

## **Apprenticeship Summary - Draft**

### **Recent Reports**

In 2002, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA) and the Council for Education Policy, Research and Improvement (CEPRI) released reports on apprenticeship training in Florida. The OPPAGA report, “Apprenticeship Program is Beneficial, But Its Ability to Meet State Demands Is Limited,” produced the following conclusions:

- The program benefits participating students, since those who complete apprenticeships have a higher level of earnings than comparable adult vocational programs. The program also benefits participating employers by filling regional demand for skilled labor.
- However, the program lacks a systematic approach to meeting statewide demand for skilled labor. Field representative service areas are not aligned with state workforce regions, and the program lacks guidelines for allocating funding to program sponsors.
- Limitations in the program’s data system hinder its ability to provide information to stakeholders. Also, inaccurate and inconsistent reporting by local education entities undermines program administrators’ ability to evaluate performance.

The CEPRI report examined demographic distribution of students and the completion rates. Students in apprenticeship programs have completion rates that meet or exceed those of traditional certificate programs. The following recommendations on accountability and workforce funding were approved in February 2002:

- Accountability:
  - Uniform standards for the reporting of apprenticeship headcount and instructional hours should be developed by community colleges and school districts.
  - The State Apprenticeship Council should evaluate the recent decrease in the percentage of females in registered apprenticeship programs.
- Workforce Funding and Fees
  - The exemption of matriculation and fees should be statutorily amended to give the community college or school district the discretion to grant exemptions for matriculation, registration and laboratory fees, under the following conditions: a) Fees may only apply to the related training instruction hours required by the apprenticeship agreement and may not exceed the vocational clock hour fee; b) The community college or school district should consider the local contributions of the program sponsor toward the related training instruction component of the program in the decision of whether to grant the exemption; c) The program sponsor should have the flexibility to seek a partnership agreement with another LEA if an agreement on fees cannot be reached between the sponsor and the LEA. In the event a new agreement is reached with another LEA, in the fiscal year following its inception, the base and performance funding relating to the apprenticeship program should be transferred to the new LEA.; d) The waivers granted by the local LEA for apprenticeship students should be excluded from the waiver limit of eight percent for workforce development appropriations.

- Provisions for the start-up of new programs should remain a local decision. The current oversight of the State Apprenticeship Council and the local arrangements are sufficient to ensure the development of quality programs. However, all colleges and districts maintain the flexibility to utilize existing opportunities for expansion such as any new performance incentive funding, potential workload increases in future funding formulas, and workforce development grants.

### **Summary of Funding Mechanisms in Other States**

Apprenticeship training in 27 states, including Florida, is governed by State Apprenticeship Councils (SAC). These councils are responsible for policymaking and program registration. In the remaining 23 states, the federal Bureau of Apprenticeship Training (BAT) oversees the programs. Each of the 26 SAC states was contacted to determine their statewide policies on three areas:

- 1) Is funding provided for related training instruction? If so, by what mechanism?
- 2) Are students charged tuition at technical centers or colleges for related training instruction?
- 3) Are program sponsors (i.e., employers or employer groups) charged fees by the state for program registration?

Responses have been received by 20 of 26 states (See **Table 1**). Overall, Florida's apprenticeship funding is more generous than most other states. Nine states do not provide any funding for related training instruction for apprentices. Of the remaining eleven, only three states have a process similar to Florida's where funding is received through technical centers and/or college budgets. Most of the other states provide limited funding for tuition reimbursement for students or instructor costs. Fifteen of the twenty states report that tuition is charged to students for their enrollment in a community college or technical center; although in many cases the apprentice's employer may pay for or reimburse the tuition.