

Program Year 2016-2019 MICHIGAN STATE PLAN

Purpose of the SCSEP State Plan

For each state to be eligible to administer the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) under section 506 of the Older American's Act Amendments (OAA) of 2010, the governor or their designee, must submit a State Plan which includes a four-year strategy for the statewide provision of community service training and other authorized activities for eligible unemployed low-income person 55 years of age and older. The intent of the SCSEP State Plan is to foster both short and long-term coordination among various national and state SCSEP grantees and their sub-recipients operating within the state; facilitate the efforts of key stakeholders, including state and local boards under WIA, and to work collaboratively through a participatory process to accomplish SCSEP's goals. Furthermore, SCSEP State Plan requirements also emphasize the importance of partnerships among grantees of other programs, initiatives, and entities operating within the state.

Section 1 Governor's Vision

In January 2015, Governor Rick Snyder outlined in his State of the State address, his top priorities for his second term. The overall state priority, identified as the "Rivers of Opportunity", placed an emphasis on putting people first, with the goal of helping all Michiganders succeed, no matter their stage in life. This has been accomplished through collaboration and cooperation to restructure State government, resulting in an effective, efficient, and accountable system which better serves its citizens. Over the last year, the following key actions have taken plan and are ongoing for Michigan's reinvention:

- Revolutionizing how government operates by reducing bureaucracy and inefficiencies in the system through restructuring government by combining talent and workforce;
- Ensuring that training is demand-driven by creating partnerships with education and employers, building a seamless One-Stop system for both employers and job seekers, emphasizing the value of science, technology, engineering, and math education, and investing in skilled trades training and career tech education opportunities;
- Creating Prosperity Regions across the state, thereby allowing local areas to devote their resources to leverage state resources that help create more and better jobs and training;
- Assisting the structurally unemployed by offering services tailored to meet individual needs;
- Providing one-stop shopping for veterans; and

- Increasing accountability through measuring outcomes and results.

On December 18, 2014, the Michigan Department of Talent and Economic Development was created under Executive Order 2014-12. The department was created with merged functions previously within the Economic Development, Talent Investment, and Workforce Agencies into one department. This merger brought together key functions in order to streamline and assist business and local economic development partners with growing the economy. In April 2015, under Executive Order 2015-11, the Governor's Talent Investment Board (GTIB) became a business majority led board of industry executives, legislators, labor officials, education leaders, local elected officials, state agency directors, and other representatives consistent with the provisions of the WIOA Section 101(b). The GTIB plays a vital role in bringing citizen involvement, engagement, and oversight to the state's talent enhancement effort, as well as serving as a catalyst for talent enhancement and economic development entities. The GTIB recommends policies to the Governor and state departments that guide workforce investment and training at both the state and local levels. The GTIB is the principal private-sector policy advisor on building a strong workforce system aligned with state education policies and economic development goals. The GTIB has established the following strategic priorities to guide its work:

- Educate students, parents, job seekers, teachers, counselors and administrators about local in-demand careers and prepare students for those careers.
- Expand awareness of and access to adult learning opportunities to qualify for local in-demand careers.

In addition to the above referenced GTIB priorities, the Governor has also aligned jobs, talent enhancement, adult learning models, coordination with economic development, prosperity regions, and improved performance accountability as key strategies for growing Michigan's economy. The following highlight some of these strategies:

Jobs Strategy:

The State of Michigan follows a jobs strategy in a demand-driven system which focuses on aligning participant training and job searches around key industry clusters. This strategy includes collaboration with key workforce agencies, employers, economic developers, and other providers and partners with shared interests. This allows for opportunities to leverage resources for services where funds are limited.

Talent Enhancement Strategy:

The Talent Investment Agency (TIA) has aligned its talent enhancement strategy around economic development efforts coordinated at the Michigan Economic Development Corporation. "Talent" is the education and work experience that employees bring to a job. "Enhancement" is the role the State of Michigan plays in improving the state's overall workforce pool. Talent enhancement efforts include: 1) talent development, 2) talent recruitment and attraction, 3) talent connections,

4) talent-based job creation and entrepreneurship, along with 5) workforce system reforms implemented by the Workforce Development Agency. AASA will be working closing with these agencies to ensure resources are leveraged where appropriate in order to enhancement the talent that is in the SCSEP.

Strategy for Adult Learners and Employers:

The Talent Investment Agency has spearheaded Governor Snyder's talent enhancement initiative, which is critical to Michigan's economic prosperity. The Talent Investment Agency is the State's leader in evaluating and implementing services and programs related to talent, including job preparedness, career-based education, skilled trades training, incumbent worker training, employment assistance, science, technology, engineering, and math training programs, and programs designed to help the unemployed. By putting all talent investment efforts under a single department, Michigan has been able to leverage its ability to build talent that possesses in-demand skills while helping our state's businesses grow.

Michigan's Unified State Plan includes an emphasis on work-based learning and career opportunities, such as the Michigan Industry Cluster Approach, and Michigan Apprenticeships, Internships, and Mentoring. Work-based learning will move Michigan's workforce system to a more demand-driven system through the development of industry-based partnerships that promote the economic health and welfare of regional area businesses and workers through engagement of local employers to provide direct information on in-demand jobs, skill sets required, training program requirements, and candidate assessment factors to improve successful transition from training to long-term employment. Stimulating the development of industry clusters, based on sound labor market information data, supports the overall goal of providing Michigan employers with a highly-skilled workforce and Michigan citizens with careers providing good wages and increased opportunities.

Coordination with Economic Development Strategies and Activities:

By developing positive and cooperative relationships with state agencies such as the Unemployment Insurance Agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, Michigan Rehabilitative Services, and Bureau of Services for Blind Persons, the Department of Education, and others, the State of Michigan can better serve our business customers and job seekers through unduplicated, coordinated services. Furthermore, by establishing common practices across the Talent System, business customers as well as job seekers will have consistent quality of service, no matter where they enter the system. The Workforce Development Agency will also work cooperatively with Talent System partners to implement common practices across regions, track performance, and measure employers' and job seekers' level of satisfaction to ensure consistent quality of service.

Prosperity Regions:

The Regional Prosperity Initiative was created to ensure the State of Michigan invests in the success of our regions, their local communities, and our economy in ways that are meaningful to the people who are working, playing, and doing business there every

day. This has ensured finite resources are being used wisely. As a result of collaborative efforts for regional prosperity, the state has become better equipped to attract and retain the talent that is so essential to remaining globally competitive. Finally, strong regions have provided the state a new avenue by which to deliver state services which is more efficient and responsive to the needs of the regional economy. As federal dollars become scarcer, this helps to ensure that available resources have the greatest impact possible for both job creators and residents.

Improved Performance and Accountability

The GTIB will work with the Michigan Talent Investment Agency to meet regulatory responsibilities as prescribed by federal statute and regulation, including the development and updating of comprehensive State performance and accountability measures to assess the effectiveness of core programs. Michigan Works! Agencies will provide the Unemployment Insurance Agency Work Test for claimants to ensure they are able to work, seeking work, and have not refused suitable work and provide re-employment services to profiled claimants selected by the Unemployment Insurance Agency. Profiled claimants are those claimants who will most likely exhaust their unemployment benefits before finding employment. Michigan Works! Agencies are also partnering with the Unemployment Insurance Agency to deliver the Re-employability Eligibility Assessment pilot program. This program provides one-on-one service to claimants who will more than likely exhaust their unemployment benefits prior to obtaining employment. This is similar to the re-employment profiling component mentioned above; however, claimants are to receive up to three re-employability assessments if employment has not been acquired. These re-employability assessments consist of re-employment services that are more intense and include follow up case management services.

Section 2 - As required in Section 503(a) (2) of the 2010 Older Americans Act Amendments, the State Plan must describe the state's process for ensuring involvement and seeking the advice and recommendation from a variety of representatives in the development of the State Plan

The Aging and Adult Services Agency (AASA) developed the initial draft of the State Plan. AASA is a Type II agency located within the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. AASA administers the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP) under an annual grant from the U.S. Department of Labor (US DoL).

In March 2016, the draft plan was submitted to the State Workforce Development Agency (WDA) for review and comment. The WDA is the designated State agency for Workforce Investment Opportunity Act (WIOA) funding as well as all employment and training programs for the state of Michigan, including responsibility for the development of Michigan's WIOA State Plan.

The State Plan was also made available for review and comment on AASA's website (www.michigan.gov/osa). The website allows any organization or individual with

internet access to comment on the plan from any location and at any time. AASA's website is highly visible and is one of the most frequently accessed websites in state government. A wide variety of organizations that provide services to older adults were notified of the opportunity to comment on the State Plan. AASA has had success using the website to publish other public documents, such as the Older American Act (OAA) Title III Three-Year State Plan, program and service reports, and Requests for Proposals (RFPs). Many individuals prefer this method of receiving documents as opposed to waiting for a paper copy to be mailed. AASA will provide paper copies of the State Plan should the request be made. This option was included in an announcement regarding the plan. All public comments are summarized in Section 3 and included in Appendix II.

a. State Office on Aging and the Area Agencies on Aging (Grantees under Title III of the OAA)

AASA developed the initial draft of the SCSEP State plan. AASA is the State Office on Aging and is the agency responsible for administration of the state's SCSEP grant. AASA's SCSEP projects operate in 43 of Michigan's 83 counties.

The Michigan SCSEP grant is administered locally through subgrants to 7 of the 16 area agencies on aging (AAAs) and one local Michigan Works Service Center (MWSC). The AAA network is utilized because of the expertise these organizations provide in the area of supportive services to older persons. Such expertise improves integration of SCSEP with other state and federal services, including OAA programs. As the oversight agency, AASA has a long history of working with AAAs to effectively deliver SCSEP and other services to older adults in the state. Additionally, the MWSC state subgrantee has complimented the work of the AAA state subgrantee's. As an employment and training agency, they have been instrumental in providing feedback to the state in the development of program policy, program enhancements, and assistance with improving overall SCSEP state performance measures.

Each SCSEP AAA and non-AAA state subgrantee is required to sign an approvals and assurances document each year as part of the annual SCSEP subgrant application process. This document commits the subgrantee to adhere to all applicable federal and state statutes, rules, policies, and program goals.

The 16 AAA's in Michigan were notified of the opportunity to review and comment on the state plan. AASA discussed the draft plan and importance of input during meetings with AAA and non-AAA SCSEP staff. All feedback is incorporated into the final version of the plan. AASA will work with SCSEP subgrantees as the plan is implemented in Michigan.

b. State and Local Boards under the Workforce Investment Opportunity Act (WIOA)

AASA provided a copy of the draft state plan to the State Workforce Development

Agency (WDA) for their review and comments. The WDA is the designated agency in Michigan responsible for the development of Michigan's five year WIOA state plan. A copy of the state plan was also provided to the Governors Talent Investment Board (GTIB) for their feedback. The GTIB is comprised of members appointed by Governor Snyder as the designated State Workforce Investment Board for Michigan under the Workforce Investment Opportunity Act. The plan was also distributed to the Michigan Works! Association, Inc. Michigan Works! Association is a workforce development association whose membership includes local workforce investment boards (WIBs) directors, local elected officials, and Michigan Works! Agency directors from all of Michigan Works Service Centers. Both WDA and the Michigan Works! Association work with the local Michigan Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs) across the state. As mentioned above, one SCSEP state subgrantee is a local Michigan Works Service Center, Macomb/St. Clair Michigan Works! Because of the experience and resources Macomb/St. Clair Michigan Works! has to contribute, this has served to strengthen employment services to seniors.

c. Public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations providing employment services, including each SCSEP grantee operating in the State

In February and March 2016, the four national sponsors and 8 AASA SCSEP subgrantees who administer projects in Michigan were surveyed as part of the State Plan development process. The survey gathered information on current program participants, SCSEP services, specialized On the Job Experience training (formerly OAA section 502(e) projects), and coordination with WIOA programs. Survey responses have been aggregated and incorporated in the draft plan. A copy of the State Plan survey is attached in Appendix IV. A list of the national sponsor organizations administering SCSEP projects in Michigan is also attached in Appendix VII.

Over the years, AASA has utilized surveys to gather information from SCSEP national sponsors on a number of occasions, including the development of the annual Equitable Distribution Report (EDR). AASA has found that surveys work well because several of the national sponsors operating in Michigan have administrative offices located outside of the state. In addition to the survey, SCSEP national sponsors were also notified of the opportunity to comment on the draft state plan as well.

d. Other organizations including business and labor, community-based service organizations, social service agencies that service older individuals, SCSEP participants, and other interested organizations

AASA staff attends and provides input to state workforce development staff and members of the state level GTIB as necessary. The GTIB oversees workforce development activities as required by the WIOA. AASA has offered assistance to the GTIB on matters concerning services to the mature job seeker. AASA staff have also participated in subcommittees of the state workforce board and continue to be available as necessary to participate in GTIB subcommittees as requested by Governor Snyder

or the Chair of GTIB.

Notice of the opportunity to comment on the plan was also sent to the Michigan Directors of Services to the Aging (MDSA). MDSA is made up of a wide variety of agencies that deliver OAA Title III and other state, federal, and local services to older adults in Michigan. Many MDSA agencies also serve as host sites for SCSEP participants. AASA also notified state sub-grantees and national program sponsors in the state of the opportunity for SCSEP participants to provide input on the draft plan.

Section 3 - Economic Projections and Impact

The following is a brief perspective on Michigan's economy over the last decade, as well as trends for the future.

Historically, Michigan's economy and labor markets struggled significantly during the most recent recession, which lasted from December 2007 through June 2009. However, Michigan has experienced significant recovery over the last six years, with the job-less rate falling all the way down to 5.5 percent in May 2015. Employment levels have also bounced back significantly. Since 2010, Michigan has added 293,000 employed persons to the economy. The labor force has also edged up significantly since 2012, advancing by 79,000 through May 2015.

- Despite the strong labor market performance since the recession, Michigan workforce indicators remain well below the peak established in 2000. The Michigan jobless rate in 2000 was 3.6 percent, well below the current rate of 5.5 percent. Far more striking were the long term, massive losses in labor force employment levels over this period. In May 2015, Michigan's labor force was 4,750,000 a very large drop of 411,300 since 2000. The same is true for employment, which has plunged in Michigan by 489,000 workers since 2000. The share of the Michigan population that was active in the labor market (the labor force participation rate) dropped sharply from 68.7 percent in 2000 to 60.5 percent in 2014.
- More recently, Michigan workforce trends have shown strong improvement. Since January 2014, the jobless rate has dropped 2.4 percentage points to 5.5 percent and employment advanced from 4,373,000 in January 2014 to 4,487,000 in May 2015, a gain of 114,000 (Figure 4). But there are still some areas of concern despite this general labor market recovery.
 - In 2014, 34.7 percent of the state's unemployed were without work for over 26 weeks, compared to just 3.2 percent in 2001.
 - The number of Michigan workers desiring full-time work but only able to find part-time work was 5.8 percent of total employment in 2014, compared to just 1.8 percent in 2001.

- The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes six measures of labor underutilization rates for states. The broadest measure, the U6 underutilization rate, includes the unemployed (people without a job but actively looking for one and available to work), marginally attached workers (people willing to work but who have not looked for a job for the past 12 months), and persons working part-time involuntarily. This measure for the 12-month period ending March 2015 showed a U6 labor underutilization rate for Michigan of 13.1 percent, which was tied for the fifth highest in the nation. This was despite Michigan's official unemployment rate in May 2015 of 5.5 percent, which ranked only 29th nationwide.

Jobless Rates by Demographic Categories

- Unemployment rates in 2014 were reasonably similar for men and women in Michigan, but marital status made a difference. The 2014 jobless rates for men and women in the Michigan labor force were essentially equal at 7.1 and 7.4 percent, respectively. However, individuals who were married had significantly lower unemployment rates. Married men with a spouse present had a jobless rate of just 3.0 percent in 2014, and married women with a spouse present had a jobless rate of 3.7 percent, both significantly lower than either gender as a whole.
- Jobless rates were generally inversely related to age in Michigan, until individuals reached 65 years and over. Teens and young adults face the highest unemployment rates in the state, at 20.0 percent and 14.0 percent, respectively. Competition with more experienced or skilled adults, and more frequent movement in and out of the workforce, partially explains these higher rates for younger workers. Jobless rates then tend to decrease with age down to a low of 3.9 percent for those aged 55 to 64 years old. For persons 65 years and older, labor force participation rates fall significantly, but unemployment rates go up as older workers at times face additional barriers to employment.

The following tables describe short and long term industry and occupational forecasts for Michigan over the next decade.

Industry

The two tables below rank the projected top ten growing and declining *industries* over the short-term -2nd quarter 2014 to 2nd quarter 2016- and the long-term -2012 to 2022. The industries were ranked by number of new jobs and percent growth over the time period, each weighted equally.

Table 1: Michigan Short Term Industry Forecasts - 2nd Qtr. 2014 to 2nd Qtr. 2016

Growing Industries	Declining Industries
Specialty Trade Contractors	Food Manufacturing
Administrative and Support Services	Credit Intermediation and Related Activities
Construction of Buildings	Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music
Transportation Equipment Manufacturing	Total Federal Government Employment
Insurance Carriers and Related Activities	Air Transportation
Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers	Printing and Related Support Activities
Repair and Maintenance	Publishing Industries
Furniture and Related Product	Broadcasting (except Internet)
Food Services and Drinking Places	Electronics and Appliance Stores
Truck Transportation	Paper Manufacturing

- The top three growing industries between the 2nd quarter of 2014 to 2nd quarter 2016 based on this criteria are projected to be *Specialty trade contractors, Administrative and support services, and Construction of buildings*. The top three declining industries for this time period are expected to be *Food manufacturing, Credit intermediation and related activities, and Sporting goods, hobby, book, and music stores*.

Table 2: Michigan Long-Term Industry Forecasts – 2012 to 2022

Growing Industries	Declining Industries
Ambulatory Health Care Services	Total Federal Government Employment
Social Assistance	Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing
Administrative and Support Services	Printing and Related Support Activities
Specialty Trade Contractors	Electrical Equipment, Appliance, and Component Manufacturing
Construction of Buildings	Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores
Transportation Equipment Manufacturing	Paper Manufacturing

Nursing and Residential Care Facilities	Publishing Industries
Truck Transportation	Primary Metal Manufacturing
Securities, Commodities, and Other Financial Investments and Related	Air Transportation
Food Services and Drinking Places	Utilities

- From 2012 to 2022, the top three growing industries are expected to be *Ambulatory health care services, Social assistance, and Administrative and support services*, while the top three declining industries are projected to be *Total federal government employment, Computer and electronic product manufacturing, and Printing and related support activities*.

Occupations

Table 3 and Table 4 list the top ten growing and declining *occupations* over the short and long term. Three criteria were used to rank each occupations, each given equal weight; number of new jobs over the time period, percent growth, and annual openings.

Table 3: Michigan Short Term Occupational Forecasts - 2nd Qtr. 2014 to 2nd Qtr. 2016

Growing Occupations	Declining Occupations
Construction Laborers	Word Processors and Typists
Team Assemblers	Computer Operators
Mechanical Engineers	Slaughterers and Meat Packers
Carpenters	Credit Authorizers, Checkers, and Clerks
Home Health Aides	Meter Readers, Utilities
Machinists	Career/Technical Education Teachers, Middle School
Electricians	Postmasters and Mail Superintendents
Industrial Machinery Mechanics	Print Binding and Finishing Workers
Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food	Postal Service Clerks
Inspectors, Testers, Sorters, Samplers, and Weighers	Special Education Teachers, All Other

- From the 2nd quarter 2014 to 2nd quarter 2016, the top growing occupations based on the criteria are *Construction laborers, Team assemblers, and Mechanical engineers*, while the top three declining occupations are projected to be *Word processors and typists, Computer operators, and Slaughterers and meat packers*.

Table 4: Michigan Long-Term Occupational Forecasts – 2012 to 2022

Growing Occupations	Declining Occupations
Home Health Aides	Word Processors and Typists
Personal Care Aides	Computer Operators
Construction Laborers	Postmasters and Mail Superintendents
Team Assemblers	Meter Readers, Utilities
Substitute Teachers	Jewelers and Precious Stone and Metal Workers
Machinists	Foundry Mold and Coremakers
Industrial Machinery Mechanics	Paper Goods Machine Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Heavy and Tractor-Trailer Truck Drivers	Credit Authorizers, Checkers, and Clerks
Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food	Crossing Guards
Computer User Support Specialists	Drilling and Boring Machine Tool Setters, Operators, and Tenders, Metal and Plastic

From 2012 to 2022, the top three growing occupations are *Home health aides*, *Personal care aides*, and *Construction laborers*, while the top three declining industries are projected to be *Word processors and typists*, *Computer operators*, and *Postmasters and mail superintendents*.

As is noted in the preceding tables, the long term occupational forecasts for Michigan include a number of industries that could provide substantial employment opportunities for the mature worker. For example, home health aides, personal care aides, and computer user support specialists industries are well suited to support the lifestyle of the older worker, as well as provide opportunities in areas to support ongoing services for long term care health. Other occupational opportunities may include but are not limited to medical assistant's dental assistants, health instructors, customer service representatives, housekeeping, food service, and transportation. All of these occupations are vital in the Long Term health care area. Furthermore, in the Information Technology industry, SCSEP participants could also be used to support office functions such as clerical or administrative assistants. Positions in these occupations many times allow for part time employment. Due to the need for flexibility with their schedule and impact on other benefits, participants of the SCSEP may chose part time employment and would be aptly suited to fill such vacancies.

Section 4. Service Delivery and Coordination

I. Service delivery

In the SCSEP, the delivery of services is a vital part of a participant's experience. They are placed in a wide range of host agency assignments other training opportunities to obtain the skill sets necessary for unsubsidized employment.

Skill set development will be an extension of the participant's employment goals as outlined in the participants Individual Employment Plan (IEP). A survey of SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors provided information on the training assignments of participants as well as the skill sets present. Table 5 provides a profile of participants in the SCSEP for 2015-16.

Table 5. SCSEP Subsidized Placements PY 2015-16

Services to the General Community	% 2015-16 Placements	Services to the Elderly Community	% 2015-12 Placements
Education	15%	Project Administration	4%
Health & Hospitals	21%	Health & Home Care	23%
Housing Rehabilitation	10%	Housing Rehabilitation	12%
Employment Assistance	19%	Employment Assistance	10%
Recreation / Parks & Forests	5%	Recreation / Senior Centers	7%
Environmental Quality	1%	Nutrition Programs	16%
Public Works	1%	Transportation	15%
Social Services	28%	Outreach / Referral	9%
Other	0%	Other	0%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey- February, March 2016

In addition to subsidized placement, SCSEP regulations afford participants the opportunity for an On-the-Job- Experience (OJE) training experience with local employer(s).

As outlined in Older Worker Bulletin (OWB) 04-04, participants OJE must be consistent with their unsubsidized employment goals, and:

- Provide SCSEP participants with career training and placement opportunities with private businesses;
- Facilitate the achievement of economic self-sufficiency for participants; and
- Provides SCSEP projects with opportunities to initiate/enhance relationships with the private sector, collaborate with the one-stops, meet or exceed performance standards, and broaden the options available to SCSEP participants.

In a survey of SCSEP national sponsor and state subgrantees, over forty one percent of survey respondents indicated that their SCSEP sub-projects utilized OJE projects during Program Year (PY) 2015 as a way to transition enrollees to unsubsidized employment.

Table 6. Utilization of OJE in Michigan, PY 2015

Do your SCSEP projects utilize OJE?	Yes	No
Percentage	41.6%	58.4%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

The success of the SCSEP in transitioning participants from subsidized training assignments to private employment, hinges in large part on developing and enhancing employment skills which are in demand in high-growth industries and occupations. Table 7 identifies the employment skills that were most frequently reported as present in the 2015-16 Michigan SCSEP population, with 1 being the most prevalent to 14 being the least prevalent.

Table 7. Job Skills Present in 2015-16 Michigan SCSEP Population

Skill Area	Rank
Custodial/ Home Repair	7
Food Services	11
Receptionist	3
Basic Clerical	1
Administrative/Program Assistant	5
Customer Service	2
Companions	9
Library/Teachers/Tutors	12
Child Care	10
Secretary	4
Transportation	14
Health Aides	8
Security	13
Computer/Information Technology	6

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

Employment skills that are either present or are being developed in the SCSEP population can be viewed against recent employment and wage estimates, and forecasts of the occupations that will be in demand in Michigan in the next few years. Table 8a identifies the job training provided to 2015-16 SCSEP participants, with 1 being the most prevalent to 15 being the least prevalent. Additionally, Table 9 provides employment and wage estimates, and Table 10 lists occupations with strong projected job growth and favorable employment levels.

Table 8a. Training & Skill Development Provided to 2015-16 Michigan SCSEP Participants

Skill Area	Rank
Basic Clerical	1
Secretary	4
Receptionist	2
Custodial/Home Repair	6
Administrative/Program Assistant	7
Library/Teachers/Tutors	12
Communications	14
Customer Service	3
Health Aides	8
Food Service	11
Security	10
Companions	13
Child Care	9
Transportation	12
Computer/Information Technology	5

Source: 2016 State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

After careful review of the information provided in the above referenced tables, you will find a comparison of the skills present at the beginning of the SCSEP program training experience against those provided during the training below in table 8b.

Comparison of Job Skills Present in 2015-16 Michigan SCSEP Population
Versus
Training & Skill Development Provided to 2015-16 Michigan SCSEP Participants
Table 8b

Skill Area	Job Skills Present	Job Skills Provided
Custodial/ Home Repair	7	6
Food Services	11	11
Receptionist	3	2
Basic Clerical	1	1
Administrative/Program Assistant	5	7
Customer Service	2	3
Companions	9	13
Library/Teachers/Tutors	12	12
Child Care	10	9
Secretary	4	4
Transportation	14	12
Health Aides	8	8
Security	13	10
Computer/Information Technology	6	5
Custodial/ Home Repair	7	6

Source: 2016 State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

Table 9. State of Michigan Annual Average Employment & Wage Estimates for 2014

Occupational Title	Employment	Average Hourly Wage (Estimate)	Occupational Title	Employment	Average Hourly Wage (Estimate)
Sales & Related Occupations	418,876	\$17.52	Management Occupations	200,090	\$49.84
Installation, Maintenance, & Repair Occupations	155,770	\$21.05	Architecture & Engineering Occupations	125,610	\$37.24
Personal Care & Service Occupations	105,680	\$11.52	Food Preparation & Servicing Related Occupations	363,130	\$10.06
Protective Service Occupations	72,840	\$20.51	Healthcare Support Occupations	142,250	\$13.35
Production Occupations	432,800	\$17.13	Building & Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance Occupations	121,720	\$12.57
Transportation & Material Moving Occupations	260,480	\$16.31	Computer & Mathematical Occupations	101,050	\$34.98
Education, Training, & Library Occupations	232,450	\$25.88	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, & Media Occupations	48,060	\$22.91
Healthcare Practitioners & Technical Occupations	257,300	\$35.79	Community & Social Services Occupations	56,950	\$21.50
Farming, Fishing, & Forestry Occupations	4,440	\$14.41	Life, Physical, & Social Sciences Occupations	30,010	\$28.35
Business & Financial Operations Occupations	182,640	\$31.63	Legal Occupations	24,800	\$43.55
Construction & Extraction Occupations	119,030	\$22.85	Office & Administrative Support Occupations	617,770	\$16.34

Source: Michigan Department of Management, Information, Technology/ Bureau of Labor Market Information & Strategic Initiatives

Table 10. Michigan's Top 25 Emerging/Future in Demand Occupations 2012-2022

Occupation	Growth	Annual Openings	Occupation	Growth	Annual Openings
Registered Nurses	11.4%	2,895	Insurance Sales Agents	13.7%	629
Mechanical Engineers	12.5%	1,452	Software Developers, Applications	21.3%	509
Industrial Engineers	14.9%	1,078	Computer Systems Analysts	22.6%	516
Computer User Support Specialists	18.5%	684	Tool and Die Makers	10.9%	227
Electricians	13.3%	620	Industrial Machinery Mechanics	25.3%	697
1st Line Supervisors of Constr. Workers	17.3%	336	Plumbers, Pipefitters, and Steamfitters	15.0%	317
Market Research Analysts and Specialists	29.2%	427	Software Developers, Systems Software	19.6%	294
Dental Hygienists	18.1%	394	Radiologic Technologists	11.0%	187
HVAC Mechanics and Installers	17.2%	277	Personal Financial Advisors	25.8%	224
Mechanical Engineering Technicians	14.8%	175	Physician Assistants	24.0%	151
Millwrights	16.4%	101	Web Developers	16.0%	93
Diagnostic Medical Sonographers	32.6%	108	Brick Masons and Block Masons	28.7%	70
CNC Machine Programmers, Metal & Plastic	37.9%	115			

Source: Michigan Department of Management, Information, Technology/ Bureau of Labor Market Information & Strategic Initiatives

In light of the projected job growth for specific occupations in Michigan, as well as feedback we have received from the SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees, AASA proposes to target the following high growth industries over the next four years to support employment opportunities for participants: Health and Hospital, Retail, and Tourism/Leisure and Hospitality. Targeting of these industries will be accomplished through a strategic outreach approach for state subgrantees and national sponsors to follow.

Healthcare-Michigan currently is experiencing a shortage of health care workers state wide. Besides health care workers, health systems are also in great need of experienced and reliable employees to fill vacancies in departments such as customer service, housekeeping, maintenance, gift shops, hospitality, and food service. To support participants in preparation for employment opportunities, they will be quickly identified at enrollment as to their current skill set and potential skill to be developed through community service assignment training. Once an assessment has been completed, an Individual Employment Plan (IEP) will be developed for the participant which identifies skills to develop at the assigned host agency for work based learning necessary for unsubsidized employment in the long term care healthcare industry.

Retail- Based on survey results, a large number of SCSEP participants have obtained a number of skills which could be utilized in the retail industry if allowed to fully develop. For example, many participants who are enrolled in SCSEP are able to perform basic duties which align with skills necessary for a position in the retail industry, including customer service. To target appropriate participants for placement in the retail industry, they will be screened and assessed at enrollment for the necessary skills and interest necessary for such a position. Participants will identify positions in the industry for which they are interested in. Once an assessment is completed, an IEP will be developed based on the results of the assessments which outlines the skills and training necessary for obtaining employment in retail industry. The participant will then be assigned to a host agency that matches the skills set participant will be developing. The participants IEP will have goals and objectives with achievable timeframes for skill set attainment. Should it be necessary, participants will be rotated to other host agencies to ensure necessary training is received which is transferable to the workforce.

Tourism/Leisure and Hospitality-Michigan provides numerous opportunities for potential job seekers in the area of tourism/leisure and hospitality thanks to the beautiful great lakes which are a jewel to Michigan's economy. To prepare potential participants for this industry, they will be thoroughly screened and assessed at enrollment for the necessary skill sets. Once assessed, an IEP will then be developed based on the results of the assessment. The IEP will include steps for obtaining the necessary skills to be developed in preparation for unsubsidized employment. The IEP will include goals and objectives with achievable timeframes for the development of employability skills which will translate to the workforce. The IEP, where appropriate, may include additional training to ensure development of participant skill sets which match the needs of the leisure and hospitality industry. Where appropriate, participants will be

rotated to other host agencies to ensure appropriate skills have been developed which are transferable to the workforce.

Information Technology-Computer training through a participant training experience in the SCSEP it is critical that they develop computer skills because most if not all employment opportunities will require computer usage at some point. This will be a critical skill to obtain and retain in the workforce. Specialized computer training is essential for participants as they transition to high growth industries or industries with career ladders. With the onset of the information age, most employers require potential applicants to apply for job vacancies online. Additionally, because of the evolving global economy, the majority of 21st century jobs will require specialized computer knowledge. AASA and national sponsors in Michigan will be working with all subgrantees in the state on some type of specialized computer training where appropriate. Feedback obtained from the state plan survey as well as during meetings with the SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees, also identified specialized computer training as a necessary 21st century workforce development skill.

Preparation for such these opportunities will be critical, including the development of partnerships for training purposes. For example, in some instances some SCSEP projects will be partnering with their community colleges, and/or local libraries. Additionally, other services offered at local MWSC, such as Core and Intensive Services will be explored. In order to reinforce computer literacy, SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors will be encouraged to require some type of goal and objective related to computer literacy in a participant's IEP.

Transportation-It has become evident that reliable transportation is a necessary supportive service for SCSEP participants to ensure employment is obtained and retained. Ongoing feedback from grantee meetings as well as the state plan survey identified transportation as a necessary support for a participant's job training experience and opportunity for unsubsidized employment. Without transportation, participants will be unable to complete their training assignment, limiting their opportunities for becoming economically self-sufficient. To address this issue, AASA and its partners propose to explore possible ways of leveraging resources to support participants during their employment experiences. For example, all AAA's who serve seniors have an inventory of transportation resources in their community. AASA will encourage all state subgrantees to work with their AAA on how best to serve seniors with transportation needs. Additionally, co-enrollment of participants in the WIOA and other programs administered through the MWSC system will assist with transportation resources for those in need. AASA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to work with their local senior centers, faith based organizations, community action agencies, department of human services agencies, and local transit authorities to develop strategies to address any gaps in services.

Coordinated referral system-AASA and its partners have identified the importance of a coordinated referral system for seniors served in the SCSEP as well as after they have completed their training. Once a participant exits the SCSEP whether they have

a job or not, resources will be critical in order to remain as independent as possible in the community. Such services include but are not limited to housing, food, medical, budgeting, and counseling. Many participants are on limited incomes and may need assistance with supportive services to become economically self-sufficient. AASA proposes to work with SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors in order to support a coordinated referral system, such as the development of an electronic resource guide by county of availability of services. The resource guide would be available online in data base form or hard copy form. Currently there are a number of resource guides available by county through local DHHS offices, Community Action Agencies, or United Way. AASA also proposes to work with the necessary partners to ensure resources guides are available for participants. Additionally, through the efforts of the local 211 system or the Aging and Disability Resource Centers (ADRC's), seniors would be able to access needed information from an options counselor who would have access to necessary information to support participants with the best options for accessing necessary resources.

Host agency assignment training-It is critical for a participant to receive the appropriate training for the job they wish to obtain, they must be matched with a host agency that provides them with the environment to prepare for unsubsidized employment as outlined in their Individual Employment Plan. In order for this to occur, SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors must have a diverse group of host agencies to choose from where work based training will be provided. Host agencies must also fully support a participant's job search process, including understanding the local job market in their community. AASA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to work with participants and reinforce the need for a participant to be actively engaged in the job search process, including referrals to the MWSC's. Part of this process will also include contacting employers, completing job applications, and scheduling job interviews. Outreach to employers in key demand occupations must occur if participant unsubsidized employment opportunities are to increase. This must all occur at the local level if a participant is to be successful. Where appropriate, AASA will request assistance from the WDA to assist with this process. AASA will seek assistance with outreach to potential employers, identification of employment opportunities, and linkages to community colleges and MWSC's for appropriate training as necessary.

Assistive Technology-The use of assistive technology will be vital for a participants training experience as well as obtaining and retaining unsubsidized employment. It is critical that participants have access to devices at Michigan Works! Service centers, including screen readers, specialized chairs, and other assistive devices for seniors with limited mobility.

II. Coordination with other programs

To continue to grow and develop the SCSEP in Michigan, AASA proposes to begin coordinated meetings with national sponsor and state subgrantees of the SCSEP once

the new national sponsors have been selected and contracts begin October 1, 2016. This will assist with identifying best practices for serving participants, coordination of resources, and allow for a coordinated referral system across all grantees. Additionally, AASA intends to continue to participate in a number of meetings and committees which impact the mature job seeker. For example, AASA administration and the SCSEP Program Manager will continue to be actively involved in GTIB quarterly meetings when able to. AASA has been involved in participating in subcommittees of the GTIB in the past and will continue to do so where appropriate. AASA has also partnered with the WDA on a number of issues related to serving the Older Worker. AASA proposes to continue these partnerships through future presentations at Michigan Works Association meetings, Local Workforce Investment Board (LWIB) meetings, and/or conferences. The Michigan Works Association is an organization which represents the 15 LWIBs that operate over 100 One-Stop Service Center throughout Michigan. In the past AASA has been a panel presenter along with staff from WDA at the annual Michigan Works Association Conference. AASA has also partnered with the WDA, Macomb Community College, and AARP in the development of a day long forum targeting services to the mature worker. WDA has also identified several areas of common interest on which AASA and the WDA can coordinate efforts and will be pursuing those opportunities in the near future.

The Director of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) is appointed to the GTIB per executive order as one of 10 state department directors. Because AASA is a Type II agency within MDHHS, the AASA Executive Director may be consulted on issues affecting the older job seeker. As such, any issues identified on the GTIB related to older job seekers would be referred by the MDHHS Director to the AASA Executive Director's attention. Furthermore, in order to educate and facilitate communication on SCSEP and older worker events, the MDHHS Director is invited to attend and participate in such events sponsored by AASA. This increases knowledge and education on the GTIB on issues affecting the older job seeker. In the past AASA also has had WDA staff speak on a variety of topics during quarterly meetings with state subgrantees and will continue such efforts in the future.

AASA will continue to work with the area agencies on aging to ensure to collaboration with local workforce investment boards (LWIBs) and MWSC's continues across the state. This ensures needs of older persons are represented. Locally, AASA will continue to urge state subgrantees and national program sponsors of SCSEP to attend their relevant LWIB meetings as well as to pursue membership on LWIBs where appropriate. AASA will advocate for the use of TEN 16-04, Protocol for Serving Older Workers, to be implemented as standard operating procedures in Michigan. One SCSEP state sub-grantee, Macomb St. Clair Michigan Works! operates as a MWSC which administer WIOA programs. Furthermore, several national grantees' local project offices are housed at MWSC's as well.

Pursuing opportunities to place SCSEP participants at MWSC's through host agency assignments will also be strongly encouraged. AASA envisions that the utilization of MWSC's as host agencies is a critical component of the successful operation of a

SCSEP project at the local level. Not only will the assignment benefit the participant assigned to the One-Stop Service Center, but the participant will provide a peer to peer connection to other SCSEP participants who access core and training services provided at the MWSC's in their search for unsubsidized employment. Furthermore, AASA understands trained SCSEP participants can often provide an added service to older job seekers who enter One-Stop Service Centers searching for employment. Many times the older job seeker may feel a bit intimidated upon coming into the MWSC's. Seeing an older worker assisting at the MWSC's can provide the SCSEP participant with a supportive ear and guiding hand in the job seeking process.

At the local level, SCSEP state subgrantees have established a multitude of cooperative and collaborative relationships with human service provider agencies. Linkages have been developed with community action agencies, MWSC's, vocational rehabilitation offices, LWIBs, county multi-purpose human services collaborative bodies, and county councils or commissions on aging. AASA will continue to encourage the development of such relationships.

AASA also requires all subgrantees, as a part of their annual grant application, to describe their involvement with LWIBs and MWSC's. Examples of current coordination efforts by AASA subgrantees include:

Table 11. AASA-WIOA Coordination Efforts

▪ Distribution of TEN 16-04, Protocol for Servicing Older Workers to local workforce partners.
▪ Assigning SCSEP enrollees to one-stop service centers to provide assistance to older job seekers
▪ Contract agreements to provide training services for WIOA participants
▪ Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) in place with one-stop service centers
▪ Referrals to WIOA one-stops and vice-versa depending on the employment assistance needed by the job seeker
▪ SCSEP staff participates with workforce board (WIB) in the region; SCSEP services are collocated at one-stops centers
▪ SCSEP staff are participating members of the One-Stop Service Center Advisory Committee
▪ SCSEP program utilizes dual enrollments with WIOA.

Source: AASA state subgrantee meetings, quarterly narrative reports

SCSEP national sponsor and state subgrantees operating in the state were surveyed regarding WIOA, and were asked to describe overall coordination with WIA, coordination with MWSC's, and the number of MOUs in place with LWIB. Table 12 summarizes the level of coordination with WIA for SCSEP sponsors in Michigan.

Table 12. SCSEP Coordination with Workforce Investment Act Programs

Overall Coordination w/ WIA Programs:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
Close coordination with programs	33%
Some coordination with programs	50%
Little coordination between programs	17%
No coordination between programs	0%
Involvement w/ One-Stop Career Centers:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
Involved in most One-Stop Career Centers	50%

Involved in some One-Stop Career Centers	33%
Involved in very few One-Stop Career Centers	17%
Not involved in One-Stop Career Centers	0%
Development of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with One-Stop Career Centers:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
MOUs with most/All One-Stop Career Centers	43%
MOUs with some One-Stop Career Centers	40%
MOUs with very few One-Stop Career Centers	17%
No MOUs with One-Stop Career Centers	0%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

Survey respondents also submitted suggestions for better coordination with WIOA, and provided examples of recent coordination efforts in their service areas. Survey responses are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13. SCSEP – WIOA Coordination Strategies

Suggestions for better coordination with WIOA:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enforce responsibility of the WIOA providers and One-Stops to create true two way relationships with SCSEP providers ▪ Placing more participants at One-Stops through host agency assignments ▪ More referrals of participants from One-Stops to SCSEP grantees are needed ▪ More of an emphasis in WIOA on servicing older adults and balancing WIOA goals with the employment goals of older adults (e.g., full-time employment as a WIOA performance goals versus older adults wanting to work part-time) ▪ Provide more information needed on serving older adults
Examples of current SCSEP efforts to coordinate with WIOA:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On-going referrals to WIOA programs for job search, including registering on the Pure Michigan Talent Connection and core services ▪ On-going contact between SCSEP staff and WIOA staff ▪ Co-located in several One-Stops ▪ Sharing SCSEP recruitment materials with local One-Stops ▪ Referrals from WIOA to SCSEP, SCSEP presentations at WIOA meetings, and presentations by WIOA at local SCSEP meetings

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

AASA requested that SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors provide detailed information regarding the status of MOU development between LWIBs and SCSEP Grantees, as directed by the USDOL in Training and Employment guidance Letter #26-04. Information submitted indicates that around 75 percent of the SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors have established MOU's with their respective LWIBs.

Long Term Strategy for Engaging Employers

To increase participant placements in unsubsidized employment and Employer Outreach, a number of strategies will need to be implemented. As has been previously mentioned, participants must obtain a skill set which matches the needs of the employers to fill their vacancies. Furthermore, employers must be educated on the availability of reliable and mature workers who have received training through the SCSEP, and can be hired to fill such vacancies. For this to occur a locally driven

employer outreach campaign must be developed. This will involve both state and national SCSEP providers. All need to know their local employer market. AASA proposes to partner with the WDA to assist with this. The campaign would have a three-tiered approach as follows: 1) obtain demographic information on the local labor market, determine who the local employers are, what are the employer needs, and how can the SCSEP assist with meeting those needs; 2) presentations to local business organizations, providing information on the SCSEP and how it can meet the needs of employers; 3) Development of OJE contracts with for-profit employers, and host agency agreements for non-profit employers. An employer outreach campaign will be essential to marketing assets mature workers can bring to the organization. AASA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to partner with their local MWSC's on campaigns and resources as necessary which will ultimately assist local employers with finding reliable talent for their organization and assist participants with obtaining unsubsidized employment. The final outcome will be employers seeking the SCSEP to assist with filling job vacancies.

Another resource to support an employer outreach campaign will be the senior-friendly employers list AARP publishes each year. The AARP senior-friendly employers list is comprised of a group of employers who are dedicated to hiring the experienced, reliable, and mature worker. AASA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to target employers on this list.

As was previously mentioned, employer outreach will mainly target the high-growth industries of health care, retail, tourism/leisure, and hospitality. However, where appropriate, AASA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantee and national sponsors to work with those employers identified by the participants whom they would like to target for employment. Again, having the participant actively involved in this process will be critical. Local identification will be critical as each region may have high-growth industries that vary from region to region. Local SCSEP subgrantees and the national sponsors must work together with their business community as they strategize their outreach campaign to employers.

To ensure state and national sponsors increase participant placement in unsubsidized employment and improve employer outreach, a logic model will be used. The logic model will incorporate benchmarks to assess the effectiveness of targeted strategies for improving performance in identified areas over the next four years. For example, AASA will request status updates on this information from state subgrantees and national sponsors. Additionally, AASA also intends to review Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR's) in the Performance and Results Reporting System (SPARQ) to assess entered employment rates, retention rates, and identify employers hiring participants from the SCSEP.

Long Term Strategy to Improve SCSEP Services in the State

1) Increase support for participants- Additional support for participants across all SCSEP grantees will be implemented. Michigan will begin holding state wide meetings with state subgrantee and national sponsors at least once per year. This will assist in the development of a coordinated referral system for participants, including the development of a support services guide for referrals to needed services. It was identified in the state plan meeting that support services are critical for participant's success in unsubsidized employment. Transportation was the most critical support service identified. Additionally, it was also identified in the state plan meeting that regional meetings must also be held between state subgrantees and the local national sponsors at least once per year. Because host agencies are limited to being a non-profit, National sponsors and state subgrantees of the SCSEP feel that this will assist with developing a coordinated referral system for participants in the program as well as allow for closer monitoring of participants who may want to switch grantees.

2) Multi-Year program funding-Current funding for SCSEP is based upon a program year that runs from July 1st through June 30th of the following year. Unlike OAA Title III funding, SCSEP does not allow funds to be carried over from one program year to the next, unless a formal no cost extension is approved. The inability to carry funds forward creates problems at year-end, as this is an arbitrary deadline in terms of employment activities. For example, organizations looking to enter into an On-The-Job Experience (OJE) or Work Experience (WE) contracts with the SCSEP do not recognize fiscal year demarcations. These organizations are looking to train an individual for a position to meet a business need. If agencies could have Multi-Year funding or an ability to carry-over some portion of the program year grant, that would allow SCSEP projects to enter into employment arrangements with prospective employers that are designed to meet the needs of the enrollee and the employer.

3) Standardized OJE contract forms - The OJE option under the federal OAA is a useful tool for enhancing the placement capabilities of SCSEP. This is especially true as states across the country implement the WIOA. In order to facilitate partnerships between and among WIOA programs and streamline services, thought should be given to creating boilerplate language for OJE and WE contracts for all WIOA programs.

The boilerplate language could be enhanced and made more agency/program-specific, but all programs under WIOA would have the basic minimums that should be included in all OJE/WE agreements. The boilerplate contract language should be based upon best practices of current SCSEP and other WIOA programs that are successfully utilizing OJEs and other cooperative arrangements to provide employment assistance and job placement services.

4) Exclusion of SCSEP income in federally funded public assistance programs- The current practice of excluding SCSEP income from eligibility budgets of federally funded public assistance programs such as Food Stamps, Medicaid, and subsidized housing creates a disincentive for program participants to transition to unsubsidized

employment. Upon obtaining an unsubsidized job, income from employment is then budgeted for participants who receive this kind of public assistance, often resulting in reduced benefits, or total in-eligibility. Some kind of transition program would remove this disincentive. The transition program could apply either during participation in the SCSEP or post participation. A possible solution could be that SCSEP income is excluded during a reasonable time while on SCSEP, for example 24 to 36 months, after which time the income would be countable.

5) SCSEP state subgrantee and national sponsors in Michigan suggested the following program recommendations:

- I. More administrative funding is needed. The SCSEP is a labor intensive program that requires a great deal of one on one contact with participants. For example, SCSEP program staff conducts two job searches: one for the best host agency assignment and a second for the unsubsidized employment placement. SCSEP program staff has the role of a case manager with little funds to support such a position.
- II. Increased funding for work support services for participants, specifically funding for transportation.
- III. Allocation of additional funds for specialized training for participants to enhance their employability skills. This would be funding that could be used as necessary to ensure participants have the resources that will enable them to become job ready, particularly those participants that lack specialized skills. Such funds will assist with strengthening a participant's marketability in the workforce.
- IV. Increased flexibility on use of host agencies, allowing host agency agreements with for-profit agencies. Current SCSEP requirements do not allow host agency agreements with for-profit agencies.
- V. Clarification from the US DoL on the formula for the distribution of authorized positions. Specifically, what factors are used when determining the number of positions per county in each state. Are the areas of high unemployment rates, levels of poverty, and numbers of persons most in need considered in this decision.
- VI. Allow for the ability to place participants directly into On the Job Experience placements without the two week community service assignment requirement.
- VII. More direction/clarification from US DoL on balancing "non-countable" SCSEP income (ex. food stamps, federal housing, and certain social services benefits) with unsubsidized employment goals. Non-countable income can create a disincentive for participants to transition to unsubsidized employment.

- VIII. Reduction in paperwork. With the ever-changing program requirements, more time is being spent on paper work which has made it difficult to work with participants in assisting them with becoming economically self-sufficient.
- IX. Hold training events to bring SCSEP projects together to discuss coordination of activities, share information, and discuss common problems.

Strategy for Continuous Improvement in Levels of Performance

To ensure the state grantee meets its negotiated performance goal, AASA proposes to develop the following strategy:

- 1) Ongoing assessment of subgrantee performance through review of management reports and QPR's in the SPARQ system; 2) Continuous assessment of the status of statewide participant placements for successes and failures; 3) Continuous assessment of statewide participant retention in employment; 4) Continuous assessment of statewide participant average earnings.

To accomplish this strategy, AASA will work with SCSEP state subgrantees in their use of SPARQ management reports for assessing the flow of their participants into and out of the program, as well as success or failures of participants in their placements. AASA will also provide technical assistance and training as necessary to SCSEP state subgrantees in their use of the SPARQ, including utilization of the management reports tool. SCSEP state subgrantees who are underperformers will receive compliance reviews and technical assistance monitoring in order to improve their performance. SCSEP state subgrantees that have been identified as underperformers will also be required to submit corrective action plans, and monitored for implementation of such plans.

Sections 5- Location and Population Served, including Equitable Distribution

a. Location of positions and populations for which projects of this type authorized to serve are most needed

The distribution of SCSEP resources is reviewed and updated annually by AASA and national program sponsors operating in the state. The Equitable Distribution Report (EDR) compares the location of subsidized SCSEP positions with county-specific position targets established by US DoL. This process is intended to ensure adequate program coverage across the state. Table 14 identifies the number of underserved counties in Michigan according the 2015-16 EDR. The complete Michigan EDR is attached in Appendix I.

Table 14. Equitable Distribution Report 2012, 2013, 2014 & 2015

Program Year	Counties Served above EDR Recommended Level	EDR Underserved Counties
2012-13	19	54
2013-14	22	42
2014-15	24	43
2015-16	17	56

Source: 2012-2013, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-2016 Michigan SCSEP EDR

Table 15. Analysis of EDR Underserved Counties 2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016

Of the total of underserved counties:	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
The number of counties underserved by 2 positions or less:	13	18	14	15
The number of counties underserved by 5 positions or less:	15	21	21	20

Source: 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 Michigan SCSEP EDR

Since 2006, AASA has made a number of changes in the reallocation of positions in Michigan. For example, in February 2006, AASA reallocated five vacant positions to underserved areas, and in October 2006 AASA was able to make a number of position reallocations within its sub-grantees from over-served to underserved counties. In January 2007, nine additional vacant slots were re-allocated to underserved areas by AASA. In May and June 2007, several changes were made by AARP, Experience Works, and National Urban League (NUL) which resulted in improvement to equity in 12 counties. Since PY 2006, 24 counties have been served equitably. Each year, AASA provides state subgrantees and national grantees with an analysis of the distribution of SCSEP and position targets. Over the last two years, AASA has worked diligently with the SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees for a move towards equitable distribution on the targeted counties. As such, when position levels were reduced significantly for PY 2011, AASA ensured reductions were made in counties which were considered over-served. This was done through assessing areas identified as over and under-served in the equitable distribution report, as well as the development of strategies to move those regions towards equity all the while ensuring participants were not displaced. Over the next 4 years, AASA will work diligently to move all counties towards equity.

In addition to the EDR, SCSEP national sponsors in the state also were surveyed and asked to identify significantly underserved or over-served counties and/or communities, and to describe strategies to increase service levels in underserved areas. A summary of the responses is provided in Table 16.

Table 16. Equitable Distribution Strategies

<p>National sponsor has reallocated positions in counties such as Macomb and Oakland in order to bring them more into equity More slots need to be moved to Macomb and Oakland County as they are underserved Wayne Co is over served. Some positions need to be moved out of Wayne County in order to address this. State grantee has shifted more slots into Macomb as realignments have happened. When participants have left the program and vacancies have occurred, positions have been moved.</p>

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - February, March 2016; State Plan Meeting February 2016

When changes in authorized position levels and national sponsor grantees occurred during PY 2012, it became increasingly evident that AASA needed to target its coordination efforts with national grantee sponsors over the next few years to improve equity across the state. Since national grantees control almost 80% of the positions in the state, significant shifts in positions will have to come with assistance from the national grantees in order to achieve equity. AASA made strides in bringing equity to the urban areas that were in need of positions as the population shifted. However, it is clear that some of the more rural areas remain a bit under served and some urban areas of southeast Michigan remain underserved. AASA intends to target these areas with additional positions where appropriate to ensure for equity across the state over the next 4 years.

As PY 2016 begins it is apparent that Macomb and Oakland continue to be underserved and Wayne a bit over served. The issue of serving the most in need through the SCSEP must be raised here, as a large portion of Wayne County includes persons who are economically the most in need, as well as a large number of minority persons. The County of Wayne also encompasses the City of Detroit.

It also must be noted that over the last three years the unemployment rate for Wayne County has been at or above the nation-wide average. In 2013 it was 11.6%, in 2014 it was 10.0% and 2015 it was 7.3%. Additionally, for the City of Detroit, the unemployment rate in 2013 was 19.1%, in 2014 it was 16.7%, and in 2015 it was 12.4%. The two SCSEP subgrantee which serve the City of Detroit and the surrounding areas have been very successful in placing seniors into unsubsidized employment, including those seniors who have been identified as most in need. With this in mind, AASA recommends that the two SCSEP state subgrantee continue to serve those most in need within their region. In order to make adjustments within Wayne County, AASA will transition slots away into Macomb and Oakland Counties as positions become vacant.

As a preface in sections b and c, some of the data elements are available from the 2010 Census (e.g., most socio-economic data). In some cases, data from other sources and/or proxy measures have been included, where relevant. For example, AASA surveyed national sponsors and state subgrantees to collect data on services to special populations as part of the plan development process. Survey respondents indicated that the following populations were most in need of SCSEP services:

- Individuals with Disabilities - Projects are working with vocational rehabilitation to enroll and place disabled individuals.
- Veterans - There is a significant veteran population in some areas. Projects work with Veteran Affairs, local Veteran Centers, and the Michigan Veterans Foundation.
- The "Elderly" - The older segment of the SCSEP-eligible population and those with chronic illnesses.

- Others – Displaced Homemakers, widows, non-English speakers, and low literacy applicants.

b. Rural and Urban Populations

The 2010 Census provides population figures on individuals residing in rural areas. Analysis on census-designated rural populations indicates that one-quarter of the state's residents reside in rural areas. Michigan defines rural as areas not designated as metropolitan statistical areas, as designated by the Census Bureau. Rural also includes segments of metropolitan counties that have been assigned a Rural Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) code between four and ten.

Based on the EDR distribution of SCSEP positions, Michigan projects allocate 25.0 percent of all positions (360 positions) to counties where 50.0 percent or more residents reside in census-designated rural areas. If the percentage of all persons in Michigan residing in rural areas (18.72 percent) is applied to the total number of EDR allocated positions for 2015-16 (1405 positions), a baseline of 270 positions should be located in rural areas. Currently, Michigan is meeting this baseline.

In 30 of the 42 counties in the state where 15 percent or more of the fifty-five and older population is below poverty, more than 80 percent of county residents reside in rural areas. Michigan SCSEP projects allocate 101 positions to these areas (7 percent of all positions in PY 2015-16). Residents in these counties make up only 3.6 percent of the state's fifty-five and older population. More detailed information on rurality in Michigan is attached in Appendix VI.

A proxy measure of services to non-rural individuals was developed from census data and the location of SCSEP positions across counties in the state. Based on the 2015-16 EDR, Michigan projects allocate 65.65 percent of all program positions (913 positions) to counties where less than one-third of residents reside in census-designated rural areas. If the percentage of non-rural persons in counties where two-thirds or more county residents reside in non-rural areas is applied to the total number of EDR positions for 2015-16, a baseline of 913 positions should be located in these "urban" counties. Currently, Michigan is meeting this baseline.

In Wayne County, where 99.3 percent of all residents are urban and 12.9 percent of the fifty-five and over population is below the federal poverty level (FPL), SCSEP projects allocated 421 positions (29.9 percent of all positions in 2015-16). This level of service reflects the high concentration of SCSEP-eligible individuals in Wayne County.

c. Specific Population Groups

State Plans must provide information about the relative distribution of those eligible individuals who must be afforded priority for services as provided at OAA sec. 518(b). All grantees operating within the state should describe the recruitment and selection techniques they are currently utilizing in developing this section.

All SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors are responsible for developing targeting strategies for the following special population groups:

- (a) Veterans or spouses of veterans who meet the requirements of the Jobs for Veterans Act
- (b) A person 65 year of age or older; or a person with one of the following
- (c) An individual with a disability
- (d) A person with Limited English proficiency or low literacy skills
- (e) A person who resides in a rural area
- (f) A person with low employment prospects
- (g) A person who failed to find employment after utilizing services provided under Title I of WIOA; or
- (h) A person who is homeless or at risk for homelessness

In addition to targeting the above referenced priority populations, the following relative distribution of eligible individuals must also be targeted for SCSEP services:

- 1. Persons with greatest economic need:** Those persons at or below the poverty level established by the Department of Health and Human Services and approved by the Office of Management and Budget;
- 2. Minority population:** This population would include American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asians, Black or African Americans, Hispanic or Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiian or Other Asian Pacific Islanders.
- 3. Persons in greatest social need:** The need caused by non-economic factors, which include: persons with physical and mental disabilities; language barriers; and cultural, social, or geographic isolation, including isolation brought about by racial or ethnic status that restricts the ability of an individual to perform normal daily tasks, or threatens the capacity of an individual to live independently.

In general, all OAA services, including SCSEP, target special populations. Pursuant to Section 307(a)(8) of the OAA and Federal Register Section 1321.17(8), "Outreach efforts shall place special emphasis on reaching older individuals with the greatest economic or social needs with particular attention to low-income, minority individuals." AASA utilizes a variety of data sources, including figures from the U.S Census Bureau and the Michigan Aging Information System, to assure adequate service levels to special populations.

Demographic data on service recipients is compiled for the SCSEP QPR and the OAA Title III services report (i.e., National Aging Program Information System - State Program Report [NAPIS SPR]). According to the 2014 NAPIS SPR and the most recently completed SCSEP program year data, Michigan served significant percentages of minority persons in OAA Title III and Title V (SCSEP) services. Table 17 provides an overview of the demographic distribution of Michigan's 60+ population, and service levels for OAA title III and SCSEP services.

Table 17. 2014 Older Americans Act Service Title III & V (SCSEP) Data

Population Characteristics	Michigan* 60+ Population	% Michigan 60+ Population	FY2014 OAA Title III Services (Total Clients Served)	Title V / SCSEP Participants (2014-15)
Total 60+ Population	1,996,185	100%	121,475	Total Authorized SCSEP Positions: 1405
White, Non-Hispanic	1,731,900	86.8%	81.9%	50%
African American	205,990	10.3%	15.5%	48%
Hispanic	32,655	1.6%	4.5%	2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	27,500	1.4%	0.8%	1%
American Indian/Alaskan	7,280	0.3%	0.7%	1%
Low-Income (Age 65+)	169,025	8.4%	33.7%	80%
Rural	567,350	28.4%	50%	14%

*Source: 2008 and 2009-2013 American Community Survey, U.S. Census

Greatest Economic Need

Figures from the 2010 Census indicate that 8.7 percent of persons 55 years of age and older in Michigan were below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). QPR data on Michigan SCSEP participants for program 2014-15 suggest that a large number are at or below FPL and considered at "greatest economic need." In the most recently completed program year (2014-15) more than 82 percent of SCSEP participants were at or below FPL. This percentage is much larger than the percentage of SCSEP-eligible persons below FPL in Michigan. This is significant in light of SCSEP criteria that limit eligibility to those at or below 125 percent of FPL. Of the 43 counties in the state (51.8 percent of all counties) where 15 percent or more of residents fifty-five and older are below FPL, SCSEP projects allocated 1405 positions in 2014-2015, or 63.6% of the total positions allocated. Table 18 provides figures on the distribution of SCSEP participants at or below FPL for program years 2008 to 2011. Information on persons fifty-five and older with income below FPL for all Michigan counties is included in Appendix VI.

Table 18. Michigan SCSEP Participants at or below Federal Poverty (PY 2012 – 2014)

SCSEP Participants	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11
Percentage at or below Federal Poverty Level	82.0%	%	%

Source: SCSEP Michigan Quarterly Progress Reports

SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees operating in Michigan were asked to describe efforts underway to increase participation by economically disadvantaged individuals. A summary of survey responses is shown in Table 19.

Table 19. SCSEP Strategies to Attract/Serve to Low-Income Participants

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Posters and information distributed at commodity distributions sites, energy assistance locations, and pharmacies. Information has been placed at churches, grocery stores, and Laundromats, etc. Special recruitment effort has been given to canvassing lower income communities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Services staff. Collaboration with Wayne County One-Stop operators and partners by providing SCSEP flyers and pamphlets. Outreach to senior centers, and senior subsidized

housing by providing program information. Outreach to faith-based organizations, meetings and discussions with clergy about what SCSEP can offer seniors and communities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit participants at churches, senior centers, subsidized housing, and One-Stops. Presentations made to minority groups, clubs, community meetings, and Economic Security collaborative. Posters and flyers distributed to libraries, Laundromats and grocery stores.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-income participants targeted in marketing efforts by indicating in human interest stories, work initiatives and publicity that the program serves individuals at or below the poverty level.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase marketing in areas where most in need are served
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ads in local newspapers, employment bulletin boards, information at local Senior Expos
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market through disability advocacy organizations such as the Centers for Independent Living

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

Minorities

Participation rates for minorities are an important measure of services to special populations. AASA and national SCSEP sponsors compile demographic data on program participants on a quarterly basis. Data from Program Year 2014-15 indicates that minority individuals make up 50 percent of SCSEP participants. This compares with the total sixty and older population in Michigan of which 13.2 percent are minorities. This suggests that SCSEP serves a higher percentage of minority individuals than the percentage of minorities in the overall SCSEP target population. Table 20 provides a breakdown of minority participation in Michigan SCSEP projects from PY 2008 to 2014.

Table 20. Minority SCSEP Participation - Program Years 2012 – 2014

Participant Race / Ethnicity	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
White (Non-Hispanic)	58%	59%	51%	50%
African American	40%	40%	45%	46%
Hispanic	2%	2%	2%	2%
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1%	2%	1%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.1%	1%	0.1%	1%
Total Percentage Minority Participants:	43.1%	43%	48.1%	50%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016; SPARQ Quarterly Progress Reports

A review of SCSEP QPR data and survey responses from Michigan program sponsors indicate that while a significant number of participants are minorities, projects continue to employ strategies to ensure minority participation. Examples include the following:

- Using posters, flyers, newspaper and radio advertisements, and faith-based publications to market the program to minority individuals
- Utilizing bilingual case managers to conduct outreach in the Hispanic community
- Coordinating program outreach with a cultural/ethnic/religious community centers to increase participation of low-income seniors that visit the centers

Greatest Social Need

Table 21 contains find data on percentages of individuals served with the greatest social need as available through the SPARQ web-based data collection system.

Table 21. Greatest Social Need

Need Factor	PY 2011-12	PY 2012-13	PY 2013-14	PY 2014-15
Physical and/or mental disabilities	12%	12%	13%	18%
Veterans	12%	11%	11%	11%
Language barriers	2%	1%	1%	2%
Cultural/ethnic/ social isolation	13%	11%	10%	12%
Income at or below poverty level	82%	81%	79%	92%
Poor employment history	84%	81%	80%	78%

According to survey data collected from SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees in February and March 2016, the following non-economic, social need factors were most frequently cited as those that impact the SCSEP-eligible population.

Table 22. Non-Economic Social Need Factors

Need Factor	Rank
Physical and/or mental disabilities	1
Cultural/ethnic/ social isolation	2
Geographic isolation	3
Language barriers	4

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

Another issue for consideration in terms of the effectiveness of service delivery to special population's, is the percentage of SCSEP participants identify themselves as disabled. According to SCSEP QPR data for the most recently completed program year (2014-15), 18 percent of program participants in Michigan were identified as people with disabilities. SCSEP services to individuals with disabilities can be viewed against 2010 Census figures for Michigan. Such figures indicate that 9.9 percent of individuals with disabilities between the ages of twenty-one and sixty-four are employed.

An additional factor to be considered when planning service delivery to meet the needs of people with disabilities is data from the census which shows that individuals with a census-defined disability make up approximately 42.3 percent of the state's sixty-five and older population. This figure rises to 54.4 percent for individuals seventy-five and older. This trend highlights the importance of ensuring the accessibility of SCSEP to individuals with disabilities since 25 percent of participants in 2014 were over the age of sixty-five and 4 percent were over the age of seventy-five. Other factors indicating social need include racial and ethnic factors, language barriers, and social barriers. Data on race and ethnicity for the SCSEP-eligible population in Michigan are included in Table 20. These figures show that minorities participate in SCSEP at higher levels than their percentage in the state's older population as a whole.

In terms of language barriers, according to the U.S. Census, 1.5 percent of persons forty-five and older in Michigan households that speak a language other than English are considered to be isolated due to limited English proficiency. This suggests that SCSEP should serve at least thirty individuals who are identified as isolated due to a language barrier (i.e., 1.5 percent of 1405 positions in 2014-15). As of the June 30, 2015 SCSEP data collection report, 2% of AASA sub-project participants served were individuals classified as limited English proficiency. If national grantees operating in Michigan were serving limited English speakers similarly, this suggests that Michigan is on target to utilize at least 2% of its positions with limited English proficiency individuals.

Based on the survey responses summarized in Table 22, SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors identified geographic and linguistic barriers as the third and fourth most frequently cited non-economic, social need factors behind disability and cultural/ethnic/social isolation.

Services to Veterans

Data for program years 2011 to 2014 indicate that veterans comprised on average 12 percent of all program participants in each of the last three program years. This can be viewed in light of census figures that indicate that 12.4 percent of the eighteen and older population in Michigan are veterans. Table 23 shows data on participation by veterans since Program Year 2011.

Table 23. Michigan SCSEP Service to Veterans (20011 – 2014)

SCSEP Participants*	PY 2011-12	PY 2012-13	PY 2013-14	PY 2014-15
Percentage of Participants who are Veterans	12%	11%	11%	11%

Source: SCSEP Michigan Quarterly SPARQ Reports

Steps Taken to Avoid Disruptions, to Greatest Extent Possible, when Positions are Re-distributed

In order to avoid disruptions of participants when authorized positions need to be re-distributed, AASA will work collaboratively with the national sponsors and state subgrantees to identify areas considered underserved and overserved. Once areas have been identified, AASA will request national and state subgrantees not fill vacancies in overserved counties when a participant transitions off the program. Once that position becomes vacant it will then be transferred to an area identified as underserved in order to move region towards towards equity. This will be done over a 4 year period to ensure participants are not displaced from the program. As was mentioned previously, the national sponsors control 80% of the authorized positions in the state. In order to bring counties into equity, AASA will need the full support of the national sponsors during this process. AASA will also need guidance from the US DoL in some instances regarding how to address the issue of counties identified as over served, including Wayne County. The issue with over serving Wayne Co appears to be due to concentration of positions by some national contractors. It must be noted here that Wayne County’s population includes a large percentage of most in need

persons, including minorities, as well as persons with limited English proficiency in the state. The SCSEP provides Wayne County residents a much needed service that they are not able to obtain without the support of the SCSEP.

Location of Community Services Needed, Places Where Services Are Most Needed

The term "community service" means social, health, welfare, and educational services (including literacy tutoring), legal and other counseling services, and library, recreational, conservation, maintenance, or restoration of natural resources; community betterment or beautification; antipollution and environmental quality efforts; weatherization activities; economic development; and other services essential and necessary to the community as the State may determine.

A survey of SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees identified a number of areas as those most in need service projects and the areas they serve. Table 24 provides percentages for those service projects.

Table 24. Community Service Needs

Services to General Community:	Percent	Services to Elder Community	Percent
Education	66.6%	Health or Home Care	83.3%
Social Service	100%	Recreation/Senior Centers	66.6%
Employment Assistance	83.3%	Employment Assistance	75%
Health and Hospitals	75%	Outreach and Referral	58.3%
Recreation/Parks & Recreation	25%	Project Administration	40%
Housing/Home Rehabilitation	50%	Housing/Home Rehabilitation	70%
Environmental Quality	8.3%	Nutrition Programs	75%
Public Works	8.3%	Transportation	75%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2016

SCSEP participants assigned to community service agencies are an important support to the network of agencies that address community service needs. A review of the current distribution of community service assignments noted in Table 5 suggest that these agencies serve a wide variety of the areas identified as community needs in Table 24. As national sponsors and state subgrantees assess areas of community service needs, Table 24 will be a source of information to consider when allocating positions to community host agencies.

Section 8. Appendices

Appendix I Equitable Distribution Report

Appendix II Copies of the public comments

Appendix III Agencies/Organizations who participated in the development of the Plan

Appendix IV State Plan Survey

Appendix V Michigan Poverty Rates Table

Appendix VI Michigan Rural Population Table

Appendix VII PY 2015-16 Senior Community Service Employment Program Sponsors

