



Safety in the Safety Net: TANF Reauthorization Provisions Relevant to Domestic Violence

By Nisha Patel and Vicki Turetsky

The Link Between Domestic Violence and TANF Assistance

There is a strong link between domestic violence and the financial resources of families. Women living in economically distressed families and communities are more likely to experience domestic violence, and the violence is more severe.¹ In addition, one of the main reasons that women remain with or return to an abusive partner is lack of financial resources. For women leaving battered women's shelters, access to an independent income, along with child care and transportation, are primary considerations in deciding whether to return to their abusive partner.² Although many abused women with children are employed in low-wage jobs, domestic violence can be a major welfare-to-work barrier. Violence and threats may escalate when an abused woman enrolls in job search programs, starts work, or initiates child support enforcement actions. In addition, some women face difficulties maintaining and advancing in their jobs because of the short- and long-term effects of domestic violence on their physical and mental health.³

Many women trying to leave an abusive home rely on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program.⁴ According to the U.S. Department of Justice, financial assistance to women in poverty may lessen their risk of violence.⁵ The cash assistance, child care, and supportive services provided through the TANF program can help domestic violence survivors make the transition from economic dependence on an abusive partner to employment and self-sufficiency.⁶ A number of studies confirm the high level of domestic violence among the low-income women served by the TANF program. According to the research, about 20 percent of women receiving cash assistance are current victims of domestic violence, while about 50 to 60 percent have experienced domestic violence during their adulthood.⁷

TANF reauthorization legislation pending in Congress would make a number of changes to the existing TANF program. Some proposed changes, such as increased child care funding and increased flexibility to pass through child support payments to families, could help domestic violence survivors achieve greater self-sufficiency and safety through employment. However, other changes—such as more restrictive work participation rules—may increase the vulnerability of domestic violence survivors. This paper summarizes key provisions in the TANF reauthorization bills of particular importance to domestic violence survivors and their advocates.

Status of Proposed Legislation

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 abolished the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, created the TANF program, overhauled the child support program, and made a number of other changes to existing programs for low-income families. Funding for TANF and related programs was authorized through September 30, 2002. Since then, Congress has extended the programs' authority on a temporary basis.

In February 2003, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 4, TANF reauthorization legislation. The Senate Finance Committee approved its version of H.R. 4 in September 2003, which went to the Senate floor in March 2004. However, the Senate bill was withdrawn before it came to a vote. Instead, Congress extended the current law through September 30, 2004 and again through March 31, 2005.⁸ Before the bill was withdrawn from the floor, the Senate passed an amendment by 78 to 20 offered by Senator Snowe (R-Maine) to increase child care funding by \$6 billion. Members filed 50 floor amendments before the deadline, including several amendments addressing domestic violence and marriage. These amendments were not acted on. A table summarizing the domestic violence and marriage-related amendments filed in March 2004 is attached.

This is the eighth time Congress has extended authority for the TANF program without a long-term reauthorization. The current extension expires on March 31, 2005. It is unlikely that Congress will take further action until next year. If TANF legislation is not enacted by the close of 2004 (when the two-year session of the 108th Congress ends), both houses will have to start over by introducing new legislation after the 109th Congress is installed in January.

Summaries of the proposed TANF reauthorization legislation, including side-by-side charts comparing work, child care, child support, and marriage and fatherhood program provisions in House and Senate bills, are available at www.clasp.org. Changes to the TANF, child support, and other programs proposed in the TANF reauthorization legislation will have a significant impact on domestic violence survivors and other low-income families. This summary focuses specifically on four key provisions in the legislation of special interest to domestic violence survivors and their advocates: universal engagement, work participation, marriage funding, and fatherhood funding.

Universal Engagement

Current law: Parents or caretakers must engage in work activities, as defined by the state, after 24 months of receiving assistance. Adult recipients may not receive federally funded TANF assistance for more than 60 months; some states have placed shorter time limits on assistance. States must conduct an initial assessment of the skills, prior work experience, and employability of recipients age 18 or older or those who have not completed high school (and are not attending high school) within 30 days of eligibility determination.⁹ There are no specific standards set for the assessment process; nor does

the law require referral to specific services under an individualized plan. Under a hardship exception to the time limits, states are permitted to exempt up to 20 percent of their caseload from the federal 60-month TANF time limit.

However, when domestic violence is at issue, states are given an option to adopt a more specific assessment and referral process under the Family Violence Option (FVO).¹⁰ States that adopt the FVO are required to have a procedure to (1) screen and identify TANF recipients with a history of domestic violence, while maintaining confidentiality, (2) refer them for counseling and supportive services, and (3) grant temporary “good cause waivers” from TANF requirements, including time limits, residency, work participation, child support cooperation, and family cap requirements if compliance would make it more difficult for women to escape domestic violence, unfairly penalize them, or put them at risk of further domestic violence. Currently 44 of 54 jurisdictions have adopted the FVO, while the remaining 10 indicated in their TANF state plans that they make special provisions for victims of domestic violence.¹¹

States have broad discretion to implement procedures for good cause waivers granted under the FVO. However, only states with a federally recognized FVO will receive special consideration when seeking federal penalty relief for failing to meet TANF caseload work participation rates or exceeding the 20 percent hardship exception to time limits.¹² To be federally recognized, the waiver (1) may be granted “for as long as necessary,” but must be reassessed at least every six months; (2) must identify the specific TANF requirements that are being waived; (3) must be based on an individualized assessment conducted by a person trained in domestic violence; and (4) must be accompanied by a service plan designed to “lead to work” in a safe and fair way, which is developed by a person trained in domestic violence.¹³

Proposed legislation: Both the House and Senate bills would require families receiving TANF assistance to participate in work or other self-sufficiency activities in accordance with a self-sufficiency plan developed by the state. Both bills would eliminate the current 24-month period before which states must require families to engage in work and would instead require states to develop a self-sufficiency plan within 60 days after a family first receives assistance.

The House bill would require states to assess skills, work experience, and employability of each work-eligible individual and to develop a self-sufficiency plan for each family “in consultation as the State deems appropriate with the individual.” The universal engagement language in the House bill does not explicitly mention domestic violence in the assessment or self-sufficiency plan provisions. However, the bill explicitly states that the state has sole discretion to define and design activities, monitor and review progress, and make modifications to the plan.

The Senate bill would require states to assess skills, work experience, education, work readiness, work barriers, and employability of each adult recipient, as well as each minor child head of household recipient who has attained age 18¹⁴ or has not completed high school (and is not currently attending high school). In addition, the Senate bill would

require assessment of work supports, family support services, child well-being, and, when appropriate, activities or resources to improve child well-being. The Senate bill expressly permits the family self-sufficiency plan to include domestic violence counseling, mental health referrals, and parenting courses. States may conduct assessments and develop plans “in the manner deemed appropriate by the State.” States must monitor adult participation in plan activities and regularly review the family’s progress toward self-sufficiency, revising the plan as the state deems appropriate.

Issues: Although the details differ in the House and Senate bills, both bills require all families to have plans, and both bills provide broad flexibility on what is included in the plans. Universal engagement plans could be an opportunity to engage with the family and identify needed services and linkages, including those related to domestic violence. However, the universal engagement requirement could also result in increased pressure for families to engage in work-related activities regardless of underlying circumstances and needs. Most domestic violence survivors participating in the TANF program want to work, and need concrete help with housing, child care, transportation, health care, child support, and other services. However, some domestic violence survivors need waivers from TANF requirements to safeguard themselves and their children.¹⁵

Questions remain about how the FVO and the universal engagement provisions would interact. On the one hand, both bills appear to include adequate flexibility to allow for assessments to identify domestic violence and services to address domestic violence as part of a family’s self-sufficiency plan. On the other hand, advocates might choose to argue that the FVO—and not the universal engagement provisions—specifically applies to domestic violence survivors for three reasons: (1) the universal engagement provisions could lead to increased pressure to engage families in work-focused activities, even when not appropriate, (2) the qualifications of those doing the assessments and the assessment standards under the FVO are more stringent than under the universal engagement provisions, and (3) the FVO, unlike the universal engagement provisions, underscores the need for confidentiality. Research indicates that hiring TANF caseworkers with domestic violence advocacy experience is a key to helping domestic violence survivors achieve self-sufficiency.¹⁶

Work Requirements

Current law: Single-parent families are required to participate in work activities for 30 hours per week (or 20 hours per week for single-parent families with a child under six years old). In addition, states are required to meet a federal “work participation rate,” by having 50 percent of their TANF caseloads engaged in federally defined *countable* work activities. Although states have discretion over what types of activities are *allowable* to satisfy families’ individual work hours, only certain types of activities are *countable* toward the state’s federal work participation rate. The activities in which states choose to place TANF participants may be driven by the state’s need to meet its participation rate, as states risk financial penalties if they do not meet required rates.

Under current law, participation in domestic violence services is an *allowable* but not an explicitly *countable* work activity. In other words, states may pay for domestic violence services with TANF funds and allow TANF recipients to participate in these activities to meet their individual work requirements. However, participation in domestic violence services is not specifically listed as a federally countable activity toward a state's federal work participation rates.¹⁷

Proposed legislation: The House bill would require all single-parent families to participate in work and other self-sufficiency activities for 40 hours per week. The Senate bill would increase the requirement for single-parent families to 34 hours per week, and for single-parent families with a child under six years old, to 24 hours per week. In addition, both the House and Senate bills would increase required state work participation rates to 70 percent over a five-year period.¹⁸ Neither the House nor the Senate bill explicitly references domestic violence services in its new proposed work provisions.

In order to count toward the state's 70 percent rate, the work activities must meet certain requirements. For three months in a 24-month period, the House bill would count participation in any activity reasonably calculated to meet a TANF purpose (e.g., job search, work-related education or training, or substance abuse counseling) to meet the full 40-hour week. Beyond the three-month period, the House bill would require the first 24 hours each week to be in federally defined "direct work" activities, such as unsubsidized employment, subsidized employment, on-the-job training, or supervised community service. For the remaining 16 hours, the House bill would allow states the option to define any other work activity as countable toward the work participation rate so long as it leads to self-sufficiency and is consistent with TANF purposes.

Similarly, the Senate bill would count any activities designed to move families to self-sufficiency for three months in a 24-month period toward the full 34-hour work requirement. Further, in some cases, the Senate bill would count three additional months of participation (for a total of six months) in specified "rehabilitative activities" toward the full 34-hour work requirement. These rehabilitative activities could include treatment for a physical or mental health disability or a substance abuse problem. After that three- or six-month period, the Senate bill would require the first 24 hours each week to be in federally defined "direct work" activities (though the Senate's direct work activities are somewhat more flexible than the House's direct work activities). For the remaining 10 hours, the Senate bill would count activities designed to remove barriers to work toward the state's participation rate.

The table below illustrates how participation in services to address domestic violence might count toward federal work participation rates under current law and under the House and Senate bills over the course of a 24-month period. Once again, it is important to note that while participation in certain activities to address domestic violence may not be *countable* for a state's federal participation rate purposes, these activities may still be *allowable* to meet the family's individual work requirement.

An Example of How Participation in Domestic Violence Services Could Count Toward Federal Work Participation Rates.

Time Period	Current Law	House Bill	Senate Finance Bill
First 3-month period within 24 months	Participation in domestic violence services does not explicitly count for federal work participation rate purposes.* Families may be exempted from participation under Family Violence Option (FVO).	By state option, participation in domestic violence services could count for up to 40 hours per week in order to meet the full work requirement. FVO waivers still available.	By state option, participation in domestic violence services could count for up to 34 hours per week in order to meet the full work requirement. FVO waivers still available.
Second 3-month period within 24 months	Participation in domestic violence services does not explicitly count for federal work participation rate purposes.* Families may be exempted from participation under Family Violence Option (FVO).	By state option, participation in domestic violence services could count for the 16 hours above the first 24 hours of work per week. FVO waivers still available.	By state option, in some cases, participation in mental or physical health treatment could count for up to 34 hours per week in order to meet the full work requirement. FVO waivers still available.
Next 18-month period within 24 months	Participation in domestic violence services does not explicitly count for federal work participation rate purposes.* Families may be exempted from participation under Family Violence Option (FVO).	By state option, participation in domestic violence services could count for the 16 hours above the first 24 hours of work per week. FVO waivers still available.	By state option, participation in domestic violence services could count for the 10 hours above the first 24 hours of work per week. FVO waivers still available.

*Under current law, it is possible that participation in certain services to address domestic violence may be countable for up to six weeks within the federal category of “job readiness assistance.”

Issues: Under current law, states have broad flexibility in determining work activities. Although states are subject to penalties if they fail to meet their federal work participation rates, current law also provides for adjustments to participation rates based on state

TANF caseload declines. States have been readily able to meet their rates due to caseload reductions.¹⁹ Because of the flexibility provided by caseload declines, current law has not significantly restricted state ability to provide domestic violence services when a state chooses to do so. As participation rates increase (as proposed in both the House and Senate bills), there will be further pressure on states to allow participation in only those activities that count toward the rates. Although the definition of countable activities does not expressly include domestic violence activities, participation in these activities may count for some purposes. In addition, states retain the authority to allow families to participate in domestic violence activities to meet the family's individual work requirement. Further, FVO waivers from work activities would still be available to families at state discretion.

Marriage Provisions

Current law: The TANF statute identifies four purposes of the TANF program, including: (1) to provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; (2) to end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage; (3) to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and (4) to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. Consistent with the 2nd and 4th purposes, current law gives states the flexibility to use TANF funds to pay for marriage-related services.²⁰

Proposed legislation: Both bills would amend the fourth purpose of the TANF program to “encourage the formation and maintenance of *healthy* two-parent *married* families, and encourage responsible fatherhood.” In addition, both the House and Senate bills would provide significant new spending for marriage promotion activities. The House bill would appropriate \$1.2 billion in new federal funds over six years for marriage promotion and research grants, with an additional \$600 million in federal TANF funds made available as state matching funds. The Senate bill would appropriate \$1 billion over five years for similar grants, with an additional \$500 million available in TANF matching funds.

The House bill creates two new federal funds: (1) a \$100 million annual fund for state competitive grants to develop and implement programs to promote and support healthy, married, two-parent families and to encourage responsible fatherhood; and (2) a \$100 million annual research fund, which must be used “primarily” for marriage activities. In addition, states could use \$100 million per year in TANF funds to match federal competitive grants under a 50 percent state matching requirement. Allowable marriage activities are limited to:

- public advertising campaigns,
- high school education programs,
- marriage education,

- marriage skills programs, including job and career enhancement for non-married expectant and recent parents,
- pre-marital education,
- divorce reduction,
- marriage mentoring, and
- programs to reduce the marriage disincentive in means-tested aid programs, if offered in conjunction with other activities.

Similarly, the Senate bill includes \$100 million per year for state competitive grants for marriage promotion, \$100 million per year in TANF funds available as a state match, and \$100 million per year for research grants, of which 80 percent is earmarked for marriage promotion activities. The activities specified in the House and Senate bills are identical.

The House bill does not address domestic violence. Under the Senate bill, state grantees must (1) consult with experts in domestic violence or domestic violence coalitions in developing programs or activities; (2) describe how the programs or activities will “address, as appropriate,” issues of domestic violence; and (3) describe what the grantee will do to ensure and inform participants that their involvement is voluntary.

Three marriage-related floor amendments to the Senate bill were filed, including amendments filed by: (1) Senator Baucus (D-Montana) to broaden the allowable activities funded with marriage promotion grants to include domestic and sexual violence programs, increase funding to the competitive grants program, and eliminate the research fund; (2) Senator Harkin (D-Iowa) to broaden the uses of the marriage promotion grants to address multiple barriers to self-sufficiency and stability services, including community-based comprehensive family development services; and (3) Senator Santorum (R-Pennsylvania) to increase and accelerate marriage promotion funding.

Issues: Both bills would appropriate substantial new funds for a limited set of marriage promotion activities. The Senate bill includes modest domestic violence safeguards, including consultation with domestic violence advocates, development of strategies to address domestic violence, and voluntary participation. By contrast, the House bill does not address the issue of domestic violence.

Neither bill includes funding for domestic violence activities or training that could help marriage programs develop the capacity to recognize and appropriately address domestic violence. Domestic violence advocates have raised serious concerns that without funding for such activities, marriage programs will fail to respond to signs of domestic violence between participants.

Fatherhood Provisions

Current law: Current law gives states the flexibility to use TANF funds to pay for fatherhood-related services to carry out the 2nd and 4th purposes of the TANF program. In addition, the child support program includes a limited “pay or work” provision, which allows states to use federal matching funds to coordinate with employment programs

when a non-custodial parent of a child receiving TANF has been ordered by a court to participate in work activities. States also may request federal approval to use child support performance incentive funds to help pay for employment and other related services for non-custodial parents.

Proposed legislation: Both the House and Senate bills would authorize funding for new fatherhood demonstration programs and media campaigns. However, this authority is subject to further appropriation, and the programs have been left unfunded in the legislation.

The House bill would authorize \$20 million annually for national and multi-state demonstration projects and competitive grants to public and nonprofit community-based organizations. Grant projects must (1) promote responsible parenting through counseling, parenting education, and encouragement of positive father involvement; (2) assist unemployed and low-income fathers to take full advantage of education and job training programs through outreach, information dissemination, and coordination with employment services; (3) improve fathers' ability to effectively manage family business affairs, including household management, budgeting, banking, and home management; and (4) encourage and support healthy marriages and married fatherhood through premarital education, marriage preparation, marital therapy, and relationship skills.

The Senate bill would authorize \$75 million per year for fatherhood programs. The bill would earmark \$50 million of this amount for demonstration projects, including \$20 million for 10 state projects and \$30 million for other projects to promote responsible fatherhood through (1) marriage promotion; (2) parenting activities; and (3) employment and education services.

In addition, the amount includes a \$20 million annual block grant for states to conduct responsible fatherhood media campaigns and a \$5 million annual grant to develop a national clearinghouse and national media campaign. Under the Senate bill, no funds may be used for child visitation or custody proceedings or for legislative advocacy.

The Senate bill requires fatherhood programs receiving funds to target low-income participants. At least 50 percent must be parents (1) of a child who has been a recipient within the past 24 months of TANF, child support, foster care, Medicaid, or Food Stamps, or (2) with incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty. The House bill does not require fatherhood programs to target low-income participants.

Both bills include domestic violence provisions. Under the House bill, grant applicants must describe how they will “assess for the presence of, and intervene to resolve, domestic violence and child abuse and neglect,” including how they will coordinate with state and local child protective services and domestic violence programs. Under the Senate bill, state grantees must (1) consult with experts in domestic violence or domestic violence coalitions in developing programs or activities; (2) describe how the programs or activities will “address, as appropriate,” issues of domestic violence; and (3) describe

what the grantee will do to ensure and inform participants that their involvement is voluntary.

In addition, the Senate bill would double funding for state and tribal access and visitation grants, from \$10 million to \$20 million by FY 2007. Under current law, federal grants are available for state programs to support and facilitate non-custodial parents' access and visitation of their children, including counseling, education, development of parenting plans, supervised drop-off centers, visitation enforcement, development of visitation guidelines, and alternative custody arrangements.

Issues: Both bills would authorize, but not appropriate, limited funds for fatherhood programs. Unlike the House bill, the Senate bill targets participation by low-income fathers, and permits funds to be used for employment services. A number of studies suggest that increased domestic violence is correlated with an increase in economic disparity between low-income men and women, and that violence may be triggered when women receiving TANF assistance find employment. Some advocates and researchers have suggested that providing employment-related services to non-custodial parents, as well as custodial parents, may help reduce domestic violence.²¹

The Senate bill includes some modest domestic violence safeguards, including consultation with domestic violence advocates, development of strategies to address domestic violence, and voluntary participation. These provisions are similar to those required for marriage funds under the Senate bill. In addition, the Senate bill prohibits funds from being used for child visitation or custody proceedings or for legislative advocacy. This safeguard is particularly important, because women are often threatened with retaliatory custody claims and child kidnapping threats.

Domestic violence advocates have raised serious concerns about the requirement in the House bill that funded programs assess for the presence of, and intervene to resolve, domestic violence and child abuse and neglect, including coordination with state and local child protective services and domestic violence programs. One concern is that fatherhood programs will unwittingly encourage increased contact between fathers and their children's mothers without fully appreciating the risk of domestic violence. Another concern is that fatherhood programs will not have sufficient training or expertise to understand how best to intervene in domestic violence situations without consultation with domestic violence experts. Additionally, there is a concern about potential for inappropriate coordination with child protection agencies, which can have a chilling effect on program participation and cooperation.²²

Conclusion

Given the links between poverty and domestic violence, advocates and others concerned about domestic violence may wish to monitor proposed changes in TANF legislation, as well as any new developments that emerge in the 109th Congress. Whether new flexibility to provide domestic violence services is made available or whether further

restrictions are placed on state programs, legislative changes will impact the ability to preserve safety within the safety net.

¹ Office of Justice Programs, *When Violence Hits Home: How Economics and Neighborhood Play a Role*, Research in Brief (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Sept. 2004), 1.

² M. Davis, “The Economics of Abuse: How Violence Perpetuates Women’s Poverty,” in R. Brandwein, ed., *Battered Women, Children, and Welfare Reform: The Ties that Bind* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999); E. Lyon, *Poverty, Welfare and Battered Women: What Does the Research Tell Us?* (Harrisburg, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, 1997).

³ A. Browne, A. Salomon, and S. Bassuk, “The Impact of Recent Partner Violence on Women’s Capacity to Maintain Work,” *Violence Against Women* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999); J. Raphael, *Domestic Violence: Telling the Untold Welfare-to-Work Story* (Chicago: Taylor Institute, 1995).

⁴ S. Lloyd and N. Taluc, “The Effects of Male Violence on Female Employment,” *Violence Against Women*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999).

⁵ Office of Justice Programs, 6.

⁶ N. Stern, “Battered by the System: How Advocates Against Domestic Violence Have Improved Victims’ Access to Child Support and TANF,” *Hastings Women’s Law Journal*, 14:47 (Winter 2003); J. Pearson, *et al.*, *Massachusetts Domestic Violence and Welfare Reform: An Empirical Study* (Boston, MA: Massachusetts Department of Revenue, 2001) available at www.centerforpolicyresearch.org.

⁷ See, e.g., R.M. Tolman and J. Raphael, A Review of Research on Welfare and Domestic Violence, *Journal of Social Issues*, 56: 655 (2000).

⁸ The House bill, H.R. 4, is named the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2003. The Senate version of H.R. 4 is called the Personal Responsibility and Individual Development for Everyone Act (PRIDE). The legislative text and history are available at <http://thomas.loc.gov/bss/d108query.html>.

⁹ 42 U.S.C. 608(b)(1).

¹⁰ 42 U.S.C. 602(a)(7).

¹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, *2004 Green Book* (Washington, DC: Author, April 2004).

¹² 42 U.S.C. 607; 608(a)(7)(C).

¹³ 45 C.F.R. 260.50 *et seq.*

¹⁴ In some states, individuals are considered minors until they attain age 19.

¹⁵ Pearson, *et al.*

¹⁶ Pearson, *et al.*

¹⁷ It is possible that participation in certain services to address domestic violence may be countable for up to six weeks within the federal category of “job readiness assistance.”

¹⁸ The House bill would “recalibrate” the caseload reduction credit so that states would only receive credit for more recent caseload reductions. The Senate bill would replace the caseload reduction credit with a credit for placing individuals in employment.

¹⁹ States are currently eligible for a caseload reduction credit that reduces a state’s required participation rate based on the amount that a state’s caseload has declined since FY 1994. Because caseloads have declined dramatically since FY 1994, rather than being accountable for a 50 percent participation rate, many states have effective participation rates that are zero or close to zero.

²⁰ TANF spending on marriage-related services under the 2nd purpose is limited to financially needy families, but spending under the 4th purpose is not limited to needy families.

²¹ Office of Justice Programs, 2; J. Raphael, *Saving Bernice: Battered Women, Welfare, and Poverty* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2000).

²² Pearson, *et al.*

**Attachment:
Domestic Violence and Marriage Amendments Filed to the
Senate TANF Reauthorization Bill**

The following is a table of the domestic violence and marriage-related amendments to the Senate TANF reauthorization bill that were filed when the bill was under consideration on the Senate floor. This table is an excerpt from a longer table of amendments compiled by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and CLASP in May 2004. The table provides a brief description of each amendment and comments about the amendments.

Amendment Number	Sponsor	Description	Comment
Domestic Violence			
2946	Murkowski (R-AK)	Authorizes \$20 million annually, FY 2005 through 2009, in domestic violence prevention grants, which the Secretary would award to states, tribes, or domestic violence organizations.	Additional resources for domestic violence services would help states provide better services in this area. The amendment authorizes, but does not appropriate, funds.
2958	Murray (D-WA)	Requires the governor to certify that the state has standards and procedures in place to ensure that domestic and sexual violence is addressed. Also requires the state to provide a written plan describing how the state (1) will address the needs of applicants/recipients who have been or may be subject to domestic/sexual violence, (2) coordinate with domestic or sexual violence coalitions in a state, and (3) train caseworkers for TANF recipients in domestic/sexual violence issues. Prohibits states from sanctioning if such domestic/sexual violence is a significant cause of program noncompliance and allows states to count participation in services to address domestic/sexual violence toward the work participation requirements.	Amendment would help ensure that TANF recipients who need help to address domestic and sexual violence get the help they need and provides states new flexibility to count participation in such services toward the state's work participation requirement. Provides important new protections to TANF recipients unable to comply with program requirements due to domestic or sexual violence issues.
Marriage			
2963	Santorum (R-PA) (Brownback [R-KS])	Increases funding for Healthy Marriage Promotion Grants from \$100 million/year to \$120 million/year in 2005-2008. The	This amendment increases funding for marriage-related programs and research/demonstration

		<p>amendment also increases the marriage-related research funds from \$100 million/year to \$120 million/year in 2005-2008.</p> <p>The cost of the amendment is offset by eliminating the appropriations for the Grants to Capitalize and Develop Sustainable Social Services.</p>	<p>projects. Such an increase is unwarranted. The funding provided by the underlying bill is already substantial, particularly given the untested nature of the narrow set of marriage-related initiatives that can be funded with these resources, and no case has been made that the level of funding already in the bill would not be sufficient to meet the bill's objectives.</p>
2970	Baucus (D-MT) (Harkin [D-IA], Carper [D-DE])	<p>Modifies the Healthy Marriage Promotion Grants in the underlying bill in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributes the funds to states, territories, and tribes based on a formula. Funds for states would be distributed based on population. • Broadens allowable uses of the funds to include pregnancy prevention programs, responsible fatherhood programs, domestic and sexual violence programs, and programs that help custodial and non-custodial parents meet their parenting obligations. • Funds a National Academy of Sciences evaluation of the healthy marriage promotion grants. • Increases funding for these grants from \$100 million/year to \$200 million/year and eliminates the \$100 million/year in funding for marriage-related research and demonstration projects. 	<p>This amendment assures that all states, territories, and tribal TANF programs receive healthy marriage promotion grants and broadens the allowable uses of those funds to give states more flexibility in determining the best ways to encourage marriage and to help increase family stability and well-being.</p> <p>Under the Senate Finance bill, \$100 million/year would be appropriated for research and technical assistance, of which at least 80% is set aside for healthy marriage-related activities. The \$100 million/year amount under the Finance Committee bill seems an excessive and disproportionate commitment of research funds. However, the \$5 million/year figure under this amendment seems too low to ensure that program and policy development in this area is guided by evaluation findings.</p>
2979	Harkin (D-IA)	Broadens use of healthy marriage promotion funding to include programs that address multiple	This would provide broader flexibility to the Secretary in funding activities through

		barriers to self-sufficiency and stability services, including community-based comprehensive family development services.	healthy marriage promotion grants and would allow states and the Secretary to test the effects of providing such comprehensive services in affecting marriage and family stability.
--	--	---	---