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This *Getting-Started Guide* is a revised and updated version of the one prepared in 2013 by the research team at the Ray Marshall Center and jointly published by the Center and the Foundation for Child Development. Three years is a relatively short span of time, yet there has been considerable activity in areas affecting the environment in which state and local policymakers and program administrators operate *vis a vis* designing and implementing two-generation strategies, especially those with a strong education and workforce orientation. A number of important developments have taken place over this period, including the following:

- The launch of two-generation initiatives by foundations that link quality early childhood education and workforce services, including the three-city Family-Centered Community Change (FCCC) initiative supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s seven-site Supporting Transitions to Employment for Parents (STEP) Program.
- Expansion of the Ascend Program’s network of two-generation grantees at the Aspen Institute.
- New two-generation programming from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, especially by the Administration for Children and Families Office of Head Start.
- Passage of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014, which replaces the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998. Among other provisions, WIOA mandates the creation of sector partnerships, encourages the development of career pathway strategies for training, and requires the use of integrated, contextualized adult education services, all of which have been key elements in leading-edge two-generation programs like Tulsa’s CareerAdvance®.
- The White House’s fall 2015 launch of its ten-site Rural Integration Models for Parents and Children to Thrive (IMPACT) Demonstrations that incorporate a two-generation approach. These are overseen by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- The U.S. Department of Labor’s June 2016 announcement that it is funding 14 communities under its $54M multi-year Strengthening Working Families Initiative, an effort that was originally planned to have less than half that level of funding.
- Passage of two-generation legislation in Connecticut and Utah and statewide reforms in Colorado’s Department of Human Services.

More two-generation efforts are in the offing, including the National Governors Association’s *Parents and Children Thriving Together* (PACTT), an 18-month two-generation policy academy involving up to six states (competitively selected) that will
begin in late 2016 with support from the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP). In mid-August 2016, the Annie E. Casey Foundation announced that it will be providing $1.5M to support two-generation pilots in three workforce boards through a partnership with the National Association of Workforce Boards and Innovate + Educate. Moreover, as part of its Opportunity for All Initiative, in the Fiscal Year 2017 budget the Obama Administration proposes $100M for a series of two-generation demonstrations under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program via the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and $36M for two-generation rural poverty and American Indian programs.

The academic and policy advocacy community has been quite active as well, publishing research and numerous policy briefs on two-generation topics. The environment is indeed far more receptive and conducive to addressing multi-generational poverty through two-generation strategies than it was just a few short years ago. This revised Getting-Started Guide seeks to respond to and take advantage of these changes.
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Executive Summary

The goal of a two-generation strategy is to break the inter-generational cycle of poverty, moving families toward economic security and stability through education, workforce training, and related support services. Since the original printing of this document in 2013, the innovative two-generation approach to link quality workforce development services and quality early childhood education for low-income families has evolved considerably and has influenced many state and local programs across the country, as well as federal policy.

This report is intended to serve as a guide for state and local policymakers as they begin to develop and implement two-generation strategies in their areas. It begins with an overview of four innovative two-generation programs and provides several examples that illustrate different approaches to developing a two-generation strategy with strong workforce and/or education components. While the programs are by no means identical, each has established a coordinated array of services to address the needs of low-income families and improve their educational and economic outcomes over time. The guide presents five facilitating factors that appear to be linked to the success of two-generation strategies: supportive policy frameworks; leadership; program administration; integrated and flexible funding streams; and evidence-oriented culture. The guide then details some of the common steps taken in establishing two-generation programs, and identifies recommendations for state and local policymakers interested in implementing a two-generation approach.
Overview of Two-Generation Strategies

There are multiple pathways by which parents and home setting influence children’s development over time. These are well documented and include stress, parental education, health, employment, income, and asset development.2 Other research has concluded that neighborhood also has a large influence on children’s potential economic and social mobility over time.3 This body of work clearly points to the need for more comprehensive, multi-faceted holistic strategies that address the needs of families.

Other factors also suggest the need for a broader approach. They include: the rising inequality of both income and wealth in recent decades despite periods of robust economic growth, a growing recognition that social and economic mobility in the United States is well below that of most countries and may be on the decline, and a new understanding that our policy frameworks and associated programs are inadequate to address issues faced by today’s families, in part because they tend to deal with parents and children separately. Existing programs also lack adequate resources to support them.4

Two-generation antipoverty strategies have emerged as one important response to these challenges over several decades, beginning with Head Start, arguably the first explicit two-generation program,5 which was enacted as part of Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty in 1965. In more recent decades, such strategies have progressed from what have been called 2-Gen 1.0 — relatively low-intensity services for low-income parents or providing child care for welfare mothers entering employment or job training — with only modest near-term effects in the 1980s and 1990s, to 2-Gen 2.0 efforts since the mid-2000s that are substantively quite different.6 These 2-Gen 2.0 strategies feature: simultaneous human capital investment for a wide-range of low-income parents and children, quality early childhood education, intensive career pathway training and postsecondary education offering...
stackable credentials in growth sectors of the labor market, strong employer engagement via workforce intermediaries, contextualized adult education ‘bridge’ programs, as well as a range of support services, as indicated in the accompanying text box.\(^7\)

The overarching goal of a two-generation strategy is to break the inter-generational cycle of poverty, moving the family toward economic security and stability through education, workforce training and related support services. Such strategies provide opportunities for both parents and children including economic supports and social capital in the form of family and peer support services.\(^8\) These strategies lend themselves to state and local implementation because they often draw upon existing services, coordinate with the local business community and philanthropic organizations, and can be tailored to particular regional economic conditions.

A number of effective two-generation programs have already been implemented, and they offer useful examples of the variety of approaches available to program developers. Four of these programs are described in the next section. Throughout this guide the terms, 2-Gen, 2Gen and two-generation, are used interchangeable.
Local Two-Generation Program Examples

A number of areas around the country are implementing explicit two-generation models, which are customized to meet local needs and service availability within their unique institutional and programmatic contexts. Two-generation examples include, among others: Tulsa, Oklahoma’s CareerAdvance® program; the Atlanta Civic Site in Georgia; the Jeremiah Program in Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Endicott College’s Keys to Degrees Program in Beverly, Massachusetts. These programs are profiled below to illustrate different approaches to a two-generation strategy with strong workforce and/or education components. Each program has developed a coordinated array of services to address the needs of low-income families and to improve their educational and economic outcomes over time. Rigorous research on program outcomes and impacts for parents and children is developing in the emerging two-generation field; each program’s evaluation efforts are also briefly discussed.

CareerAdvance®, the Community Action Project of Tulsa County, Oklahoma

CareerAdvance® is a sectoral workforce development program targeting jobs in the healthcare industry with a ladder of education, training, and certifications in selected occupations offering opportunities for advancement and family-supporting earnings with fringe benefits. Training is structured as a career pathways approach and has been provided at Tulsa Community College and the Tulsa Technology Center. The program began in mid-2009 as a pilot for the parents of children in Head Start/Early Head Start programs operated by the Community Action Project of Tulsa County (CAP). The program design initially featured a stackable series of training courses in nursing from Certified Nurse Aide (CNA) through Registered Nurse (RN). In 2011, a career path in health information technology (HIT) was added, followed later by stand-alone programs for Medical Assistant (MA) and Pharmacy Technician. Participants may “stop-out” (either temporarily or permanently) at each level with an industry-recognized credential that qualifies them for higher wages and advancement opportunities. In 2016, with new funding from the Health Professions Opportunity Grant (HPOG II) program from the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the program shifted to an even broader suite of health care pathways at Tulsa Technology Center to include certificates that can be obtained more quickly with fewer supports. The program also began providing services to non-CAP parents of children 0-8 years of age.
CareerAdvance® is designed to support and motivate participation through several key elements: a cohort training model; peer mentoring and support through facilitated weekly meetings of participants; tuition payments and other education/training expense support; incentive bonuses for good performance;10 adult basic education; English as a Second Language and tutoring services; and wrap-around services such as before and after school care for children and transportation assistance. From the outset, CAP has approached the design of the CareerAdvance® program as a continuous improvement process. As a result, the program model, training offerings, participant eligibility, support services, and other features have all changed to varying degrees over time. These modifications have been driven by diverse factors, including the changing needs of CAP Tulsa parents, policy changes by education and training providers, new labor market developments, and the priorities of its funders, e.g., USHHS/ACF.

Tulsa’s George Kaiser Family Foundation funded the initial development and operations of the program from 2008 to 2010; since September 2010 to 2015, it has been supported primarily by the Health Professionals Opportunities Grant (HPOG I). HPOG II began supporting the program in September 2015. The program relies on a number of community partners, including Tulsa Community College, Tulsa Community WorkAdvance, Tulsa Technology Center, Family and Children’s Services, and Union Public Schools, while CAP Tulsa provides program coordination and career coaching.

CareerAdvance® is now the subject of several ongoing evaluations, including a comprehensive multi-methods evaluation led by the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University and the Ray Marshall Center at the University of Texas at Austin’s Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, that are examining implementation and longitudinal parent/child outcomes and impacts.11

Atlanta Civic Site, Atlanta, Georgia

The Atlanta Civic Site in Georgia is coordinated and funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation through its Making Connections program, a long-term initiative to improve the futures of children at risk. The program incorporates education achievement, family economic success, and neighborhood transformation elements. It employs a strategy that bundles workforce development, work supports, and asset-building programs for low-income families.12 The program’s expectation is that parents’ employment pathway will lead to a family-supporting career and build assets and wealth while their children move along a pathway to student success. The Atlanta-area Center for Working Families, Inc. (TCWFI) is implementing this strategy in conjunction with Sheltering Arms Early Education & Family Centers, which operates a high-quality early child care center at the Atlantic Civic Center site.

The partnership between TCWFI and Sheltering Arms Center, an Educare program at the Dunbar Learning Complex, represents a two-generation strategy that promotes children’s
health and school readiness, as well as parents’ economic success. Children aged 0-10 receive high-quality care at the Dunbar Learning Complex while their parents engage in development activities at TCWFI. Key advantages of the Atlantic Civic Site include the fact that children can matriculate from the Educare program to the Dunbar elementary school adjoining the Center (following continuous alignment of curricula, assessments and standards from Pre-K through grade 3), while their parents receive workforce services from TCWFI located directly across the parking lot. The program further supports parents by offering caregiving resources, active parent engagement, and education programming. At TCWFI, each family works with a Family Coach to identify the family’s strengths and determine the services and interventions that are needed to help them thrive. TCWFI functions as a hub linking participants to an array of partner organizations. The Family Coach remains engaged to ensure that the supports are high quality and well aligned with participant needs. Drawing on support from the United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta and other funders, TCWFI is able to leverage and bundle the services of other United Way-funded organizations. The Family Coach continues to interact with participants as they transition into work, maintain their job, and take steps to advance in their careers.

The Atlanta Civic Center is also a pilot site for the implementation of the Casey Race Equity and Inclusion (REI) framework, an effort to embed a race equity lens in its programs. As an REI pilot site, the Atlantic Civic Center has agreed to undergo trainings, conduct deep team discussions, study data, engage external partners, identify equity gaps, and develop strategies to address these gaps.

It is important to note that the Casey Foundation launched a multi-site two-generation strategy in fall 2013 and has engaged an evaluator to examine the implementation and measure its outcomes and impacts over time.

The Jeremiah Program, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The Jeremiah Program defines itself as “a proven, holistic approach to transform families from poverty to prosperity two-generations at a time.” The place-based program began in Minneapolis, Minnesota and has expanded to sites in Fargo, Minnesota-Moorhead, North Dakota; Boston, Massachusetts; and Austin, Texas in the past few years.

Rather than a cohort-oriented program, individual participant goals are pursued through a coordination of postsecondary education support and employment services, early childhood programs, affordable housing, and parenting and life skills development.

The Jeremiah Program provides single-parent families with stable housing and other on-site services, including a high-quality child development center; access to a library, computer labs, classrooms, and life coaches; and job placement assistance. Participants attend Personal Empowerment Training to develop important personal characteristics that contribute to their success in workplace settings. They also participate in life skills...
education classes during their time as residents. Although rigorous evaluations have not been conducted on the effects of participation in the Jeremiah Program, the program reports strong outcomes for mothers and children. Its 2015 annual report indicated that Jeremiah women showed significant increases in economic earnings, with 82 percent of graduates who moved out in 2015 now employed and earning 67 percent more than when they started the program. Eighty-seven percent of children in Jeremiah’s Child Development Centers are performing at or above age-appropriate developmental benchmarks. Recently, the program has developed a new focus on broadening connections with major corporate funders to enhance employment pathways for participants and alumnae.

The Keys to Degrees Program, Endicott College, Beverly, Massachusetts

The Keys to Degrees Program, another place-based postsecondary initiative, began at Endicott College just north of Boston in 1993. This program provides the opportunity for academically qualified, single parents to complete their undergraduate degrees at Endicott College while living on campus. In addition to academic support services, the program combines on-campus housing, access to child care in the community, and parenting support services. The program’s goals are for students to earn a baccalaureate degree; balance academic, work, and family obligations; become economically self-sufficient in their chosen field; be responsible and contributing members of the community; and live and learn on campus with their children. The program has since been replicated at Eastern Michigan University with a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Other universities replicating the model include Ferris State University in Big Rapids, Michigan, and Keys to Success at Dillard University in New Orleans.

A survey of the cohort in residence in 2010 reported that “100 percent of program graduates were employed full-time, 86 percent were employed in a career that directly related to their field of study in college, 57 percent earned an annual salary of $40,000 or more, 71 percent described themselves as economically self-sufficient, and 100 percent did not receive support from the federal/state TANF program.” Longitudinal research on the outcomes of children involved in the program has not yet been conducted.
Facilitating Factors for Successful Two-Generation Programs

Although two-generation strategies and programs are as diverse as the communities they serve, several features emerge as consistent factors identified as contributing to success. These factors include: a supportive policy framework, leadership, program administration, integrated and flexible funding streams, and an evidence-oriented culture.

**Figure 1. Facilitating Factors of Successful Two-Generation Strategies**

In the following sections, the five factors illustrated in Figure 1 are described in detail. These factors also provide a framework for identifying challenges, opportunities, and next steps discussed later in the guide.
Facilitating Factor 1: Supportive Policy Framework

Two-generation programs are most successful when state and local-level policies include systemic approaches that simultaneously address the needs of parents and their children. Currently, most systems serving adults and children lack the necessary policy coordination for effectively operating two-generation programs. Postsecondary education and workforce programs focus on serving adults, while early childhood education programs concentrate primarily on achieving developmental outcomes for children. Adult programs tend to see children as possible barriers to parents’ successful participation and offer child care of widely varying quality in response. Child-focused programs traditionally have emphasized parent engagement and low-intensity family literacy.

Recent federal trends are encouraging. The US Departments of Education (ED), Health and Human Services (HHS), Agriculture, Labor, and the White House, as well as other federal agencies are developing policies, programs, and funding streams featuring two-generation approaches. In May 2016, ED and Ascend at the Aspen Institute convened representatives from eight federal agencies and leaders in the two-generation field to explore effective policies, regulations, and systems that set whole families on a path toward educational success and economic security. In conjunction with the conference, ED and HHS released a Family Engagement Policy Statement that further commits the federal agencies "to support and encourage States, LEAs, schools, and public and private child care and Head Start early childhood programs to take action to develop and implement effective family engagement policies and practices."21 Addressing the lack of coordination between workforce development, adult and postsecondary education, and early education programs will require examining available budgets and incentive mechanisms for each program, and overcoming institutional inertia to encourage greater coordination among existing programs.

In July 2014, Congress reauthorized the nation’s workforce development programs by enacting the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) to replace the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). WIOA requires governors to develop State Plans that include coordination with other government agencies and non-government partners, which opens the door for states to design a more supportive framework for two-generation initiatives. WIOA also mandates the creation of sector partnerships to better engage employers, prioritizes low-income individuals for services, and stresses the use of career pathways for training, all features that have been part of leading-edge two-generation programs.

Over the past few decades, some states have moved toward more comprehensive policy frameworks that incorporate workforce development, adult education, and child care.
programs, creating an opportunity for establishing two-generation programs. Currently, half of the states have emerging and/or established programs.\textsuperscript{22} For example, Utah has a history of comprehensive policymaking in workforce and family policies. Its One-Stop Career Centers are organized according to function instead of funding stream and help participants with a full range of services that span educational aid, workforce development, child care, and social supports. Additionally, Utah rotates staff through different functions, which can encourage program coordination and break down organizational silos.\textsuperscript{23}

Texas also has a supportive policy framework that offers a relatively integrated system under the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC). TWC, in conjunction with regional workforce boards, controls the major workforce development funding streams. These include WIOA training programs, Employment Services, Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) work programs, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) employment and training services, and (since 2014) Adult Education and Literacy programs, as well as child care funding through the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). Rehabilitative Services are becoming part of TWC’s array of services in 2016.

Connecticut passed legislation in 2014 requiring that the Connecticut Commission on Children “establish a two-generational school readiness plan to promote long-term learning and economic success for low-income families by addressing intergenerational barriers to school readiness and workforce readiness with high-quality preschool, intensified workforce training and targeted education, coupled with related support services.” The Commission issued its Work Group’s report in December 2014, bolstering the case for a two-generation approach and outlining changes needed in state systems.\textsuperscript{24} In 2015, the Connecticut General Assembly authorized funding to support comprehensive model two-generation programs around the state offering early learning, adult education, child care, housing, job training, transportation, financial literacy and related support services and making changes to their adult and child systems in the process.\textsuperscript{25} Seven communities are now starting to implement these model two-generation programs.

Other states with comprehensive policy frameworks that are moving deliberately to support two-generation strategies include Colorado, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{26} It should be acknowledged that the existence of supportive policy frameworks does not necessarily mean that these states are taking full advantage of them; rather there is the potential for coordinated service delivery.
Facilitating Factor 2: Leadership

Strong leadership, political and otherwise, can greatly increase the likelihood of implementation of innovative programs. Challenging the status quo to reorganize large programs, such as workforce development and early childhood education, into a structure that provides coordinated services requires substantial political will. In a study by the National Governors Association (NGA), state partners implementing sector-based strategies identified gubernatorial and legislative leadership as a success factor for these initiatives. The NGA report found that legislative support beyond the tenure of the originating governor often made the difference between a short-term initiative and long-term success.27

Research suggests that public policy changes will be necessary to support broader-scale implementation of two-generation initiatives. Examples of such changes could include lengthening Head Start to a full work day,28 year-round program to accommodate working parents, or establishing workforce system performance metrics better suited for longer-term sectoral training programs, rather than short-term “work first” programs, something that the new WIOA provisions are now doing.29 State and local policymakers will need to build a broad coalition of elected and appointed officials to ensure long-term sustainability for two-generation programs. Colorado, Connecticut, Utah, and Washington have done an outstanding job of coalition-building and demonstrating two-generation approaches at the state level; some local communities (e.g., Austin, Texas) are doing so as well.30

State and local elected officials need to be informed not only on how two-generation strategies can be implemented, but also on the potential short- and long-term effects on children and their parents, taxpayers, and society as a whole. The NGA Center for Best Practices held a Two-Generation State Policy Forum in March of 2016 to provide an opportunity for attendees to discuss and learn about the potential for supporting low-income families through two-generation policy efforts. Also, Ascend at the Aspen Institute convened groups of local, state, and federal policy influencers, program leaders, researchers, and foundation representatives to participate in 2Gen State Policymakers Institutes in 2015 and 2016. Provisions for two-generation strategies should attract bipartisan support if evidence suggests they have the potential to produce long-term positive results for families. In an effort to build the case for two-generation programs, the Aspen Institute founded the Ascend Program—a hub for two-generation strategy, policy research, and program design. Ascend named its first class of twenty diverse Ascend Fellows spanning academia, government, philanthropy and other sectors in early 2012 and named a second larger class that is wrapping up its tenure in 2016. Ascend has developed and continues to expand its network of leaders in the field and in 2015
published an anthology of writings on two-generation strategies, programs, and research from the areas of human services, mental health, justice-involved families, and early childhood.\textsuperscript{31,32} Another example of outreach and education for local political leaders is the Sector Skills Academy. The Academy was launched in 2005 as a collaboration of The Aspen Institute, the National Network of Sector Partners, and Public/Private Ventures\textsuperscript{33} to support rising leaders in the sectoral workforce development field. Through three workshops over a 12-month period, participants learn new skills in sectoral workforce development, network with other individuals in the field, and establish mentor relationships. One of the goals of the Academy is to expand the depth and breadth of leaders in sectoral programs, which can be a key component to two-generation programs.\textsuperscript{34} The 2014 group of Academy fellows represented state and local public agencies, community-based nonprofits, labor-management partnerships, universities, worker centers, Workforce Investment Boards, and community colleges.

Facilitating Factor 3: Program Administration

Successful two-generation strategies rely on program partners to provide some of the services to participants, ranging from adult education to social support. However, program inertia in the respective partners can hinder the level of coordination between agencies and lead to infighting and inaction. Having multiple agencies, funding streams, and partners involved requires strong program administration and coordination. One way to encourage coordination is to create a workforce intermediary to administer the two-generation strategy and build connections between partner programs and employers who are essential to its success.\textsuperscript{35} A workforce intermediary would have contacts between the various workforce development programs and early childhood initiatives and would also seek input from the local business community to ensure that the program is meeting the economic needs of the community. Although two-generation strategies can draw upon many different programs, the two most common partners are sector-based workforce development programs, typically provided via well-structured career pathways, and early childhood education programs.

Sector-Based Workforce Development Programs

An increasing number of local regions and states are adopting sector approaches to workforce development

### Sector-Based Programs often focus on jobs in:
- Healthcare
- Energy
- Utilities
- Information Technology
- Transportation
- Logistics
- Advanced Manufacturing

### Workforce Intermediary:
An approach to program administration that brings together employers, support services, workers, and training partners to create pathways to family-supporting careers for low-skilled workers.
as a response to their workforce challenges. Sector-based workforce initiatives target specific industries, or sectors, and are designed to meet regional workforce needs. Multiple national-level organizations have been working with states to advance their sector strategies. Governors in many states are incorporating sector strategies into state workforce and economic development policies.

The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014 requires governors to institute sector partnership strategies for their workforce programs. It specifies that such policies authorize, “ongoing state support for local sector partnerships through funding, technical assistance and/or program initiatives(s).” Figure 2 identifies 21 states determined by the National Skills Coalition to have implemented state-level sector partnership policies by 2014. This figure also identifies an additional 20 states with state-level targeted industry sector activities.

**Figure 2. Sectoral Workforce Policies by State**

![Sectoral Workforce Policies by State](image)

In response to WIOA and the general sector strategy trends underway across the country, the NGA Center for Best Practices partnered with the National Network of Sector Partners and the Corporation for a Skilled Workforce to launch *Accelerating State Adoption of Sector Strategies*. The NGA Center reports that it currently works with 25 states to create and grow to maturity state sector strategies. The *State Sector Strategies* initiative identified a set of characteristics for successful sector strategies, including:38

- Collaboration with agencies
- Alignment with other strategies such as career pathways
- Work credentialing
- Leveraging other funding
- Providing incentive and planning funds
- Strong industry and employer involvement
- Operating within an “economic competitiveness” framework
- Providing technical assistance to local areas
- Gubernatorial and legislative leadership

Policymakers should look for the above characteristics when searching for workforce partners to serve adults as part of their two-generation strategy. The National Skills Coalition based in Washington, D.C. also has helpful resources to inform state policies for sector partnerships.39

**Career Pathways**

Career pathways offer low-skilled workers a tangible path toward higher-skilled professions and increased economic success. Currently, there two types of career pathways. The first is designed around a set of courses, or components of courses, that encourage individuals to learn skills and gain postsecondary credentials related to a specific occupation. These pathways clearly identify entry and exit points along the way, from which individuals can enter postsecondary course work, exit into the labor market with a marketable skill and certificate, and reenter at a later point, earning credits that “stack” toward the completion of a degree. These are sometimes referred to as “guided pathways.”40 Part of this concept is to make navigating postsecondary education – a complex, opaque landscape – much easier for all students, but especially for those students whose families have little experience doing so.

The second type of career pathway identifies occupations that appear to have paths already built in. It focuses more on preparing individuals to earn an industry-recognized certificate than on earning a degree. Through either type of career pathway, individuals with varying levels of abilities and needs are able to earn marketable credentials, engage in further education and employment, and ultimately achieve economic success.41
Some states have joined national and regional career pathway initiatives to design and implement career pathway systems. Figure 3 identifies states participating in at least one of the following initiatives:

- **The Pathways to Prosperity Network** supports member states in creating pathways, linking high school, work, and community college to increase the number of students attaining a postsecondary credential in three workforce sectors—advanced manufacturing, health care, and information technology (http://www.jff.org/initiatives/pathways-prosperity-network). The network is supported by Jobs for the Future, which provides technical assistance support.

- **The Alliance for Quality Care Pathways** provides criteria and indicators for what constitutes a high-quality state and local career pathway system focused on community colleges (http://www.clasp.org/issues/postsecondary/pages/aqcp-framework-version-1-0). The career pathways framework and tools identify pathways for students that will have labor market value and measurements for student outcomes. The alliance is led by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP).

- **The National Career Cluster Framework** is officially recognized by the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education within the U.S. Department of Education (ED) and the National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium (https://www.careertech.org/career-clusters). The framework is organized by industry areas and career pathways that require similar knowledge, skills, and courses and result in similar career opportunities. It was created as an organizing tool for curriculum design and instruction, including the potential to bridge and align secondary and postsecondary curricula and students’ career preparation in a particular program of study.

Importantly, WIOA now offers strong encouragement to state and local programs to incorporate career pathways into their workforce offerings. As with sector partnerships, career pathway approaches are expected to expand considerably in the coming years.
Figure 3. State Participation in National and Regional Career Pathways Initiatives

States Participating in National and Regional Career Pathways
- No Initiatives
- One Initiative
- Multiple Initiatives

Source: College and Career Readiness and Success Center.

Adult and Developmental Education and Literacy Services

Many if not most of the parents being served by two-generation programs require at least some help raising their basic reading and math skills before they can progress to advanced workforce and postsecondary education programs offering college credits, credentials and diplomas. Parents who are recent immigrants may require English-language instruction as well. Still others may have literacy skill levels that are sufficiently low that they need access to more basic literacy services. While there are many excellent providers around the country, adult education and literacy programs have long been seen as being ineffective and disconnected from mainstream workforce and education systems, as well as seriously underfunded. Although offered directly by colleges, similar things can be said about developmental or remedial education. Students too often have been relegated to low-dose interventions that kept them from making real progress in a timely fashion.

In recent years, researchers and program leaders have made great strides toward improving such services. They have worked to improve student assessments and curricula and deliver services in new ways to enhance the effectiveness of adult education and literacy services, as well as the speed with which they are provided. The U.S. Department
of Education and several states and foundations (e.g., Annie E. Casey) have supported more rigorous research on effective adult education and literacy services and fostered replication and expansion of best practices in service delivery. The Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST) model developed by the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges is one of the leading approaches, and it is now being tailored and replicated in many states.\textsuperscript{44} I-BEST education services are typically delivered in the context of particular occupations by instructor teams who are able to provide both education and training content. The research indicates that students accessing such programs persist better in their programs and progress more quickly to credentials than students in more traditional courses.

With support from the U.S. Department of Labor’s multi-year Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College Career Training (TAACCCT) program initiative, community and technical colleges in many states are also demonstrating and evaluating the effectiveness of related approaches that simultaneously deliver non- or one-credit developmental reading and math classes while allowing students with basic skills deficiencies to enroll in credit courses in their chosen occupational area, an approach referred to as “co-requisite education or remediation.”\textsuperscript{45} Early results from related efforts indicate that such approaches can be at least as effective as more traditional sequential delivery modes. They also allow students to progress more rapidly to obtaining the credentials they are pursuing, an important advantage when “time is the enemy” as it is in most students’ studies.\textsuperscript{46}

The success of these efforts contributed to new directions for these services outlined in Title II of WIOA in 2014. Importantly, adult education services are to be evidence-based and integrated with training. New performance metrics are also applied to these programs, including one for measurable skills gains. All of these provisions should contribute to more effective two-generation programming around the country in the future.

**Early Childhood Education Programs**

High quality early childhood education, from pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) through third grade, has proven to be a good investment that prepares children to succeed educationally, which can lead to future success in the workforce. As of 2015, 43 states (including the District of Columbia) use public funds to support Pre-K programs in public schools, and 33 of them meet more than five of the ten research-based quality standard benchmarks outlined by The National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER).\textsuperscript{47} The map below identifies those states offering state-funded Pre-K and the number of quality standards each state meets.
Figure 4. Pre-Kindergarten Policies by State

The ten quality standards are as follows:

- Comprehensive early learning standards
- Teacher has BA
- Specialized training in Pre-K
- Assistant teacher has CDA or equivalent
- Requires at least 15 hrs/yr in-service training
- Class size 20 or lower
- Staff-child ratio 1:10 or better
- Vision, hearing, health assessments, and one support service
- At least one meal per day
- At least one site visit every five years

Although the NIEER *State of Preschool Yearbook* reports increases in Pre-K enrollment, funding, and the number of state programs meeting quality standards, it is clear that access to high-quality preschool programming remains highly unequal across the country. Intended to support access to Pre-K (and subsequently included in the Every
Student Succeeds Act), the new federal Preschool Development Grant program is expected to yield important gains in access and enrollment in state led high-quality public programming. Furthermore, under the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016, the Office of Head Start (OHS) has announced that $294M has been made available for the purpose of extending total program hours to full school day and full school year.48

In addition to efforts being made to increase enrollment, funding, and quality standards, states that are providing high-quality Pre-K could incorporate these programs as part of a two-generation strategy if other mechanisms are also in place. Successful program administration could bring together existing early childhood education and incorporate two-generation elements such as coordinated schedules (i.e. full work day education programs), parent support groups, and social supports.

Head Start and Early Head Start programs can provide high-quality early education and comprehensive support services to infants through four-year-olds in low-income families.4950 Head Start traditionally seeks to engage children’s parents, a strategy that could be expanded to include parental work force training programs as part of a two-generation strategy. Educare is an early education program that offers full work day, full-year, and high-quality education to children at-risk from birth to age five. The program provides early childhood education programming and support for parent-child relationships that “create the foundation for successful learning.”51 The program has demonstrated promising results and is currently being implemented in 17 states and the District of Columbia.52 Evaluation data from 12 Educare schools participating in the implementation study indicate that children who enroll in Educare as infants or toddlers tend to exhibit better language, cognitive, school readiness, and social-emotional development.53 Educare and Head Start are partner agencies with CareerAdvance® in Tulsa, OK, providing quality early childhood education for program participants.54

A recent evaluation of the CAP Tulsa Head Start program found that participation produced significant and consequential effects for children into the middle school years on achievement test scores in math and on both grade retention and chronic absenteeism.55 This study presents evidence pertinent to current debates about the lasting impacts of early childhood educational interventions and, specifically, Head Start. Previous studies suggested that without follow-up, cognitive gains from participation in Pre-K programs can fade by the third grade, and recommended a more comprehensive approach to early childhood education that encompasses Pre-K through third grade to ensure that students achieve academic success into elementary school and beyond. High-quality Pre-K alone “cannot inoculate children against academic failure.”56 A solid Pre-K through the third grade education is the foundation upon
which academic and personal achievement is based. The Foundation for Child Development has identified several school districts as case studies for how to approach quality early childhood education, including:\(^\text{57}\)

- Union City Public Schools, New Jersey
- Seattle Public Schools, Washington
- Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

Each of these school districts has implemented coordinated curriculum for Pre-K through third grade, and they have made promoting a two-generation strategy a priority within the schools.

**Facilitating Factor 4:**

**Integrated and Flexible Funding Streams**

Early childhood education and workforce development are currently funded from different sources, each with a unique set of requirements. Since two-generation strategies span multiple agencies and perform multiple functions, integrated sources of funding are preferred. This funding could come from a variety of entities, including traditional funding sources—workforce development and early childhood education funding, child care subsidies—but also from the business community and philanthropic resources. Given current funding constraints at the federal, state and local levels, policymakers should be prepared to “think outside the box” for resources.

*Integrated and Flexible Funding Streams:* Think beyond traditional investments to identify opportunities to link, leverage, or otherwise capitalize on existing workforce and education funding.

*Braided Funding:* Pulls together resources across a number of public, private, or non-profit funding streams to meet the needs of participating families.

Two-generation strategies should consider any and all relevant funding sources available. One way to secure funding is to take a “braided” approach. Rather than attempting to fund a program from a singular source, funding is secured from multiple sources to create a package based upon the needs of the families participating. This approach has been used successfully with workforce intermediaries\(^\text{58}\) and could be extended to two-generation programs.

**Public Funding Opportunities**

Table 1 provides a brief description of potential workforce\(^\text{59}\) and early childhood care and education funding through various public sources.
Table 1: 
Public Funding Sources for Workforce Development and Early Childhood Care and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce Development/Job Training Funding</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TANF:</strong> States can deploy the TANF block grants in ways that are much more flexible than the traditional, formulaic funding, which can lead to some flexibility for two-generation programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNAP Education &amp; Training:</strong> Under SNAP E&amp;T funds, there is an underused option that allows states to receive additional Federal funding on a cost-reimbursement basis for providing allowable services to SNAP recipients.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIOA Governors Discretionary Funds</strong> – When Congress reauthorized WIA as the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in July 2014, it also restored at least a portion of what prior to 2011 was the Governors Discretionary Funds, amounting to about 15 percent of the state allocation. These funds had often been seen as “venture capital” by governors and were used to support special initiatives, foster sector partnerships and other activities that were more difficult with regular formula allocations dedicated to local services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Childhood Care and Education Funding</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF):</strong> This funding comes to the states as a block grant, and the states then determine the standards for who receives funding. Not surprisingly, the quality of child care options varies widely, and the emphasis is much more on child care, than on early childhood education. The block-grant nature of the funding could allow states to prioritize participants of two-generation programs and set quality standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head Start/Early Head Start:</strong> Unlike other child care funding, Head Start and Early Head Start funds flow directly from the Federal government to the providers. Although the emphasis is on early childhood education, the programs are traditionally part-time, academic year programs. Federal budget for FY 2016 included $294M in funding opportunities for programs to expand to full school day and full school year services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TANF funds</strong> can be spent directly on child care, or via CCDF. The investment emphasis is typically on child care, not early childhood education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Childhood Care and Education Funding</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Funded Workforce Development:</strong> Many states have developed their own funds for workforce development. Most of these funds are supported by Unemployment Insurance taxes or general revenues. Examples of these funds include California’s Employment and Training Panel, and Texas’ Skills Development Fund. Rules for these funds vary widely, but since they operate outside of federal programs, they are not subject to federal operating rules and reporting structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local governments** are also beginning to explore and in some cases actually provide Pre-K as an investment in their community’s future. For example, San Antonio recently approved a 1/8-cent sales tax to support universal pre-kindergarten for four-year-olds.63 Other communities may have similar programs.
Federal funding for workforce programs, such as WIOA, is likely to be limited for the foreseeable future, due to budget constraints. However, other, more flexible funding streams can be used to incorporate two-generation strategies into state plans. These include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), along with state-specific funds to promote local education and workforce development.

Public funding streams for early childhood care and education include the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and other child care subsidies, Head Start, Early Head Start and publicly funded Pre-K. Costs for two-generation strategies could be lower if Pre-K and kindergarten are already in place, or states could prioritize CCDF funding for parents participating in sector-based training programs. Head Start, CCDF and Pre-K programs also can collaborate to braid funding to create full work day, full-year care. A distinction should be made between child care and early childhood education as most funding sources, particularly those for adults in education and training, provide for child care and not necessarily high-quality early childhood education.

While no states appear to have integrated their workforce development and early childhood education funding, some states have taken steps to integrate their workforce and child care funding streams. For example, Utah features an innovative approach to workforce development services that balances elements of work-first and human capital development. In 2014, the Utah High-Quality School Readiness Initiative (HB96) allowed the newly created School Readiness Board to enter into contracts with private entities to fund high-quality early childhood education for students at-risk. Utah has a highly integrated One-Stop delivery system in which Employment Centers provide a range of services, including support for child care to their participants, but it does not offer Pre-K statewide. Texas also has laid the groundwork for integrated workforce and child care funding by giving local workforce boards oversight for multiple programs, including WIOA, TANF and SNAP Employment & Training, and CCDF. The Texas early childhood care and education Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) identifies child care providers, both center-based and in-home care providers, that voluntarily meet requirements that exceed the state’s child care licensing Minimum Standards.

States could use the integration of workforce and child care funding as an intermediate step toward coordinating funding of early childhood education and workforce development.

**Philanthropic and Business Community Funding**

Despite the numerous and varied funding streams, the restrictions on public funding make it an awkward fit for innovative efforts such as two-generation strategies. Funding from the local business community and philanthropic sources can ensure that the two-generation strategy has the flexibility to meet the needs of the participants, while demonstrating meaningful results within the local area. Outside financing from philanthropic donors has provided the funding—especially the “venture social capital”—necessary for developing and initially launching most of the current two-generation initiatives. Numerous national
Promoting and local foundations have shown an interest in funding such strategies. These organizations can provide the resources needed to supplement federal and state funding streams to establish a two-generation initiative in a state or locality. Given the difficult budget climate at the federal and state levels in which many legislatures are cutting funding for education and workforce programs, decision makers wishing to adopt two-generation strategies need to explore innovative approaches to funding.66

Philanthropic organizations that have demonstrated interest in or commitment to funding two-generation strategy implementation include the George Kaiser Family Foundation, Annie E. Casey Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Evanston Community Foundation, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The local business community can also be a natural fit for funding workforce development programs, particularly sectoral programs. If there is a demonstrated need for skilled workers in the community (healthcare workers, for example), state and local leaders can develop public-private partnerships with the business community to develop and fund training programs to meet the economic needs. Developing public-private partnerships can also be a key factor in securing other types of funding.

Facilitating Factor 5: Evidence-Oriented Culture

As new programs are implemented, robust data collection and reporting systems are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of two-generation strategies to support evidence-based policymaking.67 Many states have developed data collection and reporting systems that could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of two-generation strategies from both the workforce development and early childhood education viewpoints. The goal of collecting program data is to test the viability of two-generation strategies, as compared with more traditional programs, to ensure that policymakers support programs with the strongest outcomes. Potential research elements include identifying challenges and necessary conditions for successful programs and documenting outcomes. Performance measurement can also assist policymakers in conducting long-term benefit-cost analysis.68

Washington State may offer the best and oldest example in the nation of an evidence-based culture. The state enacted legislation in 1990 that mandated evaluations of its federal- and state-funded workforce and education programs, including an outcomes evaluation every two years and a quasi-experimental impact and benefit-cost evaluation every four years, with results to be made available to policymakers and the general public.69 This legislative evaluation mandate has endured, enjoying bipartisan support, and has led to the creation of some of the best program outcomes and impact data in the country. De-identified data
are available by program, longitudinally, linking program services enrollment and near- and long-term education and labor market outcomes and impacts. These data served as the raw material for the initial Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST) evaluation and are supporting much of the research at Columbia University’s Community College Research Center at Teachers College as well. Washington designed an innovative performance measurement and management system across its workforce and education programs relying on these data and subsequently led work with the National Governors Association’s Center for Best Practices in a multi-state Integrated Performance Information Policy Academy that resulted in recommendations to Congress about common performance measurement for the federal workforce development system. The common measures contained in WIOA clearly reflect this work.

Another initiative that seeks to enhance data collection and measurement across silos is the U.S. Department of Education’s Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant Program. This program is intended to “enhance the ability of States to efficiently and accurately manage, analyze, and use education data, including individual student records.” These data systems are encouraged to include linked preschool through higher education and workforce training records as well as employment outcomes obtained through the state unemployment insurance program. On the early childhood education side, the National Institute for Early Education Research has established quality standards checklist for early childhood education (as shown earlier in Figure 4). These standards fall into ten critical areas which encompass the comprehensive services preschool or early childhood education provides and could be used as a basis for performance metrics.

Evaluation is a critical tool that can be used to understand and assess the effectiveness of two-generation strategies, as well as to build support for promising programs and policies. Several noteworthy two-generation evaluation-related efforts are underway at present. First, the Ascend Program at the Aspen Institute has identified two-generation outcome measures and is working with researchers to develop a methodology for evaluating strategies and programs. A recent Ascend Program report, Making Tomorrow Better Together (2016), helps set a foundation for how practitioners and policymakers consider the intended outcomes of two-generation programs and the pathways to achieve those outcomes. Ascend has also established a crowd-sourced 2Gen Outcomes Bank for policymakers, researchers and practitioners as an open space to share measures, indicators, tools and other information pertinent to two-generation outcomes measurement. Ascend is in the midst of what it calls “Building a 2Gen Bench,” an effort to identify consultants and organizations with expertise in an array of two-generation-related areas and can provide technical assistance to groups seeking to start and/or evaluate two-generation programs.

Foundations are playing an important role in fostering two-generation measurement and evaluation as well. In April 2016, the Annie E. Casey Foundation announced the formation of a Two-Generation Strategic Evidence-Building Advisory Group focused specifically on issues related to evaluation and evidence building for two-generation programs. The Casey Foundation is also funding evaluations of programs it is supporting, including an ongoing
evaluation of the place-based Family-Centered Community Change (FCCC) Strategy in Buffalo (NY), Columbus (OH) and San Antonio (TX) by the Urban Institute, while the W.K. Kellogg Foundation is investing in an outcomes evaluation of its Supporting Transitions to Employment for Parents (STEPS) program in seven sites.

As noted, an evaluation of Tulsa CAP’s CareerAdvance® program is being supported by a HPOG-University Partnership Research Grant from USHHS/ACF. That evaluation—the CAP Family Life Study—includes a mixed-method, quasi-experimental evaluation of program implementation, outcomes, and impacts led by a research team at Northwestern University’s Institute for Poverty Research (IPR) with partners at The University of Texas at Austin’s Ray Marshall Center, New York University, Columbia University, and Oklahoma State University-Tulsa. Another evaluation initiative of the Tulsa program is also being led by the IPR/Northwestern team with its partners, the Family Advancement Study with funding from USHHS/ACF. This study begun in 2015 features an implementation analysis as well as an experimental evaluation of parent and child impacts from the program. Finally, Northwestern’s IPR team is conducting a Child and Family Outcomes Study beginning with winter 2016 enrollments under CAP Tulsa’s HPOG II grant. This study is examining the effects of CareerAdvance® participation on parent, child, and family outcomes, for example, child academic achievement and behavior, parenting, and parent psychological well-being. Researchers are collaborating with CAP Tulsa to compare the effectiveness of the timing of investments in parent human capital on parents of younger (preschool-aged) versus older (elementary school-aged) children based on a randomized control trial of 1,000 parents in the Tulsa area. Continuous improvement is an important dimension of the Tulsa evaluations, as reflected in regularly scheduled phone calls and meetings between the research teams and CAP Tulsa leadership and staff. Parent, child, and family measures resulting from these studies ultimately will provide critical evidence for understanding and bolstering the effectiveness of two-generation strategies.

Finally, the U.S. Department of Labor will soon be launching an evaluation of its Strengthening Working Families Initiative, a $54M effort that will be operating in fourteen sites over the next three years.
Common Steps for Getting Started

The goal of two-generation strategies is to move the entire family forward out of poverty and into economic stability. States and local policymakers interested in pursuing two-generation strategies have a wide range of options open to them; the scope and breadth of their strategies can vary considerably. Because local and regional labor markets differ widely, as do postsecondary education and workforce development systems, each two-generation program must be tailored to state/local policies, program environments, and regional conditions. There is no one “right way” to approach a two-generation program. There are, however, common steps that successful programs have undertaken in their development. These are illustrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Common Steps for Establishing a Two-Generation Strategy
Conduct an Environmental Scan

Policymakers interested in two-generation solutions should begin by conducting an environmental scan of policies, programs, and resources in the region. The challenges to developing and implementing two-generation strategies are not negligible, but there are opportunities to leverage existing resources and policy frameworks in every community. Table 2 provides a checklist of common challenges and policy frameworks in every community. Policy makers should consider these opportunities associated with each of the facilitation factors for two-generation strategies discussed in previous sections. State and local policymakers considering establishing two-generation programs can start by using this list to identify which elements are present in their regions.

Table 2. Checklist of Common Implementation Challenges and Opportunities

Check each of the challenges and opportunities present in your region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitating Factor</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Policy Framework</td>
<td>□ Policy and program inertia</td>
<td>□ Commitment to evidence-based policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Policy development and planning in isolation from other systems</td>
<td>□ Support for integrated planning and policy development at state and local level with comprehensive policy structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>□ Lack of strong political and/or program leadership</td>
<td>□ Active recruitment and training for state and local policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Absence of support for high-level policies to enable coordination</td>
<td>□ Prior collaborative projects and community-driven efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>□ Rigid or resistant organizational culture</td>
<td>□ Organizational interest in efficiency and effectiveness of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Conflicting goals, performance expectations, and services</td>
<td>□ Experience with integrated family policy structures and programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Program silos – services planned, delivered, and evaluated in isolation</td>
<td>□ Active intergovernmental workgroups in social, educational, or economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated &amp; Flexible Funding Streams</td>
<td>□ Structural separation of funding and service delivery</td>
<td>□ Well-developed sector-based workforce development program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Multiple, restrictive funding mechanisms</td>
<td>□ Active workforce intermediary activity in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Resource limitations</td>
<td>□ Community &amp; tech colleges with strong workforce/ career pathways orientation and flexible scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-oriented Culture</td>
<td>□ Ineffective approaches to adult basic and developmental education</td>
<td>□ Flexible funding sources such as TANF and SNAP Employment &amp; Training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Different schedules for parent and child programming</td>
<td>□ Local and state government resources including general revenues and unemployment insurance taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Inadequate communication within and across programs and systems</td>
<td>□ Existing philanthropic and business community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Performance measures that favor short-term (temporary) results over long-term gains</td>
<td>□ Existing investments in high-quality education programs demonstrating strong outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Robust data collection and reporting systems to support program improvement and decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link Existing Services

Another common step in establishing two-generation programs can be to more directly link existing services and funding for parents and children. Local policymakers can take an incremental approach, where individual families at-risk are paired with the workforce development services they need and quality child care for their children. If there is a strong early childhood education program already providing some support services and outreach in the area, policymakers can partner with that program to see what type of workforce development training the parents need. The Early Head Start (EHS) Child Care Partnership project is an example of this type of collaboration. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has set aside $635M in funding to support opportunities for EHS programs to partner with federal, state, and local child care programs, such as the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), to support working families and families with parents in training or education programs by providing quality full work day, full-year child care. From the workforce development side, policymakers can investigate strong adult education and training programs (“bridge programs”) to identify the child care needs of the students’ families. The two-generation strategies that result might be thought of as positioned along a continuum (Figure 6) ranging from coordinated services within existing policies and programs on one end to more fully integrated strategies that require extensive policy and systems changes on the other.

**Figure 6. Continuum of Two-Generation Strategies**

| Coordinated existing services | Fully Integrated strategies |

Identify Program Champions

A vitally important step is to identify a person or persons who will serve as the “champion” for the program. The role of champion is easy to overlook; however, this is the person who will be persistent, bring partners to the table, press for support, and generally drive to get the strategy implemented. In the language of the emerging literature on collective impact initiatives, the champion may also be an organization that serves as the
“backbone” for the two-generation initiative in a state or local area. Potential champions include an existing workforce intermediary or a leader of a local community organization. An existing workforce intermediary has connections within the local business community and with workforce development programs, while the leaders of existing community development programs have extensive “on the ground” knowledge of the targeted populations. The champion might also be a political figure with a strong interest in and record of supporting family-oriented services.

Identify Funding Sources and Key Collaborators

While states and local communities need to be creative in seeking support for two-generation strategies in today’s constrained fiscal environment, there are likely to be multiple sources available. Policymakers should reach out to potential sources of funding at the regional and state levels to explore public-private partnerships to support two-generation strategies. One step is to meet with potential funders to examine their existing portfolios in early childhood, workforce development, and education to identify opportunities for more systematic funding of two-generation strategies. Finally, all partners should explore combining resources, including foundations, states, cities, and possibly private sector groups, to support two-generation strategies. A least-cost option for these key collaborators is to align the populations already being served—parents enrolled in postsecondary education and training and their children participating in quality early childhood education—so that the investments can be linked with only modest increases in overall cost. New funding can be sought from either public or philanthropic partners at the national, state, or local level. Other options may involve mixed or “braided” funding strategies. What is feasible in one state or community may not be feasible in another.

Consider Replicating or Expanding a Successful Two-Generation Program

Although it is possible for each state or local community to build its own two-generation program, there are benefits to joining with an existing program through an expansion or replication that should be considered. As Bradach (2003) notes, “Leveraging the knowledge developed by someone else can enable a new site to increase the speed of implementation and the odds of obtaining the desired outcomes.” There are a variety of ways to replicate successful programs, from individual site expansions, to nationwide rollouts of specific initiatives. Common replication approaches include:
• **Franchise Approach**—The product is the program itself, and the components are standardized. A central or national office coordinates administration of the programs.

• **Mandated Replication**—This approach is typically sponsored by government, and occurs when the parent body wants to replicate a program throughout its organization.

• **Staged Replication**—This three-stage approach beginning with a pilot to test the viability of the concept, followed by a demonstration stage where the program is implemented at a variety of sites, and then full replication.

• **Concept Replication**—This approach focuses on the general components and principles of a program that can be utilized at other sites, instead of the specific program elements. Success in this model is measured by how well it is adapted to local context.

• **Spontaneous Replication**—This type of replication comes about in response to a demand for information “from below” (for example, from a potential partner or recipient). It is usually spontaneous, and is a collaborative process for the parties involved.

The Concept and Spontaneous Replication approaches are particularly useful for state and local leaders to consider. In general, the more elements of a program that are standardized, the more likely the replication will succeed. However, this needs to be balanced with the needs of the community in which the program will be established, and the importance of culture within the program. A local evaluation plan that supports ongoing program assessment and improvements is necessary to support the unique experiences of local communities of workers and employers.
Launch a Pilot Program

Policymakers can also “start small” by establishing a pilot program, perhaps within a larger workforce development or community development organization, that can leverage the resources of a large organization, but be small enough to adjust to changing conditions. A pilot also allows for programs to establish working partnership, and identify challenges and make changes before implementing on a larger scale. An example of this approach is the CareerAdvance® program, which began as a pilot program within CAP Tulsa. Efforts should be made to identify performance measures that reflect the long-term desired outcomes of the program. Putting some effort up-front to establish good measures can pay dividends in the future by avoiding unintended outcomes.

Develop an Evaluation Plan

It is never too early to begin developing a plan for evaluating the two-generation strategy or program. It can be difficult if not impossible to evaluate an intervention as complex as one involving both parents and children with outcomes expected to unfold over a long period of time if forethought has not been given to what needs to be measured and how.

Key components of such an evaluation plan would include the following, among others:\(^88\)

- Developing a program logic model that describes the services, the delivery model and expected immediate, near- and longer-term outcomes.\(^89\)
- Identifying important program and outcome variables to be measured.\(^90\)
- Determining data sources for capturing such variables and identifying any gaps that need to be addressed.
- Outlining strategies for collecting the required data, e.g., relying on administrative data, conducting focus groups, gathering survey data.
- Deciding how rigorous and extensive the evaluation design should be, whether it is just an implementation analysis to start with, an outcomes evaluation that documents the near- and longer-term results of the intervention, an impact evaluation (quasi-experimental or experimental with random assignment), or a full-blown impact evaluation combined with a benefit-cost analysis from varying perspectives.
- Scanning the marketplace for evaluation consultants with the necessary expertise to actually design and carry out the desired evaluation.
- Identifying the audience(s) for the evaluation, ranging from internal program staff and partners in the intervention to funders, policymakers and the general public.
Evaluation can serve a number of purposes. It can contribute to understanding whether and how the intervention is working and provide insights for program staff and policymakers regarding components that may need to be improved or even dropped altogether. Such feedback can both support continuous improvement for the program and offer some actionable recommendations for policymakers to strengthen the overall approach. It can also inform future program marketing strategies in a funding world that is heavily focused on evidence-based policymaking.
Taking a Systemic Approach

The preceding portions of this Guide largely assume that state and local policymakers will be inclined to move toward developing two-generation strategy and program by coming up with a design that appears to fit the context at hand, launching a pilot program, assessing its results and then beginning to replicate and scale it based on lessons learned. This is the traditional way in which policy and program innovations are pursued. It also minimizes the political risks involved should things not work out the way policymakers and program officials had hoped.

This section describes several state and local initiatives that have opted for another path, one that pursues systemic changes in the way both adult and child policies and programs address the challenges facing families. Rather than waiting for years to complete a planning process, operate and scale a pilot program and obtain results from a rigorous impact evaluation, a systemic approach capitalizes on strong leadership to build longstanding (and trusting) cross-sectoral relationships among policymakers and program administrators.

It is important to point out that the pilot-to-scale and the systemic approaches are not mutually exclusive. As policymakers and program officials begin implementing and scaling pilot programs, they are likely to identify barriers in adult and child programs that can be addressed by modifying particular elements of their existing policies and programs. This is especially the case where continuous improvement and communication among the partners have been “baked into” the process from the outset.

What follows are three examples of systemic two-generation efforts, starting with two states that have stepped up to the challenge in a big way — Colorado, and Utah — and wrapping up with a local example from Austin, Texas. The Connecticut Commission on Children, another noted example, is presented earlier in this paper in the “Supportive Framework” section (p.14). Note that in all but Utah, both pilots and systemic change have been featured in the mix.91

Utah: Voices for Utah Children

Voices for Utah Children, a statewide child advocacy organization, applies a gender and racial equity lens as it works with policymakers to reduce poverty and bring the perspective of a two-generation strategy approach to the forefront of the discussion.
Voices for Utah Children promotes the state’s two-generation strategy in three ways:

1. **Raising awareness.** Through the use of research, media campaigns and advocacy work the organization continues to communicate the most vital needs of Utah’s children.

2. **Influencing policy.** With a voice in decisions made by policymakers, the group ensures that the needs of children are raised in every policy debate.

3. **Uniting the community.** By bringing together the power of a community – legislators, business executives, private funders, government agency representatives, nonprofit directors, and ordinary citizens – it seeks to identify and resolve problems facing Utah’s children and families.

During the 2012 General Legislative session, Voices for Utah Children worked to pass S.B. 37, the Intergenerational Poverty Mitigation Act. The legislation required the Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS) to establish and maintain a system to track intergenerational poverty-related data to identify children at-risk and other groups, identify trends, and assist case workers, social scientists, and government officials in developing programs to help individuals and families break the cycle of poverty.92

Voices for Utah Children continued working on follow-up legislation – S.B. 53, Intergenerational Welfare Reform – in the 2013 General Session. This legislation created an Intergenerational Poverty Commission and an eleven-member Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee. The Commission is made up of the executive directors of the state agencies serving Utah families — the Departments of Workforce Services, Health, and Human Services; the superintendent of the State Office of Education; the state juvenile court administrator; and the chair of the Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee. Its purpose is to collaborate in sharing and analyzing information regarding intergenerational poverty and use this information to implement data-driven policies and programs addressing “poverty, public assistance, education, and other areas as needed to measurably reduce the incidence of children in the state who remain in the cycle of poverty and welfare dependency as they become adults.”93

Currently Utah is the only state in the nation that requires the gathering of data through the establishment and maintenance of a system to track intergenerational poverty.
The state of Colorado created the Office of Early Childhood in June of 2012 with an annual budget of $157M to consolidate and streamline twenty-plus early childhood programs from four state agencies, as illustrated in Figure 7.

**Figure 7. Colorado Department of Human Services Office of Early Childhood**

The Office of Early Childhood is leading a system-wide integration of the two-generation approach across the agency to demonstrate how a state agency can produce measurable outcomes for children and families through a three-pronged focus:

1. A dual approach to employment for both parents (including custodial parents through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and non-custodial parents through child support) to improve parent and child economic well-being;
2. Increasing pathways for children from low-income families to achieve a college education and learn financial savings habits through matched college funds; and
3. Increasing the percentage of children in low-income families participating in high-quality child care, leading to improved kindergarten readiness for these children.
In 2014, Colorado passed a suite of significant child care reform bills and budget items totaling $21.7M that are advancing two-generation efforts in the state. Some highlights of these two-generation bills include:

- **HB14-1317** makes significant changes to the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP) to help parents find and retain high quality and affordable child care, support families in climbing the ladder to prosperity, and cut red tape for small business child care providers who want to serve working families.
- **HB14-1072** creates a new state child care expenses tax credit that ensures those earning less than $25,000 are able to claim a credit, which includes the CCCAP parent copayment.
- **SB14-003** creates a pilot program to address the “cliff effect” that occurs when working parents in CCCAP receive a minor increase in income that makes them ineligible for child care assistance, yet their income is not enough to cover the full cost of care.94

**Austin (TX) 2Gen Systems Initiative**

In 2013, a small group of Austin community stakeholders representing the adult workforce, adult education, early childhood education programs and others formed the Austin 2Gen Advisory Committee to discuss how local service providers might collaborate in implementing a two-generation strategy for Austin.95 The group developed a vision statement vetted by a larger group of service providers, policymakers, funders, researchers, and other stakeholders from the larger Austin community and secured formal endorsements of the vision from twenty Austin area programs and organizations.96

**Austin 2Gen Vision Statement:** Policies and programs are designed and their resources are aligned, to help parents improve basic educational skills and become economically stable, to strengthen parents’ ability to be positive influences on their children’s development, and to help children achieve their maximum potential by simultaneously addressing the needs of parents and children. Meeting the needs of both generations will produce larger and more enduring effects than can be achieved by serving parents and children separately.
With additional support from Ascend at the Aspen Institute, the Ray Marshall Center and United Way for Greater Austin implemented the Austin Two-Generation Pilot Project which provided English as a Second Language for adults with children enrolled in two different Austin ISD Pre-K sites located in some of the district’s poorest communities with large numbers of recent immigrants. The project was designed to gain an understanding of the implementation process and participant experience of a two-generation project in Austin, in order to inform future two-generation project development in the region.97

Among other significant actions, Workforce Solutions, the local workforce investment board, has reprioritized subsidized child care funds, which it administers, to support parents enrolled in training. Travis County developed an initiative to serve low-income parents in the outlying areas of the county. And, the Austin Independent School District has repurposed a vacant elementary school in East Austin near an Austin Community College (ACC) campus and a housing project to collocate an array of providers offering parent and child services, including Head Start, Skillpoint Alliance, the Central Texas Literacy Coalition, Avance and others.

Presently, United Way for Greater Austin is functioning as the Austin 2Gen “backbone,” as part of a collective impact approach to continue crafting a common agenda, gathering and mobilizing resources, and developing a longer-term research and evaluation plan. The United Way recently hired a Two-Generation Project Manager.

Recommendations for Policymakers

In 2014, the Ascend Program at the Aspen Institute published Top Ten for 2Gen: Policy Ideas & Principles to Advance Two-Generation Efforts, offering very specific direction for policymakers in Congress and Federal agencies.98 The National Governors Association (NGA) followed up in 2015 with a policy paper directed at governors distilling a series of lessons learned from decades of experience with two-generation efforts.99 Among other things, NGA indicated that governors should:

- Experiment with two-generation efforts but evaluate them;
- Clearly define their goals;
- Ensure their strategies are backed by solid research (much of which is reviewed in the paper);
- Explore policies and strategies that enhance coordination between effective adult- and child-serving programs or services, such as “no wrong door” approaches; and
- Be both creative and practical—and have stamina.
The recommendations presented in Table 3 are specific actions state and local policymakers can take to start and better support two-generation strategies. These recommendations, combined with the Common Steps outlined earlier in this paper and those from Aspen and NGA, should provide a foundation for implementing two-generation strategies across the country. The concluding section of this guide, Information and Resources, is also intended to help policymakers build their knowledge base on the topic and connect with others around the country interested in moving two-generation approaches forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitating Factor</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Policy Framework</td>
<td>Issue policy guidance and directives from state agencies to promote two-generation efforts. Integrate program funding, planning, and service delivery within and across workforce, education, and human services systems. Coordinate across agencies responsible for workforce development, education, and human services to remove barriers to collaboration.</td>
<td>Identify low-income families as a target population for service by local governments, community-based organizations, and others. Bridge the multiple systems involved and ensure that efforts target local economic opportunities using workforce intermediary organizations. Build onto existing collaborations by layering two-generation components that address identified gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Coordinate agencies to shift the operating environment away from siloed approaches toward more flexible and innovative systems.</td>
<td>Identify potential partners across workforce, education, and human service organizations. Identify program champions in the community to spearhead change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>Provide technical assistance and training to support local implementation of two-generation strategies. Convene partner agencies to educate them on steps and supports needed for two-generation approaches.</td>
<td>Develop frequent communication between organizations and among staff at various levels. Offer programming for children and parents on the same schedule to facilitate full-time/full-year engagement. Offer individualized case management, career/life coaching, and family support services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated &amp; Flexible Funding Streams</td>
<td>Allow existing funding streams to be targeted for two-generation approaches. Develop grant programs to pilot test programs and encourage adoption of two-generation strategies. Create funds to incentivize implementation of two-generation approaches locally.</td>
<td>Approach local government, philanthropic organizations, and business community groups to raise awareness and identify potential sources of funding—particularly to support the coordination tasks required for implementation. Connect existing economic support services in the community around a common mission to improve outcomes for low-income families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-Oriented Culture</td>
<td>Collect data or establish performance measures related to family services rather than just child or adult services. Allow time for programs to work through issues and stabilize before assessing the full impact of the approach.</td>
<td>Collect and use data to improve programs. Schedule time for feedback and planning sessions among partner programs to identify issues and develop new solutions. Require significant engagement in skill development each week for participants with poor basic skills, focusing on college readiness rather than GED standards. Use peer cohorts and other communities of support to help participants manage multiple responsibilities and build the social capital needed for success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the first version of this guide was published in 2013, there was far less information and many fewer resources available to help state and local policymakers begin the process of crafting and launching two-generation strategies for their areas. The landscape now is far richer – it includes a burgeoning knowledge base on varying types of two-generation strategies as well as the presence of numerous organizations, reports, and websites offering resources to help policymakers engage in the process. For example, the Anne E. Casey website offers a collection of resources that include research and the two-generation rational, state and federal policy, and state-level strategies. This section presents information on additional resources.

**Research & Program Overviews**

- *Two Generations. One Future. An Anthology from the Ascend Fellowship*  

**Guides & Tool Kits**

- Ascend Program at the Aspen Institute 2Gen Tool Kit  
  [http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/resources/2Gen-toolbox](http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/resources/2Gen-toolbox)
- National Association for the Education of Young Children  
  [http://www.naeyc.org/positionstatements](http://www.naeyc.org/positionstatements)
- Race Equity and Inclusion Action Guide  
- Student Parent Success Initiative  
• W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook
• W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Guide
• Wider Opportunities for Women: Pink to Green Toolkit

RELEVANT CURRICULA

• Goodwill of Central Indiana (Career Coaching)
  http://www.goodwillindy.org/education/#excel
• Crittenton Women’s Union (Coaching)
  https://www.empathways.org/our-work/programs/intergen

ORGANIZATION WEBSITES

• Annie E. Casey Foundation
  http://www.aecf.org/
• Ascend Program at the Aspen Institute
  https://www.aspeninstitute.org/programs/ascend/
• Avance
  http://www.avance.org/
• CSBG IM #149 Strengthening Outcomes Through Two-Generation Approaches
• Center for the Developing Child, Harvard
  http://developingchild.harvard.edu/
• Center for Law and Social Policy
  http://www.clasphome.org/
• Community Action Program of Tulsa County
  http://captulsa.org/
• Crittenton Women’s Union
  https://www.empathways.org/

• Educare
  http://www.educareschools.org/
• Education Alliance
  http://www.edalliance.org/
• Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern
  http://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/
• Jeremiah Program
  https://jeremiahprogram.org/
• Keys to Degrees, Endicott College
  http://www.endicott.edu/Keys-Degrees-Prog.aspx
• National Governors Association Center for Best Practices
  http://www.nga.org/cms/center
• National Head Start Association
  https://www.nhsa.org/
• National Skills Coalition
  http://www.nationalskillscoalition.org/
• Institute for Womens Poverty Research
  http://www.iwpr.org/
- Ray Marshall Center, University of Texas at Austin
  http://raymarshallcenter.org/
- State Sector Strategies
  http://www.sectorstrategies.org/
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children Family Office of Family Assistance, Information Memorandums:
  CSBG
- TANF
  http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/resource/tanf-acf-im-2016-03
- TANF & CCDF
  http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/resource/tanf-acf-im-2016-03
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation
  https://www.wkkf.org/
Endnotes


10 Due to budgetary limitations under the HPOG II grant, in late 2016 incentives were discontinued for new enrollees.


22 ASCEND has identified a number of 2Gen “Promising Programs.” For a list of these programs, see: ASCEND at the Aspen Institute. Promising Programs. Available at: http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/programs. Last accessed: 08.02.16.


28 The Head Start Program Performance standards defines full-day programming to mean six hours of care. For this paper we distinguish between programs providing hours of care that match the public school hours: full school day, and programs that provide services that will meet the needs of working parents: full work day.


30 Austin’s systemic two-generation vision statement has been formally endorsed by over 20 public and private organizations. United Way for Greater Austin, a 2014 Ascend Program grantee, recently stepped into the “backbone” role and hired a coordinator for this emerging collective impact initiative. See: Austin Two-Generation Advisory Committee (2015), A Two-Generation Vision for Austin. Available at: http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/resources/2Gen-toolbox/a-two-generation-vision-for-austin.


33 Public/Private Ventures closed its doors in 2012 but the Sector Skills Academy continues.


Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas, November.


Map of Educare program sites available at: http://educareschools.org/our-schools/ Last accessed on: 08.8.16


70 Visit CCRC’s website for more information about its efforts: http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/


73 A parallel Workforce Data Quality Initiative (WDQI) has been underway for workforce development programs with several rounds of funding from the U.S. Department of Labor since 2010. Most states have secured multi-year WDQI grants. For more information about the program and its state grantees, see: https://www.doleta.gov/performance/workforcedatagrant10.cfm.


It is encouraging but probably not surprising that Ascend Fellows have played varying roles in all four of these.


Utah State Legislature 2013 General Session S.B. 53 Intergenerational Welfare Reform. Available at:
http://le.utah.gov/~/2013/bills/static/sb0053.html

http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/blog/entry/colorado-lawmakers-get-savvy-on-two-gen

The committee’s membership includes Workforce Solutions-Capital Area, Austin Community College, Austin ISD, the City of Austin, Travis County, United Way for Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce, the Sooch Foundation and the University of Texas at Austin. The

Ray Marshall Center received support from the Foundation for Child Development (FCD) in part to support the work of this Advisory Committee in Austin, TX.

96 Austin’s 2-Gen Vision can be found at: http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/resources/2Gen-toolbox/a-two-generation-vision-for-austin.


98 See: http://ascend.aspeninstitute.org/pages/top10. Ascend has also convened meetings with national policymakers in Aspen and Washington, DC to explore recommended policy actions.


