

2016

Consolidated and Reformed Workforce Development and Literacy Act (1976): Speech 16

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_19

Recommended Citation

"Consolidated and Reformed Workforce Development and Literacy Act (1976): Speech 16" (2016). *Consolidated and Reformed Workforce Development and Literacy Act (1976)*. Paper 66.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_19/66http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_19/66

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consolidated and Reformed Workforce Development and Literacy Act (1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Issue: At-Risk Youth

Background: The Senate bill provides a separate authorization for at-risk youth programs. The House bill includes an At-Risk Youth Program within its four-piece block grant.

At the staff level, we have been unable to agree as to how much should go to the Governor and how much to the local workforce areas. Senator DeWine, the author of the at-risk provisions in the Senate bill, wants 50% for the Governor and 50% for the local workforce areas, with a provision that 85% of the money held by the Governor must go to local areas. He also agreed to language that would give priority to areas that have large numbers and concentrations of at-risk youth. The House wants only 25% of the money to go to the Governor and 75% to local areas.

Talking Points: I support the proposal put forth by Senator DeWine. Under his proposal over 90% of the money would go to local areas. Further, he has accepted a proposal put forth by my staff that would give priority to applications that serve large numbers or concentrations of at-risk youth. This language is important in order to make sure that money flows to those urban and rural areas most in need of help.

75% local (admin. cap of 10%)
14% local board
6% local providers

25% Governor (admin. of 4%)

TA component

OK if work out geographical