

**FOR THE COMMON GOOD
STATUS OF LOCAL TEAM COLLABORATION IN 2001**

**Report prepared by
Susan Imel
Darcie Slanker
Dae Yeon Cho**

**Center on Education and Training for Employment
College of Education
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090**

October 2001

Funding Information

Project Title:	For the Common Good
Source of Contract:	Ohio Department of Education Career-Technical and Adult Education Adult Basic and Literacy Education Columbus, OH 43085
Contractor:	Center on Education and Training for Employment The Ohio State University Columbus, OH 43210-1090
Interim Executive Director:	W. Michael Sherman
Disclaimer:	Funds for producing this publication were provided by the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Career-Technical, and Adult Education, Section 2 & 3 of Title II, Adult Education and Family Literacy, of the Workforce Investment Act. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the Ohio Department of Education nor the U. S. Department of Education and no endorsement should be interred.
Discrimination Prohibited:	It is the policy of the Ohio Department of Education that educational activities, employment practice, programs, and services are offered without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, religion, handicap, or age.

Contents

Foreword	v
Background	1
Results	2
Mail Survey	2
Telephone Interviews	4
Conclusions	7
Reference	9
Appendix A: Mail Survey Results	10
Appendix B: Telephone Survey Results	18

Foreword

For the Common Good is a state-wide project with the goal of facilitating the development of local interagency linkage teams throughout Ohio. The local teams focus on improving services to at-risk youth and adults through the development of collaborative interagency linkages. Between 1990 and 1997, a total of 47 local linkage teams were formed under the project's auspices. Information about the activities of these teams has been collected through three follow-up surveys conducted in 1992, 1994, and 1997 and through a case study of five teams conducted in 1999.

The information collected in 1999 and through other sources indicate that many of the Common Good Local Linkage Teams (LLTs) are involved in local One-stops and other activities related to the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). The current study was conducted to more fully understand what has happened to the Common Good LLTs as a result of the implementation of the WIA. The project staff and the For the Common Good State Team members express their appreciation to those individuals throughout the state who participated in the study by responding to a survey and or telephone interview.

Prior to its publication, the report was reviewed by Jeffrey Gove, Educational Consultant, Adult Basic and Literacy Education, Ohio Department of Education and For the Common Good State Team facilitator. Common Good State Team members also reviewed the survey data during a monthly meeting.

Susan Imel, Common Good project director, coordinated the study with the assistance of Darcie Slanker, program associate, and Dae Yeon Cho, graduate research associate.

W. Michael Sherman
Interim Executive Director
Center on Education and Training for

Employment

College of Education
The Ohio State University

For the Common Good Status of Local Team Collaboration in 2001

“For the Common Good,” a statewide project with the goal of facilitating the formation of local interagency linkage teams throughout Ohio, was initiated in April 1990. Between 1990 and 1997, 46 local linkage teams were formed under the project’s auspices. A case study of five teams conducted in 1999 as well as other information indicate that many of the Common Good Local Linkage Teams (LLTs) are involved in local One-stops and other activities related to the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Some LLTs have retained their identities as Common Good teams, but several have merged with other collaborative efforts. During the spring and summer of 2001, a study was conducted to determine what has happened to Common Good LLTs as a result of implementation of the WIA. Questions that were explored included the following: Did the collaboration formed through the LLTs provide a foundation for the collaboration under the WIA? What role did members of the LLTs play in forming current interagency collaboration activities? What type of support is needed for the current efforts? Information for the study was collected through a combination of survey questionnaire and telephone interviews.

Background

Between 1996 and 2001-- the period leading up to and following the implementation of the WIA-- the context surrounding local interagency collaboration was changing from what it had been between 1990 and 1995 when most of the LLTs were formed. In the early years of the Common Good project, interagency collaboration was voluntary, although highly desired by funding agencies. With the passage of the WIA, interagency collaboration became a mandate. In 1999, the five LLTs studied (Imel and Zengler 1999) expressed varying relationships to the One-stop center in their areas. The most successful teams perceived their mission as transcending the One-stop system, that is, they were broad based both in terms of their membership and their actions. Others were struggling to develop a niche for Common

Good in light of One-stop implementation. Information collected anecdotally by State Team members revealed that members of some LLTs reported feeling excluded from the collaboration activity that was developing as a result of WIA requirements.

In the fall of 2000, as a part of the project's annual information update on local teams, team coordinators were asked to indicate if their LLT was either **active**, **merged with One-stop**, **inactive**, or **defunct**. Ten of the responding coordinators responded **active**; two said **active** but also indicated the team had merged with the One-stop. Responses related to **inactive** and **defunct** reflected changes in the system at the local level. One person responded, for example, that "the organizations that are collaborating with the One-stop are no longer the same organizations the formed our original Common Good Team."

Information from a variety of sources indicating that the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act was having an impact on the LLTs provided a backdrop for the current study. To determine more about the impact as well as the relationship between LLTs and current collaboration activities, data were collected through a mail survey and telephone interviews. A one-page questionnaire was developed and sent to all individuals on the current Common Good project mailing list. See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire as well as other details about the survey. Sixteen One-stops that overlap with current and previous Common Good LLTs were identified; individuals at eight of these One-stops participated in telephone interviews. Appendix B contains a list of the 16 One-stops and questions that were used to guide the telephone interviews.

Results

Although the mail survey and the telephone interviews contained similar questions and covered the same areas, the telephone interview contained additional questions about current collaboration efforts. Information collected through the two phases of the study are presented separately, therefore.

Mail Survey

A total of 584 surveys was mailed and 204 or 35% were returned and used in the analysis. Nearly 75% of those responding had been a member of a Common Good Local Linkage Team (LLT) at some time; 50% of the respondents indicated that the LLT in which they participate is still active.

Those respondents who are members of active LLTs were asked to describe the relationship of the LLT to the interagency collaboration efforts that are part of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Most—64%—indicated that the LLT retains a separate identity with individual members participating actively in WIA collaboration efforts; another 26% indicated that the LLT retains a separate identity but participates in these collaborative efforts as a subgroup. The balance of the respondents who are members of active LLTs—12%—provided other statements describing the relationship of the LLT to current collaboration efforts. Many of these responses indicated the existence of a relationship between the LLT and current efforts (e.g., *The Common Good members are members of the One-stop and WIA and Formed into One-stop local committee with WIA collaborative*) but a few indicated they either had no collaboration or no knowledge of current efforts related to the WIA.

Those respondents who indicated that their LLT was no longer active were asked to describe what had happened to the team by selecting one of five choices. Most, 57%, said that the LLT had merged with the One-stop. In addition, 12% indicated that their team had dissolved because the original members were no longer involved, and 10% said it disbanded because of lack of interest. Over 30 percent of the respondents to this item selected **other** and wrote in descriptions of what had happened to their LLTs. Most of these reasons related to either merging with the One-stop or lack of interest on the part of those involved in the team (e.g., *Stopped receiving mailings. No agenda, no reason to go.*).

Respondents were asked to describe current interagency collaboration efforts related to WIA in their communities. Nearly 30% responded **excellent** with another 26% marking **they got off to a slow start but they are improving**. Over 17% responded that they are **struggling** with nearly 8% saying they are **nonexistent**. Nearly 20% of those responding to this item

wrote in other descriptions that varied widely, from statements indicating that interagency collaboration was healthy to some suggesting it varied according to the particular area covered by the One-stop.

When asked if the collaboration developed through the LLT had contributed to any of the current interagency collaboration related to WIA in the community, nearly 50% of the respondents said that it had. Another 11% said no and 33% said they did not know if it had. Those who indicated that the LLT had contributed to current interagency efforts related to WIA were asked to select a statement that **best** described the impact of the LLT on current collaboration. Nearly 60% of those responding to this item marked **it laid the foundation for current efforts**. The items, **it had minimal impact**, and, **it formed the core of current efforts**, were each selected by nearly 17% of those responding. Approximately 15% of the respondents selected **other** and wrote in different descriptions. Many of these statements indicated the existence of a positive relationship between the LLT and the current efforts under WIA.

Telephone Interviews

Sixteen One-stops were identified with current or previous overlap with Common Good LLTs. An individual at all 16 of these sites was identified and contacted by telephone for the purpose of discussing linkages between the Common Good and current collaboration efforts as well as interagency collaboration in general. Telephone interviews were conducted with representatives at eight of the sixteen sites; a total of nine interviews were conducted because at one site two individuals were interviewed separately. At least four attempts were made to reach each of the other eight sites, but calls and messages were not returned. Based on the information acquired from the first eight sites and from the mail survey, it was felt that additional interviews would not uncover any new or different information so the telephone interview phase was concluded.

Respondents at all but one of the sites contacted had some knowledge of the Common Good. Five of the sites indicated that the LLT was still active in some form with activities ranging from monthly information sharing meetings to active participation in local interagency collaboration, including serving as committees of the One-stop. One site reported that the LLT has floundered since the implementation of the One-stop, and the last meeting had been some months earlier. Another site reported that although the original LLT members still met

informally, they no longer function as an LLT. The LLT had set as its goal implementing the One-stop and once it was up and running functionally, the LLT was dissolved.

Individuals at five of the eight sites indicated that the collaboration developed through the Common Good LLT contributed to the current interagency collaboration related to WIA in the community. Most of the responses indicated that the LLT provided the opportunity for individuals and agencies to get to know one another and thus established a basis for current efforts. In two of the sites where the LLT was not perceived as contributing to current efforts, respondents indicated that other leadership had emerged. In the last site, the respondent had no knowledge of the LLT.

Respondents identified a number of key elements of successful collaboration in the new WIA environment including–

- memoranda of understanding
- communication, including regular meetings, electronic linkages, and printed materials
- presence of a common vision and action plan
- co-location of agencies
- willingness to do what is necessary to achieve goals and objectives
- involvement and support of county commissioners and local government
- clarification of duties
- requirements/expectations of funders that interagency collaboration will exist
- common understanding of needs of community
- shared staffing arrangements

One respondent shared that all agencies wishing to be part of the Common Good LLT collaborative efforts must agree to the principles of inclusivity, mutuality, and well being. Although every member agency is allowed and encouraged to pursue discreet activities, each member is required to keep all agencies informed of their actions. This inclusivity principle helps avoid turf issues. To the extent possible, member agencies try to find ways to collaborate on efforts. The principle of mutuality means that all member agencies may participate in an endeavor or only a few. Finally, each agency is asked to operate in a spirit of well being for all involved. The principle of well being ensures that agencies are looking out for each other and keeping each other informed of changes in the community, which is especially helpful in the new WIA environment.

Respondents named a number of challenges to current interagency collaboration efforts under WIA. Change was a theme running through the challenges offered, particularly the changes resulting from the implementation of the WIA and the creation of ODJFS. In addition, several respondents mentioned insufficient resources and some talked about turf issues. Specific challenges mentioned included–

- interpreting policy
- meeting DOL regulations
- low financial return on investment of time
- eligibility requirements
- lack of resources
- turf issues
- lack of certainty about future due to state and local changes in WIA, JTPA, and ODJFS
- poor communication
- limitations due to organizational infrastructure/requirements
- job instability

A number of strategies are employed to overcome the challenges to interagency collaboration including–

- consolidation of WIA money with PRC money and other sources of funding
- co-location of agencies
- clarification of individual duties and agency responsibilities to help eliminate turfism
- establishment of outcome measures
- communication

When asked what type of support or activity is needed to facilitate interagency collaborative efforts in their communities, respondents had varying suggestions. Continuation of state involvement was important to one respondent who said that locals tend to get bogged down in daily operations and need state staff to communicate a common vision. Another suggested involving community action programs. More funding was also mentioned as was the development of a electronic communication system. One site has chosen to work with the private sector at every opportunity as a way of demonstrating the value of the services to new sources of funding. Three respondents had no suggestions about this area.

Conclusions

The results of the mail survey and telephone interviews provide answers to the following questions regarding what has happened to Common Good Local Linkage Teams as a result of the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA):

- **Following the implementation of the WIA, are Common Good LLTs still active?**

Based on the results of the survey, a number of Common Good LLTs are still active.

It is clear, however, that the implementation of the WIA has affected many LLTs.

Some LLTs participate as subgroups in interagency collaborative groups that are part

of the WIA and many members of LLTs responding to the survey are active in WIA

collaboration efforts, apart from their role as a LLT member. Some respondents

expressed the sentiment that, with the implementation of the WIA, the need for the

Common Good LLT decreased because of other interagency collaboration efforts.

This feeling was not universal, however, as in some communities represented in the

survey, the Common Good LLT is still a leader in interagency collaboration efforts.

- **Did the collaboration formed through the LLTs provide a foundation for the**

collaboration under the WIA? Quite clearly, the LLTs have had a positive influence

on the interagency collaboration that is taking place as a part of WIA. Most of the

respondents to both the mail survey and the telephone interviews said that the

collaboration developed through the LLTs contributed to the current interagency

collaboration efforts in their communities. One telephone survey respondent said

that the Common Good laid the groundwork for collaboration by helping set up

collaboration efforts, identifying key stakeholder groups, and building rapport among

agencies. This sentiment was echoed by others who said that the LLTs provided a

means for individuals and agencies to become familiar with each other and provided a

basis for current activities.

- **What role did members of LLTs play in forming current collaboration activities?**

Members of LLTs played a variety of roles in forming current collaboration activities.

In some communities, the LLT members formed the basis for the development of the

One-stop. In one county, for example, members of the LLT set as a goal the implementation of the One-stop; once it was functioning, the LLT dissolved. In other communities, however, the LLT continues to play a role in the One-stop while maintaining a separate identity. Based on the results of the mail survey and telephone interviews, it seems clear that many LLT members have been active in current collaboration activities taking place as a part of the WIA.

- **What type of support is needed for current activities?** Information collected in the telephone interviews indicated that local communities face a number of challenges related to current interagency collaboration, many of which have to do with changes in federal and state policies. Dealing with the many changes at the local and state level that resulted from the merger of the Ohio Department of Human Services and the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services has created a great deal of confusion and uncertainty. Although several of the individuals interviewed indicated they have instituted measures to overcome some of these challenges, it seems that state leadership could provide assistance with interpreting new policies and directions.

The Local Linkage Teams that were initiated and supported by the Common Good project have been instrumental in the success of current interagency collaboration efforts in a number of communities across Ohio. Several LLTs continue to exist separate from the One-stop in their local area but others have merged with it. In some areas, those individuals who were active in the LLT are no longer involved in current interagency collaboration activities. In at least some communities, the LLT provided an important foundation for the current activities. Given this legacy, the following steps are recommended for future activity:

- **The Common Good State Team should continue to play a leadership role in fostering interagency collaboration at the local and state level.** The need still exists to help communities develop effective interagency collaboration. LLTs formed through the Common Good project could assist the State Team in continuing to foster interagency collaboration at the local level. Members of the State Team should continue to facilitate communication related to the inter- and intra state-agency

collaboration. They should also help state staff understand the need for providing assistance with collaboration at the local level.

- **The Common Good State Team should continue to support the study of local interagency collaboration in Ohio.** The current study examined the status of collaboration in communities with a history of Common Good LLTs. Findings revealed that many of the LLTs formed through the Common Good had been instrumental in the interagency collaboration activities being implemented under the Workforce Investment Act. What about communities that did not have Common Good LLTs? What are they experiencing in terms of their interagency collaboration efforts under the WIA? Have they been able to form effective interagency collaborative groups through the One-stop or other entities?

Reference

Imel, Susan, and Zengler, Cynthia J. *For the Common Good: Local Linkage Teams Case Study*. Columbus: Center on Education and Training for Employment, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1999.
http://literacy.kent.edu/CommonGood/case_studies.pdf

**Appendix A:
Mail Survey Results**

Common Good: Impact on Collaboration

The Common Good State Team wants to determine the impact of Common Good Local Linkage Teams (LLTs) on current interagency collaboration at the local level. You can assist by responding to the questions below and returning the form in the enclosed, stamped envelope **by June 15, 2001**.

1. Have you ever been a member of a Common Good Local Linkage Team (LLT)?
 a. Yes b. No (if **no**, skip to question 3)

2. Is the LLT in which you participated still active?
 a. Yes (go to 2a) b. No (go to 2b)
2a. If **yes**, which of the following statements **best** describes the relationship of the LLT to interagency collaboration efforts that are part of WIA.
 a. It retains a separate identity but participates in these collaborative efforts as a subgroup (e.g., committee).
 b. The LLT retains a separate identity but individual members are active in WIA collaboration efforts (e.g., one-stop)
 c. Other (please describe) _____

2b. If **no**, which of the following statements **best** describes what happened to the team.
 a. It has merged with the One-Stop.
 b. It disbanded because of lack of interest.
 c. It dissolved because original members were no longer involved.
 d. It broke up because of turf issues.
 e. Other (please describe) _____

3. Which of the following statements **best** describes the current interagency collaboration efforts related to WIA in your community?
 a. They are excellent. b. They got off to a slow start but are improving.
 c. They are struggling. d. They are nonexistent.
 e. Other (please describe) _____

4. To your knowledge, did the collaboration developed through the Common Good Local Linkage Team (LLT) contribute to any of the current interagency collaboration related to WIA in your community?
 a. Yes (go to 4a) b. No
 c. Don't know d. No LLT ever existed in this community
4a. If **yes**, which of the following statements **best** describes the impact of the LLT on current collaboration?
 a. It laid the foundation for current efforts. b. It had minimal impact.
 c. It formed the core of current efforts. d. Other (please describe) _____

If you would be willing to discuss the relationship between the Common Good LLT and current collaboration efforts, please list your name, telephone number and e-mail address.

Name _____

Telephone(_____)_____

E-Mail _____

Please return form in enclosed envelope or fax to Darcie Slanker of OSU/CETE at (614) 292-1260.

Common Good: Impact on Collaboration

204 Returned / 584 Sent

Response rate: 35%

1. Have you ever been a member of a Common Good Local Linkage Team (LLT)?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	148	72.5	74.0
No	52	25.5	26.0
Total	200	98.0	100.0
N/A(missing)	4	2.0	
Total	204	100.0	

2. Is the LLT in which you participated still active?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	103	50.5	71.0
No	42	20.6	29.0
Total	145	71.1	100.0
N/A(missing)	59	28.9	
Total	204	100.0	

2a. If yes, which of the following statements best describes the relationship of the LLT to interagency collaboration efforts that are part of WIA?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
a. It retains a separate identity but participates in these collaborative efforts as a subgroup	27	13.2	26.2
b. The LLT retains a separate identity but individual members are active in WIA collaboration efforts	66	32.4	64.1
c. other	12	5.9	11.7
Total	103	50.5	
Missing	101	49.5	
Total	204		

* Some respondents marked more than one item.

Comments of respondents who checked other:

008. With no collaboration
011. WIA collaboration takes place of former A.C.T. comm. Most members are same people/agencies.
015. Now One-stop.
030. No one in Portsmouth knows anything about WIA except the "all powerful" CAO.
032. The Common Good members are members of the One-stop and WIA.
037. Merged with other interagency groups-now some of its members are a part of Tri County Employer Business Connection.
038. LLT is the interagency collaboration group.
046. The LLT is composed of One-stop partners and are involved in the transition to One-stop center.

055. Formed into One-stop local committee with WIA collaborative.
058. Part of
077. No idea
079. Separate identity -supervisors and senior staff of agencies active in WIA not line staff.
100. LLT is charged by commission with One-stop and ties, advisory, etc.
128. Individual members are active in One-stop collaboration efforts
138. State team continues!
141. Folded into One-stop/WIA
151. The LLT is a separate entity with individuals from WIA, the local One Stop, and other organizations participating with it.
188. We were excommunicated from the LLT and are no longer a part of it (by the lead agency without discussion).

2b. If no, which of the following statements best describes what happened to the team?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
a. It has merged with the one-stop	24	11.8	57.1
b. It disbanded because of lack of interest	4	2.0	9.5
c. It dissolved because original members were no longer involved	5	2.5	11.9
d. It broke up because of turf issues	1	.5	2.4
e. Other	13	6.4	31.0
Total	42	20.6	
Missing	161	79.4	
Total	204		

* Some respondents marked more than one item.

Comments of respondents who checked other:

014. It has somewhat merged, but with the merged and WIA the make-up of the team did not make sense. Hardin, Champaign, Union and Logan counties made the team.
019. We became Marion Area Life Long Learning and now Marion Area One Stop Advisory Council.
033. It has merged with the One-stop and Systems Collaboration Committee.
042. Not sure what happened.
053. Agencies became too busy and some just lost interest.
055. Support funds still an issue!
077. Became a select group-some no longer invited/informed.
088. Stopped receiving mailing. No agenda, No reason to go.
118. It dissolved because of WIA and JTPA changes.
128. New director local DJFS did not continue groups.
133. Certain LLT members are on the Workforce Policy Board and/or on the Youth Council.
138. Survived the transition.
143. We felt we needed more backing from the managers/directors, also original members were not getting contracts renewed.
166. Changed somewhat, due to original members no longer involved.
170. Another staff person participated
180. Never really did get a common mission or cause established.

201. Lost momentum due to local lead person moved out of the loop during One-stop movement.

3. Which of the following statements best describe the current interagency collaboration efforts related to WIA in your community?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
a. They are excellent	59	28.9	30.7
b. They got off to a slow start but are improving	54	26.5	28.1
c. They are struggling	35	17.2	18.2
d. They are nonexistent	16	7.8	8.3
e. Other	40	19.6	20.8
Total	191	94.1	
Missing	12	5.9	
Total	204		

* Some respondents marked more than one item.

Comments of respondents who checked other:

001. I was involved with a sub-committee of our Common Good for dental health and it worked! We have a community dental clinic.

008. Nonexistent to my knowledge.

010. Not certain LLT is.

014. Some parts are working well, but we are still working on all partners' role in responsibility and funding.

016. They continue but are mostly ACDJFS/WIA members.

017. Good, but need some improvement to communicate to all staffs.

021. We are doing fine.

025. I was assigned to Portsmouth Area in past but have been reassigned-unaware of current efforts.

037. We don't hear much about WIA since the group's focus is employment and previous members who provided WIA updates don't always attend.

042. Not sure as there have been no meetings.

055. Shared funding is still an issue.

062. I am currently in Pickerington and have not attended a meeting since May 2000.

064. No knowledge beyond local group.

066. What is WIA? What is CG LLT?

095. Our WIA is not a part of the Ohio option, so they are separate from ODJFS and the county DJFS.

101. They have become strong collaborative group as the mutual trust has grown

102. I don't know anything about LLT or WIA.

109. Good.

111. A council was developed for interagency collaboration.

114. LLT members continue to collaborate. We are still trying to inform/educate Local Workforce Policy Board on "history."
118. Some members are still trying to meet on a quarterly basis to keep up on WIA development.
123. May still exist, but I am unaware of it.
124. Licking County has always had a strong relationship with our One-stop partners
130. We are involved in 3 One-stops and each is at a different level a, b, and c (refers to statements in item).
131. Between a and b (refers to statements in item).
138. Hopefully, state team is providing continual leadership.
139. WIA in Clermont County is almost invisible.
143. Medina County has always had a excellent working relationship with all agencies and the career center
149. Interagency collaboration is taking place at many levels around the state.
151. The Civilian Conservation Corp has had limited experience with the local WIA. I can't answer as to how they have worked with other local organizations.
159. Room for improvement
166. Good, but struggling.
171. I deal with six counties. Each has it's own status.
172. Varies from county to county
175. WIA hasn't meant a lot of change yet from the JTPA days, but partners continue to be helpful to the efforts.
177. I am not now a member
178. They are good. However, they recently lost a lot of funding which is having a negative impact.
184. They are steady
199. I have not been contacted or informed.
201. Change in Staff/members' leadership

4. To your knowledge, did the collaboration developed through the Common Good Local Team (LLT) contribute to any of the current interagency collaboration related to WIA in your community?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	99	48.5	51.0
No	23	11.3	11.9
Don't know	68	33.3	35.1
No LLT ever existed in this community	4	2.0	2.1

Total	194	95.1	100.0
Missing	10	4.9	
Total	204	100.0	

4a. If yes, which of the following statements best describes the impact of the LLT on current collaboration?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
a. It laid the foundation for current efforts	57	27.9	59.4
b. It had minimal impact	16	7.8	16.7
c. It formed the core of current efforts	16	7.8	16.7
d. Other	14	6.9	14.6
Total	96	47.1	
Missing	108	52.9	
Total	204		

* Some respondents marked more than one item.

Comments of respondents who checked other:

003. Once WIA board was formed, agencies were no longer kept apprised of efforts in local community
007. Some members are on the WIA board.
014. We had a relationship already established with the local JVS.
015. One group was interested in beginning, then fizzled.
037. Strong foundation then merger due to the same persons serving on several groups.
040. Provided input
060. No direct impact but certainly indirectly.
066. I am not sure what LLT is
072. Has been a vehicle to promote cooperation and trust among local agencies.
114. On-going collaborative efforts between certain members continue.
118. It mostly hurt the employers participation when all other involvement and development under the Common Good were disregarded.
121. Zero.
143. At the least it got the agencies to have contacts.
178. Gave feedback on their new system
183. Strong relationships were already established.
194. County OJFS in most counties does not understand collaboration concept.

Some respondents wrote comments at the end of the questionnaire:

94. The committees I work with are mostly spear headed by non-profit organizations. I have found DJFS employees difficult to work with for the most part. They attend meetings, but do not follow through. I work with individuals with disabilities, and many of the services I formerly provided have been discontinued because many of the families are not income eligible. This has really hurt programs like our summer program.

120. It appears that the team is doing a good job but I no longer actively participate due to staff shortage at library.

126. I personally believe that Common Good has less value now that the WIA and One-stop groups are becoming more effective.

138. I was member of state team and was not able to be really involved in last years. Retired in 2000.

143. With our grants we put together a linkage book. I gave our copy to the former WIA director. We also had a computer network that was just in effect when we disband.

**Appendix B:
Telephone Survey Results**

The following sixteen counties with existing One Stops were contacted for the telephone interview. Each county was contacted at least four times by telephone with a request to participate in the survey. A total of eight counties participated in the telephone survey.

Clinton	Montgomery
Delaware	Pickaway/Ross
Fairfield/Perry/Hocking	Pike
Greene	Portage
Hamilton	Scioto/Adams/Brown
Highland	Warren
Lake	Wayne
Mahoning	Wyandotte

Telephone Survey of Existing One-Stops with CG Overlap

1. Is the LLT still active?
 - 1a. If yes, please describe relationship of LLT to interagency collaboration. (Identify specific activities and roles of LLTs)
 - 1b. If no, please describe what happened to the team.
2. Did collaboration developed through CG LLT contribute to any of the current interagency collaboration related to WIA in your community?
 - 2a. If so, how?
 - 2b. If not, why?
3. What are the key elements of successful collaboration in your community's WIA environment?
4. What are the challenges to current interagency collaboration efforts under WIA?
 - 4a. What strategies are you employing to overcome these challenges?
5. What type of support/activity is needed to facilitate collaboration efforts in your community?

County 1

1. The LLT is still active and holds meetings on a monthly basis. The primary purpose of meetings is to give updates and provide networking opportunities.
2. Common Good laid the groundwork for collaboration. Jeff Gove and Susan Imel were very aggressive in getting local agencies involved. The Common Good manuals and workshop materials are still valuable. CG helped set up collaboration efforts, identify key stakeholder groups, and build rapport among agencies. In this county the JVS, Economic Development Committee and Chamber of Commerce have better relationships because of the LLT.
3. Key elements of successful collaboration include: 1) communicating on a regular basis (regular meetings); 2) having a facilitator vs. meeting leader to keep everyone on task; 3) having a common vision, goals and action plan; and 4) co-location of agencies. Successful collaboration is measured by completion of projects, customer surveys and measurable outcomes as defined by contracts.
4. The major challenges to collaboration under WIA include: interpreting policy, meeting DOL regulations, and the financial return on investment of time is too low.
5. The state needs to stay involved. Without the state, “it’s like school without the teacher.” Locals get bogged down in daily operations and can lose site of the bigger picture. The state level staff can help to communicate common vision and details of WIA.

County 2

1. The original LLT is still active, but not as a local linkage team. When the One-Stop was established the LLT became a sub-committee of the One Stop, serving in an advisory capacity to the One Stop. The present LLT is composed primarily of line staff from the agencies. The LLT meets regularly for information sharing and coordination. Current activities sponsored by the Sub-Committee of the One Stop (former LLT) include: sponsorship of Agency In-Service days and training institutes, advising the One Stop on plans for co-location and some fiscal matters
2. CG helped bring a broad spectrum of agencies, especially Employment Services into planning for the One-Stop. Although ES was not part of the original CG team in 1992, it had become part of it by 1995. LLT’s introduced Agency In-Service days and these have now become regular meetings for line staff from different agencies.

3. Keys to success in the county include 1) county commissioners and local governments' involvement and support; 2) physical co-location of agencies, 3) communication with the state CG team keeps locals informed of state level activity allowing locals to better plan for future; and 4) Memos of Understanding.
4. Challenges to collaboration in the current environment include: 1) lack of resources (time, money, staff); and 2) eligibility requirements remain an obstacle to helping everyone. Strategies for overcoming these include: 1) combing WIA money with PRC money and other sources of funding. Turfism has not been a problem in the county as it has been in other counties because the county agencies have not had to bid for contracts.
5. Community action programs are helping to facilitate collaboration in the county. 22 partners have signed on to the Memo of Understanding.

County 3

1. The interviewee was not familiar with the Common Good and was vaguely familiar with the LLT. However, he discussed the type of interagency collaboration taking place in this county and its success and challenges.
2. N/A Collaboration has become, "the way we do business." WIA has consolidated the work of many agencies. With limited resources, it makes much more sense to eliminate duplication of services and outsource to the "experts." For example, one of the programs at the One Stop out sources much of its training to other more capable agencies.

Examples of collaboration in this County include:

- The one stop, a university engineering department and the city career center wrote and secured a grant to provide technical training to employed and unemployed workers in the county.
- The Urban League, Community Action Agency, Great Oaks, Cincinnati State Community College, Urban Appalachian Council and the Resource Network collaborated to raise levels of computer literacy among job seekers and agency staff using the computer center at the Resource Network. In addition the National Council on Aging runs a computer literacy program for seniors in Hamilton county.
- Several non-profits and area agencies and the One-stop collaborated to secure a worker incentive grant. The grant targets improving services and employment access to disabled community members.

- A program for youth was developed out of WIA regulations for youth services. This program brings together agencies offering youth services and training and fine-tunes programs and services based on identified youth needs.
3. Joe used the phrase necessity is the mother of invention to describe collaboration efforts in Hamilton county. 45 organizations are part of the Career Resource Network in Hamilton county. Much collaboration has been somewhat forced onto agencies by limited resources and policy. In addition the nature of the labor pool necessitates collaboration. People may move from one minimum wage job to the next without getting more skills/training. In addition, the labor force is transient. Having all of the agencies collocated makes it easier for a new Cincinnati resident to identify and take advantage of services needed become a productive citizen.

Key elements of successful collaboration include clarification of duties. Many people are still confused over recent changes in JTPA and implementation of WIA. Clarifying individual duties and agency responsibilities helps to eliminate “turfism.”

4. The biggest obstacles to collaboration are turfism, and an uncertainty of the future due to state and local changes in WIA, JTPA, and ODJFS.

County 4

1. LLTs still have meetings to connect and give updates on agencies’ work. However, the interviewee is not aware of any current projects and activities by the team.
2. The interviewee does not believe the LLTs contributed to current interagency efforts. At present, the One Stop is taking a leadership role in getting all interested parties involved and getting them to sign on to the Memorandums of Understanding. Some key goals for the One Stop include improving cross-referrals and information sharing.
 - 2b. The interviewee “guesses” that LLT’s did not contribute to current collaboration because CG organizations were typically focused on helping adults get jobs and less concerned with health services and family issues.
3. The Memos of Understanding have been useful in working with agencies in getting electronic links on the website and producing printed materials for the partners to provide to their clients has supported the collaboration effort.

4. Restrictions on money and staff and their use are the greatest challenges faced by agencies in the current environment. People are always looking for ways to sustain their own agencies first and then consider collaboration second. No one is against cooperation, the issue is resources, time/money/staff
5. More funding is needed for start-up costs and improvement in technology. Elected officials stayed away from one time funding for one stops due to political constraints.

County 5

Director, One Stop Center

The director of the county one stop was not familiar with the CGLLT, however provided a reference for a county team member who was familiar with CG. The director gave an overview of the County One Stop and its organizational philosophy.

- Operating since 1997
- One-Stop is the largest in the U.S.
- \$700 million in services, \$300 million is WIA money
- Located on 8 ½ acres, one building, 47 partners (14 educators) public and private sector partnerships.
- Each organization leases space in the building
- Partnerships operate under four principles Share space, Share goals, Share problems, Share decision making. The director's job is to facilitate (not manage/control) this collaboration among the 47 partners.
- No one organization "runs" the One-stop
- Posts 13,000 jobs
- Established 1997 before One Stop concept and WIA
- Modeled after Kenosha County, Wisconsin, Welfare Reform Center
- Partner Council meetings are held monthly.
 - All 47 partners have an equal voice
 - The highest person on site at time of meeting attends the meeting and has an equal voice with all other partners
 - When a need in the community is identified, it is taken to Partner Council where resources (money, expertise, services, staff, connections) are identified in organizations and a plan is "hammered" out to serve the community need.

County 5

Director, community action agency

1. Once the One-stop opened the LLT floundered. The interviewee attributed this to a lack of executive level people on the LLT, and many of the taskforces picked up a lot of what LLT was doing. For example, poverty reduction team and workforce development team were established. The LLT was unsure if they even needed to continue to meet. The last meeting was Spring 2001. The most recent activity undertaken by the LLT was an assessment of the One-stop reception area and its ability to meet client needs. The LLT made recommendations to the One-stop on improving signage and security in the lobby. No action has been taken on the LLT's recommendations.

2. The LLT has been on the peripheral of the establishment of the One-stop. The interviewee assessed the LLT was effective at strengthening day-to-day communication across agencies and mid-level service delivery, and establishing relationships among supervisory staff across agencies. The LLT was less a part of the actual planning and implementation of the One-stop.
3. Collaboration is very strong and sophisticated in this county. The interviewee made the distinction between cooperation and collaboration stating that the desire to cooperate has always been there because each agency wants to do what is best for the customer. Collaboration is more sophisticated and has taken hold in this community in part because of the way funds are distributed. More and more funders are requiring collaboration across agencies. For example, Job and Family Services targeted community-based collaboratives in an area of the county and would only accept one application for funding.
4. The decision to collaborate is typically based on an agency's knowledge of the opportunity, available time and resources, and the potential impact on the agency's niche clientele. Obstacles to collaboration include a 1) lack of top-down sharing of information within agencies; 2) ineffective communication: smaller agencies may be left uninformed of opportunities for funding and collaboration; and 3) limitations due to organizational infrastructure; and 4) limited resources.
 - 3) **Limitations due to organizational requirements:** Each agency has outcome measures based on how well it serves a particular customer segment. Even if the agency has resources to contribute to a collaborative they may make the decision not to because the collaborative's activities do not directly impact the agency's customers.
 - 4) **Limited resources:** Once a collaborative is established and has its grant money, there is little room to add more partner agencies because there is no money to give the new partner.
5. A communications system is being developed where by all agencies in the county will be able to access a computer network and interface with other agencies on line. Phase one of this project will be primarily a tool for information dissemination. Agency services and collaboration opportunities will be posted on line. This will keep information real time and eliminate the need for mailing lists, letters and more meetings. Eventually the computer network will house a database that will allow agencies to track customers throughout the system.

County 6

1. The LLT is still active and meets quarterly to give updates on agency activities. The LLT was instrumental in setting up a dental clinic, and a community clothes closet. Presently, the LLT is working on creating a mentoring program for youth in the county to keep youth focused on employment and staying out of trouble. This is difficult because of a lack of volunteers. The LLT sponsors monthly meetings where customers can voice their problems, concerns and questions to people in the work force development and human services systems in the county. In addition, agency representatives give updates and information to clients on new services and programs. Under WIA, invitations to these meetings may be extended to employers, to gain more of their involvement.
2. Collaboration developed through CG did contribute to current interagency collaboration efforts. Communication across agencies helped to minimize turf issues, relationships among individuals in agencies were formed prior to the One Stop, and many individuals on One Stop committees are the same people from the LLT.
3. Collaboration happens successfully because it is a small community. Members have a universal understanding of the depressed economy and similarity of clients of across agencies.
4. All of the changes in the recent past (WIA implementation, One Stop implementation, WIA operating out of Department of Human Services and the merge of Employment Services and Human Services) have created a great deal of confusion at the local and state levels. No one seems to be able to answer all of the questions. A lot of time is spent figuring things out. In addition, many are very uncertain about their job stability. This makes it difficult to expect dedication and commitment on part of staff.
5. Uncertain as to the kind of support needed to facilitate collaboration.

County 7

1. Members of the original county LLT continue to meet informally, but no longer function as an LLT. Representatives from metro housing, the career center, community service agencies, OBE, JTPS and human service agencies formed the original LLT. LLT set their goal as implementing the One-stop in the county. Once the One Stop was up and running functionally, the LLT disbanded. Members continue to see each other at the One-stop, but formal LLT activities and roles no longer exist.

2. The interviewee believes the LLT activities did contribute to agency representatives' current abilities to work together. Working together to implement the One-stop grant acclimated agency representatives to each other and to the work of each agency.
3. A discussion about the key elements of successful collaboration revealed the following:
 - The county One-stop has customer advocates who are essential to inter-agency collaboration efforts. The advocates are employees of the partner agencies. Customer advocates take turns staffing the One-stop center resource room. Their duties include greeting the public, helping with registration on the Ohio Job Net, answering in-coming phone calls, making appropriate referrals, showing customers the current job postings and many other customer service tasks. The customer advocates communicate with each other on a regular basis and also receive information about current events at the One-stop through a customer advocate newsletter.
 - The county used the Memos of Understanding with their required partners but the agencies have not really relied on these for cooperation.
4. Challenges to current inter-agency efforts under WIA include:
 - A fine line exists between competition and collaboration.
 - With limited resources and staff and a constantly shrinking resource pool turf issues remain.
 - People do not like to compromise and therefore different agencies continue to spring up to serve different niches. While positive, this has the potential to create a lot of duplicated efforts.
5. Nothing to add on the support activity needed to foster collaboration efforts

County 8

1. This Local Linkage Team is still very active. In the beginning the LLT established a private non-profit fiduciary for grants and contracts. Members of the LLT advise the fiduciary.

The LLT is involved in interagency collaboration (15 agencies) through the following activities: meets regularly, administers TANF Contracts through non profit fiduciary, established a mentoring program for employee retention in the various agencies, offering training for business CEO's and HR people on the services that can be offered through various agencies and the Common Good, held job fairs, resurrected what used to be JTP job matching system.

2. The County Commissioner asked the LLT to serve as the One Stop advisory group. Currently, they are the only group asked to review county policy. This gives the team an opportunity to advocate for OJFS.
3. Three people from different agencies in the county attended the State Common Good Institute in 1995 at which they developed and adopted a joint mission statement and basic operating principles. All agencies that wish to be part of collaborative efforts with the CG must agree to abide by these principles. The principles are:
 - “Inclusivity” –every member agencies is allowed and encouraged to pursue discreet activities, but they are required to keep all of CG agencies informed of their efforts. This helps to avoid turf wars.
 - Mutuality—to the extent possible member agencies should find ways to collaborate on endeavors. Mutuality may mean have all members participate in an endeavor, or can be only a few if this is the best strategy.
 - Well-being—Each agency should operate in the spirit of well-being for all involved. This helps to ensure agencies are looking out for each other and keeping each other informed of changes in the community. Especially helpful principle in new WIA environment.
4. The biggest challenge to current interagency collaboration is the constant “changing of hats.” Past and present members of the LLT have changed roles and positions within human services agencies. OBES is in a “state of flux” and no one knows quite what to expect next. Communication and the LLT principles seem to help overcome this confusion.
5. Activities that support collaboration efforts in the community were discussed. The county LLT’s primary strategy is to take advantage of all opportunities to collaborate with the private sector and prove its value. They have chosen this strategy because as the government dollar remains constant or dwindles and the need for services increases the private sector will need to step in to fill the resource gap. The LLT promotes agency services to the private sector that will benefit both the private sector and their common customers.