

**UCLA**

**Working Paper Series**

**Title**

Asian Pacific Islander Community Based Organizations and Welfare Reform

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9ts9f7h2>

**Author**

Vargas, Marcos

**Publication Date**

2000-03-01



## ***The UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies***

*...established to promote the study, understanding and solution of regional policy issues, with special reference to Southern California, including problems of the environment, urban design, housing, community and neighborhood dynamics, transportation and economic development...*

### **Working Paper Series**

#### ***Asian Pacific Islander Community Based Organizations and Welfare Reform***

By Marcos Vargas

Working Paper #33 in the series

**The Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies**  
UCLA, School of Public Policy and Social Research  
3250 Public Policy Building  
Los Angeles CA 90095-1656  
Director: Paul Ong  
Phone: (310) 206-4417  
Fax: (310) 825-1575  
<http://www.sppsr.ucla.edu/lewis/>  
*March 2000*

API community-based organizations (CBOs) can play a critical role in the implementation of welfare reform because they are well positioned to provide culturally appropriate social services that can assist Asian Pacific Islander welfare recipients transition from welfare to work. The research clearly indicates that programs designed for the larger welfare population are ineffective in reaching particular ethnic groups such as Southeast Asians. On the other hand, API CBOs have the experience, insights and commitment to develop and operate programs geared to meet the specific needs of the API population. Moreover, these organizations individually and collectively can be an effective voice in the political and policy arenas, speaking up for this vulnerable population. With government devolution and the shifting of responsibility downward to the counties and local agencies, there are new opportunities for innovation that should include API CBOs in the implementation of welfare reform. API CBOs, however, must overcome significant organizational, financial and human resource limitations if they are to meet the massive challenges posed by TANF.

This paper will examine these issues based on a review of the existing literature and the analysis of a survey of forty-eight Los Angeles based API CBOs. The paper is organized into five sections. Section I provides an overview of API CBOs, describing their growth over the last two decades, the scope of services they provide and recent shifts in organizational service and constituency focus. Section II addresses efforts by CBOs under welfare reform to provide effective welfare-to-work and other related programs targeting API welfare recipients. Section III addresses efforts underway by CBOs with little or no experience in providing services targeting API welfare recipients. Section IV describes the collaborative efforts being undertaken by CBOs in assisting API welfare recipients and addressing the overall effects of welfare reform on the API community, including advocacy, planning and policy activities being undertaken collaboratively by CBOs in response to welfare reform. Section V discusses the strengths and limitations of CBOs in assisting API welfare recipients under welfare reform, concluding with a list of policy recommendations. The paper describes the survey research methodology.

## **I. API CBO Overview**

Over the last two decades, the number of API CBOs has grown significantly, along with a significant increase in the scope of their activities. According to the UCLA *Asian Studies Center Community Directory*, the number of Los Angeles and Orange County API CBOs has more than quintupled, growing from 106 in 1980 to 588 in 1994.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, a July 1997 survey of forty-eight Los Angeles based API CBOs around issues of welfare reform indicates that as much as two-thirds of those surveyed were established in the eighteen-year period between 1976 and 1994.<sup>2</sup>

The organizational and service orientation of many of today's API CBOs indicates a significant influence by the civil rights movement of the sixties and early seventies. Efforts by many API activists of this period, to rally in solidarity with African American and Chicano/a civil rights student and community groups, eventually led to attempts to also improve conditions in their own API communities. These Asian Pacific activists directed their efforts at organizing immigrant workers in the garment and restaurant industry, as well as forming community-based social service programs, such as health clinics and legal aid centers. The objective of these social service programs was to provide culturally appropriate services to Asian immigrants and refugees who were underserved by the existing social service system. The API CBOs established during this period, from approximately 1965 - 1975, represented the nation's first federally funded API CBOs. Over time a number of these CBOs expanded their service programs to address broader urban problems facing API communities, including housing, employment training, mental health services youth programs and senior services. Many of these CBOs were established initially as programs of already well-established API CBOs, eventually spinning-off to form independent CBOs. Some of these CBOs also received limited financial and technical support from several local and nationally based charitable foundations, as well as regional United Way affiliates.

---

<sup>1</sup> UCLA Asian American Studies Center. *Asian and Pacific Islander Community Directory*. University of California, Los Angeles. 1980 & 1994.

<sup>2</sup> UCLA Department of Urban Planning, Asian American Studies Center, and Asian Pacific Policy Planning Council. *Survey of Asian Pacific Islander Community Based Organization Response to Welfare Reform*. Summer 1997.

While there are some pan-Asian CBOs, most CBOs are organized programmatically along ethnic lines, including Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese. Table 1 indicates the growth of Los Angeles API CBOs by ethnic orientation from 1980 to 1994. Similarly, Table 2, which draws from a sample of forty-eight Los Angeles API CBOs, indicates a significant tendency toward services targeting particular ethnic groups versus those oriented toward pan-Asian or multi ethnic populations. Particularly significant is the capacity of CBOs to serve specific underserved populations, Table 2 further indicates a significant bias toward API ethnic populations other than Southeast Asians. This service bias is particularly evident among those CBOs focusing on a single ethnic population, where over 90 percent were oriented toward API populations other than Southeast Asians. Further tabulations of the primary and secondary ethnic orientation of the CBOs surveyed indicates that only 14, or 29 percent included Southeast Asian ethnic populations as one of their target service populations.<sup>3</sup> This apparent lack of inclusion of Southeast Asians in the ethnic service orientation of CBOs indicates a significant limitation in their collective capacity to appropriately provide welfare-to-work related services to the populations with the greatest needs.

---

**Table 1: Los Angeles based API CBOs By Ethnic Orientation**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1994</b>
Chinese	a/a*	106
Cambodian	a/a*	21
Japanese	43	118
Laotian/Thai	1	32
Korean	18	128
South Asian	18	n/a*
Pacific Islander	8	25
Vietnamese	n/a*	n/a*
Filipino	18	87
Tibetan	n/a*	n/a*

---

Source: Asian American Studies Center, 1980, 1994 *Asian and Pacific Islander Community Directory*.<sup>4</sup> \*n/a refers to situations in which accurate counts were not available due to insufficient data.

---

<sup>3</sup> This statistic, however, does not include those API CBOs surveyed of which Southeast Asians have been included under a Pan Asian ethnic orientation.

<sup>4</sup> UCLA Department of Urban Planning Comprehensive Masters Project. *Asian Pacific American Entrepreneurship and Community Economic Development*. 1997.

---

**Table 2: Ethnic Orientation of Forty-eight API CBOs Surveyed**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Single Orientation</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total*</b>
Chinese	4	12	1	13
Filipino	3	8	2	10
Laotian	0	1	4	5
Japanese	7	12	2	14
Thai	1	2	0	2
Korean	5	11	1	12
Samoan	0	1	0	1
South Asian	1	6	0	6
Pan Asian	n/a	5	1	6
Cambodian	1	7	2	9
Multi-Latino	n/a	1	4	5
Vietnamese	1	10	2	12
Multi-Others	n/a	1	0	1

---

\*Several survey informants listed multiple primary and secondary API ethnic orientation. The “Total” column indicates the total frequency of specific API ethnic groups listed one or more times by individual API CBOs as their primary or secondary service orientation.

---

For API CBOs, a shift toward broader service and constituency focus has also been underway in recent years. API CBOs have a strong tendency to target their services to residents of ethnic enclaves.<sup>5</sup> However, in recent years, factors including increasing demographic change have contributed to an expansion of orientation to include more dispersed geographical service areas, as well as greater inclusion of multiethnic constituencies and service populations. One of the best examples of this is the Chinatown neighborhood, which over the years has been transformed from what was once a predominantly Cantonese population to one with a mix of Cantonese and Vietnamese of Chinese descent. This increase in multiethnic constituency and service orientation may also be a result of pan-Asian and multiethnic organizing efforts around common concerns, such as anti-immigration policy and welfare reform. The broadening of API CBOs service and constituency focus can also be seen in the formation in recent years of API regional, statewide and nationally based organizations. Such groups include the National Asian American Legal Consortium and the newly formed National Asian Pacific American Network Council. This

---

<sup>5</sup> Local service focus linked to tendency toward single ethnic orientation, as CBO targets specific ethnic groups residing in ethnic enclaves. LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute (1993) *Beyond Asian American Poverty* LEAP, Los Angeles.

particular shift toward a broader pan-Asian orientation may be a natural reflection of both population growth, as well as part of the natural development and maturing of API organized political responses to public policy issues of concern to APIs state-wide and nationally.

There is a strong indication that API CBOs are increasingly engaging in collaborative efforts with other CBOs. While inter-organizational collaboration among API CBOs includes some collaboration in the direct provision of social services, the CBOs surveyed indicated a strong and apparently growing movement toward collaborative advocacy, planning and policy activities. Of the CBOs surveyed in a 1996 UCLA study of CBOs providing services targeting immigrants, 89 percent of the API CBOs indicated their participation in ongoing coalition efforts.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, of the CBOs surveyed in this research project, just under 60 percent of those which were involved in one or more forms of advocacy activity were also involved in one or more coalition efforts around the issue of welfare reform. This was slightly lower for API CBO social service providers, of which 55 percent were involved in one or more coalitions around the issue of welfare reform. While there is less evidence of inter-organizational collaboration in the area of social service delivery, the current tendency toward collaboration does reflect both a willingness and capacity for expanded collaboration in other service areas, including programs targeting API welfare recipients.

### **API CBO Service Activities**

API CBOs have a strong tendency to provide multiple types of services, including a mix of social services, community development and advocacy activities. Organizational factors, such as specific ethnic orientation, as well as organizational longevity, demographic shifts, and changes in Asian American political movements, contribute to the unique service mix of many of today's CBOs. Moreover, efforts in recent years by many API CBOs to address the impact of changes in public policy on API population have resulted in significant shifts in the range and scope of services provided by these organizations. The following provides an overview of API CBO

---

<sup>6</sup> Estrada, Leobardo, and Vargas, Marcos. *The Effects of Anti-Immigrant Sentiment and Public Policy on California Immigrant Rights and Service Organizations*. Aspen Institute. 1997.

service activities in three areas: social services, community economic development, and advocacy/planning/policy activities.

### **Social Services**

While generally integrating the three service areas listed above, API CBOs, like most ethnically based CBOs, have historically placed a greater programmatic emphasis on social service delivery over other activities. This emphasis on social services is indicated by the service function of the majority of the API CBOs listed in the *UCLA Asian American Studies Center Community Directory*. The same tendency was also found for the API CBOs surveyed under this research project, of which nearly two-thirds provided one or more types of social services as part of their overall program operations. The provision of multiple services by many API CBOs illustrates their broad mission to address the multifaceted needs of low income APIs. On the other hand, the provision of multiple services also represents a possible limitation, as the capacity and effectiveness of programs can be diminished when limited human and financial resources are spread across multiple programs. Furthermore, efforts to maintain a multitude of programs during lulls in funding cycles can also place significant pressures on the overall financial position of the organization.

Services provided by API CBOs include a broad range of social and community development services, ranging from educational services to legal assistance, healthcare/education, and services targeting at-risk API youth. Table 3 lists the number and type of social and community development services provided by the API CBOs surveyed. The most commonly provided social service offered by API CBOs is community education and outreach. Community education and outreach services include programs to inform and educate ethnic populations regarding public health information and services available by government agencies or other community based non-profit service organizations. Community outreach also involves efforts to inform API immigrant communities regarding important changes in immigration law and other public policies affecting immigrants. API CBO effectiveness in the area of community education and outreach is directly linked to their extensive network within ethnic enclaves and within the immigrant community. API CBO's effectiveness in the area of community education and



outreach is further attributed to their bilingual/bicultural, and often multilingual/multicultural, service skills and their years of experience in the development and dissemination of public information targeting specific ethnic populations.

---

**Table 3: API CBO Services**

<b>Service</b>	<b>No.</b>
Community ed./outreach	26
Education courses	12
Citizenship/naturalization	20
Legal Assistance	10
Health care/education	17
Youth	10
Counseling/mental health	15
Technical Assistance	8
Immigration assistance	14
Childcare	6
Voter registration	13
Other	15

---

Many of the social services provided by API CBO service providers target low-income, immigrant and senior API populations. Of the twenty-nine API CBO service providers who responded to the portion of the survey indicating their primary and secondary service population, 55 percent directly target low-income populations, while 52 percent target immigrants and refugees, and 55 percent seniors.<sup>7</sup> The strong emphasis on low-income populations indicates a potentially high level of experience and competency in assisting API welfare recipients. Furthermore, this expertise places them in a good position to assist refugee welfare recipients, given the disproportionately high percentage of Southeast Asian refugees affected by welfare reform.

---

<sup>7</sup> It should be noted that non-recognition of these or other service populations by the API CBOs surveyed as one of their primary or secondary service populations does not preclude their inclusion among the organization’s overall service population.

---

**Table 4: API CBO Service Provider Service Population**

<b>Service Population</b>	<b>Primary</b>		<b>Secondary</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Immigrant/refugee	12	41	3	10	15	52
Low income	15	51	1	3	16	55
Youth	5	17	4	14	9	31
Seniors	11	38	5	17	16	55
Women	5	17	4	14	9	31
Other	0	0	1	3	1	3

---

### **Community Economic Development**

In recent years, a small but growing number of API CBOs have adopted a community development approach toward addressing the needs of their target populations, through the provision of community economic development (CED) services and activities. CED activities being undertaken by API Community Development Corporations (CDCs) and CBOs include employment training and development, business development, housing, community development planning, and, to a very limited degree, neighborhood capital accumulation in the form of community development credit unions. While Los Angeles is home to only two API CDCs, a number of CBOs have, in recent years, entered into community economic development efforts. Of the forty-eight API CBOs surveyed, over one-third are currently engaged in one or more forms of community economic development, while even more are in the process of involving themselves in CED work.

The CED work most commonly provided by API CBOs is employment training and development, targeting low-income residents and API immigrants and refugees.<sup>8</sup> Services provided under employment training and development include job training, job readiness, job placement and employer outreach, and less formal job referral services. Table 4, which lists the type and number of CED services and activities, indicates that approximately one-quarter of the

---

<sup>8</sup> UCLA Department of Urban Planning Comprehensive Masters Project. *Asian Pacific American Entrepreneurship and Community Economic Development*. 1997.

API CBOs surveyed are providing one or more forms of employment training and development. Of these, just under one-half target Southeast Asians as their primary or secondary client population.

**Table 5: API CBO Community Economic Development Activities**

<b>CED Activity</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total</b>
Job placement	9	2	11
Credit union	1	0	1
Job training	7	3	10
Manufacturing Cooperative	1	0	1
Business assistance	3	2	5
Labor/community Organizing	3	1	4
Housing	5	2	7

Community economic development strategies undertaken by some API CBOs have also included efforts to address the low wages and hazardous working conditions of API and other immigrant workers, many of whom are employed by API small businesses. Along with the increase in API participation in CED activities, the early 90s also brought the development of several API workers centers, including the Los Angeles based Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates of Southern California (KIWA) and the Northern California based Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (AIWA). Undertaking an organizing strategy which includes both union-based and community-based organizing, API worker centers are attempting to improve the wages of API immigrant workers by bridging both workplace issues and community issues. Similarly, indicating a concern by some API CBOs over worker rights and economic justice issues, a number of CBOs have become active in broad based multiethnic efforts to increase the wages of low wage workers, as seen in the successful campaign to pass a living wage ordinance in the City of Los Angeles.

**Advocacy, Planning and Policy**

While the provision of social services continues to play the primary function of most API CBOs, a growing number are becoming involved in advocacy, planning and public policy activities.

Anti-immigrant and anti-Asian sentiment have prompted more API organizations to involve themselves in advocacy activities, both in an effort to address the current policy concerns of APIs, and as part of a long-term effort to promote greater civic participation among API immigrants and their political integration into the American democratic system.

The policy issues of concern to API-CBOs are generally not unlike the concerns of other disenfranchised groups in the U.S., including the issues of community economic development, political representation, and public education. However, because of the high percentage of Asian immigrants and refugees within the overall API population, API CBOs are also placing particular advocacy focus on issues of immigrant rights and welfare policy (with a particular emphasis on the direct impact of these policies on Southeast Asian refugees). Health policy, which ranks high among API CBOs surveyed, and likely reflects concerns over a broad range of health issues affecting API communities, may also reflect an emphasis on Medicare-related issues which are of concern to a significant number of API senior service CBOs. The following table lists the issues being addressed by the API CBOs.

---

**Table 6: Advocacy Issues Addressed by API CBOs**

<b>Advocacy Issue</b>	<b>No.</b>
Affirmative Action	15
Political representation	15
Community Economic Development	15
Public education	16
Health policy and planning	19
Welfare Policy	27
Housing policy and planning	11
Workers Rights	9
Police and public safety	11
Other	7
Immigrant rights	26

---

The advocacy activities (including planning and other policy activities) undertaken by API CBOs match the general advocacy objectives mentioned above. These objectives, which generally reflect the formal or informal advocacy mission of individual API CBOs, included: 1) efforts to impact public policy affecting APIs, and 2) long range community development activities seeking to politically empower APIs, which as a group have been historically disenfranchised.

The advocacy/ community development strategies undertaken by Latino CBOs and API CBOs tend to emphasize this dual advocacy mission through a broad range of activities ranging from community organizing, educational efforts and, direct efforts, to meetings with elected officials, to naturalization and voter registration efforts. Table 6 lists these and other advocacy activities and their frequency as utilized by the API CBOs surveyed in response to welfare reform policy.

---

**Table 7: Advocacy Activities Undertaken by API CBOs in Response to Welfare Reform**

<b>Advocacy activity</b>	<b>No.</b>
Community organizing	14
Public demonstrations	6
Community education	22
Public policy development	5
Litigation	2
Voter registration	7
Meetings with elected officials	18
Responses in the media	11
Naturalization	14
Other	2

---

Escalation of anti-Asian and anti-immigrant sentiment in the 90s has prompted many API CBOs to intensify their efforts to impact public policy through active participation in advocacy, planning and other policy-related activities. Such efforts include: community organizing, participation in impact litigation, meetings with elected officials, and public responses in the media. This shift in program emphasis toward advocacy activities among API CBOs is reflected in the level of advocacy involvement among the forty-eight Los Angeles and Orange County API CBOs surveyed. Two-thirds of the CBOs surveyed were engaged in some form of advocacy activity addressing one or more issues, including immigrant rights, affirmative action, public education, and welfare policy. The majority of those CBOs involved in immigrant rights advocacy indicated that their involvement had increased in intensity from previous years.

Advocacy efforts by CBOs in response to anti-Asian and anti-immigrant sentiment have also resulted in an increase in pan-Asian and interethnic collaboration among API CBOs. With the growing number of API CBOs participating in advocacy and other activities to impact public policy, several new API CBO coalitions also formed at the local, state and national level. Furthermore, well-established local CBOs, such as the Asian Pacific Policy Planning Council

(A3PCON) and the Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California (APALC), have successfully undertaken the facilitation of a number of pan-Asian collaborative. With the increase in anti-immigrant policy affecting immigrant communities across ethnic and racial lines, advocacy efforts by API CBOs have also entailed collaborative efforts with multiethnic organizations, particularly Latino CBOs.

### **Program Funding**

Like most nonprofit organizations, API CBOs generate funding from a variety of sources, including government, foundation, corporate, fee for service, United Way, and individual donations. Also similar to the general CBO community, many API CBOs remain, to a large degree, dependent on government funding as their primary source of revenue. Of the API CBOs surveyed, 58 percent depend on government funding as one of their primary sources of revenue. This is substantially greater for API CBO service providers, of which 67 percent depend on government funding as one of their primary sources of funding. Following government funding, foundation grants provide a substantial source of funding for API CBOs, with 45 percent depending on foundation funds as one of their primary sources of funding. With the general diminishing of government funds as a dependable long-term source of support for CBO's ongoing services, many CBOs are stepping up fund development efforts in the areas of corporate and individual solicitation. A number are also charging fees for service once provided at no cost. Consistent with this trend, API CBOs are generating a growing proportion of their revenue base from these sources.

**Table 8: API CBO Program Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Greatest Source</b>		<b>2nd Greatest Source</b>		<b>3rd Greatest Source</b>		<b>Some Source</b>		<b>Not Source Funding</b>		<b>Source Total</b>	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Government	23	48	4	8	1	2	5	11	15	31	33	69
Foundation	7	15	10	21	5	11	2	5	23	48	24	50
Corporate	2	4	8	17	8	17	7	16	22	46	25	52
Fee for Service	2	4	4	8	8	17	10	21	24	50	25	50
United Way	0	0	3	6	7	16	7	16	30	62	17	35
Individual	9	19	5	10	12	25	7	15	15	31	33	69
Other*	7	15	3	6	1	2	9	19	28	58	20	42

\*Other sources include religious organizations and labor unions.

## II. API CBOs Serving API Welfare Recipients

As earlier described, a number of API CBOs are currently providing employment training and placement services, as well as other program services targeting poor and low-income APIs. However, as the effects of welfare reform on API communities continue to unfold, a number of these CBOs are expanding their services to the poor in an effort to more effectively address the needs of API welfare recipients impacted by welfare reform. Indicating this growing concern, thirteen, or approximately one-half of the providers surveyed, have established service programs specifically targeting the needs of API welfare recipients.

The scope of services provided range from traditional forms of welfare-to-work programs, such as job training, job readiness, and job placement, to social services geared toward other related needs of API welfare recipients in their transition from welfare to work, including health services, English instruction, and citizenship services. The following table lists the types of services which CBO survey respondents indicated they were providing and the frequency in which they are provided.

---

**Table 9: API CBO Services Targeting API Welfare Recipients**

<u>Program Service</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Job Training	5
English language	6
Job readiness	6
Citizenship/naturalization	9
Job referral	6
Other	1
Healthcare	4

---

Southeast Asian refugees are disproportionately affected by welfare reform. Of the API CBOs which are targeting their services to API welfare recipients, just under three-quarters identify their primary or secondary service orientation as either Southeast Asians or pan-Asian (of which Southeast Asian populations are likely included). As a consequence, most of these CBOs are attempting, within their welfare-related program services, to address the needs of Southeast Asian welfare recipients, such as linguistically and culturally appropriate employment and

placement services, citizenship assistance and English instruction. Table 8 indicates that following citizenship and English instruction, these CBOs are providing services in job readiness, job referral and job training, and healthcare services.

**Table 10: API CBO Services Targeting Southeast Asian Welfare Recipients**

<b>Program Service</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total No.</b>	<b>Percent*</b>
Citizenship	4	4	8	67%
English	4	4	8	67%
Job readiness	4	2	6	50%
Job referral	4	2	6	50%
Job training	3	1	4	33%
Healthcare	2	1	3	25%

\*Percent of API CBOs which directly target Southeast Asian populations for services and providing particular service targeting this population.

As a result of welfare reform, many API CBOs with established programs targeting welfare recipients have experienced significant internal organizational changes. More than 60 percent indicated that efforts to address welfare reform had a significant impact on one or more of their existing programs. For many, the increase in service demand, in areas including employment training and placement, citizenship services, English instruction, and mental health services have resulted in significant internal pressures. These pressures have included the overtaxing of existing program staff and pressures associated with funding program expansions. Since under one-third of the API CBOs provide program services target welfare recipients, the organizations must make significant reallocations of internal resources. Such internal resource reallocations generally necessitate cuts in one or more other programs.

**Services to API Welfare Recipients in The Context of Government Devolution**

Despite the increase in government funds allocated to welfare-to-work programs under welfare reform, the API CBOs providing services for welfare recipients identify lack of adequate funding as one of the primary barriers to their effectiveness in assisting welfare recipients to move from welfare to work. Despite difficulties by a number of API CBOs in securing and maintaining adequate government funding for employment training, placement and other welfare-to-work related program services, over sixty percent are currently receiving some source of government funding. In comparison, in the period 1996/97 only one of the CBOs surveyed was receiving



government funding for the specific purpose of serving welfare recipients. Furthermore, of those currently receiving government funding as some portion of their overall program budget, nearly one-half were receiving either county or federal funding.

**Table 11: Funding Sources of API CBOs Providing Services Targeting API Welfare Recipients**

Funding Source	Greatest Source		2nd Greatest Source		3rd Greatest Source		Some Source		No Source Funding		Source Total	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Government	7	54	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	38	8	61
Foundation	1	8	5	38	2	16	0	0	5	38	8	61
Corporate	0	0	4	31	2	16	0	0	7	53	6	46
Fee for Service	1	8	1	8	1	8	0	0	10	76	3	23
United Way	0	0	1	8	2	15	0	0	10	77	3	23
Individual	2	15	0	0	3	23	2	16	6	46	5	38
Other*	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	85	2	15

\*Include funding from religious organizations and labor unions.

**Table 12: Types of Government Support Received by API CBOs Providing Services that Target API Welfare Recipients**

Type of Government Funding	Primary	Secondary	Total
City	1	1	2
County	5	1	6
State	3	2	5
Federal	5	1	6

In some circumstances, government funding, which at one time was more readily available for serving the API populations impacted under welfare reform, is diminishing significantly. Specifically, the funding for programs which have historically addressed specific needs of Southeast Asian refugees is dramatically decreasing. This is due primarily to the determination by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to restrict most of their programs to refugees who have been in the country for less than five years. Due to the declining number of Southeast Asian refugee clients who have been in the U.S. for less than five years, funding for Southeast Asian welfare recipients is less available.

API CBOs have also sought non-government sources of funding to address welfare reform. Over sixty percent of the API CBOs providing services targeting welfare recipients are receiving funding from foundations. However, at the time of the survey, none of the API CBOs providing

services targeting welfare recipients were receiving foundation grants targeted for welfare recipients. Private funding, such as foundation grants, will continue to be a source of funding for a few welfare-to-work programs; however, the limitations of such funding, including foundations' traditional unwillingness to fund programs on a multi-year basis, make their viability as a significant source of ongoing program support unlikely. Furthermore, investigations of foundation grantmaking nationally have documented a significant shift away from programs serving immigrants, placing a lower funding priority on API CBOs which are seeking grants support to service welfare recipients.<sup>9</sup>

### **III. API CBOs with Limited Experience in Serving API Welfare Recipients**

In an effort to meet the demand for services resulting from the effects of welfare reform on API communities, a growing number of CBOs are undertaking efforts to expand the capacity of their existing programs, while others are attempting to establish new programs. Still others are attempting, at a minimum, to remain informed of changes in the law and local service availability, as they attempt to provide necessary referrals to the growing number of clients seeking assistance. For API CBOs with little or no experience in providing services targeting welfare recipients, the pressures associated with an increase in social service demand and advocacy needs brought on by welfare reform have been particularly challenging.

While not all API CBOs are being directly impacted by welfare reform, a significant number are. As welfare reform continues to unfold, it can be expected that a growing number of CBOs will directly feel the effects. Of the forty-eight API CBOs surveyed, over half expressed that welfare reform was directly impacting their existing service programs. As might be expected, API-CBO service providers, in part because of their tendency toward comprehensive multi-service delivery, which targets low-income APIs, are seeing a direct impact of welfare reform on their existing programs. Of the twenty-one CBO providers of social services surveyed, over two-thirds indicated that welfare reform was impacting their programs. Of those CBOs that had indicated being impacted by welfare reform, 15, or 65 percent, have little or no experience in providing services targeting welfare recipients.

---

<sup>9</sup> Hispanics in Philanthropy and Asian American/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy. *1994 Newcomers in America: A Grantmakers Look at Immigrant and Refugee Issues*. 1996

As described earlier in this paper, many API CBOs have well-established social service programs geared toward the distinct cultural and linguistic needs of API populations, and are therefore well-positioned to address many of the special needs of API welfare recipients under welfare reform. Despite this clear strength, other CBOs with little or no experience in serving welfare recipients are facing a number of external and internal challenges in their efforts to serve this population. These challenges include: 1) the need for up-to-date information on changes in the law, as well as information on appropriate and reliable service referrals; 2) internal pressures on staffing and general organizational service capacity and 3) significant limitations in the availability of funding to service this population in an environment of government devolution.

While job training, job placement and other employment related welfare-to-work services represent the greatest increase in service requests resulting from welfare reform within the API community, a number of CBOs not accustomed to serving welfare recipients are experiencing an increase in demand for non-employment services. These include requests for information and referral, naturalization, and English instruction. As the implementation of the two-year time limit takes effect, many of these CBOs can expect an even greater demand for these and other services, including childcare, health and mental health services.

---

**Table 13: Services Provided by API CBOs of Limited Experience in Serving Welfare Recipients\***

<b>Program Service</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>
Citizenship/naturalization	7	47
Immigration assistance	4	27
Community economic development	4	27
Counseling/mental health	6	40
Health care/education	5	33
Youth	4	27
Education courses	4	27
Childcare	3	20
Employment training	3	20
Technical assistance	3	20
Job placement	3	20
Community education/outreach	10	67
Legal assistance	4	27
Voter registration	3	20

---

\*More specifically, the API CBO population covered by this table are those API CBOs which have expressed having had their existing service programs impacted by welfare reform, yet which do not provide program services targeting welfare recipients.

---

Most CBO service providers who have been impacted by the increase in service demand resulting from welfare reform are trying to meet these increases while maintaining the same level of staffing. Increased caseload, compounded with the special language, culture, and educational needs, have resulted in tremendous pressures being placed on staff. More established API CBOs, which are typically larger in staff size, have been able to absorb a significant number of new clients, but for most smaller, less established service providers, a significant increase in caseload, but has resulted in a substantial strain on the entire organization, affecting all programs, as well as the organization's overall viability.

As described above, many API CBOs, because of their reputation as a reliable source for information and social services, are finding themselves besieged by requests for services, most of which they do not provide. While considering themselves generally informed in regards to welfare reform issues, many API CBOs continue to struggle to keep up with current changes and interpretation in welfare policy. Many API CBO social service providers are therefore finding it difficult to provide reliable information and referrals to welfare recipients requesting assistance.

One of the greatest increases in service demand resulting from the passage of welfare reform was for citizenship assistance. As indicated by the survey respondents, since the bill contained provisions to eliminate welfare assistance to legal residents, many CBOs have received a substantial increase in requests by API permanent residents for assistance in becoming naturalized citizens. Even those few CBOs which had previously established citizenship programs expressed being overwhelmed by the increase in demand. While many CBOs had referred these requests to other service providers, in an effort to meet the growing demand for citizenship services, some CBOs developed their own programs in conjunction with other CBOs already providing citizenship services, including a number of Latino CBOs, which have well-established citizenship programs.

This escalation in the demand for citizenship services has stemmed primarily from the fears by API permanent residents of losing their existing or future public assistance. However, with Congress' reinstatement of most welfare services to legal residents, the need for welfare

recipients to become naturalized citizens has lessened. For API permanent residents attempting to move from welfare to work, there remain advantages to naturalization, one of which is meeting the citizenship qualification for some government-related jobs. For many immigrant and refugee welfare recipients, citizenship also has the potential of instilling a sense of social membership and personal validation as a contributing member of society. Citizenship also allows the newly naturalized welfare recipient to voice her/his concerns regarding welfare reform and other related legislation by voting in all local, state and federal elections. For CBOs interested in increasing API political participation, the provision of citizenship services targeting API welfare recipients continues to be an organizational priority. In this regard, through citizenship services CBOs address the long-term community development need of politically empowering API communities.

### **Pressures to Reorganize Internal Operations**

While most of the CBOs surveyed indicated that their existing program services have been impacted by welfare reform, few CBOs have found it necessary to reallocate their organizational resources to meet the increase in demand for services. Not surprisingly, CBOs which have included Southeast Asian immigrants and welfare recipients in their service target population and API CBO advocacy groups were those most likely to undertake such internal reorganization. As the effects of welfare reform on API communities continue to unfold, internal organizational pressures to reorganize limited human and financial resources are likely to also continue.

The majority of those CBOs which have been impacted by increases in service demands resulting from welfare reform have experienced an increase in case load while program staffing levels have continued unchanged. This also applies to CBOs with little or no history in providing services targeting welfare recipients. For those CBOs currently unequipped to meet the demands for specialized services, including bilingual and multilingual staffing, the pressures to increase staff size can be expected to intensify in the coming years. For a number of these organizations the pressure to increase staffing may, over time, result in some level of program reorganization, including reallocating human and financial resources to programs targeting welfare recipients, or increasing staffing by securing additional program funding.

Despite these and other internal resource limitations, CBOs with little or no experience in serving welfare recipients have shown a clear willingness to play a role in providing opportunities to help clients move from welfare to work. Of those API service providers which have little or no experience in serving welfare recipients, over 60 percent expressed a willingness to serve as an employer of last resort for welfare recipients unable to secure other employment. While some of the respondents that indicated willingness to have their CBO serve as an employer of last resort may be unclear as to the programmatic requirements for providing such a role, their willingness is one more indication of the overall commitment of CBOs to assist API welfare recipients move from welfare to work.

#### **Funding in the Context of Government Devolution**

API CBOs which target Southeast Asian refugees and receive funding from sources such as the Office of Refugee Resettlement or the Job Training Policy Council have a greater chance of securing future funding to service API welfare recipients. However, CBOs with little or no track record in securing these and other federal funding have less chance of success in securing government funding. Therefore, smaller, less established CBOs continue to have the greatest difficulty in securing government funding.

As already mentioned, while foundation funding for program start-up may be an option for some CBOs, foundation funding is generally limited to one year, often with restrictions on reapplying for a second year. The problem with one year foundation grant funding is the potential for requiring to end the program after one year, or risk having the program run a deficit until additional funding can be secured.

#### **IV. Inter-Organizational Collaboration and Coordination**

In recent years an increasing number of CBOs have become involved in inter-organizational collaboration, particularly in the areas of advocacy, planning and public policy. Consistent with this trend, most CBOs providing services to API welfare recipients are participating in a number of local and state-wide coalition efforts, or are working collaboratively with other CBOs in

efforts to address direct service needs or public policy needs related to welfare reform. CBOs providing services to API welfare recipients are also more likely than other API CBOs to be actively involved in coalitions and other collaborative efforts. Ninety percent of these CBOs are involved in one or more coalitions, compared to 49 percent for the overall sample of CBOs surveyed. These coalitions include participation in such groups as the LA County Welfare Coalition, CHIRA, A3PCON, the New California Coalition, and the California Immigrant Welfare Coalition.

Correspondingly, most CBOs providing welfare-to-work programs and other related service programs targeting API welfare recipients also depend on coalitions and other advocacy organizations for information on issues of welfare reform. As a result, 92 percent of the surveyed CBOs providing services targeting welfare recipients consider themselves well informed regarding welfare related issues. Of these, over two-thirds acquire their information from coalitions and other advocacy organizations, including A3PCON, the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights CHIRLA, the New California Coalition, L.A. County Welfare Coalition, the California Immigrant Welfare Collaborative, the API California Action Network, and APALC.

For the provision of services to welfare recipients by CBOs with little or no prior history of service to this population, inter-organizational information sharing becomes particularly important. Information needs of CBO service providers include information covering changes and interpretation of state and federal regulations under welfare reform, welfare recipients rights, best practice model programming, the availability of funding opportunities in the provision of welfare recipient services, and advocacy efforts underway targeting changes in reform implementation. While information of this type would be valuable to all CBOs intent on providing program services targeting API welfare recipients, for smaller, less established CBOs, with little experience in administering government program contracts and limited exposure to federal and state welfare regulations, information sharing of this kind can be invaluable.

While advocacy and general information sharing collaborative efforts are not uncommon among CBOs targeting welfare recipients, significantly less inter-organizational collaboration appears to

be taking place in the direct provision of welfare-to-work programs. While the most common form of service related collaboration is in the area of cross referrals among organizations, fewer organizations were found to be engaged in ongoing collaborative efforts around service coordination and ongoing service related networking. Ongoing service delivery collaboration among those API CBOs targeting service for welfare recipients includes joint fund development and grantsmanship, and official links to city One Stop Welfare-to-Work designations, including some joint case management. Similarly, among those CBOs with little experience in serving welfare recipients, some inter-organizational service delivery is taking place, particularly in the form of co-sponsorship of outreach and service events (such as day-long mass citizenship service fairs), staff in-service training, and the provision for technical assistance. While there is some indication that service coordination may be increasing, this does appear to be an area of weakness among API CBOs, which, if strengthened, could help ease the problems associated with inadequate financial and human resources as well as creating stronger links to state and private industry. One significant barrier to maintaining this form of collaboration is related to the aforementioned conditions of understaffing and overworking.

While the principle function of most local coalitions is in the area of advocacy and the coordination of activities to impact public policy, service delivery system coordination is becoming increasingly important. Groups facilitating these and other inter-organizational collaborative efforts to address welfare reform include: A3PCON, the Coalition for Humane Immigration Reform of Los Angeles, the New California Coalition, LA County Welfare Coalition, the California Immigrant Welfare Collaborative, and the API California Action Network. With very real limits to the human and financial resources available to individual API CBOs, such collaborative efforts will continue to play a critical role in the provision of services to API welfare recipients by API CBOs.

Lastly, while the survey of responses to welfare reform provided little indication of API CBO participation in collaborative fund development strategies to generate funding to serve API welfare recipients, a growing number of CBOs, including a number of California based immigrant rights and service organizations (IRSOs), have undertaken successful collaborative



government and foundation proposal writing efforts. In this process, one organization typically serves as the lead organization, overall program manager and fiscal receiver, while other participating organizations serve as a larger service network, often participating in joint case management and inter-organizational referrals. This form of inter-organizational collaboration could serve as an effective fund development strategy for API CBOs seeking support for services targeting welfare recipients.

## **V. Conclusion: Engaging API CBOs in the Implementation of Welfare Reform**

Many API CBOs are in a unique position to address the special needs of API welfare recipients under welfare reform. The effective engagement of API CBOs in the planning and implementation of welfare reform requires a commitment by policy-makers, managers of welfare programs and the CBO representatives to collaboratively address the challenges that hinder effective provision services to the API community. These challenges include:

1. cultural and linguistic service needs of Southeast Asian welfare recipients and those of other API ethnic populations;
2. socio-psychological issues, such as the trauma of war among many hard to serve Southeast Asian refugee welfare recipients;
3. overall service needs being greater than current availability of appropriate welfare-to-work services and other complementary services targeting API welfare recipients; and
4. problems of poverty among APIs that are structurally related to the regional economy, as reflected in the high percentage of API immigrant participation in low-wage service and manufacturing sector jobs.

Effective engagement of CBOs in the task of moving API welfare recipients to work necessitates a full assessment of the multiple resources CBOs bring to the process. As indicated by the survey results, CBOs bring a number of organizational and programmatic strengths to

addressing the challenges of moving API welfare recipients from welfare to work. These strengths include:

1. a collective track record extending back two to three decades of community social services, community development, and advocacy/planning/public policy activities;
2. extensive programmatic experience and strong commitment to providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to diverse API communities;
3. multiple service orientation appropriate for addressing the comprehensive needs of welfare recipients. This orientation is particularly important in addressing the multiple needs of hard to serve welfare recipients, including childcare, health services, adult education, counseling and citizenship;
4. committed staff and volunteers;
5. institutional credibility and respect among API community residents and the broader API community;
6. local neighborhood/ethnic enclave focus, which includes a strong awareness of the needs of API community residents, and an emphasis on community development activities;
7. increasing collaborative orientation, both Asian and inter/multiethnic;
8. successful track record among some CBOs in the provision of welfare to work programs; and
9. extensive API community network for the purpose of community outreach and education efforts. This is particularly important for getting out accurate and up-to-date

information about welfare reform and other related policies affecting immigrants and refugees.

Along with the strengths API CBOs can bring to the process of moving API welfare recipients to work, many also bring with them organizational and programmatic limitations. While some of these limitations are particular to API CBOs, others are common to all CBOs. Furthermore, while these limitations can impede the utilization of CBO resources in the implementation of welfare reform, they should not be seen as impermeable barriers. On the contrary, the limitations described below, which apply to some of the CBOs surveyed, can be viewed as challenges necessitating attention in order to most effectively utilize the resources of CBOs. These limitations include:

1. limited experience in collaborative and inter-organizational coordination in the area of direct social services, and in particular in the provision of welfare-to-work programs;
2. limited capacity for program expansion (internal program and fiscal management systems, (particularly in the management of large, government funded programs);
3. tendency toward single ethnic service orientation, while collectively experiencing a significant shift toward multi-ethnic service orientation;
4. current and future demand for welfare to work programs, which are greater than the current overall collective API CBO capacity (i.e., limited number of API CBO service providers);
5. limited access to program funding resources due to limited government and foundation funding targeting API welfare recipients. And for a number of API CBOs, limited experience in securing and managing government grants and in securing foundation support; and

6. lack of adequate participation of CBOs in the planning and implementation of welfare policy and program delivery.

### **Policy Recommendations**

Given the significant service resources API CBOs can bring to assisting API welfare recipients move from welfare to work, it is imperative that strategic efforts be taken to more effectively engage CBOs at every level of planning and program implementation. Since many of the limitations described above result from existing government or philanthropic foundation policies, responsibility for action toward addressing these limitations falls not only on the board and executive directorship of API CBOs, but also on elected policy makers and government welfare program managers. In an effort to contribute to greater inclusiveness of API CBOs in the planning and implementation of welfare reform, the following policy recommendations are provided:

1. encouraging greater effort by government funding programs, such as JTPC, to solicit request for proposals (RFP) from API CBOs for welfare to work programs, and other welfare related program services;
2. establishing foundation funding for start-up and multi-year general operating expenses targeting innovative programs serving API immigrants and refugees, as well as organizational development (capacity building) funding toward increasing longer term organizational viability of API CBOs;
3. promoting One Stop program policy allowances to subcontract with API CBOs for linguistic and culturally sensitive providers;
4. offering targeted government and foundation funding for coalition efforts toward increased and continued facilitation of inter-organizational collaboration;
5. encouraging greater inter-organizational collaborative participation by API CBOs in

the areas of information sharing, direct program service delivery, advocacy, and service coordination.

6. overcoming the limitations of the single ethnic orientation CBOs by encouraging API CBOs to develop greater working linkages with CBOs of other API ethnicities. Greater participation in existing pan-Asian coalitions can assist in facilitating such collaborative efforts; and

7. offering government and foundation funding to API CBOs for community outreach and education.

In summary, the data contained throughout this paper clearly indicates that API CBOs play a crucial role in the implementation of welfare reform in moving API welfare recipients from welfare to work. Their strengths in doing so include experience in providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to diverse API communities and their emphasis on providing multiple service delivery which are important to addressing the multiple needs of API welfare recipients. However, despite the numerous strengths CBOs can potentially bring to the process of welfare reform, CBOs are not a panacea. Many API CBOs, individually and collectively as a sector, bring with them very real limitations in meeting the challenges of moving API welfare recipients from welfare to work, including limited collaborative and inter-organizational experience and a prevailing tendency among many CBOs toward single ethnic service orientation.

Recent increases in inter-organizational collaboration, facilitated in large part by API and welfare and immigrant rights coalitions, indicate a positive step in addressing the many issues surrounding welfare reform. However, other barriers rest more directly on forces external to API CBOs, including the need for greater inclusion in the planning and implementation of welfare policy, and greater expansion of funding support by government agencies and non-profit foundations. Therefore, given the multiple challenges of welfare reform as well as the long-term causes of API poverty, it is imperative that collaborative efforts among government and API CBOs be expanded to put the many resources of CBOs to their most effective use.

## **Appendix Research Methods**

### Asian Pacific Islander Response to Welfare Reform UCLA Survey of Asian American CBOs

The primary objective of the survey of API CBOs was to determine the degree and scope to which API CBOs have been undertaking activities in response to welfare reform and its projected impact on API communities. A secondary objective of the survey was to examine to what degree, if any, the implementation of welfare reform was affecting the overall functioning of API CBOs by gathering information on any significant changes in priority as well as shifts in resources undertaken by these organizations in response to welfare reform.

A joint effort by Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council (A3PCON), the UCLA Asian American Studies Center and the UCLA Department of Urban Planning, the survey instrument was designed with input and feedback from the staff of each joint sponsor organization. The design of the instrument was also drawn in part from a previous UCLA survey conducted in 1996/97 on the impact of anti-immigrant sentiment and public policy on California immigrant rights and service organizations. This UCLA study entailed a survey of fifty-six California based CBOs which provide immigrant rights advocacy and social services to immigrants. The survey which included as sample made up of Latino, API, and multi-ethnic CBOs, provided insight into how best to structure a specific investigation of Asian American CBOs and their response to welfare reform.

Made up of twenty-seven questions, the survey of API CBOs was divided into four sections: organizational background, services, funding, and welfare related activities. Survey questions under the organizational background section were designed to gather general organizational information, such as year established, services provided, organizational ethnic orientation, staff size, and geographical service focus. Responses to these questions were particularly useful given the organizational diversity of Asian American CBOs serving the API community. A preliminary survey of Asian American CBOs in five urban areas (Los Angeles, San Francisco, Boston, New York, and St. Paul) also indicated tremendous variations among API CBOs.<sup>10</sup> The analysis of

---

<sup>10</sup> Fu, V. and Paul Ong. "Asian Pacific Americans in the New Urban Initiative," (unpublished paper). *Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute, UCLA*. February 29, 1996.

such organizational information also provided greater insight into the advocacy and social service capacity and ethnic/geographical orientation of Asian American CBOs providing welfare related services.

The survey's section on services entailed questions designed to gain greater insight on the general service focus of API CBOs by gathering information on specific advocacy and social service programs provided. Given the tendency of ethnic oriented CBOs to provide multiple services, the service questions were designed to establish both primary and secondary services provided by API CBOs. Given the strong service link between efforts around community economic development and the employment needs of welfare recipients, several questions focusing on community economic development services were also included.

The availability of funding to CBOs for welfare related activities, and the ability of API CBOs to access such funding is central to the ability of these groups to engage in the provision of welfare related services and other activities in response to welfare reform. While several state and county welfare legislative proposals and program plans make specific references to an expanding role for the non-profit sector in the provision of "welfare-to-work" and other welfare-related programs, it is not clear to what degree state and federal funds will be made available to API CBOs for services to welfare recipients under the new welfare budgetary guidelines. Therefore, several funding related questions were included in the survey with the intent of gathering information on the overall funding base of API CBOs, as well as the type of government and other private funding currently being acquired for specific welfare related activities and economic development programs.

The final section of the survey focused on specific types of welfare reform social service, advocacy, planning and policy activities being undertaken by the API CBOs. Service related questions were designed to gather information on services specifically targeting API welfare recipients or which have been developed in response to welfare reform, as well as previously existing programs which have been significantly impacted by welfare reform. Welfare related service questions also sought to gather information on inter-organizational linkages, in the form

of participation in coalition efforts around welfare reform, and the sources of up-to-date welfare reform information. Questions were also included to determine to what degree welfare reform is impacting these organizations and what particular challenges they are experiencing in their efforts to service the API welfare recipient population.

The survey sample was derived from a listing of Los Angeles and Orange County API CBOs compiled by the UCLA Asian American Studies Center for the forthcoming API Community Directory. The database provided names, addresses, phone/fax number, and general service descriptions of approximately eight hundred Los Angeles and Orange County API organizations. For the purposes of creating a survey sample of Los Angeles API CBOs most relevant to the provision of welfare related activities, only those CBOs most likely to be engaged in welfare reform activities were included in the sample. Organizations not included in the sample were those from the following directory organizational classifications: arts and culture, media, gay/lesbian/bisexual, and war veterans. The final survey sample included one hundred and thirty-five API CBOs, focusing on organizations involved in social service, advocacy, planning, and policy activities.

The survey was conducted during the months of July and August 1997, a period nearly one year into the implementation of federal welfare reform. The period was also reflected by tremendous uncertainty on the part of CBOs, and state and local government agencies, as the state legislature fine tuned a number of key provisions of the reform act. In mid-July, the survey and cover letter were mailed to the executive directors of one hundred and thirty-five Los Angeles API organizations. The cover letter attempted to convey the urgency of the investigation, and emphasized the survey's joint sponsorship of A3PCON, the UCLA Asian American Studies Center and the UCLA Department of Urban Planning in an effort show the study's broad based community support and its spirit of collaborative participation. The mailing was followed a week later by a faxed letter to all those groups with fax numbers, as a form of reminder and to further encourage participation. Follow-up phone calls were also made two weeks later to those organizations which had not yet returned their completed survey or who had not been faxed a letter.



By the fourth week, forty-eight completed surveys were returned. From a review of approximately fifteen of the surveys, a coding instrument was developed. The development of the coding instrument variables were made up from the original closed ended multi-variable questions, those close ended questions which were answered by having filled in the “other” space, and by creating new variables from answers given to open ended questions. The answers contained in each survey were then individually coded by hand, onto the coding instrument. A template of the coding instrument was put onto a QuatroPro spread sheet. Each of the coded surveys were entered onto the spreadsheet. Once completed, the spreadsheet was saved in a Dbase format and transferred into an SPSS file. In the SPSS program frequencies and cross tabulations were run of original variables. Additional new variables were created by combining individual variables. For example, the combination of individual Southeast Asian ethnic orientation variables were created into one Southeast Asian variable that could be cross tabulated with other variables, such as API CBOs providing job training and development related services. Including the original variables, one hundred and fifty-six variables were created for the final data analysis. Of these, eighty-six were utilized for the final report. It is hoped that the balance will be utilized for future research, possibly in combination with comparative data collected from a follow-up study of API CBOs.

## References

- Estrada, Leobardo, and Vargas, Marcos. *The Effects of Anti-Immigrant Sentiment and Public Policy on California Immigrant Rights and Service Organizations*. Aspen Institute 1997.
- Fu, V. and Paul Ong. "Asian Pacific Americans in the New Urban Initiative," (unpublished paper) *Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute, UCLA*. February 29, 1996.
- Hing, Bill Ong. "A Making and Remaking Asian Pacific America: Immigrant Policy," *The State of Asian Pacific America: Policy Issues to the Year 2020*. Los Angeles: LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute and UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1993.
- Ong, Paul, and Nakanishi, Don. "Becoming Citizens, Becoming Voters: the Naturalization and Political Participation of Asian Pacific Immigrants." *Refraining the Immigration Debate*. LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute and UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1996.
- UCLA Asian American Studies Center. *Asian and Pacific Islander Community Directory*. University of California, Los Angeles, 1980, 1994, 1997.
- UCLA Department of Urban Planning Comprehensive Project. *Asian Pacific American Entrepreneurship and Community Economic Development*. 1997.
- Western Center on Law and Poverty. *California Watcher's Update*. Number 5, August 1997.

**UCLA/A3PCON Survey on Asian Pacific Islander (API)  
Response to Welfare Reform**

Organizational Background

Background materials requested:

- Organization mission statement
- Organization and program brochures

Name of Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Fax Number \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

Main office    yes \_\_ no \_\_

Satellite office    yes \_\_ no \_\_

Organization is a 501©3, yes \_\_ no \_\_

Year organization was established \_\_\_\_\_

Contact person \_\_\_\_\_,

Title \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Which of the following organizational categories best describes your organization? *Please check the appropriate box. If more than one, please indicate your primary activity and secondary activity.*

<b>Organizational Category</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Advocacy, planning and policy		
Community economic development		
Education		
Employment		
Health (including mental health and health education)		
Immigrant and Refugee		
Legal Services		
Senior		
Children and youth		
Other		

1A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. How would you describe the organization's geographical service area focus? *Please check the appropriate box. If more than one, please indicate one primary and one secondary.*

<b>Geographical Focus</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Neighborhood		
Citywide		
Countywide		
Statewide		
National		

2A. If neighborhood focus, please indicate the name. \_\_\_\_\_

3. If the organization has a particular ethnic orientation, please indicate by checking the appropriate box.

<b>Ethnic orientation</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Korean		
Chinese		
Japanese		
Filipino		
Cambodian		
Vietnamese		
South Asian		
Taiwanese		
Other <i>Specify</i> _____		
No ethnic orientation		

Services

4. Does your organization provide any of the following services to individuals? *Please check the appropriate box. If more than one please indicate whether a primary or secondary service.*

<b>Service</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Citizenship/naturalization		
Community Economic Development		
Voter registration & other related		
Health care/education		
Educational courses		
Job training		
Job placement		
Legal assistance		
Immigration assistance		
Counseling/mental health		
Youth		
Childcare		
Technical assistance		
Community education/outreach		
Other		

4A. If other, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_

5. If your organization provides community economic development services, please specify the type of service. *If more than one, please specify whether primary or secondary service*

<b>Community economic development service</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Job training/development		
Business assistance		
Housing		
Community credit union		
Other		

5A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

- 5B. Please indicate the types of funding sources supporting your community economic development service. *If more than one, please specify the primary and secondary source.*

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Government: Federal		
State		
County		
City		
Foundation		
Other		

6. Is your organization involved in any of the following advocacy, planning and policy activities? *Please check the appropriate boxes.*

<b>Public Policy Issue</b>	<b>Currently addressing</b>	<b>Addressing in greater intensity than previous years</b>	<b>Was, but no longer addressing</b>	<b>Plan to increase activity over the next two years.</b>
Affirmative action				
Community Economic Development				
Health policy and planning				
Housing policy and planning				
Immigrant policy				
Police & public safety				
Political representation				
Public education				
Welfare policy				
Workers rights				
Other				

6A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

7. If your organization is an advocacy, planning, and policy organization, please describe its primary constituency. *Please check the appropriate box. If more than one, please indicate your primary and secondary constituency.*

<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Immigrant/refugee population		
Low income population		
Specific ethnic community		
Youth		
Seniors		
Women		
Other		

7A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

8. If your organization is a social service organization, please indicate its primary and secondary service population. *Check the appropriate box.*

<b>Service population</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Immigrant/refugee population		
Low income population		
Specific ethnic community		
Youth		
Seniors		
Women		
Other		

8A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

9. How many paid staff does your organization currently employ? \_\_\_\_\_

10. What are the current sources of your organization's funding?

<b>A. Funding Source</b>	<i>Check if yes.</i>	<b>B. Rank each funding source by what portion it makes up of your overall budget <i>Check once for each column.</i></b>		
		<b>Most</b>	<b>2nd most</b>	<b>3rd most</b>
Government contracts/grants				
Foundation grants				
Corporate contributions				
Fee for service				
United Way				
Individual donations				
Other				

10A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

11. If receiving government funding, specify government sector by checking the appropriate box. *If more than one, please indicate the primary and secondary government sources.*

City	Primary	Secondary
County		
State		
Federal		

Welfare Related Services

12. Is your organization informed about welfare reform legislation and proposed program?

Yes \_\_\_

No \_\_\_

12A. If yes, what are your main source(s) of information? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13. Have any of your existing programs or services been impacted by recent welfare reform?

Yes \_\_\_

No \_\_\_

13A. If yes, explain how: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

14. Does your organization provide program services specifically targeting API welfare recipients?

Yes \_\_\_

No \_\_\_

14A. If yes, please specify the type of program(s). \_\_\_\_\_

15. What, if any, program services does your organization provide in response to welfare reform? *Check the appropriate box.*

Program Service	Primary	Secondary
Job training		
Job readiness		
Job referral		
Childcare		
Health care		
English language		
Citizenship/naturalization		
Transportation		
Other		
None		

15A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

16. What percentage of your total client population would you estimate receive welfare? \_\_\_%

17. How many staff does your organization employ in programs targeting welfare recipients?\_\_\_

18. Under a policy where unemployed welfare recipients are required to perform community service, is your organization willing to serve as a community service employer of last resort?

Yes

No

19. What is the organization's primary and secondary advocacy/public policy strategies for addressing welfare reform issues? *Check the appropriate boxes.*

<b>Advocacy/Public Policy Strategy</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Community organizing		
Public demonstrations		
Public responses in the media		
Meetings w/ elected officials		
Community education		
Naturalization		
Developing public policy		
Voter registration		
Litigation		
Other		

19A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

20. Was any government funding received in 1996/97 tied to welfare related activities (Probe: welfare to work program, naturalization, and community outreach)

Yes

No

20A. If yes, specify type of program, and type of government funding. \_\_\_\_\_

21. Has your organization received additional funds from any of the following types of funding sources to respond to welfare reform issues? *Please check appropriate box.*

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Government contracts/grants		
Foundation grants		
Corporate contributions		
Fee for service		
United Way		
Individual donations		
Other		

21A. If other, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

22. Have you made any significant reallocation of funds and/or staff in response to welfare reform?

Yes

No



23. Does your organization participate in any formal ongoing coalition efforts around welfare reform issues?

Yes \_\_\_

No \_\_\_

23A. If yes, which coalitions? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

24. What do you perceive as the greatest challenge facing API welfare recipients under the current welfare reform? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

25. What do you perceive as your organization's greatest challenge in serving API welfare recipients in the wake of recent welfare reform? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

26. What are the organization's plans over the next two year in regards to addressing the needs of API's impacted by welfare reform? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

27. Are their any other comments you would like to make? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_