

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES  
COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL  
IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING  
ROOM G-50  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008  
10:07 A.M.

PRESENTATION ON HOUSE BILL 1743  
PENNSYLVANIA RETIREE MENTORING WORKS  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

BEFORE:

HONORABLE PHYLLIS MUNDY, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN  
HONORABLE TIMOTHY F. HENNESSEY, MINORITY CHAIRMAN  
HONORABLE JOHN C. BEAR  
HONORABLE LAWRENCE H. CURRY  
HONORABLE EUGENE A. DePASQUALE  
HONORABLE JOHN T. GALLOWAY  
HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA  
HONORABLE STEVE SAMUELSON  
HONORABLE KEN SMITH  
HONORABLE RICK TAYLOR

ALSO PRESENT:

CHARLES W. QUINNAN, MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
SHARON E. SCHWARTZ, MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DEBRA B. MILLER  
REPORTER

**DEBRA B. MILLER**  
**(717)439-3785**  
***dbmreporting@msn.com***

## I N D E X

## TESTIFIERS

<u>NAMES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
REP. JOHN C. BEAR PRIME SPONSOR OF HB 1743	4
RAY PRUSHNOK LEGISLATIVE & POLICY DIRECTOR, PA DEPARTMENT OF AGING	18
LINDA T. BLANCHETTE DEPUTY SECRETARY FOR THE OFFICE OF INCOME MAINTENANCE, PA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE	18
NEIL CASHMAN, JR. SENIOR ADVISOR FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, PA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY	18
RAY LANDIS ASSOCIATE STATE DIRECTOR OF AARP PENNSYLVANIA	45
JAMIE C. RAY, ESQ. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, PHILADELPHIA, PA	62
STEPHEN HERZENBERG EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE KEYSTONE RESEARCH CENTER, HARRISBURG, PA	75

1 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Good morning, everyone.

2 I would like to call this meeting of the  
3 House Aging and Older Adult Services Committee to  
4 order.

5 May I ask the members to introduce  
6 themselves, please, starting with Representative  
7 Curry.

8 REPRESENTATIVE CURRY: I'm Representative  
9 Lawrence Curry from eastern Montgomery County, the  
10 154th District.

11 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Ken Smith, Lackawanna  
12 County, 112th District.

13 MR. QUINNAN: Chuck Quinnan, Executive  
14 Director of the committee for the Democrats.

15 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Phyllis Mundy from Luzerne  
16 County.

17 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I'm Tim Hennessey  
18 from Chester County.

19 MS. SCHWARTZ: Sharon Schwartz, Republican  
20 staff, Director.

21 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Deberah Kula, Fayette  
22 and Westmoreland Counties.

23 REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Rick Taylor,  
24 Montgomery County.

25 REPRESENTATIVE GALLOWAY: John Galloway,

1 lower Bucks County, 140th District.

2 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: And---

3 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: John Bear, Lancaster  
4 County.

5 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: John is a member of our  
6 committee as well as the prime sponsor of House Bill  
7 1743, and that is the topic of our hearing today.

8 At this time, I would like to turn it over  
9 to Representative John Bear from Lancaster County to  
10 sort of explain his bill and talk about what he  
11 perceives as the need for it.

12 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you.

13 Good morning, and thank you for your  
14 participation today. I hope everyone had a wonderful  
15 Memorial Day weekend. And I would like to thank  
16 Chairmen Mundy and Hennessey for scheduling today's  
17 hearing on my Retiree Mentoring Works Demonstration  
18 Program, also known as House Bill 1743.

19 Before I go into the testimony submitted by  
20 John L. Green, who actually was the founder of this  
21 program and is also the Executive Director of the  
22 Southeast Kansas AAA, I would just like to highlight  
23 a few things about my bill, including that I think,  
24 you know, first of all, this is only a 3-year  
25 demonstration program with minimal costs, number one.

1           Two, the bill has been written to be very  
2 flexible, and I think it provides a great deal of  
3 latitude for the four agencies that would be  
4 responsible for its administration, including the  
5 Department of Aging, the Department of Public  
6 Welfare, the Department of Labor and Industry, and  
7 the Team PA Workforce Investment Board.

8           Next, I also want to mention that I think  
9 this is a really great fit for Pennsylvania given our  
10 demographics, the growing senior population, and our  
11 existing infrastructure like the Team PA Workforce  
12 Investment Board. And I can certainly say from  
13 Lancaster County's perspective and my district in  
14 particular, you know, we have a lot of people  
15 retiring to the area. There are a lot of  
16 abilities and talent that can serve as mentors  
17 potentially.

18           And lastly, I just want to mention that, you  
19 know, this program has been tested and proven to  
20 work. It began in 1998 as a pilot program in Kansas.  
21 It is still there today. In fact, the turnover rate  
22 has dropped from 35 to 50 percent to 17 percent since  
23 this program has been in its existence, and it has  
24 been used as a model really for other mentoring  
25 programs in Kansas and throughout the United States.

1           And also, it has been awarded the United  
2 States Committee's National Award For Excellence in  
3 aging programs. So, you know, this thing has been  
4 vetted, it has been out there, and it has been a  
5 success and modeled elsewhere.

6           So really today I see the purpose of the  
7 hearing to do a few, just really to vet a few minor  
8 issues, including the compensation of mentors,  
9 administration costs, and also how we administer it  
10 here in Pennsylvania.

11           And with that, I would like to go into a few  
12 comments from John L. Green, as I mentioned, who is  
13 the Executive Director of the Southeast Kansas AAA,  
14 founder of the program, and I just want to read a few  
15 paragraphs about why he thinks this program would  
16 work in Pennsylvania and why it has been so  
17 successful in Kansas:

18           "Dear Chairmen Mundy and Hennessey:

19           "My name is John L. Green and I serve as  
20 Executive Director of the Southeast Kansas Area  
21 Agency on Aging in Chanute, Kansas. My reason for  
22 writing today is to applaud your efforts in proposing  
23 legislation to establish a senior mentoring program  
24 in the state of Pennsylvania. No issue is of more  
25 importance for America today as the issue of ensuring

1 this country will maintain a viable, trainable,  
2 retainable workforce in the future as baby boomers  
3 exit the workforce in the next ten years.

4 "In 1998 I wrote a grant proposal and  
5 submitted it to the Kansas Department on Aging with  
6 the premise that seniors with a successful background  
7 of living could teach younger workers the "soft  
8 skills" needed to succeed in today's workplace. At  
9 the time, employers were telling me they had no  
10 problem training younger workers in job specific  
11 skills but these same younger workers did not possess  
12 the generic life skills that most of us take for  
13 granted. Those skills included 1) punctuality,  
14 2) good attendance, 3) the ability to add more value  
15 than you cost, 4) the ability to get along well with  
16 others, 5) the ability to maintain a functional  
17 family and 6) the ability to maintain a positive  
18 attitude and hope for the future.

19 "Why did Kansas need a senior mentoring  
20 program? Why is Pennsylvania embracing mentoring?  
21 Looking back through America's history, we have  
22 always mentored our young most often through the  
23 family unit. Labor unions had apprenticeship  
24 programs, elders taught young people valuable lessons  
25 in our churches but somewhere along the line many of

1 our young people have advanced to adulthood without  
2 the necessary knowledge and skills to survive.  
3 That's why House Bill 1743 is so crucial. It becomes  
4 more than just giving lip service to what we, the  
5 more fortunate, call the "American Dream." It  
6 becomes an issue of learning how to dream, and  
7 realizing the effort and skills needed to achieve  
8 that dream. Our mission is to pass the torch to a  
9 new generation. We must not only convey wisdom, but  
10 more importantly, we must instill inspiration; for  
11 inspiration is the spark that ignites the soul to  
12 action. The mentor is the catalyst.

13 "During the last 10 years administering the  
14 Mentoring Works program I have seen lives change.  
15 And not only have the lives of young people been  
16 changed, I have seen retirees become impassioned  
17 about turning young people's lives around. Although  
18 the Mentoring Works program has changed over the  
19 years and we are performing many different types of  
20 mentoring, the one most important on which this  
21 program started was mentoring welfare-to-work clients  
22 and watching a light go on inside those individuals  
23 when they realize that they are significant. They  
24 realize that they do matter. That's when the flicker  
25 becomes a flame and hope is born. From there it



1 becomes a matter of how to deal with life's  
2 challenges. But, the real change is that change in  
3 self-image that will be the spark that ignites their  
4 soul to action. That's what makes..." this program  
5 worthwhile.

6 And then he just goes on to mention about a  
7 person actually going through the program, how this  
8 turned their life around, and how the interaction  
9 with his mentor really provided those skills to  
10 succeed, not only in his job but also in his family  
11 life as well.

12 So I just would be happy to answer any  
13 questions, but I did want to provide that quick  
14 overview.

15 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you, Representative  
16 Bear.

17 Could you just sort of go into your bill a  
18 little bit, about what it does and how it is  
19 structured?

20 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Essentially, again,  
21 this bill is really flexible. It basically provides  
22 for creating this mentoring program.

23 It would be administered by the four  
24 agencies we had mentioned, including the Department  
25 of Aging, the Department of Public Welfare, the

1 Department of Labor and Industry, and also working  
2 with the Workforce Investment Board.

3           And essentially it asks for those mentors to  
4 be those that are 60 years of age to serve as mentors  
5 in the program. Basically the powers and duties of  
6 the mentor recruitment and training is that "The  
7 department shall establish a process for recruiting  
8 quality retiree mentors, training those mentors and  
9 purchasing the needed technology to make the program  
10 operational."

11           In terms of funding, we are saying here that  
12 it is open, that "The department may seek potential  
13 funding opportunities in the form of grants through  
14 government agencies as well as private sector dollars  
15 to fund the program."

16           And then to have that interagency  
17 cooperation as well as local cooperation through  
18 AAAs.

19           Essentially, this would be a 3-year  
20 demonstration program. We would have an annual  
21 report at the end of each year that would be  
22 submitted by the department and sent to the General  
23 Assembly.

24           So it is very open. The only major thing  
25 here, the general rule, is that retirees shall serve

1 as advisors, counselors, and teachers to clients in  
2 one-on-one scenarios, covering topics such as  
3 job-seeking and job-keeping skills, work ethic, and  
4 responsibility as a trusted employee, and that these  
5 mentors would be reimbursed their expenses, and that  
6 is it. That is basically the bill.

7 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Could you explain who would  
8 be mentored?

9 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Well, it would be  
10 those who are currently on the welfare rolls, just  
11 currently rolled off welfare, or low-income  
12 individuals.

13 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: And how do you define "low  
14 income" and "low wage"?

15 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Well, you know, that  
16 is not mentioned here, but I'm sure there are  
17 different standards in terms of how you would get  
18 that number.

19 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay.

20 Representative Smith has a question.

21 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you,  
22 Representative Bear, for being here today.

23 As a member of the Workforce Investment  
24 Board for Lackawanna County, this legislation excites  
25 me. I think that it is needed.

1           And as an employer myself, I could see the  
2           great gap between the lowest coming into the  
3           workforce today and those that are exiting the  
4           workforce, and the life skills that the individuals  
5           have that are leaving are of great value.

6           My question is, why is -- and excuse my  
7           ignorance -- but why is there legislation needed to  
8           bring this program forward?

9           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Well, you know, this  
10          was -- I do not know that it is being done today,  
11          first of all, as far as I'm aware. And two, as you  
12          mentioned, there are a lot of folks out there that  
13          have a lot of abilities that they want to share with  
14          the younger generation as retirees, and so we thought  
15          at least if we could model something that has been so  
16          successful in other States as Kansas, that has been  
17          recognized nationally, at least give it a shot here  
18          in Pennsylvania, at least, you know, in one spot  
19          maybe.

20          I mean, when we say a demonstration program,  
21          it is something that we would all have to agree to.  
22          The flexibility in the bill, the language of the  
23          bill, allows us and the departments to decide what  
24          that would be and what we could afford. But at least  
25          have one place to try it, so it would be maybe

1 10 mentors, 2 mentors, and leverage the existing  
2 Workforce Investment Board, that why not give it a  
3 shot?

4 I mean, I don't think there would be huge  
5 costs involved. As you will probably hear from  
6 testifiers that are here today, there are probably  
7 opportunities to get this funding, not only through  
8 grants and through the various agencies but maybe  
9 through private sources, too.

10 So I think it is something worth doing.  
11 Again, the bill is very flexible. But my whole goal  
12 in this whole thing is basically to say, you know,  
13 you got these folks that are retiring, Pennsylvania  
14 is certainly an aging State, there are a lot of  
15 people moving into the State with these different  
16 abilities, like former executives, whatever, and  
17 let's share that and help these people and give them  
18 a hand up instead of being punitive in our welfare  
19 reform bills. So that is really why this came about.

20 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I agree with you,  
21 John, and I can tell you that the Workforce  
22 Investment Board in Lackawanna County has been very  
23 successful and very proactive.

24 And I can tell you also as an employer that  
25 I find it interesting that we can bring together what

1 I call the "me" generation today -- you know, it's  
2 about "me," what's in it for "me," and I need to be  
3 satisfied today -- meeting or coming together with  
4 the "giving" generation, as I call it.

5 So I think it could be a very interesting  
6 program. Thank you.

7 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Yeah, and I just want  
8 to follow up. I mean, I was asked the question,  
9 well, don't people who are trying to come off the  
10 welfare rolls, they still need maybe child care and  
11 things like that. I'm not saying this substitutes  
12 that. I'm just saying this is another tool in the  
13 toolbox to possibly help folks and give them that  
14 personal interaction.

15 Sometimes agencies, you know, they try to  
16 give personalized attention to everyone, but just  
17 because of the sheer numbers, they don't always have  
18 the ability to carry a lot of people that maybe can  
19 just mentor one or two people, have that personal  
20 relationship and talk to them, you know, not only  
21 about hard skills but also about the soft things in  
22 life -- how to get around and how to do things  
23 better, be a friend. I mean, that is why I see the  
24 benefits of this program.

25 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Very good.

1           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Hennessey.

2           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you,  
3 Phyllis.

4           John, I'm envisioning something where the  
5 State agency, whichever State agency we pick, sort of  
6 administers the program, but then, you know, the  
7 partnership opportunities would be with the private  
8 sector.

9           A couple of meetings ago, hearings ago, we  
10 heard from Senator Harris Wofford who had, I think it  
11 was Experience Works? His group of volunteer mentors  
12 which exists out there. But this, I would think,  
13 would be something where we would require people who  
14 are coming into, say the CareerLink to look for a  
15 job, to partner with a group like them and the  
16 private sector and maybe other groups throughout the  
17 Commonwealth eventually.

18           But, you know, we are not talking about  
19 setting up a large State bureaucracy here. We are  
20 actually trying to use assets that are already  
21 existing and somehow focus those efforts, and I  
22 don't know what the proper term is, you know, but  
23 just to make them more fruitful by directing people  
24 to get that kind of opportunity through the  
25 mentoring.

1           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: No; you bring up a  
2 really good point, and I want to thank you and  
3 Chairman Mundy for allowing us to come and talk about  
4 this, because really I think it was through the  
5 testimony of Senator Wofford that kind of ignited a  
6 little thought in all our brains to say, hey, you  
7 know, those things are out there potentially for  
8 funding, and this would make sense to fit in that.

9           And in terms of costs, in Kansas, I believe  
10 the first year cost around \$200,000, and that was for  
11 about 12 mentors, I believe. But in Kansas, they  
12 actually pay their mentors. What we are saying here,  
13 we will just reimburse them for expenses.

14           So we think, you know, or my thinking, I  
15 think this would be significantly lower in costs than  
16 that \$200,000 that Kansas did. But again, in Kansas,  
17 I think it paid huge dividends in terms of when you  
18 look at the turnover rate. It was lowered  
19 significantly down to 17 percent. So I think it was  
20 a real win-win all around.

21           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, thank you.  
22 If I could just follow up with something.

23           I think it is important, and I think Senator  
24 Wofford mentioned this, but we tend to look at  
25 Pennsylvania as an aging State, and sometimes that



1 takes on a negative connotation. But what it also  
2 means is that we have a lot of people who are about  
3 to retire who have a wealth of experience and a lot  
4 of skills that they are more than willing to pass on  
5 to other people if they simply have the opportunity,  
6 and I think this program, you know, if we can bring  
7 it to fulfillment, really gives them the opportunity  
8 and creates the framework to allow them to do that.

9           And it refocuses not on the age so much as  
10 the wealth of experience that they have, and I think  
11 that is a real positive.

12           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Yes; absolutely.

13           I mean, I think, although some would say  
14 that our aging population is a challenge, I think  
15 there are some great opportunities in it, too, and  
16 that is why it may work for this.

17           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: And I think your  
18 bill will actually focus on that positive aspect of  
19 this, so thank you for that.

20           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you.

21           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Madam  
22 Chairman.

23           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Any other questions?

24           Thank you, Representative Bear. We  
25 appreciate your testimony.

1           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you.

2           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: You can join us up here as  
3 a member of the committee.

4           We are going to ask the Rendell  
5 Administration representatives to come forward at  
6 this time and offer their comments on the bill and  
7 the idea.

8           We are going to ask you folks to come  
9 forward and then introduce yourselves for the  
10 stenographer and the audience, if you will.

11          MR. PRUSHNOK: Good morning, Chairman Mundy  
12 and Chairman Hennessey and members of the committee.

13          My name is Ray Prushnok. I am the Director  
14 of Policy and Legislative Affairs at the Department  
15 of Aging, and I will be presenting, I guess, our  
16 testimony in brief.

17          But really we have two fine experts here on  
18 workforce issues -- Neil from the Department of Labor  
19 and Industry, and Linda from the Department of Public  
20 Welfare on the needs of their clients.

21          DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: Good morning.

22          I'm Linda Blanchette, Deputy Secretary for  
23 the Office of Income Maintenance in the Department of  
24 Public Welfare.

25          MR. CASHMAN: Neil Cashman, Senior Advisor

1 to the Secretary of Labor and Industry.

2 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you very much for  
3 being here, all of you.

4 Mr. Prushnok, you may begin.

5 MR. PRUSHNOK: Thank you.

6 Again, thank you, Chairman Mundy and  
7 Chairman Hennessey and the members of the committee,  
8 for the opportunity to testify on this important  
9 issue.

10 We applaud Representative Bear for bringing  
11 House Bill 1743 forward and engaging us in a dialogue  
12 that helps meet the Department of Aging's goals for  
13 civic engagement, the Department of Public Welfare's  
14 goals for self-sufficiency for their clients, and the  
15 Department of Labor and Industry's efforts to  
16 strengthen our Commonwealth's workforce.

17 I'm Ray Prushnok from the Department of  
18 Aging, and I'm joined, again, by Linda Blanchette,  
19 Deputy Secretary from the Department of Public  
20 Welfare, and Neil Cashman, Special Assistant for  
21 External Affairs at the Department of Labor and  
22 Industry.

23 Our departments support the concept of using  
24 retirees as a resource for providing support to  
25 recipients of welfare payments and other low-wage

1 individuals as they seek employment. A retiree  
2 welfare-to-work mentorship program will contribute to  
3 the Commonwealth's continued workforce development  
4 and job-placement efforts.

5           Additionally, this bill would continue the  
6 successful efforts of the Department of Public  
7 Welfare in serving clients and assisting them in  
8 their efforts to achieve self-sufficiency. It would  
9 also broaden the scope of services that are provided  
10 to welfare-to-work clients by strengthening the  
11 relationships of our departments.

12           The bill, by providing for the establishment  
13 of a comprehensive welfare-to-work mentoring program,  
14 provides an avenue for job advancement for DPW  
15 clients so that they can continue to be productive  
16 and enjoy the increased income offered by staying on  
17 the job.

18           The bill provides tremendous opportunities  
19 for individuals with significant work and life  
20 experiences to share those experiences and impact  
21 positively families who are striving to obtain  
22 independence and self-sufficiency.

23           The Department of Public Welfare has made  
24 significant progress in reducing the number of  
25 families relying on TANF, the Temporary Assistance

1 for Needy Families, cash assistance and helping to  
2 get adults into the workforce.

3           Today, there are approximately 207,000  
4 adults and children receiving TANF cash assistance.  
5 Of the total, 72 percent are children and 28 percent  
6 are adults. This means that fewer Pennsylvanians are  
7 receiving cash assistance than at any time since  
8 1961.

9           The decline has been especially significant  
10 in the last 2 years. The number of persons receiving  
11 cash assistance has declined by 24 percent since  
12 October of '05.

13           The good news for TANF families is that more  
14 low-income parents are able to get the training and  
15 support they need to get jobs and stay employed. The  
16 number of job placements has been up every year since  
17 2003-04, and job placement by employment and training  
18 vendors has doubled from 8,700 in '05-06 to 16,000 in  
19 '06-07. This program would be a strong complement to  
20 these efforts.

21           Through the Industry Partnership Program,  
22 the Department of Labor and Industry has vastly  
23 improved and expanded opportunities for individuals  
24 to receive training in what has been identified as  
25 high-priority occupations.

1           There are 90 partnerships and over 6,000  
2 companies involved, and 53,000 people have been  
3 trained since its inception. If implemented, this  
4 program could coordinate with that larger strategy.

5           The Department of Aging would be charged  
6 with recruiting individuals ages 60 and older to be  
7 mentors for DPW clients and low-wage individuals. We  
8 would also be responsible for providing necessary  
9 training for the mentors, reimbursing them for  
10 expenses and purchasing the needed technology to make  
11 the program operational.

12           The Department of Aging is uniquely equipped  
13 to administer such a program with our experience and  
14 the local expertise of our area agencies on aging in  
15 administering volunteer programs such as the PEER  
16 program, APPRISE, and the ombudsman programs.

17           Learning from the Kansas experience, much of  
18 the training of mentors was an evolutionary process,  
19 and training included required reading, hands-on  
20 experience, group-training sessions on what problems  
21 clients may have, and how to understand the services  
22 that clients regularly rely upon.

23           While not licensed or certified as  
24 counselors, the Kansas mentors used their training to  
25 identify community resources for their clients' needs

1 and developed a referral system to immediately  
2 respond to crises experienced by their clients.

3           House Bill 1743 provides little guidance  
4 regarding the development of such training programs  
5 but rather says that the mentors would serve as  
6 "advisors, counselors and teachers" to aid clients in  
7 developing "job-seeking and job-keeping skills, work  
8 ethic and responsibility."

9           Additionally, one of the things that the  
10 Department of Labor and Industry has pointed out is  
11 the question of coaching versus mentoring and the  
12 values of each.

13           Coaching is a learning technique that  
14 involves observing an individual at work and  
15 providing feedback to enhance performance or correct  
16 deficiencies. This method focuses the client  
17 specifically on career and skill development to  
18 maximize opportunities and eliminate barriers to  
19 employment, while mentoring is a relationship that  
20 gives people the opportunity to share professional  
21 and personal skills and experiences, all of which may  
22 not necessarily relate to career development.

23           House Bill 1743 is focused on providing  
24 clients with the tools necessary to successfully gain  
25 or retain employment. The Department of Labor and

1 Industry believes the more efficient use of resources  
2 in activities designed to provide job-training skills  
3 is through coaching as opposed to mentoring.

4 Successful implementation of this bill will  
5 require funding which is currently not available.  
6 The primary driver would be the geographic scope of  
7 the demonstration and the number of volunteers in the  
8 regions we would serve.

9 But we thank you first for the opportunity  
10 to discuss this legislation, and while our  
11 departments are strongly supporting the concept, the  
12 availability of adequate financial support would be  
13 critical in implementing a successful pilot.

14 And as I mentioned, we will be glad to  
15 answer any questions you may have for each of our  
16 departments at this time. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you.

18 Representative Bear, do you have any  
19 questions of the departments?

20 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Yes.

21 You did mention a very important point,  
22 that, you know, the bill the way it is written is  
23 pretty open and pretty flexible now. If we are able  
24 to find the funding, do you feel that this is  
25 something we can work out in terms of, you know,



1 putting more detail behind the bill? Also, working  
2 out the coaching versus the mentoring part of the  
3 equation is something that I feel you need to  
4 clarify.

5 MR. PRUSHNOK: Madam Chair and  
6 Representative Bear, I will first respond to that and  
7 then allow my colleagues as well.

8 I think that, yes, if there was adequate  
9 funding that we could identify, it would make things,  
10 you know, much easier, and it is something that we  
11 are definitely interested in.

12 I think that the one thing that was of  
13 concern immediately was that the bill as written, the  
14 geographic scope wasn't very clear. So while the  
15 title was a demonstration program, it was not  
16 immediately apparent to us that it would be isolated  
17 to, you know, several counties and the statewide just  
18 seemed a little intimidating.

19 If I could ask Neil and Linda to respond.

20 DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: Sure.

21 From the Department of Public Welfare's  
22 perspective, any additional support that our  
23 transitioning clients can get is certainly most  
24 appreciated.

25 We do have a pretty comprehensive employment

1 and training program run through our Bureau of  
2 Employment and Training Programs. We do have  
3 intensive case management already built into the  
4 program that does some of the things that are  
5 mentioned in the Kansas program -- the life skills,  
6 the job coaching, helping to remove barriers and  
7 those kinds of things -- although mentoring,  
8 additional mentoring and coaching could supplement  
9 that.

10 In terms of being able to work out kind of  
11 the specifics and the details, I certainly think that  
12 because we kind of run our program through  
13 community-based organizations and counties across the  
14 State, we can certainly partner with the Department  
15 of Aging and the Department of Labor and Industry and  
16 bring together on a smaller, maybe county level or  
17 regional scale, the appropriate organizations to pull  
18 something like this together.

19 There would be some administrative effort on  
20 our part to make sure that we are monitoring and  
21 tracking all those activities for our welfare-to-work  
22 clients, but the additional support certainly would  
23 be welcome if we could work it out and have the  
24 funding to support the administrative effort.

25 MR. CASHMAN: Representative, as you

1 mentioned during your opening remarks, Kansas did in  
2 fact in their program pay their mentors. The  
3 information we have is somewhere between \$8 and \$10  
4 an hour.

5 I'm not suggesting that that is a necessary  
6 step, but if you look at the success of the Kansas  
7 program and expect the same kind of success, I think  
8 you would have to model it, you know, compare it side  
9 by side, so that we will probably get, well,  
10 obviously we will get some good results from  
11 volunteers. The bill does provide for repayment of  
12 the mentors' expenditures.

13 So yes, there is a definite benefit to the  
14 bill as written. If in fact funding were provided to  
15 pay the mentors, you will probably see more and  
16 reflect some of the things that Kansas noted in their  
17 program.

18 That is what we wanted to point out. There  
19 are some differences between this bill and the Kansas  
20 program. We do not want the committee to think that  
21 the successes associated with Kansas are automatic if  
22 the program started. There are some funding issues  
23 that could give you better results.

24 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I have a kind of a macro  
25 question that I would like you all to react to.

1           Often demonstration programs like this are  
2 set up through the budget and not through a piece of  
3 legislation that is enacted into law. Would it be a  
4 better idea to try to form a demonstration project  
5 through the cooperation, the interagency cooperation  
6 of your three departments, just with a budget line  
7 item?

8           MR. PRUSHNOK: Chairman Mundy, I think that  
9 while certainly we could initiate a program like this  
10 I think through a budget initiative, I think that the  
11 legislation certainly gives us an impetus to move  
12 along more quickly.

13           I think it is something we are all  
14 interested in. Civic engagement is one of our State  
15 plan priorities and finding more valuable ways to  
16 engage our retiring workforce, as Chairman Hennessey  
17 mentioned with the Experience Works, and just  
18 everyone acknowledging that there is a lot of  
19 knowledge out there.

20           So I think that we are not opposed to it,  
21 but I think with many competing priorities, it is  
22 oftentimes tough to bring it to the front burner.

23           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: So you want the bill?

24           MR. PRUSHNOK: Again, I think you heard our  
25 concerns about the need for adequate funding to

1 implement this and to be clear about the scope of a  
2 demonstration, if we were to move forward with it.

3 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: So we need significant  
4 refinement on the bill. You know, then we get to the  
5 point where if you make it too specific and too  
6 limited, then do you have to change the law if you  
7 want to expand the program or you want to replicate  
8 the program in other areas?

9 I mean, I'm really -- Representative Bear  
10 and Representative Hennessey and I had a meeting  
11 earlier, and I expressed my concerns about doing this  
12 through a piece of legislation, and that is what I am  
13 kind of struggling with. So if we do a bill that  
14 sets up a demonstration program, then how do we make  
15 it statewide if it is successful, or how do we, you  
16 know, expand it to other geographic areas?

17 DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: I guess my  
18 response would be, you know, is there a way to build  
19 that kind of flexibility into the legislation that  
20 speaks to kind of the sustainability of the project  
21 based on the outcome of the pilot project? And that  
22 may be one way to handle it, to be more specific in  
23 the bill about what the expectations are as a result  
24 of the pilot and then this is what would happen after  
25 that. Just an idea.

1           CHAIRMAN MUNDY:   And Chuck Quinnan, our  
2 Executive Director, just asked me, what about if we  
3 somehow set it up that you would implement this  
4 through regulatory action?

5           MR. PRUSHNOK:   Well, Chairman Mundy, as you  
6 know, regulations sometimes take a long time, too.

7           But again, I think as Linda mentioned, you  
8 know, changing the language does not necessarily have  
9 to make it inflexible. I think that, again, what we  
10 are looking to do is clarify that this would be  
11 demonstrated in, you know, geographic regions as  
12 resources become available to implement such a  
13 program.

14           And we wouldn't want to, you know, give the  
15 impression that we could launch something like this  
16 on a statewide level without, you know, having the  
17 ability to demonstrate it in some geographic areas  
18 and making sure that we have the resources to do it  
19 right in those areas before going and pursuing it  
20 statewide.

21           CHAIRMAN MUNDY:   So you will work with us to  
22 refine the bill to make it something that you can  
23 live with?

24           DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE:   We would be  
25 happy to.

1 MR. PRUSHNOK: We would be happy to do that.

2 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Smith.

3 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you.

4 As a member, as a longtime member of the  
5 Workforce Investment Board, over the years I have  
6 seen a lot of cuts to very good programs coming from  
7 the Federal level. My question is this: Can we rely  
8 or are we able to rely on funding from the Federal  
9 level for a program such as this?

10 MR. PRUSHNOK: Maybe my colleagues will know  
11 better on workforce funding streams.

12 MR. CASHMAN: Representative, as a member of  
13 the local Workforce Investment Board, I'm sure you  
14 are aware of the cuts that the Feds are implementing  
15 for the WIA funding. So I guess based on that, I  
16 would say no, we cannot count on it.

17 And not only can we not count on it year to  
18 year based on the workforce investment funding, not  
19 only did they cut our money; they took money back  
20 midyear, which makes it even more difficult, because  
21 everyone budgets for a certain amount. And it is  
22 something they call a rescission. I don't know if that  
23 is supposed to be less harmful than a cut, but in  
24 reality, it is extremely devastating to a program  
25 when you are midyear and you get a rescission.

1           So the answer, quite honestly, is no, you  
2 cannot count on Federal funding going forward.

3           REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Or we have seen the  
4 change in focus in programs as well. But in this  
5 legislation, we will be okay through the State  
6 funding; we wouldn't have to rely on the Feds. We  
7 will be okay on the State level?

8           MR. CASHMAN: Well, the bill as currently  
9 drafted does not really identify a funding source.  
10 It allows for the Department of Aging to go out and  
11 seek grants and outside funding sources.

12           So as written, you know, funding is an  
13 issue, but even if it were to provide an  
14 appropriation, those appropriations are, you know, a  
15 year-to-year issue. It could have, you know,  
16 \$500,000 this year and \$100,000 next year.

17           So, you know, there is definitely no  
18 certainty with the Feds, but at least with the State  
19 budget, there is a local connection here with the  
20 members of the committee and the General Assembly to  
21 know that once you implement a program, if it is  
22 successful, that you would be more likely to fund it  
23 going forward, hopefully.

24           REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I know the  
25 frustration well. Thank you.



1 Thank you, Chairman Mundy.

2 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Bear.

3 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you. Just a  
4 couple of questions.

5 First of all, in terms of training, how much  
6 are you spending on these training programs right  
7 now? Do you know? I think that Linda mentioned  
8 that.

9 DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: Our New  
10 Directions budget, I believe it is about 187--- Hold  
11 on; I do not want to quote the wrong amount. Sorry.

12 John -- I'm sorry, Representative Bear;  
13 excuse me. John is a classmate of mine, so I have  
14 all the greatest respect for him as Representative  
15 Bear.

16 Can I get back to you on that exact amount?

17 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: The reason I'm asking,  
18 I'm just trying to break it down in more detail  
19 now---

20 DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: Right.

21 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: ---because, you know,  
22 the bill is kind of broad in terms of allowing, you  
23 know, it is now flexible to the departments to put a  
24 framework that I think is doable, and that is what I  
25 want to get to now.

1           So in the training budget, what are we  
2 spending? Where is the money coming from, is my  
3 question. And then to follow it up to geographic  
4 issues, that's a fair question. But in my mind, I  
5 think if you pick one or two very strong Workforce  
6 Investment Boards in areas of need and maybe figure  
7 out what it would cost them to implement this.

8           So again, I don't know the costs to be that  
9 great if you pick one or two places. So I would ask  
10 for the guidance of the departments, you know, where  
11 do you think this should be put in the State? Do you  
12 have any ideas of any particular areas, whether it be  
13 Philadelphia, Lancaster, Harrisburg, who knows?

14           So that is one question I would like to have  
15 answered, and then two, when you pick a place, then  
16 what are the actual costs of administering it?

17           If you have a strong Workforce Investment  
18 Board, I mean, is that just a matter of, is there the  
19 availability of the current workforce folks to take  
20 this on as an added responsibility? What equipment  
21 do you need? You know, that kind of thing. Because,  
22 I mean, I do not think if we break it down in those  
23 terms it is that daunting really.

24           And also the last question I was going to  
25 ask is, I wasn't sure if any of you were familiar

1 with the National Fund for Workforce Solutions. They  
2 are basically a group that has funding, like \$30 to  
3 \$50 million worth of funding available for things  
4 like this program.

5           So I just threw a lot of questions out  
6 there, but, you know, I'm just trying to break it  
7 down on a more detailed level, because maybe if you  
8 focus on one or two places and just talk about the  
9 X's and O's and what needs to be done, I don't think  
10 it -- I'm guessing it's not that huge an effort  
11 potentially, at least to try it along that basis.

12           DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: Let me  
13 respond. I found my page.

14           The proposed budget for '08-09 for the  
15 New Directions program is \$137 million.

16           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Okay.

17           DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: In response to  
18 your question about forming a partnership at the  
19 local level, as I stated earlier, our employment and  
20 training programs are run at the local level for our  
21 community-based organizations. The workforce  
22 investment areas kind of oversee those.

23           And developing a partnership with a local  
24 agency, like a AAA, would not be out of line with  
25 what we do already. In fact, our guidelines

1 encourage partnerships at the local level. So  
2 certainly we could form the partnership necessary to  
3 do this, and we have relationships with employers as  
4 well.

5 But there is always administrative effort  
6 involved in a program like this, especially on the  
7 welfare side, because we have such a high degree of  
8 accountability in terms of tracking and reporting  
9 activity. So we would have to, depending on the  
10 size of the program, we would have to determine what  
11 that administrative burden would be. But there  
12 would certainly be some administrative burden  
13 involved.

14 MR. PRUSHNOK: Madam Chair and  
15 Representative Bear, I think that from our  
16 perspective and from the local area agencies on  
17 aging, they are first going to be concerned about  
18 what the burden would be on them locally when it  
19 comes to, I guess first, recruiting and identifying  
20 volunteers, whether it is through advertising or  
21 other needs, and then, once they have found a pool of  
22 volunteers that are interested, to properly screen  
23 them and vet them to make sure that they are  
24 qualified and competent and that there is no shady  
25 past and all those things.

1           So I think there is going to be some effort  
2 on their part as well as the question of what level  
3 of intensity would we want to require in terms of  
4 training and what kind of competencies would we like  
5 to make sure that the mentors gain.

6           So those are things that we need to think  
7 about and things that we really need to put our heads  
8 together if we are going to do this and do this  
9 right. And, you know, all of those things would, of  
10 course, come with some kind of cost.

11           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: So what I'm kind of  
12 hearing from you then -- correct me if I am wrong --  
13 it sounds like you believe this bill has potential.  
14 It has worked in Kansas. And you also told us you  
15 feel it should be done in terms of a bill versus the  
16 budget process or regs. The biggest issue is where  
17 we would do it, what would need to be done, and then  
18 how we get the funding basically, right?

19           MR. PRUSHNOK: I think in terms of whether  
20 it comes through regs or a bill, that is something I  
21 think we are probably impartial on. But we think it  
22 is a good idea that deserves careful consideration.

23           But again, we do not want to bite off more  
24 than we can chew and make sure that if we do move  
25 forward, that we have funding and we can support it

1 and it is sustainable.

2 MR. CASHMAN: Representative Bear, if I may,  
3 I believe you also provided this document to our  
4 office and Secretary Vito on the Kansas experience  
5 when we first met with you back in November or  
6 December on this issue, and in that document, it  
7 gives some summary points of how to start a program,  
8 and underneath, I think that that, you know, answers  
9 a bunch of the issues.

10 One of the things they mention here, and I  
11 think that is why we have three different departments  
12 involved, Aging would be responsible for recruiting,  
13 you know, through the AAAs or whoever. They are  
14 going to have the contact with the pool of mentors  
15 that we are going to need and that L&I would then use  
16 to mentor the clients that Welfare, that would be in  
17 that system.

18 And also, as our testimony referenced, in  
19 our Industry Partnership where industries identify  
20 needs for workers in certain industries, that they  
21 identify the skills that those workers need so that  
22 L&I would then also be pulling from a pool of  
23 potential clients for mentoring, and I am assuming  
24 that they would be those, or the question really is  
25 about the low-wage earners.

1           So you can see the interaction between the  
2 three different departments. You know, it starts  
3 with Aging getting us mentors. L&I and the workforce  
4 boards, I guess, would be responsible for really  
5 training those mentors, because I think at that point  
6 in time we would have to train them on the skill  
7 relationship that we need, the talk or the  
8 interaction to develop those skills. And Welfare,  
9 again, would be supplying the clients.

10           One of the issues in the Kansas report, it  
11 says to locate within the offices of the referral  
12 system. So I'm assuming that once L&I trains these  
13 individuals, we would have to put them, from the  
14 Kansas experience, it looks like they located in the  
15 Welfare offices.

16           So I think the Kansas model gives us a good  
17 guideline. It says somewhere in the very beginning  
18 that it is not a cookbook, but it gives you  
19 something. So I think there is a lot of information  
20 in this report that could be useful in developing a  
21 program, either through correcting -- no, I'm sorry;  
22 I don't want to say correcting -- making legislation  
23 better, improving it, or even if you were to go  
24 through a demonstration project somehow to, or  
25 without legislation to come up with some kind of

1 guideline of what you want these three agencies to do  
2 collectively.

3           The other thing is, they talk about the  
4 geography of this issue. We need a pool of mentors  
5 in the area where it is most -- you know, we may have  
6 a pool of mentors in one county or one Workforce  
7 Investment Board, but that is not where our need is  
8 for the clients that we are trying to serve.

9           The client base from a welfare perspective  
10 may be very much lower there, from the needs of the  
11 job market, from the Industry Partnerships that we  
12 have identified, you know, so we have to focus there.  
13 That is, again, where L&I and Welfare have to work  
14 with Aging to say, okay, we have identified -- maybe  
15 that is what we do, we reverse it and say, where is  
16 the clients, then go pick it out, not pick out a pool  
17 of mentors and try to build your program around that  
18 one.

19           So there are a lot of different angles here,  
20 but the Kansas report gives a wealth of information  
21 that could build a successful program whichever way  
22 we go it, through either a demonstration project,  
23 through nonlegislative or legislative. So I think we  
24 have a lot of background here to work from. It is  
25 not like we are going to reinvent the wheel; we are



1 just going to pick the things that worked.

2 And there are other States, also. There are  
3 other State experiences in there that we can compare  
4 similarities to and learn a lot from.

5 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you, and I agree  
6 with you. I think that I would love to work with all  
7 three agencies to actually add that detail to the  
8 bill to make it, you know, feasible. So I appreciate  
9 your input.

10 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Anybody else?

11 Representative Hennessey.

12 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thanks, Phyllis.

13 Ray, I was struck by your testimony when you  
14 first gave it, and then I reflected back on it and  
15 tried to balance that against the language of Section  
16 4, where it sounded like we were going to be  
17 recruiting individuals -- through the Department of  
18 Aging -- recruiting individuals, training them,  
19 purchasing technology, you know, the equipment they  
20 are going to need, and then I see that is reflected  
21 in language on page 4 of the bill.

22 Maybe we ought to change that, because what  
23 I am thinking is what we ought to be doing is  
24 identifying programs out there that are already doing  
25 these kinds of things and trying to link up with

1 those organizations, like Senator Wofford -- is it  
2 Experience Works?

3 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Experience Wave.

4 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Experience Wave;  
5 I'm sorry.

6 I mean, I don't think it's a good idea for  
7 us to be establishing responsibilities to -- why  
8 reinvent the wheel? I think we need to rework the  
9 language of Section 4 there so that you could go out  
10 and identify programs that are already doing this  
11 kind of work and have already given their people the  
12 training that they need. If we could somehow just  
13 have someone in the agency look at a program like  
14 Experience Wave, if we could just look at the program  
15 and say yes, it works, it would work in our  
16 situation, and give it a stamp of approval, then we  
17 don't need to go ahead and have anybody in the  
18 Department of Aging trying to establish a training  
19 program which is already being done in the private  
20 sector.

21 And the whole benefit of having the ability  
22 to partner with those groups is the fact that you  
23 don't have to replicate what they have already done  
24 and done very well. You have this senior corps of  
25 retired executives out there. You have got this

1 experience where you have got tutorial programs that  
2 are out there a lot. I have a good friend who is  
3 retired now and says he is getting a whole lot of  
4 fulfillment just teaching people to speak English and  
5 read English better.

6 So there are programs out there that are  
7 already doing this kind of stuff. I don't think we  
8 want to have somebody at the level of the Department  
9 of Aging trying to reinvent those programs.

10 So what I suggest to you is if you could  
11 take a look at Section 4 and see whether or not you  
12 could reword it and give us a suggestion in terms of,  
13 instead of trying to develop those programs, just try  
14 to identify them, allow the bill to say that you  
15 could identify the programs that are already working,  
16 and sort of recruit them.

17 MR. PRUSHNOK: We agree. I think that is a  
18 strong suggestion, that we do not want a duplicative  
19 effort of the local organizations that are doing this  
20 well right now.

21 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Well,  
22 thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Taylor.

24 REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Good morning, and  
25 this is addressed to any one of you.

1           I guess the question probably has been asked  
2 lately, but do we have any sense of what this really  
3 will cost? I mean, from the pilot program to the  
4 full implementation, a program like this from  
5 implementation and then just running it annually.  
6 Any sense; a ballpark.

7           MR. PRUSHNOK: Again, we are not really  
8 certain. We would have to do, I think, a lot of  
9 further analysis, depending on what is available in  
10 terms of private resources, as Chairman Hennessey was  
11 discussing.

12           Again, what we know from Kansas is that  
13 they were spending, you know, \$200,000 a year for  
14 12 mentors, as Representative Bear mentioned, but  
15 they had a slightly different structure than what is  
16 presented here.

17           So again, it will cost something, but it  
18 would take further analysis.

19           REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: I do not know what  
20 the population of Kansas is, a few million? So just  
21 to extrapolate that. I'm just trying to get a sense  
22 of this, especially, you know, given that we are in  
23 some tight budgets.

24           You know, I applaud Representative Bear. He  
25 is one of the good guys. He is really out there

1 trying to make people's lives better, but I'm  
2 concerned about a program like this right now at this  
3 juncture with our budgets.

4 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Anybody else?

5 Thank you very much. We appreciate the  
6 departments being here and taking your time to work  
7 with us, and we look forward to working with you to  
8 see if we can get something accomplished.

9 DEPUTY SECRETARY BLANCHETTE: Thank you.

10 MR. CASHMAN: Thank you.

11 MR. PRUSHNOK: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Our next testifier is  
13 Ray Landis, the Associate State Director of AARP  
14 Pennsylvania.

15 Good morning.

16 MR. LANDIS: Good morning.

17 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you for being here.

18 MR. LANDIS: Glad to be here. Thank you,  
19 Chairman Mundy, Chairman Hennessey, and members of  
20 the committee.

21 MR. LANDIS: I'm pleased to be here today to  
22 discuss House Bill 1743, and again, I'm Ray Landis,  
23 Associate State Director for Advocacy with AARP.

24 I think my testimony is going to be in a  
25 slightly different direction than what we have heard.

1 I do not think I have any of the answers for possible  
2 funding for this type of program, but one thing that  
3 AARP does have experience in in Pennsylvania and  
4 across the country is running volunteer programs and  
5 the pluses, and I would say it is almost entirely  
6 pluses there. There may be a minus or two, but very  
7 few in working with volunteers and especially older  
8 volunteers.

9 Our National Policy Book states that  
10 "Volunteering offers older people the opportunity to  
11 serve as resources to one another, to their  
12 communities, and to the nation." Volunteerism comes  
13 in many different forms and means many things to  
14 different people, and our experience at AARP shows us  
15 that older Pennsylvanians who have a desire to  
16 volunteer approach volunteerism in many different  
17 ways.

18 We have a number of different programs in  
19 Pennsylvania that work with volunteers in different  
20 capacities. I think our biggest program is our tax  
21 assistance program, and our tax-aide volunteers, in  
22 some cases, have been accountants and worked with tax  
23 issues all their lives. In some cases, they have  
24 done nothing with taxes other than filled out their  
25 own returns every year.

1           So I believe that a volunteer program such  
2 as this, you could recruit people who may have been  
3 involved in human resources their entire lives and  
4 want to continue, or you could find individuals who  
5 think that this is a very good cause and want to come  
6 into the program and start helping people, even  
7 though they might have little experience in the type  
8 of human resources work that mentoring might involve.

9           I think that the key thing for volunteers is  
10 the desire that they want to help others, and we see  
11 that in our volunteer corps in Pennsylvania, whether  
12 they are using the skills that they developed or  
13 whether they are learning new skills that are  
14 benefiting them. The whole goal at the end of the  
15 day is to help others, and we do believe that  
16 House Bill 1743 would enable older volunteers to get  
17 the experience of helping others.

18           And one thing that we have seen with  
19 volunteers who get this experience in helping others,  
20 the volunteers are also benefiting greatly by their  
21 role -- in this case, their role as a teacher or as a  
22 coach -- in providing the benefit for those in the  
23 welfare-to-work programs. The volunteers who have  
24 experience in the work environments and are conveying  
25 their knowledge and advice to those in the

1 welfare-to-work program we do feel can enable these  
2 individuals to either find a new job or continue to  
3 hold down the job that they currently have.

4           One thing we have realized as we work with  
5 volunteers across Pennsylvania is that every  
6 individual volunteer is different. Some volunteers  
7 desire a great deal of flexibility in their volunteer  
8 work and other volunteers demand a defined structure  
9 to their volunteer work. We found that our greatest  
10 success at AARP is when we are able to create  
11 volunteer opportunities that can accommodate both of  
12 these desires, and we believe that this type of  
13 mentoring program has the potential to work with all  
14 types of volunteers. And as a mentoring program such  
15 as this would be established, we would urge that the  
16 guidelines allow the program to take advantage of the  
17 best traits of volunteers and permit them to function  
18 in the environment that works best for them.

19           I know there has been some discussion about  
20 the fact that Kansas paid their volunteers, and our  
21 experience has been that we have many people who are  
22 willing to volunteer without pay, but we do think  
23 that a key aspect would be to reimburse them for  
24 their expenses, especially as we encounter rising  
25 gasoline prices. Asking individuals to have to drive



1 to a volunteer site and not reimbursing them when gas  
2 is close to \$4 a gallon, I think, would be a real  
3 detriment to the ability to recruit volunteers for a  
4 mentoring program such as this.

5           There is one cautionary note we would like  
6 to add to the discussion of this program. AARP does  
7 believe that volunteer programs are best used as  
8 complements to trained professionals instead of  
9 substitutes for the services these professionals  
10 provide.

11           Individuals moving from welfare-to-work  
12 often need assistance with many difficult issues. I  
13 think child care is possibly the best example of  
14 that. And an important part of the training of the  
15 volunteer mentors must be to ensure that the mentors  
16 know sources where they can refer their individual  
17 mentees when there is a question or concern a mentor  
18 cannot address, such as perhaps how to obtain child  
19 care or what some of the problems are that can arise  
20 in that situation.

21           But AARP feels that the retiree  
22 welfare-to-work mentoring program can be a great  
23 benefit to those receiving as well as providing the  
24 mentoring services. We do support the passage of  
25 House Bill 1743, and AARP would look forward to

1 offering any assistance our organization could  
2 provide in the implementation of this program.

3           And I would add that we do see this as  
4 similar to the long-term-care ombudsman program.  
5 There are, of course, differences, but we have helped  
6 the Department of Aging in the recruitment of  
7 long-term-care ombudsman, and we believe that AARP  
8 could, if this program was implemented, assist in the  
9 recruitment of individuals who would be interested in  
10 being volunteer mentors.

11           So thank you again for the opportunity to be  
12 here, and I would be glad to answer any questions  
13 that anyone would have.

14           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Bear.

15           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you, Mr. Landis,  
16 for coming to testify.

17           The first question I have is, have you had  
18 any problem in training volunteers in general for  
19 your different initiatives, like the tax assistance  
20 program?

21           MR. LANDIS: It is interesting; we have not  
22 had problems recruiting volunteers such as tax aide  
23 or our driver safety program for individuals who are  
24 assigned to a task and go out and do that. Where we  
25 have the most problem recruiting volunteers is

1 finding volunteer leaders, someone who is willing to  
2 take on a leadership role and coordinate the  
3 activities of other volunteers.

4           So the kind of situation of a mentor, we  
5 have found that there are a lot of AARP members and  
6 older Pennsylvanians in general who want to go out in  
7 their community, want to volunteer, want to find a  
8 source for volunteering, as long as they do not have  
9 to take on too large a role, where they can have that  
10 flexibility and be assigned a task and do that task  
11 and know at the end of the day that that has been  
12 their role.

13           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: So you do not think  
14 that a volunteer will be intimidated by a one-on-one  
15 relationship with another person helping them in  
16 their work situation?

17           MR. LANDIS: I think you would have to have  
18 a certain kind of individual. I mean, there are  
19 individuals who might be intimidated and might not  
20 want to do that, but there are other individuals --  
21 and I think we found this in the ombudsman program --  
22 who do like the one-on-one contact with individuals  
23 and know at the end of the day that there is a  
24 demonstration that they have really done something  
25 and done a good task in their volunteering role.

1           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: I was also wondering  
2 if you could help explain a little bit more about  
3 your long-term-care program that you just mentioned,  
4 how that has worked in partnership with the various  
5 agencies and the AAAs?

6           MR. LANDIS: Well, what we have done, we  
7 have had a very limited role in the ombudsman  
8 program. And we have not done this in the past  
9 couple of years, but in the past when the Department  
10 of Aging has had a problem in recruiting volunteers  
11 for the ombudsman program in a certain county, they  
12 have asked us if we could assist, and what we have  
13 done is very simply done a mailing to some of our  
14 members who have identified themselves as interested  
15 in volunteer opportunities and let them know that if  
16 they are interested in this type of opportunity, they  
17 can contact the Department of Aging and go through  
18 the training for the ombudsman program.

19           So that has been our role, and that just  
20 sort of is a conduit to our members who are  
21 interested in volunteering.

22           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: It just sounds like  
23 there is the potential to do the same thing for this  
24 bill, if it were to happen in law, that maybe AARP  
25 would be able to do the same type of thing that you

1 did with the long-term care.

2 MR. LANDIS: I don't want to make a  
3 promise---

4 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: It is a possibility?

5 MR. LANDIS: I think it is a possibility to  
6 have a partnership.

7 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Samuelson.

9 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: That AARP tax  
10 assistance program is a huge success up in the Lehigh  
11 Valley. Thank you.

12 I wanted to ask if you had any statistics on  
13 how many tax assistance programs you have in  
14 Pennsylvania and how many retirees are involved?  
15 That is the first question.

16 MR. LANDIS: I do not have those with me. I  
17 can certainly provide those and would be glad to  
18 provide those to you. I can't tell you -- roughly  
19 last year we had, I don't know how many programs  
20 operated in the State, but there were roughly 2,500  
21 tax-aide volunteers across the State, and I will be  
22 glad to get you the firm details on the exact number  
23 of sites and the exact number of volunteers and folks  
24 that we helped.

25 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: And you mentioned

1 other volunteer efforts. I know we have about  
2 2 1/2 million citizens over the age of 65, a huge  
3 source of wealth -- a wealth of talent, experience,  
4 wisdom -- and I know people are involved in so many  
5 volunteer efforts.

6           There is a one-on-one mentoring program in  
7 my community where 38 retirees are one-on-one mentors  
8 with 38 seventh grade students, and it is in its  
9 second year now, a huge success, and they are trying  
10 to expand it to other middle schools.

11           I wonder if you have an idea in rough terms  
12 about how many of our 2 1/2 million seniors are  
13 currently volunteering some time in their  
14 communities, or nationally if you have seen a  
15 statistic on what percentage of citizens take time to  
16 volunteer?

17           MR. LANDIS: No, I do not have -- I would  
18 not be surprised that AARP at the national level does  
19 have that statistic, and I will be glad to try to get  
20 it to you.

21           And I think, the one thing I will say is  
22 that I am always very pleasantly surprised when a new  
23 volunteer opportunity arises, that you tend to think,  
24 well, everyone that wants to volunteer has found  
25 something that they want to do and they are out there

1 doing it, and how are we, if you introduce a new  
2 program, how are we going to find new people to do  
3 this? And I'm always very pleasantly surprised, when  
4 there is a new opportunity that arises, more people  
5 seem to respond to that. And I'm always pleased,  
6 when I go to an event honoring our tax-aide  
7 volunteers, some of them will come up to me and say,  
8 I never realized this program was out there; I just  
9 heard about it; and I stepped up and wanted to  
10 volunteer. You tend to think that everybody that  
11 wants to volunteer is already doing something, but I  
12 think that each new opportunity finds more people to  
13 come out and to volunteer.

14 But I will be glad to -- I do believe that I  
15 can get those statistics from the national office and  
16 would be glad to provide those to the committee.

17 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Bear.

18 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you.

19 Like Representative Samuelson, I have to say  
20 that program has been a huge success in my area, the  
21 tax assistance. Our office does it, and it keeps us  
22 busy for quite awhile with volunteers coming in and  
23 out.

24 I want to ask you about another volunteer  
25 organization called SCORE. Are you familiar with

1 that, and can you explain to us a little bit about  
2 that and the retired executives?

3 MR. LANDIS: I must say I am not familiar  
4 with the SCORE program. I do know that it is the  
5 retired executives, that they go out and volunteer.  
6 But we have not had any real interaction with them in  
7 Pennsylvania, so I don't know very many details of  
8 how their program operates.

9 REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: The reason I asked  
10 was, at least in Lancaster County, between the tax  
11 assistance volunteers through your organization and  
12 SCORE, which is, again, the Service Corps of Retired  
13 Executives, those are two very strong bases of  
14 retirees that love to volunteer in the community.

15 A lot of what SCORE does is essentially  
16 helps people who are trying to start their own small  
17 business, help them with business plans. What they  
18 do is very much mentoring and coaching through the  
19 process of developing a business and getting people  
20 on their feet, and this group just is expanding like  
21 crazy.

22 And in some regards, I feel that that would  
23 be a good base, too, to possibly pull from for  
24 mentors to maybe help these -- you know, they  
25 basically seem to help with this program, if it were



1 implemented, to help people out in the workforce to  
2 keep jobs.

3           So that is why I brought it up, because  
4 those are two very strong areas, at least in  
5 Lancaster County, of volunteers of seniors.

6           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Anyone else?

7           Representative Smith.

8           REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you.

9           Thank you, Mr. Landis, for being here today  
10 and thank you for your testimony.

11           I do not have a question; I just have a  
12 comment. I can tell you firsthand I have seen  
13 mentoring programs work, and I'm going to use myself  
14 as an example.

15           I have my formal education, and then I also  
16 have had the great pleasure of being mentored very  
17 informally by all the people that were employed  
18 within our business. And, you know, when you are  
19 young and you think you know everything, you come to  
20 realize that you do not know much, and those that  
21 have been in the business a long time, they, in a  
22 very gentle way, share their life experiences with  
23 you. And I have often said that the older I get, the  
24 smarter they become. I have learned a lot.

25           So as this program takes off, and hopefully

1 AARP will be a part of it, I think it is going to be  
2 a great resource, and at the end of the day, the  
3 Pennsylvania workforce will be the winner for it.

4 So thank you for your testimony.

5 MR. LANDIS: Sure.

6 And I would say that my experience with our  
7 volunteers, I feel I have been mentored by the  
8 volunteers that have worked with us in AARP, and I am  
9 sure you see some of them that come into your office  
10 that work with us. But they are just -- they have  
11 such a wealth of knowledge, and I feel blessed to  
12 have been able to work with so many of them and learn  
13 so much from them.

14 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Hennessey.

15 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Madam  
16 Chairman.

17 Ray, the bill identifies a target population  
18 for volunteers as 60 and older. I have always been  
19 sort of struck, and rather prudently 10 years ago  
20 when I got my first invitation to join AARP when I  
21 turned 50, because I always thought that, you know,  
22 retirement at age 50 was a pipe dream for just about  
23 everybody.

24 Does it make sense for the bill to focus on  
25 60, age 60? Should we be looking at 62? 65? You

1 know, what's your thought in terms of the age  
2 appropriateness of the bill?

3 MR. LANDIS: I tend to think that a bill  
4 like this, and, you know, of course our membership  
5 starts at 50, but to be honest, most of our  
6 volunteers are over the age of 60, because most of  
7 our members that are below that age are still working  
8 full time, and when we are able to get them to  
9 volunteer, they will do it, you know, on a very  
10 flexible, informal basis.

11 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Right.

12 MR. LANDIS: You know, they will be a  
13 tax-aide volunteer that will come out and do a  
14 session on a Saturday, say.

15 So I can see that it could be useful to have  
16 a lower age than 60, depending upon how the program  
17 was structured, if there was enough flexibility for  
18 the mentoring to take place, you know, on weekends  
19 and in the evening. But if the program is structured  
20 in a way that you are looking for the mentors to  
21 perhaps visit the workplace of those who are  
22 being mentored every once in a while, I think that  
23 would really discourage folks that are still in  
24 the workforce full time from wanting to be a  
25 mentor.

1           So, you know, it could work for younger  
2 people if there was some flexibility in the structure  
3 of the program. I think that's the whole key to it.

4           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Thank you.

5           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: One last question.

6           In your testimony, you said that "AARP  
7 believes that volunteer programs are best used as  
8 complements to trained professionals instead of  
9 substitutes for the services these professionals  
10 provide." I'm not sure I understand what it is you  
11 are trying to get at there. Could you elaborate a  
12 little bit on that?

13           MR. LANDIS: Well, I think the only thing I  
14 was trying to get at and where AARP has been on this  
15 is that we do not see this type of program, a  
16 mentoring program, for folks moving off of welfare to  
17 work as a replacement for the individuals that are  
18 counseling welfare-to-work individuals and with the  
19 details of their movement in the system.

20           So I know that there are rules and laws and  
21 regulations that these individuals must follow, and I  
22 think it would be our view that a mentor is not the  
23 proper person to ensure that the welfare-to-work  
24 individuals are following each rule and law that they  
25 have to in their transition program.

1           The mentor, we feel that the mentoring role  
2 would be that role of providing advice and skills  
3 existing in the working place instead of trying to  
4 get these individuals to follow the law that they  
5 have to be.

6           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay. I understand.

7           Well, we are in the embarrassing position of  
8 not having had our last two testifiers arrive yet.  
9 So Mr. Quinnan went to check to see if there are any  
10 messages from them.

11           But until they do arrive, we are going to  
12 just take a little break and give our stenographer's  
13 fingers a rest, and we will reconvene when, and if,  
14 those last two testifiers do arrive.

15           Mr. Landis, we appreciate very much your  
16 being here, and thank you for your testimony.

17           MR. LANDIS: Thank you.

18           (A recess was taken.)

19           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: All right. We will  
20 reconvene our meeting.

21           We have Jamie C. Ray, Assistant Director of  
22 the Client Assistance Program in Philadelphia. Would  
23 you please come forward and present your testimony.

24           Thank you for traveling all the way from  
25 Philadelphia to be with us today.

1 MS. RAY: Thank you very much,  
2 Representative Mundy. Good morning.

3 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Good morning.

4 MS. RAY: It is really a pleasure for me to  
5 be here today, and it is particularly a pleasure  
6 because I noticed that Representative Bear was one of  
7 the prime movers with regard to this bill.

8 He is actually, of course, the  
9 Representative from Lancaster County, which is my  
10 home area. While I now live in Philadelphia, I'm  
11 actually from Holtwood, Pennsylvania, originally. So  
12 that was a pleasure.

13 As Representative Mundy said, my name is  
14 Jamie Ray, and I am the Assistant Director and an  
15 attorney with the Pennsylvania Client Assistance  
16 Program.

17 CAP is an advocacy program for individuals  
18 with disabilities who may experience difficulties  
19 navigating vocational rehabilitation services in the  
20 State of Pennsylvania. So as a CAP advocate, I deal  
21 directly with individuals who are facing work-related  
22 issues. So there is really a nice parallel between  
23 what I do at work and what bill 1743 is aiming to  
24 achieve for individuals who are participants in  
25 welfare-to-work.

1           Really, though, what I would like to share  
2 with you today are two things. The first thing is my  
3 own personal experience with mentoring. I was really  
4 pleased when our Executive Director asked me to come  
5 and provide testimony today, because I really feel  
6 that mentoring has made a very positive impact in my  
7 life as a person with a disability, and I believe  
8 that I probably would not be sitting here today if it  
9 had not been for some of the mentors who have been a  
10 part of my life.

11           You know, as a person with a disability, it  
12 is sometimes easy for people to look at you and  
13 perhaps make snap judgments based upon the way you  
14 look, the way you walk, as opposed to perhaps really  
15 what you have to offer in the workplace, and that was  
16 my experience early on.

17           But fortunately, there were several lawyers  
18 who were able to mentor me and just provide me with  
19 the support that I needed to be successful at work.  
20 And I have been with the Client Assistance Program as  
21 an attorney for almost 10 years now, and I think  
22 mentoring was directly a part of that.

23           So I am always very excited when I see a new  
24 mentoring program that would be available to folks,  
25 and in this case, folks who are participants in the

1 welfare-to-work program.

2           What you may not know and may be of some  
3 interest to you is that the Rehabilitation Act, which  
4 is the act, of course, that authorizes the Client  
5 Assistance Program and authorizes vocational  
6 rehabilitation services for folks with disabilities,  
7 really kind of parallels and is like almost a  
8 precursor to the welfare-to-work legislation in that  
9 it really represents a shift in vocational  
10 rehabilitation from just providing services to a  
11 person in a services kind of mentality to really  
12 providing supports to a person that are going to  
13 enable that person to become more independent and to  
14 be more successful in the workplace.

15           And when I look at voc rehab and then I look  
16 at this piece of legislation with regard to the  
17 mentoring program, I see that it really looks like it  
18 is aimed to do the same thing. And certainly the  
19 Client Assistance Program wholeheartedly supports  
20 1743.

21           We see this as an opportunity for people to  
22 have a support system in place. We see this as an  
23 opportunity for not only the individual at work to  
24 benefit but also the employer, because through this  
25 program, the employer should be able to reduce their



1 turnover.

2           They should also be able to, at little or no  
3 cost, provide supports that are going to allow a  
4 person who might not otherwise be able to remain at  
5 work to remain at work and be a productive member of  
6 society, an independent person, and a taxpayer, and  
7 those things, we feel, are really key.

8           Now, I told you that I was going to share  
9 with you two stories, and the first was my own. The  
10 second is the story of a woman named Karen, who is  
11 actually one of my CAP clients.

12           Now, Karen is someone with a disability and  
13 someone who was accessing vocational rehabilitation  
14 services and found that she needed some advocacy  
15 assistance from the Client Assistance Program. But I  
16 bring her up to you because she is also a person who  
17 is participating in the welfare-to-work program, and  
18 let me share with you just a little bit of the  
19 portion of her story that I know.

20           That is that over the past year, Karen has  
21 had at least five different jobs that I'm aware of,  
22 but unfortunately, she has not been able to  
23 consistently hold any of those five jobs, and while  
24 there are a variety of reasons, some of them health  
25 related and some of them not, I would venture to say

1 that from talking to her, a key reason is the lack of  
2 a mentor in her life.

3           So when I look at this bill it really  
4 excites me, because to me it seems like a piece of  
5 legislation that will give someone like Karen a  
6 chance to actually not only just get her foot in the  
7 door but actually get a leg up and be able to  
8 maintain employment.

9           There are a multitude of issues that I have  
10 seen Karen go through, from things with her children  
11 to things related to her disability to things related  
12 to the fact that she has been out of the workforce  
13 consistently for over 10 years, and there are  
14 technologies and other things that she is just not so  
15 familiar with.

16           Now, yes, of course vocational  
17 rehabilitation can provide her with training with  
18 regard to those technology issues and such, but that  
19 is really only the tip of the iceberg, and I think  
20 really what 1743 is aiming to do is to recognize that  
21 simply providing somebody with concrete tools is  
22 really not enough to make you successful at work.  
23 You need that person who can be your sounding board,  
24 who, as the piece of legislation says, in following  
25 the Kansas model can be a sounding board, can be a

1 listener, can help you to solve problems, not only in  
2 the workplace but problems that may relate to your  
3 personal life that are impacting your ability to  
4 perform at work.

5           So, you know, I shared that story with you  
6 because I think it is a direct example of how this  
7 piece of legislation could positively impact a person  
8 like Karen.

9           I can't say enough about the importance of  
10 mentoring, and while I do not intend to go on  
11 forever, I think it is important to point out that,  
12 you know, mentoring is nothing new. It is new in  
13 this context certainly, and I applaud this bill for  
14 bringing it to this context, but when you look at it,  
15 I hope you will look at it as something that has  
16 proven itself to be successful.

17           Of course, I have spoken to you about the  
18 mentoring that I received as a young student and then  
19 as a young attorney, but I'm also now someone who  
20 provides mentoring to others. I participate in a  
21 mentoring program through the Women in the Profession  
22 division of the Pennsylvania Bar Association. I  
23 participate in a mentoring program through the  
24 American Bar Association that provides mentoring  
25 services directly to law students and lawyers with

1 disabilities, and I think that the problem-solving,  
2 the listening ear, the goal-setting, the educational  
3 resources, all of these things are things that I see  
4 in my own mentoring experiences and things that are  
5 directly a part of bill 1743. So for that, I  
6 certainly applaud the bill.

7 I just want to take a moment and introduce  
8 everyone to the intern that I brought with me from  
9 our office. Her name is Kiersten Pennington, and she  
10 assisted me with quite a lot of the research related  
11 to this bill, and she is also going to be  
12 participating in a Vista mentoring program in  
13 California later on this summer.

14 I thank you.

15 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Why would anyone  
16 want to go to California for the summer when they can  
17 stay in Pennsylvania?

18 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I agree.

19 Questions?

20 Representative Smith.

21 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you very much  
22 for your testimony today.

23 Very briefly, approximately how many clients  
24 do you have in the mentoring program, and what is the  
25 cost of running the program?

1 MS. RAY: Let me be clear that the Client  
2 Assistance Program does not run a mentoring program.  
3 We provide advocacy services for individuals with  
4 disabilities.

5 The mentoring programs that I was speaking  
6 of were, one, a program through the Women in the  
7 Profession division of the Pennsylvania Bar  
8 Association, and two, a mentoring program through the  
9 American Bar Association.

10 As to the program through the Women in the  
11 Profession, I would say that we have about 80 people  
12 involved in that program currently. I'm not sure of  
13 the cost of running the program.

14 And as far as the American Bar Association  
15 program is concerned, that program is primarily  
16 operated through an e-mail and Web-based system, so I  
17 would imagine that the cost is rather low, and there  
18 are lawyers and law students participating from all  
19 over the United States.

20 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you very much.

21 MS. RAY: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Hennessey.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you.

24 Ms. Ray, you said that you were a client of  
25 OVR before you became an attorney?

1 MS. RAY: Yes.

2 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I guess as you  
3 worked your way through law school or whatever?

4 MS. RAY: Yes, sir.

5 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Were you involved  
6 in any kind of mentoring programs at that point, or  
7 was it simply going to OVR to receive specialized  
8 training or whatever? Can you tell us about your  
9 experience with OVR?

10 MS. RAY: Sure.

11 My experience with OVR was that I became  
12 involved with OVR actually when I was already in  
13 college. I became involved in it a little bit later  
14 than what some folks might.

15 But in any event, OVR provided me with some  
16 assistance in terms of going to college and law  
17 school. I was also provided with counseling and  
18 guidance services from my OVR counselor, which I  
19 would consider to be an informal type of mentoring.

20 As far as formal---

21 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Excuse me. But  
22 that was a referral out to a different counselor? It  
23 wasn't OVR?

24 MS. RAY: No, sir. The OVR counselor  
25 provided the informal mentoring to me.

1           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Oh; they did.

2       Okay.

3           MS. RAY: I also at that time participated  
4       in a career-shadowing mentoring program, which was  
5       not connected to OVR at all. It was something that I  
6       did through my college, and through that, I got to  
7       shadow an attorney and see the type of work that they  
8       did.

9           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: And then was that  
10       what prompted you to go to law school, and did you  
11       continue that mentoring concept or association on  
12       your way through law school?

13          MS. RAY: Actually, what prompted me to go  
14       to law school was a project that I did when I was in  
15       11th grade in high school. No, that is not accurate.  
16       I was in seventh grade, actually, and we had a  
17       program where we could choose careers that we were  
18       interested in, and then we put on a mock trial.

19          This particular mock trial happened to deal  
20       with making alcohol as though they were a person,  
21       personifying them, and putting alcohol on trial for  
22       all of the negative things that it can do in your  
23       life.

24          So that is what prompted me. But as far as  
25       the mentoring relationship is concerned, the answer

1 is, yes, that mentoring continued, and in fact the  
2 attorney who I originally shadowed in Lancaster  
3 County is someone that I continue to be in contact  
4 with even today.

5 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Your work with  
6 CAP, it is an advocacy program, so that if a person  
7 has a disability, they contact you and you access  
8 whatever services are available to them. Are there  
9 mentoring programs out there that you routinely  
10 contact and try to set people up with these kinds of  
11 mentoring services?

12 We had some discussion before you arrived in  
13 terms of whether or not -- we do not want to reinvent  
14 the wheel. We think there are probably programs out  
15 there, probably many more than we are aware of now,  
16 that would be an easy fit for the Department of Aging  
17 or any of our State agencies to try to contact and  
18 partner with to help certain people out.

19 I mean, so we do not want to, at least from  
20 my perspective I don't think it is a good idea for us  
21 to be having the agency go ahead and replicate those  
22 kinds of services when they are available in the  
23 private sector if we just partner with them.

24 Can you tell us about any of those kinds of  
25 programs and mentoring programs that you have been in



1 contact with which are particularly successful and  
2 helpful?

3 MS. RAY: Well, let me offer this, and I  
4 certainly appreciate your desire not to offer a  
5 duplicative service.

6 Other than the Kansas model, the Kansas  
7 program, I am not aware of any mentoring program that  
8 is specifically like this, because I guess I would  
9 describe it and say that I think that most of the  
10 individuals that are involved in the welfare-to-work  
11 program, I would view them as almost falling through  
12 a crack, because, of course, there is no guarantee  
13 that any particular person is going to have a  
14 disability, and therefore, you know, be able to get  
15 counseling and guidance services through OVR. There  
16 is no particular guarantee that that individual is  
17 going to be a young person who may fall under the  
18 auspices of some other program.

19 This program really seems to be targeted  
20 towards those individuals who are a part of the  
21 welfare-to-work system regardless of age, disability,  
22 gender, or anything else.

23 That having been said, you know, the only  
24 program that I can think of that is even remotely, I  
25 think, along the lines of what you are speaking of is

1 a 1-day shadowing program that is offered to high  
2 school students who have disabilities who may wish to  
3 come and shadow someone who is a State employee. So  
4 you may be familiar with it. It usually takes place  
5 in October, and as I said, it is a 1-day event that  
6 is part of Disability Awareness Month.

7 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Thank you  
8 very much.

9 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Samuelson.

10 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: The Client  
11 Assistance Program has offices in Philadelphia and  
12 Harrisburg. Do you offer services beyond those two  
13 regions?

14 MS. RAY: Yes, sir. We offer services  
15 across the entire State of Pennsylvania. We are the  
16 statewide advocate for persons with disabilities  
17 seeking vocational rehabilitation services.

18 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Through phone and  
19 Internet, or how---

20 MS. RAY: Through phone and Internet, but  
21 also we will travel to a client of OVR if that is  
22 necessary.

23 You may or may not know that there are, I  
24 believe, 17 district offices of OVR throughout the  
25 State. We would go to any one of those district

1 offices or a similar location to meet with a client  
2 from time to time.

3 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Thank you.

4 MS. RAY: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you very much, Ms.  
6 Ray.

7 MS. RAY: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: We appreciate you coming  
9 from Philadelphia to share your experiences with us.  
10 Thank you very much.

11 MS. RAY: My pleasure. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Our last testifier is Steve  
13 Herzenberg, the Executive Director of the Keystone  
14 Research Center here in Harrisburg.

15 Thank you for coming. We appreciate your  
16 being here.

17 MR. HERZENBERG: You're welcome,  
18 Representative Mundy and colleagues.

19 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: You may begin whenever you  
20 are ready.

21 MR. HERZENBERG: We at Keystone Research  
22 Center operate just like a modern business -- on a  
23 just-in-time basis. So copies of my testimony will  
24 come walking into this room shortly.

25 In addition, I was originally scheduled for

1 12 o'clock and just pulled out of a meeting of my own  
2 finance committee, so again, I apologize for coming  
3 in at the last minute and very much appreciate the  
4 opportunity to speak with you today.

5           You will get my written testimony, and so,  
6 you know, I will use that as a guide but depart from  
7 it to a large extent in terms of the specific words.

8           I am Steve Herzenberg. I hold a Ph.D. in  
9 economics from MIT. I'm the Director of the Keystone  
10 Research Center.

11           For those who do not know, Keystone is a  
12 nonprofit, nonpartisan, independent think tank, the  
13 mission of which is to promote prosperity and  
14 opportunity in Pennsylvania.

15           Given that mission, workforce development is  
16 clearly an area which we regard as very important,  
17 because effective workforce programs can both  
18 strengthen the economy and expand opportunity.

19           Keystone has had the privilege of working  
20 with both of the past two gubernatorial  
21 Administrations in Pennsylvania on the issue of  
22 workforce development. Governor Schweiker  
23 commissioned from us an evaluation of the  
24 implementation of the Workforce Investment Act in  
25 Pennsylvania and, just before he left office, sent

1 that report with a generous letter of transmittal to  
2 the incoming Governor and suggested that he look  
3 closely at its recommendations in designing his  
4 workforce strategy.

5           We have in fact worked closely with the  
6 Commonwealth under Governor Rendell in the crafting  
7 and the implementation of their workforce development  
8 strategy, built on a foundation of investment and  
9 what the Commonwealth calls Industry Partnerships,  
10 these training consortia connected to key industries  
11 in different regions of the Commonwealth.

12           One other aspect of Keystone's workforce  
13 development work that is worth mentioning because it  
14 relates to the topic of today's testimony, we are  
15 currently serving as a fiscal agent and the staff for  
16 something called the Pennsylvania Fund for Workforce  
17 Solutions.

18           That is a new project that represents really  
19 a partnership among national foundations, a bunch of,  
20 about 10 at this point, Pennsylvania foundations in  
21 four different regions -- Erie, southwest PA,  
22 southeast PA, and south-central PA, and we are going  
23 to grow that group, we hope -- and the Commonwealth.  
24 And the logic of that overall project is that all of  
25 the foundations actually share the view of the

1 Commonwealth, that if you want to help low-income  
2 workers, if you want to pursue an antipoverty agenda,  
3 then you actually have to engage with the demand side  
4 of the labor market. And pulling together those  
5 Industry Partnerships and using them as a way of  
6 getting information on where are the jobs, where are  
7 the skill gaps, where are the career paths, you know,  
8 that is critical knowledge across the board, but  
9 including, too, the most vulnerable workers.

10           So again, if you want low-income workers to  
11 get jobs and move up in the modern economy, you have  
12 got to find that sweet spot where you are doing  
13 something that really benefits employers at the same  
14 time it is benefiting the workers and low-income  
15 families. I mean, just as workforce programs  
16 historically, nationally and in Pennsylvania, have in  
17 general tended to be supply-side focused, and so  
18 again, one of the innovations of the Commonwealth's  
19 new strategy is to try to make the whole approach  
20 dual-customer connected to the demand side of the  
21 economy and informing the training and other services  
22 delivered based on the knowledge about the demand  
23 side in the context of low-income workers and  
24 welfare-to-work.

25           The idea of a dual-customer strategy is also

1 novel and exciting, and I think it has possibilities  
2 for the future. And you will, I think, understand  
3 after I talk more specifically about this mentoring  
4 bill why that service has become, I think, a main  
5 service background.

6           These comments are based obviously on the  
7 body of experience that Keystone and I have in these  
8 areas. They are also based on a reading of the bill  
9 and a reading of the replication manual published by  
10 the U.S. Department of Labor based on the Kansas  
11 model. They are not based on anything more than  
12 that, so if there's a formal evaluation, for example,  
13 that has been done of the Kansas program, I didn't  
14 come across it. I looked for it.

15           So now turning to the idea of a mentoring  
16 program and also making a set of comments on the  
17 Kansas program that sort of precipitated the interest  
18 of the committee in this approach.

19           I think my first comment about the Kansas  
20 program is that the manual, replication manual,  
21 suggests that the distinctive ingredients of that  
22 program go beyond and are broader than at least what  
23 the phrase "retiree mentoring" connotes to me.

24           So I think what I want to do is talk through  
25 my interpretation of why the Kansas program, to some

1 extent based on its self-evaluation, appears to have  
2 succeeded, and then I want to think about those  
3 observations in the context of Pennsylvania right now  
4 in the implementation of this workforce strategy.

5 I think one point that maybe is not made  
6 forcefully enough in the written testimony you will  
7 get is, and I think this point may have been made by  
8 others before me, but it is important to know that  
9 these were half-time paid positions, so they were not  
10 mentors in the sense of voluntary mentors a few hours  
11 here and there. I mean, it was a sense of serious  
12 commitment and some reward. So there was similar  
13 capacity, staff capacity, if you want, that was  
14 associated with the mentoring program in Kansas, you  
15 know. So probably if you want to get whatever  
16 results they got, the same kind of level of  
17 commitment to staff capacity would need to be  
18 present.

19 I think a second point that I want to  
20 underscore is that the Kansas program seems to have  
21 had unusually deep engagement with employers and  
22 their workforce challenges with entry-level  
23 employers, again, at least by the tradition and  
24 standards of traditional workforce programs. So here  
25 are some quotes from the replication study:



1           "Mentors called on companies, talked to  
2 decisionmakers and performed a needs-assessment  
3 survey to determine each employer's most pressing  
4 problems. Without exception, employers were  
5 concerned about their escalating turnover rates and  
6 wanted to retain quality employees."

7           Let's see. The program also, at least  
8 initially, hired unusually qualified mentors, so  
9 "Prospective mentors were required to have a lifetime  
10 of verifiable achievement in business, industry,  
11 education or government.... Those chosen as mentors  
12 knew exactly how to approach corporations to gain  
13 acceptance of mentoring."

14           A basic condition of the program with  
15 private sector businesses was the acceptance of  
16 mentors at the actual job site. "Agreements were  
17 developed to provide businesses with Welfare-to-Work  
18 participants in exchange for housing on-site mentors  
19 to handle job-related programs."

20           So again, this goes back to my observations  
21 about one of the things that is distinctive about  
22 Pennsylvania's workforce strategy in general, which  
23 is that employer engagement. The Kansas program was  
24 designed based on some appreciation of the employer's  
25 needs and what they were looking for. I think that

1 was a strong foundation for what was done there.

2           A second observation is that you learn in  
3 the Kansas replication study -- actually, well, you  
4 learn partly, as I'm sure you all know, that there is  
5 a whole range of different kinds of mentors. But you  
6 also learn that in this specific example, that at  
7 least there are a couple of pretty distinct kinds of  
8 mentors.

9           We have already talked about this sort of  
10 starting group of members where, again, part of what  
11 they seem to have brought to the ball game, in  
12 addition to whatever skills they have to mentor the  
13 welfare-to-work clients, was actually a set of  
14 abilities that relate to the employer and engaging  
15 with the employer.

16           There was a very distinct group of mentors,  
17 peer mentors, that emerged out of the Kansas  
18 experience. The details of why it emerged I could  
19 answer, but I will not bother explaining. But they  
20 ended up partway through funding a much less high  
21 status and qualifying group of mentors, but peer  
22 mentors and folks really from the same kind of  
23 background as the other welfare-to-work clients in  
24 fact pulled out of this same pool of people, and they  
25 got their halftime position in the role of peer

1 mentor while other people got placed at different  
2 kinds of employers.

3           One thing that you learn from the body of  
4 experience on successful workforce programs with  
5 entry-level workers is that that kind of peer  
6 mentoring role really can be very, very important.  
7 One of the examples I know best is from a  
8 manufacturing partnership in Wisconsin, which now  
9 places about 500 workers a year, and when they do  
10 placements in manufacturing, I mean, they have this  
11 whole system of carefully selecting mentors, getting  
12 them 3 days of training -- echoes, again, of the  
13 kinds of things that happened in Kansas -- and that  
14 kind of mentor, you know, gives the new worker at the  
15 workplace somebody to turn to, someone to help them  
16 learn the ropes, someone who is not a supervisor. So  
17 that is a second key ingredient.

18           A third thing you learn in the replication  
19 report is that the Kansas program went as far as  
20 establishing a "mentor the supervisor" program and a  
21 supervisor training program. And when you read it,  
22 what becomes clear is that this element seems to  
23 emerge organically out of the program.

24           So they got started. They were smart enough  
25 to make that connection to the employer. They did

1 various things to help employees change their  
2 behavior so that they could succeed more. But then  
3 they said, okay, well, some of this is also about  
4 changing the employer's behavior and the employer's  
5 practices, including supervisors' practices. So they  
6 started to intervene, you know, in that way.

7           So again, now we have got three somewhat  
8 different roles -- engaging the employer, peer  
9 mentoring, pushing on supervisory training, and if  
10 you interpret it broadly, organizational practices of  
11 the employer. Again, that goes beyond what the  
12 notion of a retiree mentoring program suggests to  
13 me.

14           One last thing you see sort of in passing in  
15 the Kansas program is that some of the kinds of  
16 mentoring are this sort of a more traditional case  
17 management type, you know, help employees get a car,  
18 get comfortable with riding the bus, get access to  
19 child care, those kinds of things we are used to from  
20 sort of traditional case management in welfare  
21 programs. But clearly, resources that provide  
22 support or subsidies for those kinds of support  
23 services were also in the background of any success  
24 of the Kansas program.

25           So again, to me, adequately funded support

1 services that complement whatever accomodation of  
2 mentoring rules are in place also emerges out of that  
3 experience as something that is important.

4           So summing up the Kansas model, it seems to  
5 have amounted to a lot more than a "retiree mentoring  
6 program" narrowly conceived. It provided a vehicle  
7 for engaging with employers around their interaction  
8 with entry-level welfare clients and modifying both  
9 worker and employer behavior in supportive ways that  
10 work for both parties.

11           I think that whoever drafted HB 1743  
12 actually clearly picked up on some of the most  
13 important elements that I have underscored of the  
14 Kansas program. So the draft bill, for example,  
15 underscores the need to address "problems on the  
16 employment site" and the need to make employers "part  
17 owners" of a program that helps low-income workers  
18 transition to work and become productive and  
19 self-sufficient.

20           Okay. Now, having walked through those  
21 features of the Kansas program, what are the  
22 implications for Pennsylvania today? So two key  
23 ones.

24           The first one is, once again to underscore,  
25 that the single most unusual innovation in the Kansas

1 program is that engagement with employers and the  
2 development of sort of a dual-customer approach to  
3 the delivery of these welfare services. That  
4 dual-customer approach is really the most distinctive  
5 feature of Pennsylvania's Job Ready PA program.

6 So Pennsylvania, of all States, has perhaps  
7 the largest investment now in employer engagement and  
8 workforce needs assessment through the Industry  
9 Partnership program. That is not Kansas. That is a  
10 great resource for beginning to reach down to the  
11 entry level and help people get jobs, keep jobs, and  
12 move up.

13 But the second key observation about  
14 Pennsylvania right now is that Pennsylvania's  
15 welfare-to-work programs have, for the most part,  
16 been disconnected from the Industry Partnership  
17 strategy and Job Ready PA.

18 Now, I do not think that is a particularly  
19 controversial statement? Okay. And I know it is  
20 sort of on the minds of the workforce team and the  
21 Administration that this is a frontier that they want  
22 to try to figure out how to push on.

23 So the good news, in a sense, is that there  
24 is an opportunity there. There is new ground to be  
25 broken if we can bring this Industry Partnership

1 infrastructure together with some of the  
2 services that are available for welfare-to-work  
3 clients.

4           So again, it seems to me that HB 1743  
5 provides a way into a debate about how the public and  
6 private sectors can invest more strategically as well  
7 as more in services that find that sweet spot that  
8 helps employers and helps workers move to  
9 self-sufficiency.

10           Now, my reading of the Kansas experience  
11 suggests that an effective program that does this  
12 should provide support for employer outreach and  
13 engagement around the challenges of recruiting and  
14 retaining qualified entry-level workers;  
15 identification of best practices that can help  
16 employers reduce turnover among entry-level workers  
17 while simultaneously enabling workers to stay long  
18 enough to have a chance to move up to better jobs;  
19 investment in workplace peer mentors, selected and  
20 trained following best practices as one approach to  
21 reducing turnover; investment in supervisory training  
22 and modifications of employer practices; and adequate  
23 investment in support services and more traditional  
24 case management.

25           One obvious candidate for overseeing the

1 implementation of these added services would be the  
2 Industry Partnerships themselves perhaps through some  
3 competitive bid process, you know, with some kinds of  
4 requirements around engaging with welfare-to-work  
5 programs as partners.

6           Now, let us think just briefly, because I  
7 have gone a long way from retiree mentors -- I know  
8 that; I meant to -- workers over 55 or 60, retired or  
9 still employed, could be a great resource in this  
10 type of program, which I see in Pennsylvania. Their  
11 experience and wisdom could enable them to serve in  
12 various roles, from employer outreach to peer  
13 mentoring to supervisor trainer.

14           How much resources should be limited to use  
15 with seniors or retired seniors is another question.  
16 My gut feeling, and you all know this, is that it may  
17 not make sense to be too prescriptive. So perhaps  
18 seniors and retired seniors could be given preference  
19 in some aspects of program implementation. It is  
20 cost effective, and they are a great resource.

21           So the kind of program I just outlined is  
22 going to require more resources, which is always the  
23 tough part of the conversation, or one of the tough  
24 parts. So three things about that quickly.

25           These types of investments, implemented



1 well, are almost certainly cost effective for society  
2 as well as, in some cases, cost effective for  
3 employers even without public subsidy. So one thing  
4 that is going to be recognized, I think in your  
5 legislation and also in the Kansas replication study,  
6 is that these kinds of programs done well focus on  
7 improving retention at the work site, in part through  
8 the use of mentors of different kinds, and have a  
9 chance to become sustainable once employers recognize  
10 they are valuable. So that is a good thing.

11           Second, I think the idea of a demonstration  
12 program, combined with evaluation -- I would say  
13 "rigorous" evaluation; that is more expensive -- has  
14 merit as a way to reduce the upfront costs of what  
15 you folks have started a conversation about, but also  
16 get the information necessary for the larger-scale  
17 investment down the road.

18           And then the third thing I will say about  
19 money is a national and State foundation interest in  
20 these areas does create opportunities for the State  
21 to leverage funds from other places, but the State is  
22 unlikely to get away without providing some new money  
23 to sweeten the spot and to bring in those other  
24 funders to be a part of a significant demonstration  
25 project.

1           The last thing I will say is a phrase that  
2 sticks in my head and that reading the legislation  
3 about the Kansas experience brought to mind from that  
4 Wisconsin partnership that I mentioned in passing,  
5 "industry driven but worker centered." That, in a  
6 sense, is where you intend to go.

7           Industry driven is about, hey, there is an  
8 economy out there; there is a labor market out there.  
9 If you want people to succeed in our kind of society,  
10 you know, you have got to help them get the skills  
11 and behaviors they need to get and keep a job.

12           But the worker-centered piece, you know, is  
13 about -- and the whole orientation of the mentoring  
14 piece is part of being worker centered -- okay, we  
15 will let you know what the standards are and what the  
16 behaviors are, and we are not going to be ambiguous  
17 about that, we are not going to water it down, but we  
18 are going to be supportive and we are going to  
19 implement a program, you know, in a way that takes, I  
20 do not know, the most vulnerable but maybe some of  
21 the more vulnerable folks in our economy and give  
22 them a chance in a way that helps employers but  
23 also helps those workers in so many ways, not just  
24 in terms of their income, and helps their families.

25           I applaud all of you for starting, I think,

1 what is an important debate and would be happy to  
2 answer any questions.

3 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you, Mr. Herzenberg.  
4 Very interesting.

5 I would say that you, with your employer  
6 engagement piece, you sort of added a whole new  
7 dimension to my thinking about the bill. And as you  
8 were talking, it really brought back memories,  
9 because I have been in the Legislature for 18 years  
10 now, but the 10 years before that, I was an  
11 employer, and we had about 60 employees in a  
12 manufacturing facility that made molded plastic  
13 products.

14 And, you know, our employees were not  
15 extremely low wage but they were entry level, at  
16 least they started at entry level, and our turnover  
17 was high. And they had attitude problems, I thought,  
18 at least a lot of them did, with the notion that they  
19 had to show up for work every day, that, you know, it  
20 was impossible for us as an employer to have extra  
21 people, you know, working for us who could just take  
22 over their job if they didn't show up.

23 So, you know, it just really struck home  
24 with me that some of these soft skills that we are  
25 talking about helping people with are important. But

1 one thing that you really said that struck me, and  
2 I'm going to ask you for an example, is an example of  
3 change in supervisory behavior.

4 MR. HERZENBERG: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Can you give me an example  
6 of the kinds of things you are talking about with  
7 regard to that?

8 MR. HERZENBERG: Sure.

9 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: It is kind of off topic a  
10 little bit, but I'm just curious.

11 MR. HERZENBERG: Yeah, and I'll give you one  
12 sort of slight abstraction and I'll give you a local  
13 story, and I'll volunteer to cooperate in putting  
14 together another panel that could bring some of the  
15 people most qualified to answer that question across  
16 the country.

17 I mean, the conceptual example I will give  
18 you is the long-term care, so let us say nursing  
19 homes. Research on nursing homes sort of shows that  
20 there are really quite different organizational  
21 models that exist in different parts of the  
22 nursing-home industry.

23 So one of those models treats frontline  
24 caregivers or skilled caregivers and treats residents  
25 as living human subjects and provides supportive

1 supervision, job-coaching supervision, in the trade  
2 to help aides learn how to listen and understand the  
3 needs, to contain their anger when they get  
4 frustrated, you know, a series of very, very concrete  
5 skills.

6           Then another part of the nursing-home  
7 industry is, they used to go under the name of  
8 Medicaid mills. There were books written about this  
9 stuff called "Tender Loving Greed" and "A Loving  
10 Care." You have people who are treated like  
11 unskilled menial laborers and you have residents who  
12 are treated as objects. I have been in nursing homes  
13 when people have yelled out, "Go get the stroke on  
14 hall 3." So, I mean, supervisory training is kind of  
15 the tip of the iceberg in that case, and in lots of  
16 cases, in terms of those profoundly different  
17 organizational models.

18           So I think that is an onion you always want  
19 to unwrap. I mean, I think the State's investment  
20 in, I do not know what the number is, 12 or 14  
21 long-term-care partnerships, I mean, they started to  
22 train people and they started by expanding training  
23 capacity for key occupations. That is how you get  
24 employers to the table; you address their immediate  
25 needs. But then they went pretty quickly to

1 supervisory training, which is kind of the roots of  
2 the retention problem, and then some of them have now  
3 gone to trying to explore more sophisticated  
4 diagnostic techniques to understand what is driving  
5 your turnover and what it is costing you to sort of  
6 motivate deeper organizational changes. So that  
7 gives you a flavor.

8           The example I'll give is True Temper, which  
9 is, I think, a wheelbarrow manufacturer here.  
10 Actually a few years back, True Temper was using, you  
11 know, primarily temp agency workers for its new  
12 entrance and had a very high turnover rate. This is  
13 a small but unionized plant in a commodity market, so  
14 it is a really tough, competitive situation, you  
15 know. And again, she walked them through, this is  
16 how you establish a peer mentoring program; this is  
17 the training you need, you know, to give to folks;  
18 you know, this is the kind of labor management  
19 committee you should set up that includes some  
20 of your union folks but also some of your  
21 supervisors.

22           So again, I can't do as well in terms of the  
23 specifics of that at a work site, but they ended up,  
24 again, shifting away from their lives in the temp  
25 agency. It wasn't a perfect implementation.

1           But those are some kinds of things, and  
2           again, I know, as someone who has mismanaged a small  
3           business for 12 years, I really have a lot of empathy  
4           for people who manage poorly, and, you know, I think  
5           the nuts and bolts of helping supervisors and other  
6           managers learn how to implement a different set of  
7           practices that are more supportive, less frustration,  
8           you know, is really important.

9           And again, the Industry Partnership that  
10          Pennsylvania had, it barely scratched the surface in  
11          terms of exploring their potential as learning  
12          structures within which more employers can become  
13          good or best practice.

14          So again, I think your legislation for  
15          low-income workers obviously provides a way into that  
16          conversation.

17                   CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you.

18                   Representative Bear.

19                   REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Well, thank you for  
20          coming out and providing the indepth analysis of the  
21          Kansas welfare model as well as what we are proposing  
22          here.

23                   My question really revolves around funding,  
24          the issue as you got to it at the end of your  
25          testimony.

1           You mentioned the Pennsylvania Fund for  
2 Workforce Solutions. Is that an area that we could  
3 possibly have some grants available there? I mean,  
4 what is your estimate, where can we get the funds and  
5 what do you think it might cost us to set something  
6 like this up?

7           MR. HERZENBERG: Probably that is a longer  
8 conversation. That is a 3- to 5-year project. The  
9 strategic intent of the way is to actually get the  
10 Pennsylvania philanthropic community and the United  
11 Ways aligned with this kind of work for the long  
12 term. That is what the national foundations are  
13 about, is sort of persuading folks on the ground in  
14 Pennsylvania that if you want to pursue an  
15 antipoverty strategy, there is actually an effective  
16 way to do it.

17           So there is, you know, there is something to  
18 talk about there. I mean, the way that works is that  
19 the national fund expects to spend up to \$50 million  
20 over 5 years across the country, and then it is  
21 demanding a local match of 4 to 1. So that is what,  
22 \$250 million?

23           And our goal, working in partnership with  
24 the foundations and with the Commonwealth, is  
25 actually to bring as much of that money into



1 Pennsylvania as we can, basically making the argument  
2 that we can be a test best for this stuff, because we  
3 got this Industry Partnership infrastructure.

4           So I think there's a conversation to be had.  
5 Hey, when there are three other groups of funders --  
6 no, two other groups -- well, when there are other  
7 funders at the table, I think you guys are going to  
8 have an opportunity, you know, to use a bit of money,  
9 yes, to leverage maybe some of those resources. So  
10 it is worth exploring in more detail.

11           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: It just seems from  
12 your testimony, though, I think it might be a wise  
13 investment, because it seems like Pennsylvania is  
14 really, you said it well for this, given, you said,  
15 the Job---

16           MR. HERZENBERG: Ready.

17           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: ---Job Ready program  
18 in PA.

19           MR. HERZENBERG: Yes.

20           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: And it is really  
21 making the welfare-to-work with this Job Ready PA  
22 initiative or has made a lot of things aligned  
23 already.

24           MR. HERZENBERG: Right, so it is an  
25 opportunity. That is right. I think there is.

1           REPRESENTATIVE BEAR: Thank you.

2           MR. HERZENBERG: Thank you.

3           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Hennessey.

4           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you,  
5 Phyllis.

6           Steve, thank you very much for your  
7 testimony. It was certainly thorough and well  
8 thought out.

9           One of the things, the information that we  
10 received, though, indicated that not only Kansas has  
11 this kind of a program but a couple of other States  
12 as well, and everybody has been focusing on Kansas,  
13 including us.

14           But New Mexico and California apparently  
15 have used the Kansas model to build their own types  
16 of programs. Did your research indicate anything  
17 with regard to their successes? Were you able to  
18 compare them? Or if not, if it didn't cover that, is  
19 it possible for you to supplement?

20           Can you give us some idea of how those two  
21 States and their programs compare with what  
22 Pennsylvania has in mind here?

23           MR. HERZENBERG: There was a summary of  
24 those two other States in the replication guide. So  
25 I have not looked at those cases more deeply, and

1    there is a huge literature on mentoring that, you  
2    know, I do not have command of.  So I would be -- I  
3    mean, the impression I got from the California and  
4    New Mexico examples is that they may not have been as  
5    deep in terms of maybe their theory but certainly  
6    their practice.

7            But, you know, I would be happy to talk at  
8    more length and go to some of our national contacts  
9    and, you know, come back with information that  
10   answers some of your more specific questions.

11           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:  I'm just thinking  
12   that if there are experiences out there and learning  
13   opportunities for us, we might as well take a look at  
14   them now before we get too deeply involved in  
15   crafting this kind of a program, or before we ask the  
16   agencies at the State level to try to develop their  
17   own---

18           MR. HERZENBERG:  You know, I think---

19           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:  Their own  
20   experiences.  I'm sorry.

21           MR. HERZENBERG:  No, that's all right.  No,  
22   I'm pretty confident that the following is going to  
23   be true, that mentoring, you know, high-quality  
24   mentoring, supportive mentoring by someone who has  
25   got some kinds of skills that are potentially

1 valuable to the client and where there either is not  
2 a gap in culture or that the gap can be bridged are  
3 great things. Too many people do not have the  
4 support structures that they need to succeed.

5           And I'm also pretty confident in saying that  
6 mentoring programs that operate on the side of the  
7 employment relationship, and therefore, without the  
8 ability to begin to achieve the changes in both  
9 client behaviors and employer practices that you saw,  
10 and I'm talking the Kansas case and I think that  
11 Pennsylvania's Industry Partnerships would make  
12 possible, are not going to do as much, because I  
13 think most of the retention challenge is tied up in,  
14 you know, those systems of recruitment and employer  
15 behavior.

16           So, again, absolutely more skills on the  
17 part of an individual worker can help, but you are  
18 working on the smaller part of the problem, not the  
19 bigger.

20           REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you.

21           Thank you, Madam Chair.

22           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Anyone else?

23           Thank you very much, Mr. Herzenberg. We  
24 appreciate your coming today and your indepth  
25 analysis of the Kansas experience.

1           MR. HERZENBERG: Thank you, Representative  
2 Mundy.

3           CHAIRMAN MUNDY: The meeting is adjourned.

4

5           (The hearing concluded at 12:17 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1           I hereby certify that the proceedings and  
2 evidence are contained fully and accurately in the  
3 notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that  
4 this is a correct transcript of the same.

5

6

7

-----  
Debra B. Miller, Reporter

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25