among the TANF-leavers. Social support was discussed three times from
organizational members and once in the TANF-leavers group. Education was mentioned twice in the organizational members group and once in the TANF-leavers group.

Organizational members discussed the need for immediate, consistent child care services to assist the population transitioning off of TANF services. One organizational member proposed having a tiered payment system to accommodate families leaving TANF to support continued employment. Another organizational member explained that her biggest challenge consisted of attempting to quickly help clients gain employment to become eligible for child care but to also facilitate taking the state-required job search classes that fail to provide child care services to facilitate completion. The members explained that if their clients had continuous child care, the clients could more easily accomplish their goals. Similarly, researchers Austin & McDermott (2003) have demonstrated that access to transitional child care helped previous TANF recipients pursue their higher education goals. Although Texas offers limited transitional child care assistance, the program is not often offered or discussed with clients leaving TANF (Anderson, Halter, & Gryzlak, 2004). A consistent and cohesive child care system would help to insulate these families from further disruption and pitfalls. Statewide access to free or low-cost childcare is necessary to help young families remain employed and progressing towards employment and educational goals. Social workers should advocate for policies like universal child care that would help to support families in poverty.

Five organizational members discussed the lack of emergency funds for clients leaving TANF as a major barrier on the road to self-sufficiency. One organizational member explained that clients’ progress can revert to chaos due to one unplanned event such as a car repair, illness, or an increase in a regular bill. Researchers also support transitional cash assistance to help families transition to a self-sufficient lifestyle (Miller et
Providing continued cash assistance is imperative to help families learn to manage a budget and avoid material hardship.

The organizational members described ‘education’ as providing resources for formal education opportunities and other resources such as GED classes, financial management and English courses to the adult TANF-leaver. The TANF-leaver who wanted ‘education’ in a transitional services program discussed having afterschool programs available for her children. She wanted her children to have access to additional academic support, tutoring, and disability services.

Additionally, organizational members explained that having a strong social support system and a community health worker volunteer model were necessary to create trust and a strong bond with the client (McCormick, 2011). The members revealed that the key to helping clients adopt new behaviors and problem-solving strategies includes having a peer or trusted case manager that the client can relate to or who has had similar experiences. Researchers have produced substantial evidence that supports the community health worker model of a community person impacting significant change among peers (Balcazar et al., 2011; Friedman et al., 2006; Shilling, 2002). One organizational member explained that,

“Some of the things were just related to coping and living in an urban environment without a lot of resources.”

He believed that many of his clients lacked role models and lived in resource-barren areas. According to NASW’s value of the importance and centrality of relationships (Workers, 2008), social workers should strive to build stronger, more positive communities for families leaving TANF services.
Chapter 5
Discussion

Poverty is a leading factor in health, education, mortality, and crime with far-reaching, intergenerational implications for families with children. The TANF policy intended to serve as the safety net for marginalized families living in poverty fails to adequately address the structural barriers that help to perpetuate poverty. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has also asserted that TANF needs to undergo serious reform to provide an effective safety net for families in poverty (Pavetti, 2016). This study uses the Grounded Theory Methods to explore the specific barriers that organizational members and TANF-leavers experience during the transitional period after leaving TANF and provide a framework for a program that could more adequately respond to those needs. Key conclusions include:

1. Transitional medical, childcare, education, and cash support services are necessary to help stabilize TANF-leaver families;
2. Service integration is needed to serve TANF-leaver families;
3. Structural barriers, such as stigma and discrimination, require attention to best serve this population;
4. Mentorship and social support programs are needed to help families achieve self-sufficiency.

As mentioned previously, media portrayals and the politicization of social welfare have contributed to persistent negative stereotypes that impact social welfare usage and adherence (Clawson & Trice, 2000). To combat this, politicians and media outlets must begin to share less biased anecdotes about people living in poverty. More focus should
center on how to help families living in poverty instead of seeking to blame the plight of poverty on a person or circumstance. Irrespective to circumstance, people living in poverty often need help, not judgement. Social workers should help to challenge this perception by advocating for the poor when they are unfairly represented in the media (Clawson & Trice, 2000) and engaging in political processes that will help to create policies that support people living in poverty.

These findings highlight the need to comprehensively address policy solutions to best serve families attempting to gain economic independence. Social workers should advocate for policies such as universal healthcare or Medicaid expansion that would incentivize low-income families preventively caring for their needs, when possible (Garfield, Damicco, Stephens, & Rouhani, 2016). Social workers should also lobby for improved workplace leave policies that may avert some of the need for TANF (Heymann & Earle, 2000). Values included in The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics require that social workers seek to address social problems and pursue justice on behalf of vulnerable and oppressed populations (Workers, 2008). This mandate would require social workers to transcend only providing direct services by also seeking to create programs that transition vulnerable families towards self-sufficiency.

Conclusions

This thesis study illuminated the need for social workers to have a comprehensive policy response to families living in poverty. TANF policy focuses on decreasing the number of people receiving welfare but neglects to include poverty reduction as a mechanism for families to achieve economic independence from welfare. Additionally, TANF policy focuses little on preventive programs and resources such as financial literacy classes, vocational training, or reducing barriers to employment. Once these families stop receiving TANF benefits, there is a strong need for a transitional
services program to help stabilize these families. The researcher plans to expand this study as part of a future dissertation.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. Primarily, low recruitment due to a methodological design issue significantly impacted the study. The methodological design assumed that TANF-leavers would be recruited through the UTA partner agencies. Unfortunately, the agencies were not open to facilitating or allowing recruitment through their agencies. The researcher contacted over 40 agencies: community health clinics, churches, homeless shelters, hospitals, schools of social work, county health departments, WIC offices, non-profit youth programs, private and governmental healthcare organizations, community health workers and other similar individuals and organizations. The researcher received nine affirmative responses to hang flyers and eight members who consented to an interview.

The low response rate from the agencies resulted in low recruitment. Most agencies explained that the time of year coincided with end-of-year deadlines and their busy season. Some agencies explained that in light of funding concerns from anticipated budget cuts, they preferred not to ask their clients to complete additional tasks and potentially inconvenience or disaffect them.

Lack of funding presented a major challenge to this study as well. Without an incentive to participate in this project, the population of TANF-leavers may have not been motivated to engage in data collection activities. However, the important themes illuminated by the study participants illustrate that North Texas individuals require a specialized approach to poverty alleviation programs and resources. Moreover, social work should view the complexities of issues and call for the creation of policies that empower the individual as a whole. More resources should be dedicated to social
workers seeking to address community and administrative practice issues such as the distribution of TANF resources and its correlation to sustainable employment. Future research is needed in this area to investigate the most effective strategies to create a transitional services program for families leaving TANF in Texas.
## Table 1. TANF Leavers Demographic Information

$n = 5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Been Married</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some HS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently employed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a student</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time since TANF benefits ended</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or longer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving low income housing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving food stamps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A - Literature Review: TANF Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Topic:</th>
<th>To identify barriers to achieving self-sufficiency in TANF population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last name First Author (Year)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams (2013)</td>
<td>503 women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson-Butcher (2004)</td>
<td>322 Kentucky TANF-eligible participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin (2003)</td>
<td>14 current and past single mothers college students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell (2005)</td>
<td>17 caseworkers, supervisors, and administrative personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank (2007)</td>
<td>2.2 million low-income single mothers in 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie (2013)</td>
<td>30 African-American and Latina women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (2001)</td>
<td>40 TANF recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler (2008)</td>
<td>28 women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan (2008)</td>
<td>16 rural mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dworsky (2007)</td>
<td>1,075 individuals that applied for TANF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia (2001)</td>
<td>4,014 active TANF cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert (2014)</td>
<td>34,409 WIC program participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutman (2003)</td>
<td>366 CASAWORKS for Families (CWS) recipients to assess barriers and employment barriers for substance abusing women enrolled in CWS (job program) interviews: baseline, 6 months, 12 months interviews severity of substance abuse, barriers to employment population experienced more employment barriers than general welfare comparison group low-income, substance abusing women longitudinal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetling (2005)</td>
<td>1146 single-parent families to examine employment barriers of short-term vs. long-term TANF recipients in large city phone interviews questionnaire, demographic data employment assets, barriers to employment having an ill family member predicted longer use of TANF low-income rigorous design, large sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildebrandt (2016)</td>
<td>22 community-dwelling women in poverty to explore the health and socioeconomic well-being of women in poverty interviews and demographic data interviews barriers to economic independence after TANF participants in poverty experienced multi-factorial barriers to employment low-income women validated tools, rigorous design, small sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildebrandt (2012)</td>
<td>106 women to compare the experiences of female TANF participants at different stages in the welfare system interviews questionnaire, demographic data, scales barriers to employment health, limited education, systematic oppression and policy characteristics led to greater welfare dependence low-income women longitudinal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang (2012)</td>
<td>4,928 single mothers with a child with an educational disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore (2015)</td>
<td>459 previous welfare recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrone (2005)</td>
<td>129 long-term TANF recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meara (2006)</td>
<td>22 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molnar (2001)</td>
<td>1 food bank that serves 6 rural, poor counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montoya (2001)</td>
<td>248 female TANF recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenstern (2006)</td>
<td>collection of studies, policy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisi (2006)</td>
<td>94,465 TANF recipients who were single mothers with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilkinton (2010)</td>
<td>Collection of studies, policy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollack (2002)</td>
<td>Collection of studies, policy review and analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematical data analysis models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell (2010)</td>
<td>26 families who had children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies, interviews, questionnaire, demographic data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoppelrey (2005)</td>
<td>Collection of studies, policy review and analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic literature review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Study Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seccombe (2007)</td>
<td>637 TANF-leavers (quantitative), 90 TANF-leavers (qualitative)</td>
<td>to explore health and health care access among TANF-leavers</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>barriers to economic independence after TANF</td>
<td>low-income, great mixed methods study, rigorous, detailed, large quantitative data analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegel (2007)</td>
<td>114 TANF-leavers, 129 TANF returners</td>
<td>to explore patterns of employment and employment barriers</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>barriers to employment, work patterns, earnings, job education and training, health benefits</td>
<td>low-income, in-depth analyses, rigorous, explored several multivariate analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons (2001)</td>
<td>collection of studies, policy review and analyses</td>
<td>to explore TANF lifetime limits and poverty alleviation</td>
<td>systematic literature review</td>
<td>barriers to economic independence after TANF</td>
<td>low-income, state-level review for Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speiglman (2011)</td>
<td>143 parents associated with child-only CalWORKS cases</td>
<td>to explore TANF needs in child only California</td>
<td>case studies, interviews</td>
<td>barriers to employment for families</td>
<td>low-income children, state-level review for California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Target Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromwall (2001)</td>
<td>489 female behavioral health program services recipients</td>
<td>to identify prevalence of mental/behavioral health issues co-occurring in the TANF population</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>structural barriers to employment for women with mental health issues</td>
<td>low-income women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromwall (2002)</td>
<td>487 female recipients of public mental health services</td>
<td>to identify barrier to employment</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>structural barriers to employment for women with mental health issues and related quality of life concerns</td>
<td>identified structural barriers to economic independence for women with behavioral health issues, policy recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan (2001)</td>
<td>201 TANF recipients</td>
<td>to analyze the relationship between TANF status and psychological well-being</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>perceived well-being, self-efficacy, perceived control</td>
<td>identified that TANF-leavers were happier regardless of income, suggests that program may negatively influence happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size and Characteristics</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor (2004)</td>
<td>284 long-term welfare recipients</td>
<td>to discuss personal barriers to self-sufficiency</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>questionnaire, demographic data</td>
<td>personal and structural barriers to employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherill (2015)</td>
<td>64 families who receive SNAP and TANF benefits</td>
<td>to examine barriers to farmers’ market usage by SNAP and TANF recipients</td>
<td>mixed-methods, survey and interviews</td>
<td>focus groups, questionnaire, demographic data</td>
<td>perceptions about farmers’ markets and health foods, barriers to food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B - Literature Review: Transitional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Topic:</th>
<th>To identify transitional services and programs that were available to families that left TANF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last name First Author (Year)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronstein (2009)</td>
<td>20 African-American females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukefeld (2012)</td>
<td>322 Kentucky TANF-eligible participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Information

1. **Gender**  
   1 – Male; 2 – Female; 9 – Unknown

2. **Date of Birth**  
   Enter 09/09/9999 if unknown

3. **Race**  
   1 – American Indian/Alaskan Native; 2 – Asian; 3 – Black or African American; 4 – Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; 5 – White or Caucasian; 6 – Other/More than one race; 9 – Unknown/Missing

4. **Ethnicity**  
   1 – Non-Hispanic; 2 – Hispanic; 9 – Unknown

5. **What is your current marital status?**  
   1 – Married; 2 – Widowed; 3 – Separated; 4 – Divorced; 5 – Never Been Married; 6 – Other

6. **What is the highest level of education you completed?**  
   1 - Grade School; 2 – Some High School; 3 – High School Graduate; 4 – Some College; 5 – Associate’s Degree; 6 – Bachelor’s Degree; 7 – Some Graduate School; 8 – Master’s Degree; 9 – Completed Other Graduate Degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., D.O., etc.); 10 – Technical School (e.g. cosmetology, legal assistant); 11 – Other

7. **What is your current employment status?**  
   1 - Not currently employed; 2 – Employed part-time; 3 – Employed full-time; 4 – Retired;

8. **Are you a current student?**  
   1 – Yes, a full-time student; 2 – Yes, a part-time student; 3 - No

9. **What is your estimated annual household income?**  
   1 - $0 - $9,999; 2 – $10,000 - $14,999; 3 - $15,000 - $19,999; 4 - $20,000 - $24,999; 5 - $25,000 - $29,999; 6 - $30,000 - $39,999; 7 - $40,000 - $49,999; 8 - $50,000 - $59,999; 9 - $60,000 - $69,999; 10 - $70,000+

10. **How long has it been since you last received TANF benefits?**  
    1 – 0 to 2 months; 2 – 3 to 6 months; 7 months to 1 year; 3 – 1 year to 2 years; 4 – 2 years or longer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Are you currently receiving low-income housing benefits (section 8)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is your household currently receiving food stamp benefits (SNAP)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PEBS Survey Instrument

After reading some statements about employment, please rank the following by circling a number on a scale of 1 to 5 according to how each item affects your securing a job. 1 = Not a barrier and 5 = Strong barrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not a barrier</th>
<th>Strong barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Having less than high school education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Work limiting health conditions (illness / injury)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lack of adequate job skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lack of job experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Racial discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lack of information about jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Lack of stable housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Drug / alcohol addiction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Physical disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Fear of rejection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lack of work clothing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>No jobs in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>No jobs that match my skills / training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Being a single parent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Need to take care of young children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Cannot speak English very well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Cannot read or write very well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Problems with getting to job on time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Lack of support system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Lack of coping skills for daily struggles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Anger management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Past criminal record</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E - Focus Group Questions

Thank you for being willing to participate in the ICALS focus group. I am conducting this focus group to find out which experiences were the most difficult to overcome after you stopped receiving TANF benefits. I hope that this information will help Dallas and maybe the state of Texas to create a transitional services program that will make it easier for families in the future to transition off of services. I want to ask about 6 common areas that other research studies have presented in similar conversations with families across the US. Lastly, I will ask you if there are any other circumstances that were not mentioned that caused you a significant amount of trouble.

Child care

1. In the past 12 months, was child care or lack of child care ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?
2. What types of child care services were helpful or would have been helpful in a transitional services program?

Mental Health

3. In the past 12 months, was your or a family member’s mental health ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?
4. What types of family member’s mental health services were helpful or would have been helpful in a transitional services program?

Housing

5. During the past 12 months, was your housing situation ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?
6. What types of housing services were helpful or would have been helpful in a transitional services program?

Child’s/Other Family Member’s Health

7. Does your child have a health, behavioral or other special need? Do have an elderly, disabled, or sick family member or friend you are caring for? During the past 12 months, was this ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?
8. What types of healthcare services were helpful or would have been helpful in a transitional services program?

Domestic Violence

9. During the past 12 months, was your relationship with a current or past partner ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?
10. What types of services were helpful or would have been helpful in a transitional services program?

**Alcohol/Drug Dependence**

11. During the past 12 months, was your use of alcohol/drugs ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to start working, or could not attend education or training activities? Have you been diagnosed as having a drug or alcohol use problem in the past year?

12. What types of services were helpful or would have been helpful in a transitional services program?

**Other Concerns**

13. Are there any other issues that were not discussed today that presented significant challenges for you once you stopped receiving TANF benefits? What services were helpful or would have been helpful to resolve those concerns?
iCALS Focus Group | AGENDA

Meeting date | time 8/7/2017 12:00 AM | Meeting location [Location]

Agenda topics

Time allotted | 1.5 hours | Facilitator Maria Cole, MPH

I. Welcome (5 mins)
   a. Mention restroom and snacks
   b. Remind that we will record

II. Attendance & Orientation (20 mins)
   a. Guidelines
   b. Surveys

III. Questions & Discussion (45 mins)

IV. Gift Card Distribution (15 mins)

V. Closing (5 mins)
   a. Thank you!
iCALS Individual Interview | AGENDA

Meeting date | time 8/7/2017 12:00 AM | Meeting location [Location]

Agenda topics

Time allotted | 1 hour | Facilitator Maria Cole, MPH

I. Welcome (5 mins)
   a. Remind that we will record

II. Attendance & Orientation (10 mins)
   a. Guidelines
   b. Surveys

III. Questions & Discussion (30 mins)

IV. Gift Card Distribution or Donation to the Organization (10 mins)

V. Closing (5 mins)
   a. Thank you!
Appendix H - Demographic Questions (Organizational Members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I - Interview Questions (Organizational Members)

1. Do you work specifically with families leaving TANF?
2. What does your typical client/population served look like (e.g. race, sex, age, condition)?
3. What services do you typically provide?
4. What barriers do you typically encounter in providing services to this population?
5. Are there any local community resources that you typically refer families to who may not be able to get all of your needs met through your organization?
6. If there were no financial restraints, what would you include in a transitional services program for families leaving TANF?
Appendix J - Informed Consent Form

UT Arlington
Informed Consent Document – Written Version

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
Maria Cole, MPH
University of Texas at Arlington
School of Social Work
Maria.Cole@mavs.uta.edu

FACULTY ADVISOR
Rebecca Hegar, Ph.D., Professor
University of Texas at Arlington
School of Social Work
rhegar@uta.edu

TITLE OF PROJECT
Project Interview and Conversations about Leaving Services (ICALS), Formative Evaluation with Focus Groups

INTRODUCTION
You are being asked to participate in a research study about leaving the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) services. Your participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate or discontinuing your participation at any time will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand. You are invited to participate in this research because you met the following criteria:

- are between the ages of 18-65 years old;
- have discontinued TANF services within the last 3 years or provide services to the TANF-eligible population; and
- speak English.

Organizational members must meet the following criteria:

- Have provided or overseen the distribution of services for individuals who recently stopped receiving TANF benefit; and
- Been engaged in role for at least 6 months.
PURPOSE

This study is being conducted to find out about the experiences that make it challenging for families once they stop receiving TANF services. The purpose of this study is to collect information about the specific challenges that families face so investigators can build a framework for a transitional services program.

DURATION

You will be asked to participate in 1 study visit, which will last approximately 60 to 90 minutes.

NUMBER OF SUBJECTS

The number of anticipated subjects in this research study is 30. Twenty participants will be from families who no longer receive TANF benefits. Ten participants will be from organizations that provide services to families who no longer receive TANF benefits.

PROCEDURES

The procedures which will involve you as a research subject completing surveys and answering interview questions. Focus group participants will attend a face-to-face meeting with 5 – 9 other people also involved in the study. The meeting will be led by the investigator and cover topics about the transition from TANF benefits. Interviewees will attend a face-to-face meeting and answer questions about the services they provide and any challenges that they face.

The meetings will be audio recorded. After the meeting, the tape will be transcribed, which means they will be typed exactly as they were recorded, word-for-word, by the researcher. The tape will be destroyed after transcription.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS

If you agree to take part in this study, there may be direct benefits to you. The researchers cannot guarantee that you will benefit from taking part in this research. However, possible benefits of taking part in this study may include learning about local community resources.

We hope the information learned from this study will benefit other families leaving TANF services in the future. Information gained from this research could lead to better programs for families transitioning off of TANF services.

POSSIBLE RISKS/DISCOMFORTS

There is minimal risk for you in this study. One possible risk is that you may feel nervous or embarrassed to share your opinion in the group setting. If this is a concern for you, you have the option to discontinue at any time or choose not to be a part of the study.
COMPENSATION

There is no compensation available for this project.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES

There are no alternative procedures offered for this study. However, you can elect not to participate in the study or quit at any time at no consequence.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to decline participation in any or all study procedures or quit at any time. Should you choose not to complete all study procedures, you will be unable to receive compensation.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every attempt will be made to see that your study results are kept confidential. A copy of this signed consent form and all data collected from this study will be stored in the School of Social Work for at least three (3) years after the end of this research. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at meetings without naming you as a subject. Additional research studies could evolve from the information you have provided, but your information will not be linked to you in anyway; it will be anonymous. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, the UTA Institutional Review Board (IRB), and personnel particular to this research have access to the study records. Your records will be kept completely confidential according to current legal requirements. They will not be revealed unless required by law, or as noted above. The IRB at UTA has reviewed and approved this study and the information within this consent form. If in the unlikely event it becomes necessary for the Institutional Review Board to review your research records, the University of Texas at Arlington will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by law.

CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS

Questions about this research study may be directed to Maria Cole, MPH at Maria.Cole@mavs.uta.edu or Rebecca Hegar, Ph.D. rhegar@uta.edu. Any questions you may have about your rights as a research subject or a research-related injury may be directed to the Office of Research Administration; Regulatory Services at 817-272-2105 or regulatoryservices@uta.edu.
As a representative of this study, I have explained the purpose, the procedures, the benefits, and the risks that are involved in this research study:

Signature and printed name of principal investigator or person obtaining consent  Date

CONSENT

By signing below, you confirm that you are 18 years of age or older and have read or had this document read to you. You have been informed about this study’s purpose, procedures, possible benefits and risks, and you have received a copy of this form. You have been given the opportunity to ask questions before you sign, and you have been told that you can ask other questions at any time.

You voluntarily agree to participate in this study. By signing this form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits, to which you are otherwise entitled.

SIGNATURE OF VOLUNTEER  DATE
WE NEED YOUR INPUT!
Tell us about your experience leaving TANF!

Researchers are looking for 20 people to take part in a 90-minute focus group. Participants will be asked to describe their experiences after leaving the TANF program.

For details, email Maria.Cole@mavs.uta.edu or call 469-844-0450

Participants must:
- Be between 18 and 65 years old
- Have not received TANF within the last 3 years
- Speak English
Dear

As a graduate student researcher at the University of Texas at Arlington, I am conducting a research study to find out more about the experiences of families who leave the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) services. As you are likely aware, families leaving this program experience increased risk for unemployment, homelessness, and domestic violence concerns. Some programs exist to help these families, but few programs can comprehensively address the needs of every family. The purpose of this study is to collect information that could help to build or enhance a transitional services program for these families. I am soliciting two groups for this study. The first group of participants will consist of individuals who have exited TANF within the last 3 years and speak English. This group will be asked to participate in a 90-minute focus group to discuss their experiences after leaving TANF. A second group of participants will be asked to participate in an interview to describe any challenges that they’ve experienced in providing services to this population. These individuals may be caseworkers, administrators, intake personnel or other members of an organization that serve this population.

Thank you for considering participating in this study and helping others to find out more about the study. A recruitment flyer for the family members is included. All research participants will receive a $25 gift card for their participation. Please feel free to contact the study investigator, Maria Cole, MPH at Maria.Cole@mavs.uta.edu or 469-844-0450 with any questions.

Regards,

Maria Cole, MPH
University of Texas at Arlington
School of Social Work
University of Texas at Arlington, MSW, ‘17
Maria.Cole@mavs.uta.edu
Mobile 469-844-0450
Research Sponsored By:
UT Arlington School of Social Work
Charles Koch Foundation

**General Proposal**
The Charles Koch Foundation supports research that spurs social progress, well-being, and long-term prosperity. Although we invite proposals for a select number of issues, we encourage proposals for any research that shares the goals and vision of the Charles Koch Foundation.
The Foundation primarily supports research and educational programs that analyze the impact of free societies, particularly how they advance societal well-being. The best way to find out if your project request is a good match with the goals and vision of the Charles Koch Foundation is to submit an online grant proposal.
https://www.charleskochfoundation.org/apply-for-grants/general-proposal/

**Foundations of Well-Being**
Well-being is a critical topic with broad implications for how individuals and societies organize to maximize human fulfillment and welfare.
https://www.charleskochfoundation.org/apply-for-grants/requests-proposals/foundations-well-being/

Grant Description
The Charles Koch Foundation is interested in supporting research that furthers an understanding of the origins and drivers of individual and societal well-being. We are especially interested in research that:

- Enhances an understanding of well-being’s historical and philosophical foundations.
- Identifies and explores key drivers of individual and societal well-being.
- Measures well-being using scientific methods.

Grant Criteria
- A one-to-two-page abstract of the project on behalf of your university, college, think tank, or other 501(c)(3) organization. The abstract should provide sufficient detail for reviewers to assess the nature and feasibility of the idea.
- A CV or résumé.
- A brief, itemized budget.
- Final projects should be original, of academic journal quality, and must not have been previously published.

Funding
Funding levels are commensurate with the requirements of the research and the potential for the research to advance an understanding of critical issues. Accepted proposals may also receive support to disseminate the research findings.
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October 27, 2017

Maria Cole
Dr. Rebecca Hegar
School of Social Work
The University of Texas at Arlington
Box 19129

IRB No.: 2017-0776
Title: Interviews and Conversations about Leasing Services (iCALS): Formative Evaluation with Focus Groups

Original Approval Date: September 22, 2017
Modification Approval Date: October 25, 2017
Expiration Date: September 22, 2018

EXPEDITED MODIFICATION APPROVAL

The UT Arlington Institutional Review Board (UTA IRB) Chair (or designee) reviewed and approved the modification(s) to this protocol on October 25, 2017 in accordance with Title 45 CFR 46.110(b)(2). Therefore, you are authorized to conduct your research. The modification(s), indicated below, was/were deemed minor and appropriate for expedited review:

- Removed compensation from the study, as there is currently no source of compensation available
- Revised the Informed Consent to reflect the removal of compensation
- Added two sources where flyers will be posted for subject recruitment: the UTA campus and Arlington Life Shelter
- Added a flyer for study recruitment to the protocol materials

MODIFICATION TO AN APPROVED PROTOCOL:

Pursuant to Title 45 CFR 46.103(b)(4)(iii), investigators are required to, “promptly report to the IRB any proposed changes in the research activity, and to ensure that such changes in approved research, during the period for which IRB approval has already been given, are not initiated without prior IRB review and approval except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject.” Modifications include but are not limited to: Changes in protocol personnel, number of approved participants, and/or updates to the protocol procedures or instruments. All proposed changes must be submitted via the electronic submission system prior to implementation. Failure to obtain prior approval for modifications is considered an issue of non-compliance and will be subject to review and deliberation by the IRB which could result in the suspension/termination of the protocol.
INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT:
The IRB approved version of the informed consent document (ICD) must be used when
prospectively enrolling volunteer participants into the study. All signed consent forms must be
securely maintained on the UT Arlington campus for the duration of the study plus a minimum
of three years after the completion of all study procedures (including data analysis). The
complete study record is subject to inspection and/or audit during this time period by entities
including but not limited to the UT Arlington IRB, Regulatory Services staff, OHRP, FDA, and
by study sponsors (if the study is funded).

ADVERSE EVENTS:
Please be advised that as the principal investigator, you are required to report local adverse
(unanticipated) events to The UT Arlington Office of Research Administration: Regulatory
Services within 24 hours of the occurrence or upon acknowledgment of the occurrence.

TRAINING AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES:
All investigators and key personnel identified in the protocol must have documented Human
Subjects Protection (HSP) training on file AND must have filed a current Conflict of Interest
Disclosure (COI) with The UT Arlington Office of Research Administration: Regulatory
Services. HSP completion certificates are valid for 3 years from the completion date.

COLLABORATION:
If applicable, approval by the appropriate authority at a collaborating facility is required prior to
subject enrollment. If the collaborating facility is engaged in the research, an OHRP approved
Federalwide Assurance (FWA) may be required for the facility (prior to their participation in
research-related activities). To determine whether the collaborating facility is engaged in
research, go to: http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/assurance-engage.htm

CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS:
The UT Arlington Office of Research Administration: Regulatory Services appreciates your
continuing commitment to the protection of human research subjects. Should you have questions
or require further assistance, please contact Regulatory Services at regulatoryservices@uta.edu
or 817-272-3723.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Deborah Behan, PhD, RN-BC
Associate Clinical Professor, Nursing
UT Arlington IRB Chair

REGULATORY SERVICES SERVICES
The University of Texas at Arlington, Center for Innovation
202 E. Border Street, Ste. 201, Arlington, Texas 76019, Box 19188
(1) 817-272-3723 (F) 817-272-3528 (E) regulatoryservices@uta.edu (W) uta.edu
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