

training and home-based services to assist individuals to have the skills to provide those kind of services. We talk about...there was a provision in this law that preempted any other state law that might be in conflict, and allowed the Department of Social Services to override any other statute that might be in conflict. So we take that out and we suggest, if there's another statute that is in conflict, that that be brought to our attention from the Department of Social Services, and the Legislature can deal with it next session. We clarify what's involved in case management, and included in that is the idea that the workload of no more than 70 cases per caseworker. We talk about absent parents being able to participate in self-sufficiency contracts to get some training and assistance, perhaps at their expense. We talk about child care transition being available up to 185 percent of poverty. Currently, it's available up to 110 percent of poverty. We talk about the two-year limit that currently is in the bill being extended if no job is available. We also allow a hardship exemption on the two-year wait. After you've been on assistance for two years, you have to wait two years more before you have the chance to get back on, but we allow for an exemption if a hardship occurs during that period of time. We do...there's a family cap in the original bill. These committee amendments say that that family cap does not stop increased child support or other income made available to that additional child. So we don't block that additional assistance with the committee amendments. We talk about "learnfare", which is you shall be penalized by loss of assistance if your child, minor child does not attend school. This changes the "shall" to "may". It makes it optional that if a welfare family child does not go to school that they may lose their benefit, but not necessarily lose their benefit as in the original bill. We also require increased communication between the school and the family to head off any problems in this regard. We talk about on teen parent support, that that support is not as in the original bill. We do not pursue that teen parent support if the parents' income is less than 300 percent of poverty. We talk about income disregards, and we specify, although it's generally in the bill, it's not very specific, but we talk about income disregards of 50 to 70 percent of earned income so that people can go out and earn income and not be discouraged by losing whatever they earn back into the system. We also recognize that current proposal talks about an ADC reduction in standard of need, and then that money would be returned with this higher income disregard. This committee amendment says if you choose to go with the higher disregard