

Connecticut
Strategic Four Year State Plan
for the
Senior Community Services
Employment Program

July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011



Prepared by:
Aging Services Division
Connecticut's State Unit on Aging
Department of Social Services

M. Jodi Rell
Governor

Michael P. Starkowski
Commissioner

M. Jodi Rell
Governor

Michael P. Starkowski
Commissioner
Department of Social Services

Pamela A. Giannini
Director
Bureau of Aging, Community and Social Work Services

Published by:

Aging Services Division
(The State Unit on Aging)
Department of Social Services
25 Sigourney Street
Hartford, Connecticut, 06106-5033

Phone: (860) 424- 5274

FAX: (860) 424-5301

Toll Free: 1 (866) 218-6631

“In youth we learn; in age we understand”
- Marie Ebner- Eschenbach (1830 – 1916)

Verification of Intent

Table of Contents

Verification of Intent

Introduction	4
Background	5
Strategic Plan.....	18
Long Term Strategies.....	39
Recommendations.....	40

Appendices

- Appendix A Area Agencies on Aging
- Appendix B CT SCSEP Providers
- Appendix C Equitable Distribution
- Appendix D Attendees and Comments from Public Forum
- Appendix E Comments on the Plan
- Appendix F Letters of Support

References

Acknowledgments

Introduction

The Connecticut Department of Social Services (DSS) is pleased to present the *2008 – 2011 Four Year State Plan for the Senior Community Services Employment Program* as required by the National Department Of Labor. Many changes have taken place since the development of the last Plan. The Elderly Services Division was renamed the '*Aging Services Division*' and merged into the 'Bureau of Aging, Community and Social Work Services.' The Bureau, supports programs such as Employment, Congregate and Home Delivered Meals, Caregiver Support Programs, Elder Abuse Prevention, Information and Assistance, Health Promotion, Protective Services for the Elderly, Conservator of Estate and Persons, Personal Care Assistance, Domestic Violence Shelters, Shelter Programming for the Homeless, and Energy and Weatherization Programs for Low-Income Households.

The Aging Services Division's goal is to assist older adults and adults with disabilities to have a choice in how they want to live, to live with dignity and to maintain their independence. In 2008, the broad themes remain the same: health care, transportation, housing and income security. As the proportion of Connecticut's population over the age of 60 continues to grow, these challenges will affect every aspect of life in Connecticut.

Recognizing that the challenges of tomorrow require different responses, the Connecticut Legislature passed Public Act 05-280 in 2005, establishing a Department on Aging. The effective date for a new Department on Aging is July 1, 2008.

Connecticut can be proud of what has been accomplished to benefit older workers since its last plan. Connecticut's WIA Strategic Two Year State Workforce Investment Plan for the period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2009 presented Governor M. Jodi Rell's vision for the state and support for economic growth. Connecticut's strategy for supporting economic growth is in response to demographic and economic realities including the aging of the workforce, the globalization of the world economy, the projected shortages in critical skills, the need to increase the emphasis on education in science, technology, engineering, math skills and the high cost of consumption and production in Connecticut. Older Workers, including people with disabilities, homeless people, and those with mental health issues must be included in our efforts to ensure that all Connecticut citizens can be productive. Our major priorities are to help reduce the barriers to employment for low-income older adults and to encourage the development of new strategies that are responsive to the challenges faced by future older workers.

Part I
Background

Aging Connecticut:

In 2007, the number of individuals age 65 and older totaled 36 million nationwide (U.S. Census Bureau 2003). They represented 12.4 percent of the U.S. population. The number of older Americans increased by 12 percent since 1990 compared to an increase of 9.1 percent for the under 65 population. By 2030, the number of people age 65 and older will reach 20 percent of the U.S. population. By 2050, there will be about 79 million older persons, more than twice their number in 2000. Since 1900, the percentage of Americans who are at least 65 years of age tripled. In 1990 these individuals represented 4.1 percent of Americans; in 2000 they represented 12.4 percent.

There are 601,835 people age 60 or older and 470,183 people age 65 or older residing in Connecticut. Nearly 18 percent of all Connecticut residents are age 60 or older and 13.8 percent are age 65 or older.

Older persons who reached age 65 in 1998 could expect to live an additional 17.8 years; women could expect to live another 19.2 years and men another 16 years. There are an estimated 50,454 people living in the U.S. who are 100 years of age or older; Connecticut accounts for 785 of the nation's centenarians.

The largest growth rate of older Americans will occur during the next 30 years as the Baby Boomers, those born between 1946 and 1964, reach age 60. Starting in 2006 we saw the first wave of Baby Boomers turning 60. This first wave will continue to 2010 and will contribute to a significant increase in Connecticut's older adult population. The oldest individuals in this group were eligible for services under the Older Americans Act in 2006 and will be eligible to receive Social Security benefits at a reduced rate in 2008. In the next few years, many of these individuals will also begin to leave the workforce through retirement. According to AARP (2001), 60 percent of workers today take Social Security at age 62, making it the most common retirement age in the U.S. In 2011 the oldest baby boomers will be 65 years of age and eligible for full Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Table 1 CT Population Projections for Selected Age Groups

Connecticut Statewide	Projections 2010	Projections 2015	Projections 2020	Projections 2025	Projections 2030
Aged 60 +	711,209	783,959	874,840	956,513	1,001,115
Aged 65 +	515,621	577,083	642,541	723,326	794,405
Aged 85 +	93,698	102,288	105,584	112,044	132,440

Data Source: Interim State Population Projections, 2005
US Administration on Aging

The aging of the veteran population is a major challenge confronting Connecticut as well as the rest of the country. Today, 9.2 million veterans are age 65 or older, representing 38 percent of the total veteran population. By 2033, the population of older veterans will increase to 45 percent of the total. As in the general U.S. population, those ages 85 or

older (the “old-old”) are the fastest growing segment of the veteran population, representing 4 percent of current veterans.

These projections suggest the far-reaching implications of the aging baby boom generation for the state’s capacity to provide health and long-term care services while protecting the economic security of older adults.

Race, Ethnicity and Cultural Factors:

Some racial and ethnic groups have faced health and economic disparity. Assistance must be directed to such groups because ethnic diversity enriches our culture and gives us a variety of perspectives, new models for problem solving, and deeper insights into our own values and priorities.

Currently, older individuals of color comprise over 16.1 percent of all older Americans (65 years of age and older). These numbers are expected to increase in the future dramatically. It is estimated that between 1999 and 2030, the older minority population 65+ is projected to increase by 217 percent, compared to 81 percent for the older white population. Nationally, the number of African-American elders will increase by 128 percent, Asian American elders will increase by 301 percent and the number of Hispanic American elders will increase by 322 percent. American Indian and Alaska Native elders will increase by 193 percent.

Ninety percent of Connecticut’s population identify themselves as non Hispanic White, 5.3 percent as African American, three percent as Hispanic or Latino, one percent as Asian and one percent as multiracial (U.S. Census 2000).

African American and other minority adults nationally show a higher poverty rate, 22.3 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2001), and lower life expectancy, 71.8 years (CDC 2001) when compared with the White population. Individuals who are not members of a minority group have a poverty rate of 8.3 percent and can expect to live 76.9 years. The life expectancy at birth among minority men, primarily those who are African American is 69 years compared to 75.3 years for White men. Similar concerns also exist for other minority groups such as Latinos, American Indians and Asians, where issues of race, ethnicity and health are closely intertwined with the socioeconomic challenges that face these groups.

The North Central and Southwestern regions are experiencing growth in their Russian populations. Providing culturally appropriate outreach and assistance to this group and other minority individuals who reside in the State is essential for overcoming disparities in access to health and social services. These issues, however, add to the complexity and costs for delivering services to such persons.

Gender and Marital Status:

Older women numbered 20.6 million nationwide in 2000 while older men numbered 14.4 million. The ratio of older women to older men was 146 to 100 respectively. Connecticut reported a similar gender ratio with 147 older women to 100 older men.

Fifty-six percent of persons between the ages of 65 and 84 are women; women comprise 60 percent of individuals age 85 and older. Twenty-seven percent of women between the age 65 and 84 have lost their spouse, 61 percent of those age 85 and older are widowed. Women have a longer life expectancy than men; they also tend to marry men who are two or three years older than they are; hence, they have a much higher probability of losing their spouse.

Being unmarried (widowed, divorced, separated, or never married) increases a woman's vulnerability to poverty. (Weitz and Estes 2001). According to the Social Security Administration (1998), 50 percent of older unmarried women rely on Social Security for 80 percent of their income. Social Security is the sole source of income for 25 percent of the nation's older women.

The higher rate of poverty among older women remains a primary issue today. Older women have a poverty rate of 11.8 percent compared to 6.9 percent for older men. Several major factors contribute to their diminished economic circumstances. During their working years, women continue to lag behind men in earnings and benefits. According to the Census Bureau (2001), the median earnings for full-time, female employees in Connecticut in 2000 were \$24,978 or 77 percent of men's earnings. One explanation of the lower earnings by women is their intermittent work history due to their roles as the primary family caregiver of children and parents. Furthermore, by virtue of living an average of six years longer than men, women are more likely to decrease their financial security by financing the uninsured medical and long-term care expenses incurred by ill husbands. Because of these and other factors, women age 75 and older are twice as likely to be poor as men the same age. African American women 75 and older are six times as likely to be poorer than White men the same age (IRWG 2002).

Older women living in retirement are at greater economic risk than men. In 1993 women age 65 and older had a median annual income that was 57 percent of their male peers. In 1995 the average Social Security benefit for women was \$538 per month compared with \$858 for men. Not only are women's Social Security payments less than men's but such payments are likely to be their only source of income. Economic disparities may decrease in the future as more women receive higher retirement income benefits from Social Security, pensions and other retirement savings. The women, however, who are most likely to have increased Social Security benefits, are wealthier baby boomers, who are likely to be white. Women of color will likely continue to be poorer.

Economic and Labor Market in Connecticut

Connecticut's industrial make-up, along with the rest of the nation, will continue its shift from a manufacturing-based to a service-economy. By 2014, the manufacturing industry will employ less than 10 percent of the workforce.

Connecticut will continue to be dependent on the defense and insurance industries but must look at diversity in the fields of research and development, medical device manufacturing, biotechnology, recreation and tourism.

The projection is that a large number of high-tech, knowledge-driven jobs will grow out of such industries as healthcare, finance, insurance, fuel cell, medical device and fiber optics requiring highly skilled workers.

It is expected that the majority of Connecticut's employment growth will come from its service industry in the Health Care and Social Assistance sector. There will be a demand for healthcare professionals as hospitals, community care facilities, and personal care services generate thousands of new jobs to keep pace with the State's aging population. There will be a greater need for registered nurses and practical nurses.

Gaming expansions and lifestyle changes will drive the growth of food services jobs and the creation of additional accommodations in the hotel industry. The educational services industry will add nearly 1,300 jobs annually over the next decade to address teacher retirements.

There will be an increase of 2,600 jobs in Connecticut's trade, transportation, and utilities for each year during the next ten-year period. Specialized services in the accounting, tax preparation, engineering and computer systems services will continue to grow more than 2,500 jobs annually.

With a rise in highway and commercial building construction, construction and extraction occupations are forecasted to grow by over six percent.

The State's hospitality and leisure sector in the next ten years will provide 2,100 annual openings led by the success in the southeast of the State's casinos which has produced a demand for workers in food preparation and serving-related occupations.

In summary, Connecticut's manufacturing employment will decline as jobs with low-skilled responsibilities are eliminated and plants become more modernized. Modern manufacturing plants require a more sophisticated and higher skilled workforce. This will lead to increased opportunities for Connecticut's workers.

(Reference: State of Connecticut Strategic Two-Year State Workforce Investment Plan for Title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1989- Connecticut Department of Labor, 2007)

Summary of 2005 Area Agency Needs Assessment Findings

Between November 15, 2005 and December 30, 2005 Connecticut's five area agencies on aging conducted an extensive survey of the needs felt by participants in Older Americans Act (OAA) funded programs and other older persons. Altogether 1,101 older persons completed survey questionnaires. Respondents included participants in at least 120 service programs for the elderly and residents of at least 124 towns. The questionnaires used in the survey contained 83 separate questions dealing with nine major concerns, 32 separately delineated needs, and a number of demographic and attitudinal characteristics. These questionnaires were based on a survey developed by the Agency on Aging of South Central Connecticut (AASCC) for an earlier study and

refined through a series of focus groups conducted by the area agencies during October of 2004. AASCC trained staff in the use of the questionnaires, coordinated data collection efforts and tabulated the results.

The participating area agencies and associated service programs solicited survey respondents. Because the sampling procedure was not random (as would be the case in a national opinion poll for example) it is not clear as to how representative respondents are of any larger population. They were, however, drawn primarily from participants in area agency funded or operated service programs and their responses can be reasonably viewed as reflective of the problems and concerns of the people who regularly use these programs. Table 2 “Comparison of Demographic Characteristics”, beginning on page 13 compares certain of the respondents’ demographic characteristics with those of participants in OAA funded programs recorded by the Department of Social Services’ management information system. The table also provides a column with comparable percentages from the 2000 census. Respondents were generally similar to survey respondents only a little younger, a little more likely to be women, a little more likely to be African-American or Hispanic, a little less likely to be married, and a bit more likely to have very low incomes. Both groups contained a much high proportion of women, poor people, minority group members, very old individuals, single persons and renters than the general elderly population in Connecticut.

Health and health related concerns completely dominated the needs identified by clients. Health was the most commonly identified concern. Most of the top ranking needs dealt with services that would be useful for persons struggling with difficulties induced or exacerbated by failing health. Even the widespread concern with transportation could be the result of mobility impairments brought on by declining health. A multivariable regression analysis looking at the number and severity of the needs identified by respondents found that a poor health assessment was the best overall predictor of the number of needs respondents identified.

Financial concerns were the next most common needs identified by these respondents. This is not surprising given the very low incomes reported by respondents, yet no specific financial need was identified by more than half of the respondents. The two most commonly identified financial needs, “paying for medications” and “paying for medical care” could be as reflective of the health status of respondents as of their financial concerns. Assistance with financial management, a potentially useful and cost effective program provided by many area agencies, both in Connecticut and elsewhere, seemed to have been of interest to a little less than a third of survey respondents.

Transportation was the third most commonly identified concern and the second most commonly identified need. As noted above, transportation needs are often associated with declining health, a concern well attested to within the respondent population. It has also been documented as a problem of low-income individuals in general, and most respondents reported very low incomes. As anyone who deals with the elderly or other limited mobility populations should be aware, Connecticut has a very fragmented and inconsistent public transportation system. People without access to an automobile are assured of some level of difficulty in getting around and people without resources are

most likely to find themselves in this situation. Area agencies and advocates for the elderly have long been aware of this need and have initiated many creative programs to address it. The persistence of the problem is more likely a reflection of the system's lack of resources rather than any failing of effort or vision. This finding should encourage the elderly services network to persist in its effort to strengthen elderly transportation services.

In past studies, housing needs were highly associated with the overall number of needs expressed. While this relationship was not specifically examined in this data, the pattern is likely to hold. Apparently changes in one's life status – the death of a spouse, declining health, changes in household composition or income – encourage people to look for alternatives to their current housing arrangements. Most of these respondents were probably not in the midst of a life altering transition at the time they were surveyed, so the expression of housing concerns was relatively modest compared to other areas. One finding of the multiple variable regression analysis that ought to be noted is that senior housing residence was a negative predictor of the overall number of needs identified. To put it another way, people who had a number of characteristics that predicted a high number of needs but who were elderly housing residents had a lower number of needs than those who were not. This finding suggests that senior housing provides some extra benefit to high-risk individuals.

Older people are notoriously unwilling to admit to emotional or psychological concerns. The relatively high proportion of respondents (around 40 percent) who identified loneliness or emotional well being as needs was unusual in needs studies of the elderly. Since this was not a random probability survey, the interpretation is not certain. This finding supports the position that mental health is often a neglected area when it comes to elderly services and that some experts believe that older people suffer from a great deal of undiagnosed depression.

Most of the respondents to this study were not living with either spouses or grandchildren, so that needs associated with either spousal care or child or grandchild care were not commonly expressed. Respondents who did, however, express a need for either spousal or child care, were significantly more likely to be male, Hispanic and indicate a general need for some or a lot of help.

Information and assistance is a very commonly expressed need in many studies of the older population. The general population is typically not very familiar with the services available to older adults; therefore finding such services, when needed, could be a problem. While concern about finding help was not insignificant in this study, most of the respondents to this survey were already receiving some form of benefit from the aging network and had a starting place to seek additional assistance. It is not unreasonable to believe that informational services would probably have had a higher priority among an unaffiliated set of respondents. Taking that into consideration, however, it is interesting to note that doctors are mentioned more often than any other information source except for friends or neighbors. The level of health concern in this set of respondents may make doctors or doctors' offices a particularly important link in their search for assistance.

As mentioned earlier, part of the analysis of the survey was to look at the relationship that various demographic and psychosocial variables had to the overall number and severity of problems reported by respondents. The purpose was to try and determine if there were subgroups in the population who were particularly vulnerable and in need of additional attention. Multiple regression attempts to predict the number of needs (or some other score) that individuals will have based on correlations between the various independent measures (or variables) and the dependent measure or score (in this case needs). It does this by calculating the amount of the variation between the observed and predicted score that can be attributed to a particular variable. The essence is to find the best predictors of the dependent score. Thirteen variables were examined using this methodology. They were: Gender, Age, Income, Hispanic Identity, African-American Identity, Marital Status, Own House, Private Apartment, Senior Housing, Self-Assessed Health, Outlook, General Self-View, and Activity Level. The equation that best fit the observed results explained about 23 percent of the variance, which is respectable for social science research. The following variables were included in the final equation in order of their predictive value: Self Assessed Health, Outlook, Income, General Self-View, Hispanic Identity, Activity Level, Senior Housing Residence and African-American Identity. This is interesting because, among the elderly, age and income are often associated with measures of vulnerability. In this set of respondents, when self-assessed health and psychosocial variables such as general self-view and outlook were known, knowing age and gender did not add to the predictability of the equation. What this means, at least for people like these survey respondents, is that if you want to know how vulnerable they are likely to be, it is more important to know the self-assessment of their health and what they think of their outlook than to know their age or their gender.

The rates of response for individual needs, cross-tabulated by area and social and demographic characteristics can be found in the following tables. Significant associations are marked. Those marked with a ** have about one chance in a hundred of occurring by chance. Those marked with a * have one chance in twenty of occurring by chance. Those marked with a ~ have one chance in ten of occurring by chance. By convention, the first two are considered statistically significant. The third is considered borderline.

Note: Area (1) Southwest Connecticut Area Agency on Aging, Area (2) Agency on Aging at South Central Connecticut, Area (3) Eastern Connecticut Area Agency on Aging(Senior Resources), Area (4) North Central Area Agency on Aging. Area (5) Western Connecticut Area Agency on Aging

Table 2 Comparison of Demographic Characteristics

	Area					Average	Significance	Total Valid Cases (Not Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5			
Total Questionnaires	174	402	105	324	96			
Concern								
Health	88.9%	85.1%	86.3%	85.5%	88.4%	86.2%		1,075
Fiscal	81.5%	72.1%	66.7%	70.1%	72.2%	72.6%	*	1,042
Spouse's Health	44.7%	35.5%	53.1%	51.2%	52.1%	44.3%	**	592
Children	68.0%	63.0%	65.2%	65.1%	68.2%	64.6%		938
Grandchildren	66.2%	60.0%	57.8%	62.1%	59.0%	61.3%		907
Living Location	52.7%	43.9%	37.1%	43.5%	41.4%	44.4%		1,020
Friends	50.9%	37.2%	25.6%	40.8%	37.5%	39.5%	**	1,021
Transportation	62.4%	57.6%	54.5%	59.1%	47.9%	57.6%		1,062
Rights	59.9%	46.9%	47.3%	47.7%	44.4%	49.0%	*	1,040
Finding Help	65.5%	46.6%	51.1%	47.5%	39.6%	49.8%	**	1,049
Need								
Physical Health	67.6%	69.3%	57.1%	67.8%	45.2%	65.4%	**	1,075
Emotional Well-Being	54.8%	43.6%	32.3%	39.5%	28.6%	41.8%	**	1,049
Self-Care	47.0%	49.7%	26.3%	43.2%	23.9%	42.9%	**	1,054
Spousal Care	31.4%	22.3%	17.9%	28.5%	19.6%	25.0%		628
Child Care	20.0%	17.7%	11.0%	14.7%	7.0%	15.7%	~	853
Grandchild Care	25.7%	18.6%	8.2%	16.3%	8.6%	17.4%	*	841
Grief	39.9%	33.3%	36.4%	34.6%	29.3%	34.7%		871
Maintaining Friendships	35.5%	25.1%	28.6%	27.3%	20.0%	27.3%	~	1,052
Intergenerational Contact	22.7%	19.0%	23.7%	25.9%	15.7%	21.8%		1,024
Loneliness	56.3%	43.8%	40.6%	39.5%	25.3%	42.6%	**	1,056

	Area					Average	Significance	Total Valid Cases (Not Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5			
Transportation	59.4%	64.7%	47.9%	58.3%	35.2%	57.9%	*	1,059
Mobility	55.4%	58.7%	46.3%	52.3%	31.9%	52.9%	**	1,052
Safety Out of the Home	39.8%	38.9%	24.0%	33.2%	18.7%	34.2%	*	1,049
Safety at Home	53.0%	53.3%	40.6%	47.8%	31.1%	48.5%	**	1,041
Finding Help	52.6%	41.1%	35.1%	43.7%	28.3%	42.1%	**	1,051
Finding a Place to Live	28.2%	28.4%	18.9%	27.1%	19.4%	26.3%		1,038
Paying for Housing	38.6%	34.7%	29.5%	34.2%	18.9%	33.3%	**	1,044
Paying for Utilities	43.1%	36.6%	30.8%	37.1%	33.0%	37.0%		1,041
Taxes	36.0%	23.8%	24.2%	28.6%	19.8%	26.9%	*	990
Chores	54.9%	58.2%	42.1%	47.1%	39.1%	51.2%	**	1,039
Homemaker or Home Health Aid	46.7%	40.4%	24.7%	35.8%	28.6%	37.6%	*	1,043
Trustworthy Helpers	54.4%	42.1%	34.7%	37.8%	23.3%	40.6%	**	1,042
Family Understanding	43.0%	36.5%	30.1%	33.4%	24.7%	35.1%	*	1,028
Meals and Nutritional Advice	30.2%	30.3%	24.1%	29.6%	22.2%	29.1%		1,032
Grocery Shopping	46.5%	56.5%	31.3%	43.3%	31.9%	46.5%	**	1,051
Ordering Finances	39.5%	34.4%	27.4%	32.1%	25.3%	33.1%		1,044
Managing Bills	40.4%	30.9%	27.1%	30.9%	20.9%	31.2%	*	1,044
Understanding Medical Benefits	58.4%	45.5%	38.0%	38.4%	41.3%	44.5%	**	1,054
Medical Costs	53.2%	42.9%	37.5%	37.8%	26.7%	41.2%	**	1,036
Cost of Medications	53.8%	42.5%	35.8%	42.1%	31.1%	42.7%	**	1,036
Finding Helping Agencies	55.9%	45.8%	41.8%	45.0%	41.8%	46.5%	~	1,050
Preventing Illness	46.7%	39.9%	37.9%	39.0%	27.8%	39.5%	~	1,032
Keeping Active	34.9%	33.9%	33.7%	33.3%	20.4%	32.7%		1,047

	Area					Average	Significance	Total Valid Cases (Not Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5			
Count of All Problems Reported							**	1,101
None	4.6%	4.7%	14.3%	6.2%	15.6%	7.0%		
1 to 5	20.1%	18.9%	21.0%	25.0%	30.2%	22.1%		
6 to 10	19.0%	25.9%	27.6%	22.5%	17.7%	23.3%		
11 to 20	30.5%	32.6%	22.9%	26.9%	31.3%	29.5%		
21 or more	25.9%	17.9%	14.3%	19.4%	5.2%	18.2%		
Problem Score							**	1,101
None	4.2%	4.7%	14.3%	6.1%	15.6%	6.9%		
1 to 5	17.6%	15.0%	19.0%	22.6%	27.1%	19.1%		
6 to 15	30.9%	37.7%	38.1%	33.4%	33.4%	31.3%		
15 to 25	21.2%	21.7%	15.2%	17.8%	14.6%	19.2%		
26 or more	26.1%	20.9%	13.3%	20.1%	11.5%	19.9%		
scored as 0								
Social and Demographic Variables								
Gender								1,074
Female	81.5%	80.8%	77.9%	75.9%	76.8%	78.9%		
Male	18.5%	19.2%	22.1%	24.1%	23.2%	21.1%		
Age							**	1,069
Under 65	10.1%	10.8%	23.9%	12.4%	10.5%	12.3%		
65 to 74	34.3%	25.4%	29.3%	32.4%	38.9%	30.4%		
75 to 84	40.2%	46.0%	33.7%	41.0%	31.6%	41.3%		
85 or Older	15.4%	17.8%	13.0%	14.3%	18.9%	16.1%		
African-American	27.2%	13.1%	2.0%	14.6%	4.3%	14.0%	**	1,070
Hispanic or Latino	15.6%	11.1%	0.0%	5.8%	1.1%	8.4%	**	1,070
Relative Income							**	1,029
Poor	15.2%	22.1%	12.8%	17.1%	9.4%	17.6%		

	Area					Average	Significance	Total Valid Cases (Not Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5			
Low-income	53.2%	54.5%	37.2%	46.1%	38.5%	49.0%		
Modest or above	19.3%	12.4%	19.2%	20.1%	34.4%	18.4%		
Refused	12.3%	11.1%	30.8%	16.8%	17.7%	15.1%		
Education							~	1,067
Not High School Graduate	38.0%	38.0%	43.5%	38.8%	21.1%	37.2%		
High School Graduate	38.0%	39.3%	33.7%	36.3%	43.2%	38.1%		
Some College or College Graduate	24.1%	22.7%	22.8%	24.9%	35.8%	24.7%		
Employment							*	1,072
Not Currently Working	67.8%	81.7%	70.3%	81.8%	67.0%	77.2%		
Employed Full-time	4.1%	2.8%	5.5%	2.2%	5.3%	3.3%		
Employed Part-time	14.0%	3.3%	6.6%	6.9%	12.8%	7.2%		
Volunteer	14.0%	12.3%	17.6%	9.1%	14.9%	12.3%		
Current Marital Status							*	1,068
Couple	25.0%	19.2%	28.3%	27.5%	32.6%	24.5%		
Currently Alone	75.0%	80.8%	71.7%	72.5%	67.4%	75.5%		
Family Unit							**	866
One Person	59.7%	71.5%	50.0%	61.8%	52.6%	62.9%		
Two People	26.4%	21.4%	31.8%	29.0%	38.5%	27.0%		
Three or More People	14.0%	7.1%	18.2%	9.2%	9.0%	10.0%		
Housing							**	1,075
House	42.8%	35.3%	42.4%	37.4%	47.9%	38.9%		
Apartment	19.7%	18.5%	10.1%	18.7%	5.3%	16.8%		
Senior, Congregate or Assisted Housing	31.8%	39.1%	43.4%	40.6%	43.6%	39.2%		
Other	5.8%	7.0%	4.0%	3.2%	3.2%	5.1%		

	Area					Average	Significance	Total Valid Cases (Not Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5			
Self-Assessed Health							**	1,099
Good or Better	70.1%	66.6%	75.2%	68.5%	91.6%	70.7%		
Not So Good	29.9%	33.4%	24.8%	31.5%	8.4%	29.3%		
Self-View							**	1,098
Great or Good	79.3%	70.6%	74.3%	77.8%	91.5%	76.2%		
Less Than Good	20.7%	29.4%	25.7%	22.2%	8.5%	23.8%		
Outlook							**	1,088
Positive	59.8%	57.9%	51.0%	64.2%	74.0%	60.8%		
Neutral	29.3%	26.9%	35.6%	20.4%	19.8%	25.6%		
Negative	10.9%	15.2%	13.5%	15.3%	6.3%	13.6%		
Independence							*	1,067
Needs a lot of help	10.7%	17.2%	8.8%	11.4%	7.4%	12.8%		
Needs some help	49.4%	49.2%	46.1%	45.1%	44.2%	47.3%		
Needs little or no help	39.9%	33.6%	45.1%	43.5%	48.4%	39.8%		

Concern = Percent very or somewhat concerned

Need = Percent who very much or somewhat need help

Significance:

~ = 0.10 significance level

* = 0.05 significance level

** = 0.01 significance level

Part II

Senior Community Services Employment Program

Strategic Plan

Section I. Purpose of the State Plan

This State Plan focuses on Title V of the Older Americans Act (OAA), which is the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP). The State Plan's purpose is to describe the statewide provision of authorized activities for eligible individuals who desire employment training and gainful employment. In applicable sections, the Plan describes current operations and long term strategies, including workforce development, to be implemented over the next four years. The goal is to continuously improve services offered to the Program's targeted population. The Plan is a living document that will be adjusted over the years to guide the ongoing operations and strategies of SCSEP in Connecticut.

SCSEP creates subsidized work experience opportunities and provides job skills training and supportive services for Connecticut's older workers. Enrollment in SCSEP is open to job seekers, age 55 and older, with a family income at 125 percent or less of the poverty levels established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

With eventual unsubsidized employment as a goal, the Program provides subsidized work experience at host training sites as well as guidance, training, counseling and workshops through the national sponsors and sub grantees. The Program contributes to vital community service activities by assigning productive trainees the opportunity to receive work experience that will help them become more competitive for employment.

The State of Connecticut receives OAA funding for the Senior Community Service Employment Program through an annual grant with the U.S. Department of Labor. Connecticut Department of Social Services, Aging Services Division and national sponsors are grantees and the Administrators of the program. The Division is the State Unit on Aging. The two national sponsors, Easters Seals and the WorkPlace, Inc. work collaboratively with the State Unit on Aging.

The Division is one of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) partners in the State's One-Stop Career Center system. The One-Stop Career Centers are located throughout the state; and the sharing of resources and information are encouraged between the Centers and SCSEP to provide effective services for Connecticut's older workers. Future coordination will increasingly emphasize workforce development in view of demographics and job market changes.

Section 2. Involvement of Organizations and Individuals

A forum was held on April 17, 2008 to gather input on the future of older workers in Connecticut and to develop long-term employment strategies to assist low-income older adults. An array of state and local advocates, members of aging and labor networks, Title V beneficiaries including participants and host agencies participated in the discussions. Specifically, stakeholders involved in the Plan included:

- Connecticut Area Agencies on Aging – Non-profit planning agencies that receives Older Americans Act funding through the State Unit on Aging to provide services in Connecticut. The State is divided into five regions.
- State and Local Boards under the Workforce Development Act (WIA)
- Public and private non-profit agencies and organizations providing employment services. Aging Services contracts with four providers to administer the state authorized positions. Two national sponsors, Easter Seals and The WorkPlace, Inc. also administer authorized slots in the state.
- The Department of Social Services' divisions that provide services to older individuals - The Department provides Home and Community-Based Services such as personal care, adult day care, case management and Protective Services for the Elderly, etc. Also, in the Department is the Bureau of Rehabilitation Services (BRS) which provides services for those with disabilities.
- Grantees under Title III of the Older American Act – The area agencies on aging contract with non-profits to provide services such as congregate and home-delivered meals, legal services, transportation, case management and in-home care, etc.
- Community-based organizations serving older adults – Community Action Agencies and Independent Living Centers.
- Unemployed older individuals –Agencies such as Senior Companion program, Senior Centers, Hispanic agencies, One-Stops and OAA- and state-funded providers.
- Business Organizations – Local business organizations as well as the Chambers of Commerce.
- Advocacy Groups – Connecticut Commission on Aging, Connecticut Elder Action Network (CEAN), and AARP.
- Labor Organizations and Veteran Groups – AFL-CIO, etc.

Appendix D contains the sample letter sent to the above, a list of the participants who attended the forum and compilation of comments received at the forum.

Section 3. Solicitation and Collection of Public Comments

During the Month of June 2008, a draft copy of the State Plan was made available for public review on the website. It was also distributed by mail or email to the public,

interested individuals, agencies and organizations. Comments and input were requested and considered for inclusion in the Plan.

Appendix E is a compilation of public comments received on the draft State Plan.

Section 4. Basic Distribution of SCSEP Positions within the State

a. Location of Positions

All SCSEP providers of services in Connecticut work cooperatively to improve the equitable distribution (ED) of SCSEP positions. The distribution of authorizations is based on the Equitable Distribution Report (EDR), which identifies each county's percentage of the state's program-eligible population.

The Aging Services Division will work closely with the Department of Labor, the National SCSEP partners and State SCSEP grantees, to continue to improve the equitable distribution of SCSEP positions within the state.

Recently changes have been made to the state's distribution. These changes have been made as dictated by the U.S. Department of Labor and based on national DOL funding changes and Connecticut's high minimum wage. As changes in the EDR arise, the Division will redistribute the authorizations among the counties in Connecticut based on the EDR information...increasing positions where needed and decreasing authorizations in over-served counties. Current participants will not be impacted by any changes in positions re-allocations.

Connecticut's Equitable Distribution can be found in Appendix C

Four Year Strategy:

PY 2008: Adjust position allocations based on current Equitable Distribution Report.

PY 2008: Through PY2011, continue to work collaboratively with the national SCSEP sponsors to achieve an optimal distribution of SCSEP positions.

PY2009: Through PY2011, continue to adjust position allocations in response to changes in the geographical distribution of the program eligible population.

b. Rural and Urban Populations

There are three leading trends that are influencing the state's current population: rural depopulation, out-migration of young adults and young families and an increasing proportion of older individuals.

Rural residents continue to migrate to larger cities within the state. This movement is due to better employment opportunities, increased health care availability, closer proximity to family and friends, transportation, etc.

The out-migration of young adults and young families will have a major impact on the future of Connecticut's population. Connecticut's high cost of living, including its tax structure is among the reasons that young adults leave the state. The trend creates an age imbalance that is evident when examining population pyramids. The pyramids, particularly for rural areas, are top heavy with many older residents and fewer children and working age (tax paying) residents. When young people leave the state, they take their children and future children with them. As a result, the number of children (future tax payer and future care providers) will consistently decline for rural areas.

The third significant trend is the increasing proportion of older residents. This is due, in part to modest in-migration of older adults who are returning to the state to be close to family and friends. Older adults desiring to return to informal care networks, already a growing trend in population redistribution will increase as the baby-boomer population ages.

These three demographic trends pose serious concerns for Connecticut. How will communities remain viable in the face of continued rural depopulation? How much will property taxes have to be increased in order to make up for decreased income taxes resulting from the increase numbers of "retired" Connecticut citizens? What will be the impact of increased property taxes on individuals living on fixed incomes? Will public and private entities continue to provide physical, social and health care services to an ever-aging population? Who will be the support providers in the state in the future? Will there be sufficient numbers of caregivers to meet the projected increased demand?

Connecticut's counties can be described in three ways, as mostly urban, a mix of urban and rural areas and predominately rural.

Table 3

Characteristics or persons age 55 or older with incomes at or below 125 percent of poverty by County Connecticut, 2000									
Characteristic	County								
	Fairfield	Hartford	Litchfield	Middlesex	New Haven	New London	Tolland	Windham	Connecticut
Total	20,985	25,985	4,630	3,815	26,050	6,435	2,270	3,375	93,545
Sex									
Male	6,250	8,290	1,325	1,100	7,630	1,960	760	995	28,310
Female	14,735	17,695	3,305	2,715	18,420	4,475	1,510	2,380	65,235
Age 70 or over	12,595	16,155	2,970	2,490	16,575	4,055	1,395	2,120	58,355
Living Alone*	8,721	10,528	2,004	1,801	11,585	3,043	903	1,485	40,070
Institutionalized*	2,885	4,583	817	817	4,175	985	386	483	15,131

**Characteristics or persons age 55 or older with incomes at or below 125 percent of poverty
by County
Connecticut, 2000**

Characteristic	County								
	Fairfield	Hartford	Litchfield	Middlesex	New Haven	New London	Tolland	Windham	Connecticut
Rural*	377	595	1,646	540	363	1,003	674	1,136	6,334
Educational Attainment									
Less than 9th grade	5,525	7,410	895	730	6,635	1,800	455	1,000	24,450
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	5,355	6,320	995	775	6,915	1,545	530	890	23,325
High school graduate (including equivalency)	5,410	7,235	1,625	1,440	7,890	1,745	760	1,005	27,110
Some college, no degree	1,840	2,235	365	440	2,270	625	300	155	8,230
Associate degree	425	600	165	95	545	155	63	85	2,133
Bachelor's degree	1,280	1,190	385	170	1,040	350	120	155	4,690
Graduate or professional degree	1,145	1,005	189	165	765	210	60	85	3,624
Veterans Status									
Civilian veteran	2,550	3,655	690	495	3,395	1,160	490	505	12,940
Non-veteran	18,435	22,325	3,930	3,325	22,645	5,270	1,790	2,870	80,590
Disability Status									
Has a disability	11,980	15,755	2,640	2,285	15,770	3,925	1,255	2,010	55,620
No disability	9,005	10,220	1,980	1,535	10,280	2,505	1,020	1,370	37,915
Race									
White alone	15,895	19,530	4,500	3,520	20,835	5,755	2,185	3,110	75,330
Black/ African American alone	3,290	3,700	68	175	3,630	375	8	68	11,314
American Indian and Alaskan Native alone	59	120	4	25	78	69	4	14	373
Asian alone	255	290	35	14	215	53	18	19	899
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	4	4	0	0	4	10	0	0	22
Some other race alone	950	1,530	8	23	780	74	20	89	3,474
Two or more races	535	805	4	59	500	80	38	70	2,091
Hispanic Origin									
Hispanic or Latino	2,345	2,950	30	69	1,950	245	28	135	7,752
Not Hispanic or Latino	18,640	23,030	4,595	3,745	24,095	6,185	2,250	3,240	85,780

**Characteristics or persons age 55 or older with incomes at or below 125 percent of poverty
by County
Connecticut, 2000**

Characteristic	County								Connecticut
	Fairfield	Hartford	Litchfield	Middlesex	New Haven	New London	Tolland	Windham	
Limited English Speaking*	2,696	3,257	67	116	2,122	216	47	156	8,677

Data Source: SCSEP 2000 Census Data Summary Tables 2, 3 and 4

A significant challenge is to arrange training assignments and jobs for participants who have transportation barriers. Public transportation resources are not fully developed in Connecticut especially in the rural areas.

**Table 4
Employment of Persons Age 45 and Older with Incomes at 125 Percent of Poverty**

County	Persons age 45 and older at 125 percent of poverty			Percent of Labor Force Participants Unemployed
	Employed	Unemployed	Not in labor force	
Fairfield County	4,280	1,095	22,995	20.4%
Hartford County	4,045	1,250	29,400	23.6%
Litchfield County	970	150	4,765	13.4%
Middlesex County	730	365	3,675	33.3%
New Haven County	4,210	970	28,875	18.7%
New London County	1,145	355	7,120	23.7%
Tolland County	495	65	2,575	11.6%
Windham County	665	110	3,775	14.2%
Connecticut	16,540	4,360	103,180	20.9%

Data Source: SCSEP 2000 Census Data

Connecticut is a small state geographically. In all six counties, from the more urban counties of Hartford and New Haven to the rural regions of Litchfield and Windham, the SCSEP program is strongly felt statewide with adequate resources to serve program enrollees.

Four Year Strategy:

PY 2008: Identify and monitor appropriate transportation efforts in Connecticut.

PY2008: Increase community partnerships to develop additional Independent Transportation Networks (ITN) systems in Connecticut.

PY 2009: Track progress and advocate for additional transportation.

PY2010: Track services for older adults in rural areas.

PY2010: Research distribution of program – eligible individuals within each county.

PY2011: Manage position allocations within each county according to distribution.

c. Specific Population Groups

SCSEP outcomes directly hinge upon the ability to continually recruit interested applicants and maintain a waiting list of eligible applicants who can fill vacancies as they occur. Effective outreach to older jobseekers, especially those who are low income, have multiple barriers to employment, and poor employment prospects, require innovative and non-traditional methods of recruitment.

Strategies to raise awareness of SCSEP, in general and priority groups:

- Train grantee staff on how to develop an effective recruitment plan. The plan should include an analysis of the demographics of the county, a map of the locations of host agencies and participants' residences and local One-Stops, and a strategy of the untapped areas for targeted recruitment efforts. This process will serve as the blueprint for local recruitment plans at the start of each program year and is one of the National Sponsors "best practices."
- Enlist community members in daily contact with the targeted population to serve as SCSEP ambassadors (such as clergy, health paraprofessionals, homeless shelter volunteers, and drivers who transport older persons with disabilities).
- Partner with food banks to insert flyers into holiday food baskets.
- Use non-mainstream media (foreign language newspapers, oldies/religious radio stations as well as cable channels, church bulletins, school newspapers read by grandparents raising grandchildren, senior – focused newspapers, and websites and e-mails forums).
- Recognize successful program participants by enlisting them as recruitment coaches, particularly those who can reach priority groups, such as non-English speaking older adults.
- Continue to sponsor national and statewide events such as Older Workers Week, Older Americans Month and recognizing employers who hire older workers.

- Leverage state and national partnerships to reach potential participants, including Retired Senior Volunteer Program. Maintain a strong presence in all One Stops, ensuring One-Stops post SCSEP vacancies, and enhance One-Stop partnerships, services and referrals.
- Develop partnerships with veteran services and organizations such VA centers, VFWs, American Legions, and providers that transport disadvantaged veterans to VA hospitals.
- Encourage community employers to refer older job applicants who do not have the skills to be hired.
- Work with vocational rehabilitation services, host agencies, centers for independent living, and other non-profits that serve individuals with disabilities to identify eligible older adults.
- Working with organizations that serve primarily African-Americans and Hispanics.
- Obtain referrals from energy assistance providers.
- Partner with Medicare Part D enrollments efforts.
- Placement of flyers in Social Security offices, Post offices, banks, libraries, shopping centers, social service offices, senior centers, and other public places older adults frequent.
- Develop a marketing strategy for SCSEP to including local branding.

In selecting participants from among eligible applicants, priority will be given to those individuals age 65 or older or to individuals who meet at least one of the following characteristics:

- a) Have a disability;
- b) Have limited English proficiency or low literacy skills;
- c) Reside in a rural area;
- d) Are a veteran or spouse of a veteran;
- e) Have low employment prospects;
- f) Have failed to find employment after utilizing services provided under Title I of the Workforce Investment Act; or
- g) Are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Additional priorities are identified in the Older Americans Act, Section 503(a):

- Eligible individuals with the “greatest economic need” which means the need resulting from an income level at or below the poverty guidelines established by the Federal Government;
- Eligible individuals who are minority individuals; and
- Eligible individuals who are individuals with “greatest social need”, which means the need caused by non-economic factors. These factors include: physical and mental disabilities; language barriers; and, cultural, social, or geographical isolation—including isolation caused by racial or ethnic status—that restricts the ability of an individual to perform normal daily tasks, or threatens the capacity of the individual to live independently.

SCSEP grantees will strive to serve these populations at least in proportion to their percentage of the population. Staff with oversight responsibilities will review SCSEP participant characteristics on a regular basis to ensure targeted populations are being served.

Each applicant’s eligibility will be determined by an interview and will be documented on an intake form. To be eligible for SCSEP, an applicant must be:

- At least 55 years of age;
- A resident of Connecticut;
- A member of a family whose includable income does not exceed 125 percent of applicable poverty guidelines;
- Eligible to work in accordance with the immigration Reform Act of 1986; and
- Unemployed as defined by OAA.

Four Year Strategy:

PY 2008: Continue to target priority individuals and add training sites that can accommodate individuals with significant barriers to employment.

PY 2008: Through PY2011, establish a partnership with literacy organizations and adult education programs to provide assistance to participants lacking a high school diploma or GED.

PY2009: Develop a mentor program to match participants with working professionals.

PY2009: Research detailed demographics on the distribution of priority individuals.

PY2010: Develop an approach to target priority individuals based on the distribution.

PY2011: Continue to adjust recruitment and selection techniques to support priorities.

Section 5: Supporting Employment Opportunities for Participants

Earlier in this document information was provided on the industries and occupations that are expected to see growth. The industries and occupations most likely to provide substantial employment opportunities for SCSEP participants are food services, educational services, recreation, retail, office support services, janitorial services, health care and social assistance and customer service.

Applicants for the SCSEP in Connecticut have the following skill levels and employment history.

- Multiple barriers to employment (age, and often disability on top of the obvious economic need that must be there to qualify for enrollment, homelessness, low-literacy, displaced homemakers, etc.);
- Often low levels of education (completed anywhere from 8th grade to high school);
- Often have come with a gap from the time they were last employed and the time at which they seek help from SCSEP to re-enter the workforce;
- Often low skill levels or skills that were acquired many years ago and before the technological changes that have come fast and furious to the workforce in the past decade. Many of the people who come to us need to not only learn a skill but learn to assimilate to a workplace setting and the accorded expectations;
- Older adults who experience cultural, social or geographical isolation;
- People with poor employment history or prospects;
- People who are receiving public assistance; and
- People with limited language skills.

Substantial Employment opportunities for SCSEP participants:

SCSEP has been successful in placing most of its participants in unsubsidized employment with community service agencies –especially with host training sites—and in other service-oriented industries. The most prevalent occupations for SCSEP participants include jobs in maintenance and custodial work, office clerks and receptionists, van drivers, child care workers, senior center program assistants, retail sales associates, housekeeping, food service, and customer services.

Many potential employers are looking for full-time employees willing to work nights and weekends. However, the typical SCSEP participant usually accepts only part-time employment with daytime hours during the normal work week. Therefore, the program mostly targets community service organizations and small businesses, since these employers have more of the type of jobs that SCSEP participants are seeking.

Developing community service training assignments that meet participant and employer needs:

Host training sites are recruited and chosen for their diversity and their willingness to train program participants in the skills they need to meet their work goals (such as computer experience for an office trainee) and to land the jobs they prefer. Education, job history, skills, interest, transportation needs and job goals are all considered when participants are assigned to their host training sites.

SCSEP participants are receiving training and work experience in many job skill areas, such as clerical and receptionist work, customer service, kitchen/food service, janitorial, maintenance and housekeeping, security, and older worker specialist. The program is always looking for agencies that provide the greatest community service, good training opportunities and future hiring potential. Also, as training assignments become vacant at proven training host sites, due to job placements, rotations, or terminations, the Program makes every effort to assign new trainees to those host agencies.

Participants are primarily assigned to non-profit community service agencies, day care centers, schools, medical clinics, senior centers, nutrition programs, housing offices, government offices, and to other non-profit agencies for job/skills training.

Four Year Strategy:

PY2008: Monitor local job trends and identify existing opportunities for employment, including the Bureau of Rehabilitation Services' (BRS) Connect-Ability initiative.

PY2009: Strengthen coordination with One-Stops to respond to changes in job trends.

PY2010: Continue to improve analysis of assignments to align them with job trends.

PY2011: Continue to align services with job opportunities, required skills and interests.

In addition, through marketing and networking, the program will continue to establish relationships with new businesses as they locate and expand their operations in Connecticut.

Section 6. Increasing Participants Placement in Unsubsidized Employment and Employer Outreach

Connecticut's SCSEP continues to emphasize actions that prepare participants for the successful transition to unsubsidized employment. A significant portion of that effort goes towards strengthening working relationships with the organizations that hire SCSEP participants and in establishing new partnerships with potential employers.

The Program's goals and strategies include:

A. Engaging and developing partnerships with employers:

Partner with the One-Stop Career Centers to monitor information on job openings and trends that will help identify current and future job opportunities. Maintain working relationships with the One Stop. Assign Program participants as Older Worker Specialists at the One-Stop Centers to facilitate a cross flow of information.

Use the Internet to access various job search sites to identify job opportunities for SCSEP participants. Develop job leads in the public and private sectors. Collect background information and identify present and future job opportunities. Develop job leads by advertising, attending job fairs, responding to ads on the internet and in local newspapers, contacting employers (in-person, by telephone, and by letter), offering the On-the-Job-Experience (OJE) training option, speaking at local chambers of commerce meetings, and inviting employers with jobs that are suitable for SCSEP participants to speak at training workshops. Press releases will be made to local newspapers, publications, and TV and radio stations explaining the purpose of SCSEP in an effort to build interest.

Routinely visit host training sites and encourage them to hire their assigned SCSEP participants when funds become available. Discuss with the host sites the value of hiring their trained participants. Have each training site sign a Letter of Agreement that clearly describes the temporary nature of training assignments and emphasize the site's responsibility for hiring participants when openings occur for which they qualify. A significant portion of the Program's unsubsidized placements occurs when community service training sites hire SCSEP participants that are trained in assignments with them.

Contact employers via letters, telephone calls and/or personal visits to explain the Program and to offer placement services. In return, the employer will be asked to identify employment opportunities (especially those with career ladders suitable for Program participants); benefit packages; job descriptions; and, if the employer is interested in working with SCSEP. The employer will also be asked to fax/email any suitable job openings as they become available. Participants will then be matched to the employer's needs. Periodic follow-ups with employers will be made to maintain professional relationships and to identify new job openings. Also, the Program will maintain contact with employers who have hired participants in the past to promote goodwill, provide supportive services if needed and future job prospects.

B. Identifying employment opportunities with established career ladders:

Many employers have career ladders for various occupations. However, the majority of SCSEP participants do not initially convey an interest in pursuing a

career. In reality, participants seek work experience for other benefits, such as physical and mental activity, social interaction, the opportunity to contribute to the community, and the need for income. Many older adults apply for SCSEP services due to past career choices or situations (such as health and family issues) that have resulted in insufficient income for retirement, the need for income to raise grandchildren, and/or a change in marital status (such as divorce or widowed).

Employer demand for SCSEP participants who are interested in pursuing a structured career ladder has not been widely evident. However, the Program transitioned some participants into unsubsidized employment that has led to promotions. The Program will continue its efforts to identify jobs that are of interest to SCSEP participants and that show an opportunity for advancement.

C. Placing individuals in high growth industries and occupations or other opportunities:

In an effort to identify current and future job opportunities, the Program will continue to partner with the One-Stop Centers. Information will be tracked regarding the fastest growing industries and all occupations and businesses that offer appropriate job opportunities for SCSEP participants. In addition, SCSEP participants training as Older Worker Specialist will continue to be assigned at the One Stop Centers to assist older job seekers and to provide job market and training information with One-Stop Center personnel and SCSEP managers.

Also, expanding partnerships will help the Program identify new businesses coming into Connecticut.

Because SCSEP participants do not normally seek jobs in high growth industries and occupations that would require relocation or an extended commute, the Program has primarily been successful by focusing on the local, community job markets. However, high growth industries and occupations with a presence in the local community job markets will be identified and developed as potential employers for SCSEP participants.

D. Offering retention activities for participants entering the workforce:

After each SCSEP participant has been transitioned to his or her unsubsidized job, follow-ups by a mentor will be accomplished with the successful person and his or her new supervisor to facilitate long-term employment. To foster good job retention, special emphasis is placed on sending qualified and suitable participants to each particular job interview.

Follow-up activities that are required by Program regulations, as well as more informal contacts, increase the probability that an employer will turn to SCSEP when additional job opportunities become available.

E. Increasing performance and training for entry into unsubsidized employment:

The SCSEP program strives for continuous improvement. Quality, appropriate training is a key ingredient for successful performance and will continue to be emphasized. The following training activities are ongoing and will become even more effective during the next four years.

Host training sites will be encouraged to make formal in-service and on-the-job training available for their assigned SCSEP participants. The intent is not only to increase effectiveness in the current assignment, but also to further prepare participants for unsubsidized employment.

Training will be consistent with each participant's assessment and Individual Employment Plan (IEP). Computer training will continue to be emphasized and will be offered to all participants. Free training offered through local libraries and non-profit agencies are also sought out and used. A standard intensive Job Readiness training program will be developed for SCSEP grantees to use. In addition, the Program plans to continue to use the On-The-Job-Experience (OJE) training option, which is available to qualified employers to encourage them to hire job-ready participants.

Workshops will be provided to sub grantees which will cover all aspects of the job-seeking process and topics related to health, consumer information, transportation, services for older adults, Medicare Part D, and Money Management, etc. Workshops will include speakers from community service organizations, area agencies on aging, government agencies and the local business community. In addition, mini-workshops will be arranged for specific industries such as home health care.

Participants seeking full-time employment will be encouraged to attend workshops offered through the One-Stops such as Resume Writing, Interviewing Skills and Starting a Job Search.

F. Ensuring the State's best efforts towards meeting negotiated performance measures:

The Aging Services Division, Easter Seals and The WorkPlace, Inc. will monitor and adjust activities to meet the negotiated goals and to ensure compliance with the Older Americans Act and Program regulations.

For example, Aging Services conducts assessment visits each year to review the fiscal and program management practices of its sub grantees. On-site assessment visits provide a first hand review of a sample of participant documents (e.g. assessments, individual employment plans, evaluations, timesheets, recertification's, etc). Host sites are visited by sub grantees and documentation is included in a file. Aging Services State Coordinator writes a formal report for each assessment visit, including corrective actions that are needed. Any follow up actions will be documented until the corrections have been completed. Also, the implementation of the corrective action plans will be reviewed as needed during subsequent assessment visits.

In addition, Aging Services reviews monthly financial reports that are submitted by its sub grantees to monitor operational activities. These monthly reviews are accomplished to ensure that expenditures of Federal dollars are appropriate and that progress is being made towards meeting performance measures.

Aging Services will develop and analyze monthly budget status reports based on its sub grantees monthly financial reports to compare cumulative expenditures with program budgets. Also, Aging Services will provide each sub grantee with a summary letter of the monthly budget status report, including the status of the sub grantee's expenditures and any areas of concern and/or needed corrective actions. Aging Services will provide additional financial training as needed.

In addition, Aging Services will accomplish monthly data validation of program information that is entered into the U.S. DOL national database by its sub grantees. This validation will help ensure that performance reports based on the data are accurate.

Four Year Strategy:

PY2008: Develop partnerships with local employers and emphasize retention activities.

PY2008: Create partnerships with the Chambers of Commerce in Connecticut's eight counties to market SCSEP to employers in the private sector.

PY2008: Develop a statewide marketing strategy to encourage employers to hire older workers.

PY 2009: Work with the One-Stops and the Workforce Development Boards to identify and track local growth industries and jobs – including those with suitable career ladders.

PY2009: Continue to develop and implement On-The- Job-Experience programs to provide private employer based skill development for SCSEP participants, leading to unsubsidized employment opportunities.

PY2010: Increase training that is appropriate for participants and job skills in demand.

PY2011: Continually monitor and assess programs with emphasis on meeting Program goals.

Section 7. Community Service Needs

Connecticut's community service assignments are as diverse as the people and locations served. Development of community service assignments is an ongoing process. It requires that staff be aware of local community needs, agencies/organizations that can act as host agencies, and the quality of service that can be provided by the host agency to the participant. Although development is ongoing, selection of an assignment is based primarily on the participant's needs as described in the IEP.

The IEP and the assessment are used as the basis for community service assignments and training. If we do not have a suitable assignment on file, a current or prospective agency is contacted to see if a suitable position can be developed for the new participant. Participants are referred for an interview, just as if applying for an unsubsidized position.

To be eligible to serve as an SCSEP host agency, an agency must be either 1) local, state or federal government or 2) a nonprofit agency that has obtained 501(c) (3) status. Factors emphasized in selecting the assignment include location of the assignment in or near the community in which the participant reside, the quality of training/services that can be provided by the host agency to the participant, and potential for and/or the ability of the host agency to meet special participant needs. Example of special needs include an individual with disabilities who has assistive technology needs, a non-English speaking participant who needs ESL training as part of his or her assignment, or an individual who needs specialized/personalized counseling.

To ensure quality training is provided, on-site visits are made during the host agency selection process to determine if proposed positions a) provide opportunities to learn job skills that match local jobs in demand, b) involve staff committed to providing quality supervision and training, c) offer meaningful training for the delivery of essential community services, d) provide a safe and beneficial working environment that supports a participant's ability to carry our SCSEP assignments and obtain employment, and e) meet other SCSEP requirements.

Although the participant's needs are paramount, Connecticut State and National Grantees strive to ensure that the activities to which participants are assigned are representative of the diversity of the community, meet essential community needs, and are balanced between services to the general population and to the aging population.

Participants in the SCSEP lack the skills necessary to obtain jobs on their own or through use of One-Stop core resources. Therefore, training provided through SCSEP is designed to place them in jobs that are in demand in local communities. Proven methods for developing host agency assignments and customized older worker training has resulted in jobs.

The State SCSEP Grantees will continue to work with established host agencies and recruit new agencies through advertising, presentations, and face to face contacts.

Four Year Strategy:

PY2008: Expand outreach and research efforts to delineate unmet community service needs within each county.

PY2008: Through 2011, expand partnership with the area agencies on aging and senior centers to train more participants to become counselors and information specialist.

PY2009: Develop a timeline for identifying and recruiting appropriate host training sites to meet unmet community service needs.

PY2010: Identify and recruit training sites that satisfy unmet community service needs.

PY2011: Continue expanding and defining methods for identifying unmet community service needs for recruiting new host training sites to meet those needs.

Section 8. Coordination with Other Programs, Initiatives and Entities.

Workforce Investment Act:

Connecticut continues to strive to be innovative in its approach to participants and has coordinated with the Workforce Investment Act activities in the following ways:

- The Aging Services Division holds quarterly SCSEP meetings, which focus on collaboration, sharing of information, and providing optimal services

to participants. The meeting epitomizes a full partnership among the Department of Social Services, national SCSEP sponsors, area agencies on aging, Connecticut Department of Labor and the One Stop Centers.

- Connecticut's Workforce Investment System continues to reflect the roles, responsibilities, and relationships of key public and private sector partners, community service organizations, Connecticut Department of Labor, local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs), and active partnerships with the state's One Stop Centers. Connecticut has five Workforce Investment Boards.
- The Department of Social Services' Manager and staff attend the monthly WIBs meeting in the local service delivery areas to heighten Board members awareness of current employment needs and barriers faced by SCSEP participants. Fostering this partnership allows us to build a cohesive WIA system around the One Stops and assist us with reaching our employment needs.
- Connecticut's state and national SCSEP sponsors have formed a partnership to coordinate and maintain a SCSEP presence with the One Stop Centers to facilitate the delivery of SCSEP services. Connecticut's SCSEP state and national sponsors are also successful at recruiting and serving older workers in the applicable service delivery areas by utilizing Connecticut Department of Labor Job Centers and the One Stop Centers as host training agencies.
- SCSEP representatives are members of local WIBs. Memoranda of Agreements among the SCSEP sponsors, One Stop Centers and local WIBs are in place. SCSEP Project Directors will continue to conduct workshops targeting older workers and disseminate information on SCSEP services. They will also provide presentation topics, such as interviewing skills, resume development and job search strategies at the One Stop Centers for SCSEP participants, WIA eligibility and One Stop partners.
- To encourage full participation with WIA and to facilitate the transition to unsubsidized employment, state and national SCSEP sponsors will require SCSEP participants to register with One Stop Centers and access WIA services. This requirement will be discussed and reviewed with participants during the development of the IEP.

OAA Program

- The Aging Services Division funds five area agencies on aging in Connecticut to provide Older Americans Act services. The agencies on aging are a prime source for disseminating information through the CHOICES program, which is an information, assistance and referral program. The Agency on Aging at South Central is also a SCSEP Provider.

Other Public and Private Entities

- The Connecticut Department of Labor continues to be very supportive and aggressive in maintaining effective communication and integration between WIA and SCSEP. A Connecticut Department of Labor Grants and Contracts Manager participates in the quarterly meetings and provides updates concerning the Department's policies and procedures in relationship to the WIBs. The Department also continues to monitor WIBs to ensure that compliance with the 2000 amendments to Title V of the Older Americans Act with respect to partner coordination, participant eligibility, and participant assessment is maintained.
- SCSEP will coordinate with transportation programs for older adults that are funded by the Department of Transportation (DOT) and other entities. Aging Services has been involved in recent transit workshops in an effort to more effectively meet transportation needs in all parts of the state. The Aging Services Division is currently funding four communities in the state to develop new innovative transportation models such as a model from Maine known as the Independent Transportation Network (ITN). Two of the communities will provide their first rides in the Fall of 2008. The service will be 24 hour/ seven days a week.

Collaboration with Other Partners

- Aging Services and the Bureau of Rehabilitation Services (BRS) are both under the umbrella of the Department of Social Services; therefore collaboration regarding employment opportunities for older adults has already begun.

National SCSEP Sponsors

- On an annual basis, the Aging Services Division coordinates and sponsors an Employer Recognition Breakfast to recognize employers that are committed to hiring SCSEP participants. This event is the result of a collaborative effort by national and state grantees to identify those employers that actively seek and hire older workers.
- The national sponsors participate in the quarterly meetings hosted by the Aging Services Division.

Collaboration with Other Labor Markets and Job Training Initiatives:

- SCSEP collaborates with local community colleges to coordinate training for participants. Connecticut does not have any WIRED grantees or President's High Growth Job Training Initiatives.

Leveraging Resources for other Key Partners

- There are no plans to obtain financial resources from other entities. As a state agency, the Governor and the State Legislature set our budget, soliciting funds, other than grants, is not a standard practice.
- The state's sub-grantees and the National grantees will leverage resources to provide the most comprehensive training, job readiness and supportive services to program participants.

Four Year Strategy:

PY2008: Expand cross flow of information with One-Stops regarding jobs and training.

PY2009: Update the Memorandum of Agreements with the Workforce Investment Boards after the Workforce Investment Act is reauthorized.

PY2010: Strengthen existing relationships with the national sponsors, BRS, DOL, DOT, initiatives and entities.

PY2011: Continually pursue and establish new markets and training partnerships, such as with the Workforce Innovation in Regional Economic Development (WIRED) Initiative.

Section 9. Avoidance of Disruption in Service

The Connecticut national and state sub grantees are experienced in transition and can ensure that no current eligible SCSEP participant will go without the opportunity for growth and training as a result of transition of allocations among grantees. In the event that there is a loss in positions or a transfer in positions, Connecticut will utilize the following strategies:

- Connecticut will attempt to transfer participants to unsubsidized employment.
- Connecticut will arrange for transfer of participants to other appropriate service providers of similar or like services who are operating in the geographical area.
- Participants least likely to be adversely affected will be provided 45 days advance written notice of termination and the reason for the termination. Such participants will be referred to other employment and training services in the One Stop Delivery System and the area agency on aging.

- Follow up calls to participants will be accomplished within ten days after the written notice to answer any questions or concerns, and to facilitate the transitions.

Section 10: Improvement of SCSEP Services

Connecticut's SCSEP has been successful over the past 25 years in providing work experience, supportive services and job search assistance to older workers; and in assigning productive trainees to community service agencies. The program has helped Connecticut's older adults become marketable and to re-enter the workforce while providing employers with trained, job-ready individuals. Connecticut recognizes the ongoing need to improve the employment services and training needs for older workers, as well as performance accountability to SCSEP participants.

Long-term strategy to improve SCSEP services

1. Provide staff training to SCSEP staff – Significant changes to the Program during this decade have placed greater emphasis on performance measures; and, greater priority on enrolling those program- eligible individuals who are least marketable and who have the most barriers to employment. SCSEP personnel will need to continually increase expertise and knowledge to meet performance expectations, to effectively assist the targeted population in achieving long-term employment, and to maximize the Program's contributions to community service. Such areas of expertise include job development; outreach and recruitment of partners, participants, host training sites, and employers; counseling; case management and case note writing; participant files maintenance and market research and statistical analysis.
2. Improve the coordination of SCSEP and WIA to increase the participation of SCSEP participants' utilization of WIA adult services, particularly intensive services and training services.
3. State and national SCSEP sponsors should standardize host agreements for all host training sites. The standardized agreements will strengthen the responsibility of host training sites to effectively train SCSEP participants for employment and hire participants within their organizations.
4. Aging Services Division will spearhead the establishment of a taskforce consisting of SCSEP national sponsors, Connecticut Department of Labor and One Stop Directors. The taskforce's charge will be to develop a comprehensive approach to older workers' issues and a model for coordination between SCSEP and the WIA system. It will also focus on identifying technical assistance needs and developing strategies to improve employment performance for SCSEP participants.

5. Aging Services Division will develop partnerships with home health agencies, the Board of Education, technology and information service companies and other employers to establish a system of internships for mature workers, which will provide participants with access to employment opportunities.
6. Aging Services will work with the national sponsors to develop a partnership with National GED. Partnerships with Literacy Volunteer and Adult Education providers will also be established to ensure that participants who lack high school diplomas or GED have the opportunity to access adult education programs and services. Participants should be required to enroll in adult education programs, as needed, to facilitate their transition to unsubsidized employment.

Recommendations to U.S. Department of Labor

1. Connecticut has a higher minimum wage than the rate set by Federal DOL. For this reason, we appreciate the Department of Labor's recognition that this wage differential has a major impact on the program. We recommend that the Department address this issue and its impact on the number of positions that may be filled through the performance accountability process. We also recommend that the Department allow Connecticut and other states with high minimum wages to set and adjust their performance levels.
2. To increase awareness of SCSEP nationwide, U.S. DOL should develop a nationwide outreach marketing campaign so that employers become aware of SCSEP and its job-ready participants.

Appendix A
Area Agencies on Aging

Connecticut Area Agencies on Aging

Joan Wessell
Senior Resources
4 Broadway, 3rd Flr
Norwich, CT 06360
Phone: (860) 887-3561
jcwessell@seniorresources.org

Christina Fishbein
Western CT Area Agency
on Aging
84 Progress Lane
Waterbury, CT 06705
Phone: (203) 757-5449
cfishbein@sbcglobal.net

Neysa Guerino
Agency on Aging of South
Central Connecticut, Inc.
One Long Wharf Drive, Suite 1L
New Haven, CT 06511
Phone: (203) 785-8533
nsguerino@agencyonaging-scc.org

Carmen Reyes
North Central CT Area
Agency on Aging
Two Hartford Square West
Suite 101
Phone: (860) 724-6443
Carmen.reyes@ncaaact.org

Marie L. Allen
Southwestern CT Agency on Aging
10 Middle Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Phone: (203) 333-9288
mallen@swcaa.org

Appendix B

**Connecticut SCSEP
Providers**

Connecticut SCSEP Providers

Education Connection
PO Box 909
Litchfield, CT 06759-0909
Phone: (860) 567-3381
JodiLynn Ledoux, Program Director
yledoux@educationconnection.org

Agency on Aging of South
Central CT
One Long Wharf Dr
New Haven, CT 06511
Phone: (203) 785-8533
Ron Webb, Program Director
ronscaa@yahoo.com

Jewish Family Services of Stamford
733 Summer St, 6th Flr
Stamford, CT 06901-1208
Phone: (203) 921-4161
Ilene Locker, Program Director
iklocker@ctjfs.org

Easter Seals Greater Hartford
100 Deerfield Rd
Windsor, CT 06095
Phone: (860) 714-9500
Pete Pylypyszyn, Program Director
ppylypyszyn@eastersealshartford.org

Thames Valley Council for
Community Action
401 West Thames St, Unit 201
Norwich, CT 06360-7155
Phone: (860) 444-0006 x115
Cathy Visco, Project Director
cvisco@tvcca.org

Easter Seals CT
24 Stott Ave
Norwich, CT 06360
Phone: (860) 859-4152 x309
Kathy Buck, Project Director
kbuck@eastersealsct.org

The WorkPlace, Inc.
350 Fairfield Ave
Bridgeport, CT 06604
(203) 610-8560
Janiese Void, Program Manager
jvoid@workplace.org

Appendix C

**Connecticut's
Equitable Distribution**

Connecticut's Program Year 2008 Equitable Distribution

County	Distribution Factor	Equitable Share	State	Easter Seals	The WorkPlace	Totals	Difference
Fairfield County, CT	0.2244	142	49		94	143	1
Hartford County, CT	0.2777	176		176		173	0
Litchfield County, CT	0.0494	31	32		5	37	6
Middlesex County, CT	0.0408	26			26	26	0
New Haven County, CT	0.2784	176	36		147	183	7
New London County, CT	0.0687	43	11	25		45	-7
Tolland County, CT	0.0245	15		15		16	0
Windham County, CT	0.0361	23		23		23	0
TOTALS:	1.0000	632	128	246	272	646	14

Appendix D

Attendees and Comments from the Public Forum

**Older Worker State Planning Meeting
April 17, 2008
Hosted by the CT State Unit on Aging**

Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Roxanne Aaron-Selph	State Unit on Aging
Antoinette Astle	Middlefield Senior Center
Claudette Beaulieu, Deputy Commissioner	CT Department of Social Services
Kathy Buck	Easter Seals of CT
Mary Charles	SCSEP Participant
Alice Deak	Southwest CT AAA
Susan Deschamplain	CT Department of Labor
Ed Dombroskas	Senior Job Bank
Rebecca Doyle	Western CT AAA
Emma Figueroa	City of Middletown
Zulma Garcia	Human Resources Assoc. of New Britain
Pamela Giannini, Director	State Unit on Aging
Mary-Kate Gill	New Opportunities, Inc
Jennifer Gorman	State Unit on Aging
Roberta Gould	State Unit on Aging
Cindy Grant	State Unit on Aging
Nancy Hodkoski	Torrington Senior Center
Brenda Kelly	AARP
Jean Kenny	Mansfield Senior Wellness Center
JodiLynn Ledoux	Education Connection
Steve Litke	CT Department of Labor
Ilene Locker	Jewish Family Services of Stamford
Douglas Lord	CT State Library
Yvette Mickenberg	State Unit on Aging
Siobhan Morgan	CT Dept of Developmental Services
Lawrence Morowitz	Jewish Family Services of Stamford
Irene Murray	South Windsor Senior Center
Pam Nabors	Capital Workforce Partners
Robert Norton	CT Commission on Aging
Adrienne Parkmond	The WorkPlace, Inc
Nancy Paetzell	Easter Seals CT
Pete Pylypyszyn	Easter Seals of Greater Hartford
Carmen Reyes	North Central AAA
Lori Roode	Thames Valley Council on Comm Action
Latifa Sharif	Western CT AAA
Joel Sekorski	Torrington Senior Center
Marylou Underwood	Thames Valley Council on Comm Action
Janiese Void	The WorkPlace, Inc.

Name

Affiliation

Mary Wilcox
Mark Williams
Violet Wilter

Community Renewal Team/RSVP
Town of Rocky Hill
New London Senior Center

**Older Worker State Planning Meeting
April 17, 2008**

Notes & Comments Collected

QUESTION: WHAT ARE EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS OF OLDER WORKERS?

Liability
Insurance (health)
Use greater amount of Worker's Comp
Lack of experience
Education not respected
Can't use or learn computers
Not talented/Few skills
Already have an income so they can be paid less
Don't need benefits
After a certain point responsibilities are taken away and employee pushed out
Ageism/Attitudes
Negative – slow, lazy
Cultural Bias
All of the above also applies to adults with disabilities
A perception of a lack of commitment
Adaptive equipment is available and should be considered
Skilled workers but must be flexible with hours, longer vacation

QUESTION: WHAT COMMUNITY RESOURCES EXIST TO HELP OLDER WORKERS?

CT Works
Senior Job Bank – Greater Hartford
Chambers of Commerce
Title V Programs
BRS
Small Business Administration
CT Colleges (Free course 62 years +)
Workforce Investment Board
Community Action Agencies
Community Rehab Centers
Housing Authorities
Senior Centers
Food Banks
Local Towns have list serves
Area Agencies on Aging
AARP Website

QUESTION: HOW CAN THE STATE ENCOURAGE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER WORKERS?

Started with the question – What does the state do now?

A marketing campaign using SCSEP Resources
Focus on the labor pool
To Business
To Potential Host Sites
Change the name – Don't use "Older Worker"
Target industries in need of workers

One-Stops
Capacity Building with the One-Stop Staff
Strengthen the MOUs between Workforce Boards and SCSEP
Understand the One Stop System for SCSEP Providers

Rethink "Older Worker" – it's got to encompass Baby Boomers and the Greatest Generation
Link to Existing Websites
Broaden yearly awards to acknowledge individuals in "unsubsidized" employment
Help individuals and Providers understand how entitlement programs (Unemployment, Medicare/aid) can affect SCSEP income. Work with DOL and DSS

QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES AND BENEFITS TO EMPLOYERS OF HIRING OLDER WORKERS

Benefits:

Very hard workers
Strong work ethic
Educated and skilled
Responsible
Salary savings, fringe benefit savings
Flexible
Part-time savings
Relate with clients

Challenges:

Mental health issues and/or physical
Education and skills (lack of) with advances in technology
Some people age in place
Time to train (not a lot of time available to train)
Work pace – might be too fast, difficulty in multi-tasking
Title V Specific:

Limited time at each agency (would be helpful to be 2 years)
Unsure where to place them (what position)
Limited transportation to training
Difficult to recruit people who qualify by income guidelines
Time to train (not a lot of time available to train)

Ideas:

Hold training sessions pre-placement

Computers

Phones

Forms

Files/Filing

Use Dial-a-Ride to get workers to trainings

Partner with high schools for trainings

QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES THAT AN OLDER WORKER FINDS TODAY?

Younger managers are looking for “new blood”

High cost of transportation for Title V workers

Need additional training opportunities from host agencies & placement agencies

Low expectations of employers

Learning how to navigate the different “age cultures” present in the workplace

Personal barriers:

Lack of confidence

Personal problems

Unwillingness of employers to invest in training/perceived as slow learners

Workers in SCSEP have greater challenges than other older workers.

Older workers need opportunities to use their lifetime accumulation of skills

POST LUNCH DISCUSSION

Boomers v. today’s mature worker

- Boomers – long retirement, want to continue working
- 50-60 year olds losing jobs, facing discrimination

Only low skilled jobs available

Losing health insurance

Need an integrated approach

- Low-income and “others”
- Both need services

Telecommuting

Want flexibility – work from home

CT is not in the forefront

Are we providing adequate services to diverse populations?

- Language barriers – in jobs and service providers

ESL before placement

- Programs lack workplace focus

Technology is scary (e.g. phone systems)

Need some basic training before placement

Go into the communities (e.g. Asian, Polish)

- Mansfield Retired Professors who teach (example)
- Get volunteers (Senior Center, Literacy Vols) to teach ESL, tech

Is there a curriculum to teach these basic skills?

- Use existing programs

Come up with standards & resources for pre-employment skills training

- Take advantage of the 10% waiver by US DOL for training money
- Can use training money if it's based on jobs in demand rather than what host agency thinks is needed
- Need to make the durational limit in SCSEP longer
- Can the money be used for Job Coach to go to host agency?
- Coaching is not part of the program
- Host agency is supposed to train
- Look to other programs (RSVP) to be partners

Focus on occupations in demand

#1 thing we should do

Computer skills – especially for Title V workers

CVS has programming for snowbirds (work ½ the year in 2 places)

Host agency to hire participant when placement ends

Person should seek training themselves first

It is often not realistic for host agency to be able to hire and this needs to be communicated to the participants so the placement is viewed as an apprenticeship

Partner with chambers of commerce and specific businesses

AARP has a website listing older worker friendly businesses

Tie SCSEP training to specific business openings in private sector

- The WorkPlace has a pilot like this

Employ Older Workers Week in September

- Partner with all agencies to connect to private sector needs
- Publicize

Have a representative from private sector come to speak to participants about their expectation and the difficulties in their field

Appendix E

Public Comments

Appendix F
Letters of Support