



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPRENTICESHIP (ACA)

#### Meeting Minutes

Location: Chicago, Illinois ([Webex recording](#))

Date: May 10, 2023

Time: 8:45 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. CT

8:45 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

#### CALL TO ORDER

**John Ladd, Administrator of the Office of Apprenticeship (OA), U.S. Department of Labor (DOL or the Department)**, opened the meeting. Mr. Ladd greeted the ACA members and the public and noted that all meeting materials will be available on [Apprenticeship.gov](#).

**Dr. Pam Eddinger, ACA Chairperson and President of Bunker Hill Community College**, then conducted the roll call.

#### MEMBER ROLL CALL

##### *Employer Representatives:*

- Noel Ginsburg, Employer Co-Chair and Founder & CEO of CareerWise Colorado (present)
- Amy Kardel, Senior Vice President, Strategic Workforce Relationships, The Computing Technology Industry Association (CompTIA) (absent)
  - Delegate: Rich Braden (present)
- Carolyn Holmes Lee, Executive Director, The Manufacturing Institute (absent)
  - Delegate: Pooja Tripathi (present)
- T. David Long, CEO, National Electrical Contractors Association (absent)
  - Delegate: Jared Karbowsky (present)
- Obed D. Louissaint, Senior Vice President and Chief People Officer, Aptiv (present)
- Karmela Malone, Senior Vice President of Claims, The Hartford (present)
- Timothy Oberg, Assistant Director, Independent Electrical Contractors (present)
- Valerie S. Richardson, Director, Talent & Workforce Development, Prisma Health (present)



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

### *Labor Representatives:*

- Raymond W. Boyd, Assistant Director of Education and Training, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada (present)
- Daniel Bustillo, Deputy Executive Director, 1199SEIU Training and Employment Funds, Service Employees International Union (present)
- John A. Costa, International President, Amalgamated Transit Union AFL-CIO/CLC (present)
- Stephanie Harris-Kuiper, Executive Director, Training & Development Fund District 1199J, American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (present)
- William K. Irwin Jr., Retired Executive Director, Carpenters International Training Fund (present)
- Michael C. Oathout, Director of Safety & Health, Apprenticeships and Scholarships, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers (virtual)
- Vicki L. O'Leary, General Organizer and Director of Diversity, Ironworkers International (present)
- Bernadette Oliveira-Rivera, Labor Co-Chair and Assistant Director for Training of Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA) (present)
- Anton P. Ruesing, Executive Director, International Finishing Trades Institute, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades (present)
- Todd W. Stafford, Executive Director, Electrical Training ALLIANCE (absent)
  - Delegate: Marty Riesberg (present)

### *Public Representatives:*

- Todd Berch, President, National Association of State and Territorial Apprenticeship Directors (NASTAD) (virtual)
  - Delegate: David Polk (present)
  - Delegate: Christopher D. Maclarion, NASTAD (virtual)
- Walter Bumphus, PhD, President and CEO, American Association of Community Colleges (absent)
  - Delegate: Jen Worth (virtual)
- Erin E. Johansson, Research Director, Jobs with Justice (virtual)
- Donna Lenhoff, Principal, Donna Lenhoff Associates, representing Chicago Women in Trades (CWIT) (present)
- Robbie Melton, PhD, Associate Vice President, Tennessee State University, Smart Global Technology Innovation Center (virtual)
- Traci R. Scott, Vice President of Workforce Development, National Urban League (present)



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

- Orrian Willis, Senior Workforce Development Specialist, San Francisco Office of Economic & Workforce Development (present)
- Randi Wolfe, PhD, Executive Director, Early Care & Education Pathways to Success (present)

### *Ex Officio Representatives:*

- Kevin Gallagher, Senior Advisor, Upskilling and Broadband, U.S. Department of Commerce (virtual)
- Amy Loyd, Assistant Secretary, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE), U.S. Department of Education (virtual)
- Amy Peterson, Senior Advisor, Industry Relations, U.S. Department of Energy (virtual)
- Johnathan J. Gardner, Director, Human Capital Programs, and Chief Learning Officer, Department of Health and Human Services (absent)
- Diane Shelley, Regional Administrator, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (absent)
  - Delegate: Lacia Sommars (virtual)
- Paige Shevlin, Strategic Advisor, U.S. Department of Transportation (virtual)

## WELCOME FROM THE ACA CHICAGO HOSTS

***Oliveira-Rivera:*** We are very excited to be able to host this meeting and welcome you all. This is one of 70 LIUNA training schools throughout North America that provide training to apprentices nationwide. It is an example of what is possible through true employer and labor cooperation. We hope that you enjoy your stay, and if there is anything that we can do to make it more effective and efficient or comfortable for you, please let us know. We appreciate you being here and thank you all for taking the time to learn about who we are within the building trades and the strength we bring to the apprenticeship system.

***Lenhoff:*** Thank you, Bernadette and Pam. On behalf of CWIT, let me welcome you all to my hometown of Chicago. I'm joined by Jayne Vellinga and Erika Werth from CWIT and Lauren Sugerman will be joining us as well. Welcome to all members of the ACA who are here in person and virtually. Thanks to OA, the Chair, and the Co-Chairs, and to all the work you did to get this meeting going. Special shoutout to Kenya Huckaby, who is the logistics and email queen. Special thanks to our partners as hosts, LIUNA, because your hospitality has just been terrific, and particularly of course to Bernadette and John LeConche, who were very generous with their time showing us this facility yesterday and then giving us this facility today, which is fabulous. I hope you all were impressed as I personally was with the site tours yesterday of CWIT and LIUNA, and I think you will also find as I did that these two sites do a great job of reflecting the



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

theme of today's meeting, which is really to focus on innovations and best practices from the mature apprenticeship programs from the traditional apprenticeship occupations in the construction trades. I look forward to this meeting and talking with you all further.

### **AGENDA OVERVIEW**

**Ladd:** I'm thrilled to be here today as we wrap up what really has been a 2-year journey of this committee and the capstone of the tremendous work you all have done over the past 2 years. Let me walk through the agenda here quickly.

We're going to start off as we have been in our last few meetings. We'll have some reflections from our local hosts and stakeholders. We're also going to hear from Acting Assistant Secretary Brent Parton. We're going to take a photo if we have time here; we want to really kind of celebrate this moment of bringing the ACA together here for the last meeting of this term. From there, we are going to move into a panel where we have some time to reflect on the site visits that we were fortunate enough to see yesterday, but also to hear from additional representatives from those organizations and, of course, from apprentices, which has been our practice here for the last few meetings. We'll then take a break. Then I will spend the balance of the morning continuing the discussion we started at the last meeting around family-sustaining wages. So we'll go through that. We have expanded the time there for that session to make sure we have adequate time to hear from the ACA and the additional perspectives as well as any actions that you all may decide to take. We'll then take a break for lunch at noon.

Then we're going to come back in the afternoon and we're going to go through some really important committee business. We want to share the final issue papers that have been developed by each of the subcommittees, all of the tremendous work that has been put into these issue papers over the past year. So we're going to go through each of those subcommittee papers. As we'll talk about later in the morning, we really want to focus the discussion in the afternoon about the scope of those papers as they were originally proposed. So we want to remind folks what the highlights are of the recommendations being made, highlighting any changes that were made since the last time the issue papers were presented, and then ultimately to vote to approve the balance of the existing papers that have been developed for inclusion in the committee's biennial report. So that will take us a good chunk of the afternoon. We are then going to take another break there.

After that discussion, we'll come back, and we'll turn our attention to the biennial report itself. So, again, we're sequencing this so that we can approve what the committee chooses to approve and then what is approved we'll fold into that biennial report. You have the draft of the biennial



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

report at your desk, so everybody has that again. That includes the interim report that you provided roughly about a year ago this time. So we wanted to have discussion around the biennial report, and then move to a vote to approve, or not to approve, of that biennial report.

We'll then wrap up with some next steps, our road ahead, and take a moment, again, to thank you all for the tremendous work that each of you has done over the past 2 years. Again, a shoutout to my team and my staff for all the tremendous support that they've provided to you all over the past 2 years. It's been an amazing and busy and productive 2 years and I'm really just thrilled that we're here today to look at the culmination and totality of all the work that you've done. I know a lot of us have flights out this evening, so we're going to do our best to get you out of here on time at 4 o'clock. So that is our agenda and I look forward to today's discussion. With that, I'll turn it back to Bernadette.

### **REFLECTIONS: LOCAL APPRENTICESHIP STAKEHOLDERS**

***Oliveira-Rivera:*** Thank you, John. So this morning I have the pleasure of being able to introduce my executive director at LIUNA Training, John LeConche. He is someone who has been involved with apprenticeship for over 40 years. He's always been incredibly supportive of the apprenticeship system and is someone that helped LIUNA not only start registered apprenticeship by submitting its first apprenticeship standards but is someone who has continued to innovate throughout his career to ensure that the strength of our apprenticeship program is unrivaled within the industry. One of the things that I am very excited about in terms of what we've done under his leadership at LIUNA Training is expand opportunities through strategic partnerships, ensuring that there is access for anyone who's interested in a career in construction through targeted outreach and recruitment efforts. Obviously, we have a partner here with us today at the table, CWIT, that's one example of that. We have a myriad of others that he has cultivated as executive director of training. He's also developed a very unique program for our apprenticeship coordinators, where we have a professional certification that enables our apprenticeship coordinators to provide the highest level of support to our contractors and our apprentices to ensure that they can not only enter the apprenticeship program confidently through an unbiased screening process, but also have the kind of wraparound support services that are needed and essential for them to complete these programs successfully. I understand I'm a little bit biased, but I do believe that there are few leaders out there who are as passionate and as committed to supporting registered apprenticeship as John. So, with that, John LeConche.

***LeConche:*** Thanks to Bernadette for her dedication and helping roll out the registered apprenticeship program. Forty-four years in training for me. I have started and helped write national standards, helped implement registered apprenticeship in almost every state, such as



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

Oklahoma and Texas. I have personally sat and interviewed in prisons and homeless shelters, have seen abused women, faith-based and community-based organizations, have seen what apprenticeship can do. I have seen the benefits of it. We showed a video yesterday of the long-term effects of apprenticeship. Usually over the last 44 years when new funding comes around, I can't wait work to start to get people out of poverty and into a living wage career.

Bernadette and I were in Oklahoma and San Antonio, not hotbeds of unionism and certainly not the wage rate that you heard Keith talk about yesterday here in Chicago. Local union leadership there is new to them, as is our 4-year apprenticeship high school program. Our 4-year high school apprenticeship program is the one of best available out there. The schools asked what happens when our kids graduate from high school? The local union representative misspoke and said that apprenticeship program graduating high school students go in at 60% of the wage. The school systems asked what is the point of the program then if graduating kids are going to come in at 60%? Graduated high school students actually come in at 70% to 80% and they get credit for related training hours, shortening the time that they're in apprenticeship. Laborers who go through our high school program and then go into direct entry into our apprenticeship programs are eclipsing regular apprentices and reaching leadership positions faster. Due to the wage rate, implementing our apprenticeship program in different places was different. We made sure that upon graduation from apprenticeship, apprentices were making a living wage.

The structure of apprenticeship is not the issue, it's a lack of understanding of what apprenticeship is – how flexible it is and the commitment from programs. For example, in my experience, unions never fund their own trade. What happens is that people look at structure and don't realize that it's flawed. Do we get defensive in labor? Yes. We have changed thousands of people's lives. The majority are immigrants and women who are graduating our apprenticeship program; but it's not enough, we're not doing enough to improve the lives of people. I said, how would each group, whether you are a community-based organization, or whether you are a contractor group, or a community college, how would you feel if every time you walked into a room somebody said something negative about you, or that you're not running your programs correctly, or that I tell you that trade schools spend millions of dollars a year having to develop basic education classes because apprentices coming in don't have the math, science, or reading skills to even do the trade curriculum?

Three years ago, we had a contractor who submitted a program in the state of Maryland. Our program already exists in Maryland; it's 4,000 hours and 300 hours of related training. I think in Maryland they started above the usual 60% for wages in that area. An 8,000-hour apprenticeship program was proposed for a construction worker. The rate is \$22 an hour. The starting wage was 50% of \$22 an hour. The wage was raised \$1 per year. Two years later, 3 years later, an apprentice wasn't even making \$22 an hour. Who would pass something that was as close to



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

indentured servitude as this? It passed. They splintered our program and passed the program that this employer was allowed to have an apprenticeship program starting at 50% of a wage, \$11 an hour.

We're about to start a program in Puerto Rico that we believe will finally build housing where it's needed in an area that has been too long forgotten. One of the reasons why apprenticeship can't get started in Puerto Rico was not that the system is broken, but that employers didn't want to pay the wage. The apprenticeship system we set up works. A non-union apprentice signed with us and created housing for those who don't have housing in Puerto Rico. The attacks saying that we're not doing enough and it's archaic and old and it doesn't work are all smoke screens to people not wanting to invest in apprenticeship. Maybe if we pumped more money into pre-apprenticeship programs then we could have more living wages after the finishing of apprenticeship programs.

I have had the pleasure of working with our regional manager, Terry Healy. We almost came on around the same time in the early 1980s. He has a unique perspective like I do. He takes time out of his schedule to attend and support our training effort and our apprenticeship effort. He's involved in the issues. I've respected him throughout my whole career, and I'm honored that he's my trustee. I thank him, by the way, for what you've done here in this area, and for allowing us to use this facility. So, Terry Healy.

**Healy:** I have known John for a number of years and thank him for his leadership and passion. He's very passionate and he's been in our national training fund for decades. Thanks to John and Bernadette for also helping the situation. They always look outside the box to see what we can do to make things better for our contractors and members. Thanks to Keith Vitale for the work he does at this training center. One of the main reasons we've doubled in size is because we have mandatory apprentices in contracts with contractors. We need contractors to get the jobs. I appreciate everyone for coming to the LIUNA training program. I consider this facility the crown jewel of our trades program across the country. Once we jump in, we jump in all the way. We try to make sure we have the best things for our members. We want a true apprenticeship program. This facility shows how truly important it is for us to have this training.

Since our founding 120 years ago, our laborers have been a craft of immigrants, people who had to fight for their place on the job site. We've had to carve out a place for ourselves at the table. We have to fight for the work we do all the time. We opened up our first training center in California in 1969. The first time the Department acknowledged us as a legitimate apprenticeship program was in 1994. Chicago has a pretty good wage rate at \$48.91. How do we make it worthwhile for the owners to ask for a union contractor who's going to be safe, productive, and get the job done on time and under budget? We have a whole new generation of not just laborers



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

but other trade laborers where we have to learn to get things done. There was a time in our industry where being a laborer was something that someone started out as and then pursued another field later on; those days are over. Apprenticeship is a career and not just a job; they can live in the middle class. We have the best in the industry health care benefits. Health care quality is going up and up in Chicago due to good laborers here. Our healthcare fund is very good, and our training centers can help teach members the skills that will allow them to become the best that they are. This is at no cost to the member. It's a situation where we work with management contributions from them and we sit at a table, not only to negotiate the contract, but they are partners with us at the training fund. Half the trustees here are management and half are union. Nobody in the country trains more people with no cost to the participant better than the building trades apprenticeship and training programs across the country.

High school counselors now have to realize that they cannot just tell everybody to go to college. High school counselors are now graded on how many of their students go to college. Not everybody can go to college and afford it, or they don't belong in college. Some people can't sit in a classroom and listen, and they need something hands on. Too many people come into college and come out in heavy debt or broke. They face a job market that may not match the skills of what they studied in college. At the end of the 4 years of our apprenticeship program, the apprentices have money they can put in the bank and money to buy a car or a house. They have no debt and don't need to live with mom and dad after graduating. We're trying to build the middle class here and apprentices have benefits. The trade that they have they can carry throughout their lifetime. In same time that college students are racking up \$150,000 in debt with no job prospects to pay it off, apprentices are building skills and making money.

We have doubled this facility right now because of investment in training centers like this. We have yet to be at a table where contractors ask if they have trained workers who can do quality work. We work together very closely with management. What started as a union of immigrants has grown to reach out to more marginalized communities. LIUNA has over half a million members; 55% of our members are women, minorities, and immigrants. Our diversity is our strength. We are probably the most diversified union across the country. Thank you all for joining us today and God bless you and God bless America. The largest contractor for this facility is the city of Chicago; they see the advantage of apprenticeship. I want to thank Cook County for the job that they do with our members.

**Jacobs-El:** Wow, thank you so much. My name is Bilqis Jacobs-El and I'm the director of facilities for Cook County. As Terry said, we do have a large group of skilled trades. I'm excited to be joining today and welcome to all who are attending. We are excited to recruit for CWIT from high schools and other places. CWIT goes to high schools and shows them trades. We don't have a lot of women in the skilled trades in Cook County; one female electrician and one female





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

painter. We are the largest department in Cook County under the current board president, with 500 employees and 20 different unions. We hire direct from union halls. Under the leadership of our board president, we are proud of hiring more skilled trades and hiring more women.

We are working with the Painters District Council #14 to put together an apprenticeship that we can all be proud of down the line. I want to acknowledge the leadership in the Painters District Council, Joe Rinehart, Mike Dixon, Helen Chung, and Victor Hernandez. The Painters District Council and Cook County have partnered on many initiatives, including in 2015 a program exposing those in the juvenile center to hands-on training to learn about trades. Juvenile youth will see skilled traders working in the juvenile center and ask them about how they became a plumber or an electrician. This program is still in place and picking back up again after the pandemic. Leadership of unions would also come out to the detainment facility to talk to the youth about career paths in the skilled trades. We're also proud of the facilities management engineer training program; it's now revamped. It allows employees to train and has an emphasis on equity and inclusion. It provides hands-on experience to have a career as an engineer. In 3 years, trainees receive an actual engineering license. All union members at Cook County make over \$100,000 a year. We can't pull from a pool and have requirements if we have no pool. Shout out to Pat Kelly and Roger McGinty of Local 399. The union sends us candidates that we bring on, hire, and pay, and they become full-fledged engineers at the end of the program making over \$100,000 a year.

Please let us know what the county can do to improve and increase apprenticeship. There are facilities where folks can learn apprenticeships in Cook County. We have to increase the number of skilled trades and create a pool to pull from so we can take advantage of requirements. At the Bureau of Asset Management, we keep the services of the county running. We pride ourselves in working as a team as we have strong and diverse members. We always had concerns about underrepresented women. We are looking to set up more targeted opportunities for women. We have 200 employees but only three are female. We are open to dialogue and putting those things in place and not just talking about it. Women make up just 3% of the construction skilled trade workforce in the United States. My background is in engineering. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, there was some level of support and passion for getting women into engineering and other trades. We want to take advantage of things in place right now, not just for women, but for skilled trades overall. The programs I mentioned earlier are a small step in our commitment to all people interested in skilled trades. We continue to listen and to learn from each other to find new ways to reach women and inspire them to pursue a career in the trades. Thank you all and I conclude.

**Eddinger:** Thank you all for your comments. I would like to note an agenda change; we're not going to have a group photo until the end of the next panel because we have a secretary in the



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

house. He needs no introduction, Brent Parton, our Acting Assistant Secretary for ETA. Good morning, Brent.

### DEPARTMENTAL REMARKS AND UPDATES

**Parton:** Thank you, Terry, John, Bernadette, and LIUNA, for hosting this. I will try to be brief as you've heard from me for each iteration of these things. Two years, seven meetings, and very close to one report. Those numbers do not do it justice to explain the work the ACA has done. The work doesn't end here.

When Secretary Walsh reconvened the ACA in 2021, it was due to the Biden memo where he emphasized that the ACA should be reconvened to address the need for apprenticeship. Interestingly, in that memo there were two other things; one, the memo was calling for the end of industry-recognized apprenticeship programs; the third thing it referenced was the National Apprenticeship Act. The message in the memo was very clear, focused on creating one apprenticeship system, bringing together stakeholders from the public, from industry, and from labor to strengthen that system for years to come.

Registered apprenticeship should be a core workforce strategy. We have all tackled some really difficult issues about this. In this system, it means putting diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) in the forefront, finding more workers in more sectors in the economy. This committee has leaned in these areas and done these in-person meetings where we have all learned from each other and made progress on the issues around DEIA and expanding registered apprenticeship in other industries without compromising its quality. The work has happened well beyond when this committee has convened. Work has been done in subcommittees.

Subcommittee work has been very substantive. It is important to look across the tools we have and what we can do to reform our investment strategies. The ACA wasn't created to have one report and a snapshot in time. The next ACA will address things that have yet to surface. The apprenticeship system should have that strong tripod of commitment. You've done us an honor for bringing the ACA back; we'll do the honor of taking the recommendations. We'll continue to engage at that front. Today, we'll continue to dig in on tough issues.

I want to thank you all for your remarks earlier. From 1969 to 1994 not being recognized in that way, it really helps shatter this idea that registered apprenticeship is old and it's always been done that way and it's not dynamic. As new industries come onboard, it shows us that the system is not locked in place. The work of the ACA is how is this system meeting the next set of challenges. The work of this committee has exceeded everyone's expectations. None of that is possible without you and your time. Thanks to the Chair and the Co-Chairs. Thanks to all



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

members of this ACA, and we ask you all to come back for the next term. There is a high standard going forward for other ACAs. There has been incredible leadership and teamwork with OA. Thank you to the whole OA team. Thanks to Manny Lamarre. Thanks to Kenya; she's been on the receiving end of every question possible from myself and the ACA and has been incredible. So I will not get in the way of the fun beginning and in the way of the photo, but again, thank you all, and I'm looking forward to the conversation ahead.

**Eddinger:** Parton's support has been consistent and important, so thanks for that.

**Ladd:** We're running a bit behind, so comments that we can keep concise would be great.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** It is my pleasure to introduce Leonard Gonzalez, who is the training director for the Northern California Laborers Training Fund, which is a similar type of facility to the one that you are in here. He has brought with him two of his apprentices, Afra Aldakak and Jose Hernandez, and we'll have an opportunity to hear from them directly in terms of how they came to be an apprentice and their path since that starting point. So, Leonard.

*9:30 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.*

### **30-MINUTE MODERATED PANEL: INNOVATIONS AND DEIA IMPACTS IN APPRENTICESHIP FOR THE BUILDING TRADES**

**Gonzalez:** Thanks for the opportunity to present about our program. I want to give you all the opportunity to hear from apprentices. (Video shown about the teaching of trades by the California Prison Industry Authority and LIUNA.) Our training center is running just over 4,000 apprentices in the state of California. We receive over 4,500 applications a year. We had 836 new apprentice graduates last year. We try to help those who are having problems, but the reality is that many are falling through and not ready yet. In 2022, we had 314,356 training hours. Two registered apprenticeship programs in California are public. We're a diverse union and program; 12% of trainees are females. In our apprenticeship programs in 2020 and 2022, close to 10% of trainees were women. We will hear more from Pete shortly. The core of our curriculum is the MC3. We incorporate a lot of the laborers program in the California program. Three other programs, ironworkers, carpenters, and the laborers, are funded by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). We received just over \$2 million in grant money for these programs in California in 2022.

**Aldakak:** I did 6 years incarcerated. I took a negative situation and turned it positive. I got certified in carpentry and the laborers, which is something I knew nothing about. I learned how to lay concrete. The instructors in there really help you, they put a lot of time into you. The



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

program keeps me busy and keeps me straight, too. You're on probation but you're not on probation. I'm trying to make my way to journeyman.

**Hernandez:** I'm a journeyman. I had a run-in with the law and did 4 years in prison. Minimum wage is hard because it equals poverty and debt. Thanks to you guys, in my work I have respect and equality and make a livable income.

**Gonzalez:** How did you find out about the program?

**Aldakak:** A friend was in the program already and she told me about it.

**Hernandez:** I heard about it through the community center and learned a lot.

**Gonzalez:** Hernandez started in 2020 during COVID.

**Hernandez:** I was working at Home Depot. I couldn't join laborers because of COVID, but my friend helped me get in and use his trade.

**Gonzalez:** How has the program impacted your life?

**Aldakak:** It keeps me with a job, learning constantly every day. Before this program it was a struggle to get a job, but this program has a whole bunch of jobs.

**Hernandez:** It impacted me more financially and with stability. From where I come from, I get minimum wage, so this is very helpful financially and has set me on the right path. Mentally and with stability it is helpful, because I don't have to worry about making ends meet.

**Gonzalez:** Any questions committee members would like to ask?

**Harris-Kuiper:** There was a referral from Goodwill for the training program?

**Gonzalez:** We have a partnership with Goodwill for the program.

**Boyd:** I work for United Association; can I connect with you directly?

**Gonzalez:** Yes, Bernadette has my contact information. Geographically, where are you located?

**Boyd:** I work in Annapolis, but we have over 274 training centers throughout the country, so I'd like to see if we can start to help people transition out of correctional facilities.

**Gonzalez:** One thing I want to point out for myself is that we're one of 70 training facilities under LIUNA. I don't want to step on their toes if they're going to go out for something nationally. I tend to look locally at a lot of our public agencies that we have programs with. I'm happy to help you out.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Ginsburg:** What percentage of our prisons have programs like this?

**Gonzalez:** If we spent more money on education than prisons, we'd have more programs like this. We're in conversation right now to expand just for laborers in prisons. California is looking at these programs to see the benefit of this. CDCR acknowledges that these programs are in these facilities. There is only one focus for CDCR, locate them and make sure they show up on time for work.

**Ginsburg:** You said if we build less prisons and build more programs, we'd do better. I've known a young man since he was 9 who is now in Leavenworth. His future will be defined by whether he has this type of opportunity, which he currently does not have. If we instead focus on the future of prisoners, then they'll have a better future. So thank you for what you do.

**LeConche:** Nationally, we've been doing departmental correction programs. We have totally online programs. Most of our programs are after, where inmates can come on out when they want to. Leonard has taken it to the next level of integrating it.

**Ladd:** I hate to cut this off but want to make sure we have time for other panelists as well.

**Lenhoff:** Turning it over to Jayne Vellinga, executive director of CWIT.

**Vellinga:** Those of you who were at our facility yesterday know me. This is Painters District Council #14 and the challenge with this program is that women want to do this, but they have to get a letter of intent to hire, which serves as a barrier. Representing unions is Helen Chung, representing the contractors association is Miles Beatty, and then we have Dan Penski, who is the director of the training school. What can we do to overcome that barrier? We came up with a trade-specific training program and pre-sponsorship before women enter the program. A lot of ideas here are quite replicable. Helen Chung has kept opportunities for women on the front burner of District Council #14 for years and has been doing everything possible to increase that number.

**Chung:** I'm not a good speaker, so pardon me up front. Some challenges women in the trades face are study working hours, staying in the game of the work, having male allies, and hostile environments. Hostile environments have been going on for a while. There are congregations for a lot of the trades for women who want to have children. It has changed significantly. Slowly, but surely. We now have maternity leave to help our young ladies with what they need when giving birth. We started a women's committee in 2015 and started a women's committee in the international union level as well. Having a women's committee supports our members and educates them and grows them into positions where they can grow within their organization. I have a passion for my union where I can grow well. If you have a passion, you will put yourself forward and you will talk and network. Working with CWIT and other groups, it's great to be



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

able to work with our allies to grow our industry. You guys are all on the team as well. If we cannot work together, or it is not heard, then it gets put to the side. We would like to help other organizations to grow diversity and make a difference. Thank you.

**Vellinga:** Thanks, Helen. Dan, would you like to say a few words about the development of the curriculum and the programs themselves?

**Penski:** I can talk a bit about our success with CWIT. Everything nowadays is about pre-apprenticeship to get to registered apprenticeship. It started with multiple trades coming in and looking for exposure. It started with the Women's Build Illinois grant opportunity that CWIT chased down and gave them hands-on experience. There would be an interview process to see if women would be eligible to be hired. We flipped the script and had contractors come in first. They had faith and trust in what we delivered. To give them an opportunity to meet with women first was important. At this point they identified that women wanted to be painters or blasters or in other fields. It really comes down to our International Union of Painters and Allied Trades and our District Council #14 that want more women and diversity in trades. We are in a land of opportunity here in Chicago. These are all great opportunities that are brought to me. We need to be a vehicle and grant exposure to be really successful.

**Vellinga:** One of the primary challenges we talked about was the letter of intent to hire. Can you talk about how you got contractor buy-in and their participation in the program?

**Beatty:** I think I can. We began as an organization in 2017 to educate our members, which are trade contractors, on the importance of diversity and inclusion in the building trades. We did that by developing a very strong diversity statement that we sent out to all members. The board of directors unanimously adopted that diversity statement. We have a great diversity training seminar. When we got the opportunity with CWIT, it's an easy sell, because the contractors are already up to speed. When I sent out the word that we have a pre-apprenticeship program and that we needed contractors there, they showed up.

**Vellinga:** We had more contractors than students eventually and feel really good about placing students. I know that we're running a bit late, so I wanted us to wrap up by talking about what the continuing challenges are and what's next for the partnership?

**Chung:** What's next for the partnership is growing and continuance and educating apprentices and bringing in more diversity to trades. When we have monthly meetings, we're not there to complain about anything, we're there to make a difference. We have to figure it out or reach out within ourselves. I've been in the system for 37 years. I'm proud of it, I've seen the changes, the changes are here, and I'm here to implement more changes.

**Vellinga:** Anything you wanted to add to that?



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Beatty:** I would add one thing on Mr. Healy's statements. Labor-management cooperation and agreement are essential to these programs and without it we can't go anywhere. We agree on the importance of apprenticeship and having a diverse workforce and the way to do that is through excellence in our workforce and that's the key to our success going forward.

**Eddinger:** Thanks to all four panel members.

**Vellinga:** This is a great time of opportunity in this industry and it's the time when we can translate lots of good intentions and good partnerships into real results.

**Jacobs-El:** Thank you, Helen. She did a great job speaking today.

**Eddinger:** Thank you, visitors. Our next exercise is for members of the ACA to be on stage to take a group photo with badges off. Then we are going to take a break until 10:30 a.m. We need to be back in our seats by 10:30 a.m., because I'm going to try to get a full hour-and-a-half discussion into our next really critical piece.

*10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.*

### **GROUP PHOTO AND BREAK**

*10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.*

### **FAMILY-SUSTAINING WAGES DISCUSSION**

**Eddinger:** Well, everybody, thank you for coming back. I know that was a short break because we are attempting to get you out of here by 4 p.m. So we're going to do a little compression as we go. I wanted to make sure that we have a good uninterrupted hour and a half for our family-sustaining wages discussion. There's been a lot of work and a lot of intense discussion around the issue. I don't want it to be interrupted.

At 12:30 p.m. we'll have a break for lunch, and I would encourage that we bring all lunches back and have a working lunch to continue onto the issue papers. Let me briefly frame the next hour and a half. All of you received communications regarding the recommendation of taking on family-sustaining wages at our last meeting. So I'm hoping that you have made it through those communications. The key to that is that the advice and counsel from the Department's solicitors precipitated our decision to give sufficient notice in our public agenda, which we did. In the next portion of our work here, we will widen the discussion and receive a full range of expert opinions to inform DOL and OA in their policy and implementation work. This input will take



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

the form of discussions that we're going to have around this table, as well as the written comments, which have been submitted and have been posted on the website. So they're available for public reading and consumption.

Before we start, I'd like to remind the committee that our role continues to be advisory and consultative. Providing a full context of the field through our perspectives and allowing the agency to make the best decision possible. We do not mandate. We are not the implementers and so we have trust in the Department and the expertise of the OA to ask what they need to ask, to consult when they need to consult, but ultimately to be the decisionmakers on policy and on implementation.

We'll begin today with perspectives from subcommittees for 3 minutes and then we're going to open up the discussion. Those of you who presented full papers will present to that in shorter terms. At the end, I hope there will be two actions. One is after having heard from the subcommittees, the paper presenters, and various discussions, we would decide as a group if we are ready to take a vote. So that's vote number one, if we are ready to take the vote. Then vote number two would be whatever recommendations that would come forward as part two. Any questions on the process? I'm not an expert on parliamentary procedures, but I'll stop when I am doubtful and ask for advice. I do apologize I did not do my job well last time. I will be more mindful and I look for your help. Which subcommittee wants to start? In order, the Pathways subcommittee. Do we have a spokesperson?

**Ginsburg:** I think this is an important discussion for us to have. Although we've covered many topics addressing this in the right way with the right amount of diligence, it is critically important to registered apprenticeship in its entirety. The Pathways subcommittee dealt with three points. First, we believe that any RAP, whether it is an adult or youth apprenticeship, must have a progressive wage scale for all work performed throughout the apprenticeship. It's kind of a given. I don't know if there's much debate with that.

Second, RAPs should result in a living wage at completion and lead to long-term financial growth and stability for the participant. This is where we had a lot of discussion, whether it is a family-sustaining wage and how you define that. We chose a living wage simply because it speaks to the individual. It ensures that they are able to put a roof over their head. It doesn't discriminate between whether you're an individual or if you're part of a family. It just recognizes that the skills you have, in the apprenticeship that you're completing, has a living wage.

Which brings me to the third point. The tool is critical, because how you define it will ultimately determine whether or not this will be adopted and supported by businesses, which I represent. I think everybody around this table wants to ensure that if you work in this country, you have a living wage and you can raise a family regardless of what that family looks like in terms of





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

numbers. Yet at the same time, we can't mandate it for a business. How do we discriminate between a single person, a one-parent family, a two-parent family, whether you have two children or four children? So this becomes the most critical, the tool used. It should be one that is updated for inflation, accounts for regional differences and cost of living, and is evidence based. Regional is important, because if you live in a small town, your cost of living is much less than it would be in an urban center like Chicago. And yet the standard is based on Chicago. If you're in a small community here in Illinois, you could actually put that community at a disadvantage, and ultimately adoption of registered apprenticeship would not take place because businesses would push back. It wouldn't make sense for why they placed their facilities in that community by itself. A lot of effort and research needs to be put into the tool and clear definition of what a living wage means. In our last meeting, there was real confusion about whether it was a family-sustaining wage, with one parent with two children, which is what was proposed. I don't think it will serve our movement and our objective to grow apprenticeship in this country. Defining that tool is critical to our opinion and whether or not we think this is ready to move forward.

**Eddinger:** The suggestion here is that we go through all of the subcommittees and loop back for discussion. So, the next group, please.

**Scott:** Good afternoon/morning everyone. For the DEIA subcommittee, there are several things we are committed to. First, the DEIA subcommittee remains fully committed to the language that was stated both in the Good Jobs Initiative that was jointly developed by the Departments of Commerce and Labor in accordance with the language that was presented in the last ACA meeting.

Secondly, the DEIA subcommittee uses living and family-sustaining wages interchangeably. Regardless of the language we want to use, we want to ensure that every apprentice earns enough to be able to afford adequate shelter, food, and other necessities based on their geographic area to ensure retention advancement within their apprenticeship.

Third, it's imperative we address living wages and also be inclusive of gender, race, and other ways where we may diverge in our own identities. We have to be sure that living wages aren't used as a vice to pull us apart, but rather we are able to see ourselves as equitable participants in our jobs. Apprenticeships have historically, especially in minority communities, by policy and practice, contributed to the inequitable pay for workers across the United States. For example, African American men are among the lowest paid or received the lowest paid wages in apprenticeships. We also know that although women account for 14% of all registered apprenticeships, they are overwhelmingly concentrated in lower paying jobs. A lot of that is contributing to occupational segregation. Also, we know that women make the least, earning less than African American men. African American women make the least. A bit of commentary,



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

while we're seeing now that we have the economy back at almost full employment, we still see repeats of what we saw before the pandemic. Due to occupational segregation, both by gender and by race, we're seeing those who are most vulnerable return back to those most vulnerable jobs. They're not choosing good-paying jobs.

Finally, while we do understand and appreciate stackable credentials, there needs to be better tracking to ensure equity and inclusivity is maintained. In the final piece, while we do believe apprenticeship provides a pathway, we are very passionate to ensure that there are no obstacles, that we're not turning up bricks in order to make it more difficult for everyone to achieve, but rather we're passionate that if you pay people an equitable wage, you won't need to subsidize those wages in other ways. Thank you.

**Eddinger:** I'm hoping that folks, as you're looking at these presentations, are tracking your questions, because that's coming at the end. Next group?

**Gibson:** So I'm going to be Group 1 of Industry Engagement in New and Emerging Sectors (IENES), kind of talking about what we consider from our end on this whole living wage consideration. A registered apprenticeship must end in a living wage, provide family-sustaining benefits, and adhere to the other principles laid out by the Departments of Commerce and Labor as the Good Jobs Principles. The living wage requirements should apply to all workers, including those who participate in apprenticeships as part of their K-12 academic experience.

Apprenticeship programs may offer workers industry-recognized credentials that enable them to work in certain jobs that are not apprenticeable occupations as part of their apprenticeship experience. Jobs that currently exist in the marketplace and that do not pay workers a living wage but give them foundational knowledge and skills that could be helpful to them in entering related apprenticeable occupations can be developed as pre-apprenticeships and apprenticeship pathways. Sponsors in new and emerging sectors that have multiple apprenticeship programs for various occupations, all of which pay a living wage, can create pathways for apprentices to continue to grow and meet industry needs. As we heard today, the thing that sets us apart when we talk about apprenticeships is that we are making sure that people who go through these programs cannot only take care of themselves, but their families. The apprentices who talked about it today just reassure what we've always known, at least in our group from the beginning, that the thing that separates us when we talk about apprenticeships is that living wage piece. Thank you.

**Eddinger:** Thank you. May we have the next group, please? This is the second group that's within the subcommittee, correct? Yes. Okay. This is the second group.

**Wolfe:** This is Group 2 of the IENES subcommittee. We tried to structure our responses in terms of the letter John Ladd sent out with the two issues. Quick points about those two things: one is



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

with respect to the question of the wage threshold. One question we had is what happens to the partnerships that have already been deemed apprenticeable and there is a new standard or policy, what happens? Does a re-apprenticeability process happen? I don't think the Department has the infrastructure to do what they need to do as is. Then add having to recertify everybody; seems daunting and probably impossible.

The second is, any definition of a livable wage that relies on the definition of a family becomes unworkable. If we're talking about a family-sustaining wage where it's defined one way for a single person, in another way for two parents with one child, and another way for a mother with three children, then you have apprentices in the same program who are getting paid different wages, which can't happen. In some of the papers that have been circulated, on federal poverty levels, the figures they were proposing is a family with three people or an adult and two children. That also becomes inequitable in practice, because it's not fair for the person who happens to be single to be getting paid at the rate of someone who has 2 children. So there's no way you can make sense of it. We need to figure out what this means in practical terms. What currently exists is you have to put a wage scale and raises into your standards that reflects your industry.

The third is, I do not see how we can take a vote on something that relies on a definition that hasn't yet been constructed. The analogy that keeps coming to my mind is if a surgeon says to me that they found cancer and we need to do surgery and I ask what are you going to do? They say, well, we're not sure yet, but trust us. That's not good enough. It's too complicated of an issue with too many consequences. We have to have the definitions and the clarity before we vote, not after.

On the issue of stackable credentials and stackable apprentices, I want to make two points. One, this issue of on-ramps and off-ramps and stackable credentials instead of stackable apprenticeships is tomatoes tomahtoes. As someone who uses stackable credentials and stackable apprenticeships, we can make it work either way. But here's the problem, who is considered a completer? Because if the only one who's considered a completer is the one who finishes that final rung, that has huge funding consequences. In California, we get \$3,500 per active apprentice every year, if they're active for 12 months. We get a \$1,000 bonus when they complete. For example, if someone is at the first level of a three-level program and they're not considered completed when they finish that first rung, hundreds of apprentices and thousands of dollars are at stake.

The second point I want to make is, we have a proven track record. We have research that has confirmed the efficacy of stackable apprenticeships, at least for my industry. The research has already been done. UC Berkley is about to do more research starting in July. When you work with historically marginalized communities, more specifically with poor people who don't have a



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

good track record of work, professional, or academic history, who have a million challenges and barriers to their success, suggesting to them that they get involved in a program that might take 5 to 6 years to finish, but they'll have a BA degree at the end and they'll be able to make a reasonable, ever-increasing salary – you can't market that, because they're not convinced they can even go to college. But when we say to those same folks that this is a program that's not going to cost you a penny, you're going to get paid from day one, you're going to get more money as you go through, and it's going to take you 12 to 18 months to finish, you'll have 4 college credits under your belt, and you'll get the support you need to go on at that point, that you can sell because it's reachable. You have to throw the fishhook to where a fish can grab it. If it's too shallow or too deep, it's useless. So, again, that's why I'm saying it's tomatoes tomahtoes, because we can decide not to use stackable apprenticeships – we're going to market in the way that serves our purposes without undermining. I'm not saying we're going to break the rules. You have to know who you're talking to and what's going to work for them to be able to take advantage of the opportunities we're trying to create.

**Eddinger:** Thank you, Randi. I just wanted to clarify this, the reason why you have Group 1 and Group 2 within this subcommittee is because there's variation in opinions, correct? Okay. Next group, Modernization?

**Riesberg:** The Modernization subcommittee started down this road really looking at one of the papers that we'll present later, which is quality standards for apprenticeship. Obviously, one of the quality standards for apprenticeship would be the level of wage that a person who completed an apprenticeship was able to attain at the end and going out to become a journey-level worker. As you can see the points on the slides there, I'm not going to read them to you.

Back at our original meeting in Washington D.C., I had the absolute pleasure of asking the Secretary, as we're moving toward the modernization of apprenticeship, what is it that we should hold sacred and what could perhaps be not. Obviously, anytime we have changes, there are going to be things to hold on to and there's going to be things that get left by the wayside. I remember very vividly the Secretary's answer. Secretary Walsh said, I believe that what you should do is take a look at the building trades and their established track record and try to work through the things that they've had a history of doing in there. One of which is having – there's no opinion here, not the committee's – some level of a sustainable wage for somebody who completes. For the definition of it, perhaps the MIT tool was not the right tool. It was never meant to be anything that hamstrung the Department. It was here's something that's out there and something that came from MIT research. But if there's a better tool, I don't think any of our committee would be opposed to that. It's a matter of doing what this committee is here to do. All of us are here, not for personal gain by any one of us, we're here for the betterment of



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

apprenticeship in the long term. I believe that if look at a wage that is gauged against a poverty level that we're doing the right thing for apprenticeship completers.

**Eddinger:** Thank you for that statement that we're all here for the same reason, for the apprentices. I chair large committees on a particularly large campus, and we call it shared governance or participatory governance where nobody ever agrees. So you're all doing good if you're just standing on three sides of the table.

May we move onto the next one? That was the last one? Which then brings us to your reactions to the various statements that were presented and emerging out of these subcommittees. Anyone online have anything to say? I wanted to make sure we don't forget those folks. Unless you have questions ready, we can rotate back through the order the subcommittees presented and make comments, counter-comments, affirm, or something else.

**Lenhoff:** Thank you very much. I would like to present the resolution that a number of ACA members have signed on to, which is in your packet. I think it responds to a lot of the issues that have been raised by several of the different subcommittees. First of all, I want to thank all of the subcommittees, including the one that I sit on, for being so thoughtful about this. Everybody has talked about how the ACA was really able to dig in and do the work. This is another example of that. I thought this was an extremely confusing process, to bring it up as an issue that had to be voted on and then figure out how we are going to address it. In the end, the different subcommittees did address the questions and mostly are talking about the same thing. I think that worked out better than I had expected.

Let me just tell you what this resolution does. I'm not going to read it verbatim, but I do want to read specifically what this group is proposing. It is advice that we're proposing, that the ACA adopt something that says the ACA advises the Department that the definition of apprenticeable occupation in 29 CFR 29.4 should be revised and that can be done as part of the part 29 overhaul that you're planning to do anyway. To revise it to require that for an occupation to be apprenticeable, the sponsor must demonstrate that the wage profile for that occupation, by the last stage of the apprenticeship prior to completion, pays a living wage based on local living standards. Then individual programs that register their programs utilizing those occupations would be expected to propose a wage schedule in accordance with that wage profile for their locations. Specifically, we respond to all the concerns about what's the definition and what's the right tool? I certainly agree that's important. Without knowing what that is, it's difficult to have a position. So we would like to propose that a living wage based on local living standards be defined as 200% of the federal poverty level for a family of three, adjusted by a geographic cost of living differential for those regions where the cost of living exceeds the federal average. Implementation of it has to be left to OA, but we did lay out some of these specific issues that



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

we're not making recommendations about. This was because of the request that OA made in the wage guidance paper that you put out that said please leave us discretion, give us a big principle but then let us figure out the details. Which I think does make the most sense. We did feel that the one detail that had to be nailed down was the definition. Whether we were talking about family-sustaining or living wage, take a term and define it.

On the second page, you see the list of the ACA members that have already signed on to this, or had as of the time that we sent it. I would like to point out that Bill Irwin of the Carpenters also should be added to that list. And anybody else who wants to volunteer is welcome. The big difference, I think, in this resolution that's different from the one that the ACA passed in March in San Francisco was the definition of living wage. This is in some ways a cutback from the broad concept of family-sustaining wage as the MIT calculator puts it. The actual federal poverty level, you see on page 4 what that would work out to be for different families. I believe when it says family of two, three, and four, it doesn't mean two, three, and four adults. It means one adult and two children or a family of four is two adults and two children. I think that is actually how the federal poverty level is computed. It's based on children's needs, not adults' needs. I would just point out the Pathways subcommittee specifically suggested that whatever the tool is, it should be one that is updated annually for inflation, is evidence based, and accounts for regional differences in cost of living. The federal poverty level itself is updated annually for inflation and is evidence Based, but it doesn't account for regional differences. It's a national figure, which is why the second component of the definition that we came up with is that there has to be an adjustment by the geographic cost of living differential for regions where the cost of living exceeds the federal average. How to make that happen would be left to OA. Although I'll note that there is a cost-of-living adjuster that is often used. I looked to see if there were any others and that was the main one that I saw. Obviously, the government has resources for figuring that out that we definitely should take advantage of.

One other thing I want to say is, why a family of one adult and two children? It really comes from the concept of, you take the most vulnerable and the most unique need, you make sure that their needs are met, and then you've lifted all the boats. One adult and two children is a very common situation for people who are from underrepresented communities, low-wage communities, or marginalized communities. That's the average. It is usually a mom with two little kids. If the rate is based on that then you know those people who need it the most can be taken care of. Let's take that and make that the standard. To say it isn't fair to somebody who's single that they make the same as somebody who has two kids? Somebody who's single should be happy about that because they'd be making more. Why is that unfair but it's not unfair to say that it should be based on the wage of somebody who's single and has no children? We have to pick something. You can't vary it by each worker, there has to be a standard that applies to



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

everyone. That's the reason that we suggested the one parent, two children standard. We have some more justifications that I think are somewhat responsive to some of the concerns, but I wanted to be sure that the other people who came up with this concept have a chance to speak to it.

**Eddinger:** Thank you. As far as I know there have been three documents submitted. I have a request from Todd Berch, who is represented today by David Polk, to present that paper. Then Randi to present your paper? No? David, you want to go ahead and present what Todd has forwarded?

**Polk:** Absolutely. Thank you, ACA membership. This is a letter from NASTAD with regard to this proposal: "During the previous ACA in-person meeting, NASTAD delegate Joshua Laney had abstained from voting on the wage issue as the underlying motion was not provided to my organization for any consensus in advance. As the issue of wage was not vetted by the members of NASTAD, it was my directive to abstain. I further request the issue on the table be noted that it was not unanimously voted in the affirmative by the ACA in its entirety. Upon discussion with the membership, NASTAD stands firm on supporting only the following wage mandates be inclusive of registered apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship at this time: minimum wage; prevailing wage; mutually amenable wage between a sponsor and their registered apprentice inclusive of wage progression additionally agreed upon; wages pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement; and wage pursuant, subscribed, or prescribed by states for purposes of registered apprenticeship. Though we may differ from the proponent on how to ensure a good wage, we all can agree that many have prospered from completion of a registered apprenticeship for decades. NASTAD recommends a study be done, and cited upon completion, quantifying the merits of high wages earned and the vast entrepreneur opportunities afforded to registered apprentice completers. Having a very high propensity to become business owners, many have followed this track to either open up their own shop or take over their family business. Registered apprenticeship completion is not only a succession plan, it's a substantiated, traditional, and proven method of success and pride. Respectfully, Todd G. Berch, President, NASTAD." Thank you for your time.

**Eddinger:** Thank you, David. I know this letter is dated the first of May. Are there any additional changes or additions that you or Todd may have to this statement?

**Polk:** No, NASTAD's stance is to abstain.

**Eddinger:** Thank you for clarifying that. Randi said she didn't need to present her letter. I think some of the items are embedded in the presentation. Let's open this up. I'll let this session run until 12:10 p.m. This will give us a solid 1.5 hours. I am not hearing from anyone, but I want to be mindful of those online. The discussion is open. Bernadette?



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Oliveira-Rivera:** First, I want to say that it is reassuring to go through the slides from all the other subcommittees, and although there may not be an absolute majority view on this issue of wages, there is clearly a strong feeling that ensuring a living wage is an outcome for apprentices that is guaranteed before they journey out is something that most of us see as a benefit and as a way to maintain the quality that has been the hallmark of what a registered apprenticeship is. That's because I feel as though most of us here are speaking from our heart. We want to make sure that every recommendation that we put forward to the Department provides opportunity for any worker to be able to succeed and lift not only themselves, but their families and their communities into economic self-sufficiency. At the end of the day, that benefits not just that person. As Traci said, there's less of a burden on the need to provide wraparound services when you have someone that's able to support themselves and their family. You have less investment in correctional facilities, because individuals have enough money to take care of themselves and are less likely to fall into positions that put them into incarceration in the first place. I do know that in businesses where there is a strong tax revenue, that there's pride from people who buy homes in those communities, invest back in those communities, and it makes it desirable for businesses to be there, and it impacts our employers' bottom line in a positive way. So I don't look at this as just an issue of quality of apprenticeship, but we are making a recommendation that really can have some significant societal impacts that are positive outcomes for our nation. Personally, I am a strong proponent, which is why you'll notice that my name is on the list that Donna shared, on this resolution that we should make a recommendation as the ACA that the Department consider apprenticeable occupations that guarantee a living wage, and that apprentices be earning that living wage by the last stage of their apprenticeship, so that they can journey out and be able to provide for themselves.

In terms of the tool that we use, I think that should be up to the Department. The definition that we're providing, I believe, takes into account a lot of the concerns that have been raised. Obviously, this is a discussion and I'm sure we're going to hear other perspectives. I don't believe that as a body we need to know the impact of every single implementation choice that the Department is going to make, because we won't know those ahead of time. That's not what we're asking this body to consider. I don't think that that's how we're looking at this as a whole. The Department is going to make whatever choice it's going to make on how it's going to implement it. Think about other recommendations that we're putting forward. Think about recommendations coming forward from the Modernization subcommittee, from the Pathways subcommittee, where we're talking about fundamentally changing certain procedural and structural aspects of the registered apprenticeship system. We're not raising the fact that we have currently registered apprenticeship programs, what's going to happen to those? Because we trust the process. We're asking you to do the right thing and look at the issue of wages and say, yes,





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

fundamentally, as a concept, we believe that workers should be guaranteed this, and the Department will have the appropriate expertise to determine how to move it forward.

I want to address one point, which is actually from one of the subcommittees, my own, from the other perspective. It's this idea of completers and credentialing. Registered apprenticeship programs should offer credentials as part of a worker's progression throughout their learning experience within an apprenticeship program. I don't think it should be mandatory, but I do believe that it's a valuable component of what workers achieve in their apprenticeship experience. That said, if you achieve a credential, you are not a completer of an apprenticeship program until you get that journeyworker credential in your hand. You should not get that until you have completed the full range of training that is required for you to master the occupation that you are apprenticing for. It doesn't mean that you're not marketable in the workplace and it doesn't mean that an employer might not give you extra income in the industry that you're in because you have a credential. Nothing precludes that. I would encourage this group to be thoughtful about how we look at credentialing and how it's a part of an occupation and how it fits into apprenticeship. We're not here to count completers. We're here to count success stories and make sure that we have qualified individuals at the end of the registered apprenticeship experience in whatever sector or industry you may be in.

**Louissaint:** I'd like to start from a place where I think there's harmony or principle agreement. There are three things that I took away from all of the perspectives. Then there's two areas where I think we have significant enough divergence and I'd like to give comments on those two areas of divergence. On the principles, it seems that all of the recommendations are in harmony with some level of sustainable wage. We won't get into the definition of sustainability, but there is consistency and harmony in there. Secondly, I think there is harmony in the fact that we're looking for quality apprenticeships that are not just jobs but are careers. Because it is about the sustainability of a wage today, but as the world changes, it is being able to stay sustainable and have a differentiated skill, so that you can continue to earn beyond a living wage. The third is, I think we are all in harmony around an inclusive program, is that fair?

The places where I think we diverge, or there is divergence, is when does that wage start? The comment that I make in regard to that is influenced by discussion today, right? So if you take Jose the apprentice who talked about having a wage that moderated his mental health and his stability, that was two things that influence their long-term employability. If you have someone who is unstable, financially or mentally, their ability to successfully complete the apprenticeship is challenged. So one of the things that we do have to seriously consider is, when does that definition of living wage start? Because if it starts at the end, think about the scenario that Donna painted around one mother and two children. If in a year or two they are going to get to a family-sustaining wage, what are they going to do in that year or two? That's how you get to the 3



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

women out of 200 that we heard earlier. Realistically speaking, if you can't handle shelter and food, how you can take of childcare? That doesn't enable someone to graduate and successfully complete the apprenticeship. I think if we don't seriously consider this aspect of when a family-sustaining wage starts, then we're going to continue with the same demographic of those individuals who are most privileged will be able to be the graduates of our programs. Thank you.

**Oberg:** First, I want to thank Bernadette and the other signatories to the explanatory statement that was provided. I feel like the explanatory statement does give us a common point to speak from. However, if we look at the signatures, we see eight labor representatives and we see three public representatives. You don't have a single employer representative. As we discussed earlier, apprenticeship hinges on employer buy-in. Until we know we're going to have employer buy-in on a wage statement, we cannot make this wage statement. Without employer buy-in, you won't have registered apprenticeship programs. Thanks.

**Richardson:** I'm proud to work for Prisma Health, where they are concerned about making sure that their employees receive a living wage. Our compensation model is that every year, positions are reviewed to make sure that we are market competitive. Even our apprentices start within the living wage range. So if you start there and as they progress, then you avoid creating salary compression for people that already work for you.

In our paper, we use the example of a CNA trying to get to patient care technician, which is the next level. This is usually where our youth apprentices start. They're not 18 just yet, so they are earning their CNA. They make what is consistent with the market, the education that's required, and the credential that they earn. If they so choose, they move forward to the LPN, which is also aligned with the market and the education that is required and the license that they earn. As they so choose, they keep moving forward to registered nurse, which aligns with the market rate for the geographical area, if they so choose. The people we work with a lot of times are single mothers. If it weren't for the apprenticeship, it would not be feasible for them to move forward, because they're trying to sustain their family. Knowing that they can earn while they learn and not have to pick up extra shifts or make the decision to leave us so that they can complete their clinical rotation and sometimes go into additional debt because they still have to sustain their family – what we are finding is by using the apprenticeship model, we remove that financial stress and burden from them. We allow them to keep their benefits, so that they don't drop off the benefit cliff, and we help them apply for supportive stipends that are available, so that they have what they need and we avoid them having to remove themselves from the learning environment because they owe a school \$200 or \$300 a book cost, because they've run out of funds to get all the way there.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

So we see the apprenticeship model as part of our integrated talent development process, where we can capture people who already work for us who deserved the opportunity to transition up the nursing career pathway. We can utilize this with any other career pathway that we choose within our organization, but knowing that our nursing workforce is the largest, the most needed, the most critical. Our technical college plays a major role in helping us to get those folks through the program so that we can get them to the bedside to take care of our patients. So I want to thank those who came up with this living wage resolution. I think it captures a lot of the heart of everything that we've been trying to do. I know this is why we've been so passionate, because we want to be fair to the apprentice but also give enough flexibility for the employers to make sure that we can be market competitive, take care of our people, help them to move forward, and create this workforce that we're really going to need. Thank you.

**Polk:** The 31 SAA States of NASTAD have not reached consensus on this language, firstly. Secondly, I'm going to go to a bit of combined background of myself being a state director and my time that I spent in the technical college system as an associate dean. When we talk about apprenticeship completers, we also speak to the process of apprenticeship and embedding small wins for those who go through our process. When we start to talk about stackable apprenticeships, as the previous speaker alluded to, we talk about small wins of a person going from CNA, to LPN, to RN through three different apprenticeship models that all stack upon each other. When we allude to a living wage requirement, I think that's the part that we're leaving out. We're also leaving out those small wins when we speak to on-ramping and off-ramping, because every apprentice who completes any apprenticeship, especially in the state of Wisconsin, they receive a certification for completing that apprenticeship. Therein lies that small win for them. But when we go into those stackable apprenticeships, which we are embarking upon especially in our emerging sector, those are very new apprenticeships. We need to build in those small wins for individuals to get those certifications because it also embeds the desire for them to continue to get more certifications. So the requirement itself, to base that upon an apprenticeship holistically, instead of or in lieu of the apprenticeship model, will start to beat back those gains that we've made in those emerging sectors, because we start to push the partnership of apprenticeship between employer and employee away from the table.

**Boyd:** Over the last day and a half, we've heard from several people who have been impacted by registered apprenticeship. Marty put it plainly: the building trades is the model. There is one thing that I think all of us in this room owe a serious responsibility to, which is the people we're trying to help. Not every occupation is apprenticeable. That's the first thing that we must understand. Mr. Healy said earlier, the Laborers are a fine organization. It's a travesty that it was 1965 to 1994 before they were considered an apprenticeship. We wouldn't be safe on our construction sites without every man or woman who has served as a laborer throughout this



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

country in the United States. But there was a reason that it took that long, because that particular trade at that time, people looked down on. You're pushing a broom, you're cleaning up, you're moving dirt, you're digging a ditch. It's not a skilled occupation. Those two gentlemen changed that. They gave it a different look. We've heard from people on how being incarcerated and coming out with a family-sustaining wage changed their life. That's a registered apprenticeship. Those are things that they need to do and are supposed to do. We certainly need the buy-in from the contractors and the employers. We can't do this without you. There's no possible way. You hire our people and we appreciate that, but our people deserve to be paid. There's not a person sitting in this room that does not make a family-sustaining wage. We're representing them and we have an opportunity. It is my pleasure to serve on this committee. I've learned so much from you, but make sure that you understand who you're affecting and the opportunity we have to change some people's lives. We've met them. When everybody finishes work, they deserve the respect and dignity. When they retire and say, I've done my community well. That young lady the other day said, when she drives her two children around, she's proud to say mommy built that. We owe that to them.

**Bustillo:** I just want to say my appreciation to everyone for engaging in this conversation and all the work that's gone into it as well. I'm glad we're having this discussion. So just a few things. Your points are really well taken. One thing is, we've said this before: I'm still having a hard time squaring the fact that we are the Secretary of Labor's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship. We have a Department that has principles that talk about these things too. So I know we've talked about that before, but I just want to make sure that is present. I do think that we are here for a reason. I know all of us believe in registered apprenticeship and what the registered apprenticeship system could and should be. We might have some differences with respect to the specifics around some of these particular issues, but I do think one thing has happened. We are here having this conversation because there has been a de facto presumption that every single registered apprenticeship program, just because it is a registered apprenticeship program since 2014, is good. Right? That is not necessarily always the case. The Maryland example my friend John gave earlier is really important to the context of this conversation.

We are here because we are supposed to be doing the work of setting forth a vision and standard and providing our best advice related to what direction we should be moving in. I think there are far too many examples of splintering and erosion as we're expanding, like what was referenced earlier that we need to pay attention to. There are implications of that for the work that we're all doing. I really appreciate your example, David, as well too. I think that since we're talking about studies, we should look at what you're talking about across the country, it is really small. That is a very long process as well. How many people actually progress along that particular pathway across the country? These are the things that we should be attending to as we're thinking about



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

and taking into account what we're deciding here. I think this is a particular moment where it's incumbent upon us to really take a stand. I know many of us feel very strongly about that. I know all of us here are really committed to registered apprenticeship, but I think we have to have that at the forefront of our minds as we're engaging in these topics.

**Ginsburg:** I agree with what David said earlier. I think there's unity among this group around what our aspirations are. I think leading from your heart is how I do most of the work that I do. I also ran a business for 41 years. I had to make payroll, and they understood that if I didn't, my employees would go without their rent or car payment. In balancing the decisions that we're making now, we have to take into consideration what impact this will have on businesses. Aspirationally, we agree. What I worry about as I tried to read through these documents when they first came out, with some that just came out in the last 24 to 48 hours – like the best student, it takes a few times to read through this – there is a lot of complexity to what we are proposing, and we should understand what the implications of them are before we push forward. We could have the most aspirational registered apprenticeship program in this country. It serves very few because today that is the problem. What we witnessed with the panel earlier today was it does change lives. The video that we saw yesterday does change lives in this facility. I asked the question yesterday, how do we do this beyond the trades? And how do we get businesses to understand that this is the right thing to do as well as the right thing for their bottom line? If we overstep with our recommendations, on what will ultimately be a decision of the employer, as Tim said earlier, if employers say no, we will have a very good theory, but no practice, no adoption. If you're an employer in California or in Indiana that's thinking of taking on a high school apprentice, spending 2 years training them, 2 days a week, and then 3 days a week, and then full time in the third year of their registered apprenticeship, and the wrong definition for what that living wage is turns a switch? What will happen is, they all might do apprenticeship, but it won't be registered. It won't have the quality. It won't have all the elements that we believe are essential.

So it's not that this work hasn't moved in the right direction. I don't think it's left us with the time to really absorb it and understand it and ask questions not just to opine upon it, or say why we support it, or don't support it, but to actually do the hard work of going into the details of understanding what the recommendations are that we're making to the Department. Yes, we're in an advisory committee, but don't forget that there will be politicians who look at this. If they choose to use some of these recommendations or definitions as a club to back down registration, then we will not have served our responsibility. We have NASTAD here that is at this point undecided and yet they represent the majority of registered apprenticeship states in the country, over 30 I believe. So what does it say when the advisory committee in over half of the states cannot say that this is ready for prime time. My goal is not to kick this down the street so we can



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

bury it. Just the opposite. This is an important conversation. It needs the proper vetting and then it needs a proper vote. They say in politics, you don't want to see how the sausage is made. And I've been there, so I've seen it. We don't have to make sausage here. We can make a steak. Only if we give it time and truly understand its implications. That's what I believe in the end; it's why I'm in this work, and it's what I did in my business. This is one of the best equity drivers that we could ever have in this country. It's not large enough, so I do not want to rush something that is so important that could have the opposite impact to what we actually are trying to achieve.

**Willis:** I'm going to echo those sentiments. It's going to sound like I was just taking notes on what you just said and regurgitating them, but I agree 110% that we need more analysis to make this recommendation. Otherwise it'll come off as being premature. I do believe that the living wage recommendation is ambitious and aspirational but could have negative implications if the DOL were to implement the recommendation, and could potentially have results that are contrary to DOL's goals of bringing new and emerging sectors into the national registered apprenticeship system. New and emerging sectors have recently shown so much success in being able to attract and train women and BIPOC workers and position them for upward mobility. So, again, I believe more research is needed before the ACA can make a vote on an item that we just don't fully understand.

**Wolfe:** The devil is in the details. It is so important in this conversation, because we agree on so many things and our aspirations are so aligned. I want to talk about some things that will seem a little bit outside of the realm of wages but have everything to do with wages. The first is, apprenticeship and the apprenticeship system is not synonymous with unions and labor. In a way, it would be easier if it was. Maybe historically it was and that's part of the complexity we're now in the middle of. There are many industries represented around the table and not represented that are not unionized and have no collective voice or power. That may not be because they said they don't want to be organized. That's a leap in terms of the why. So I want to raise two issues that speak to the nuance of the wage debate and call out some unintended consequences and considerations that we need to think through before we take actions that could unintentionally undermine our common goals and aspirations.

The first is, I believe with my whole heart that the labor movement is serious about advancing DEIA, tackling inequities, engaging more women and low-wage workers, and assuring folks of a living wage. But folks need to understand that the proposals being put forth will make the work of non-unionized industries more difficult than ever. In particular around issues around wages. To be clear, I'm not suggesting that I don't want to see my industry unionized. Speaking personally, I believe early childhood education (ECE) has to be organized if early educators and care workers will ever receive the same benefits and economic security that K-12 teachers have. But so far, that hasn't happened. So my challenge to you is this, if the ACA intends to be



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

inclusive of all sectors, we cannot punish, however inadvertently, unorganized industries for the fact that the labor movement hasn't prioritized them and made things possible that aren't possible without a labor movement. I would like nothing more than to ensure that ECE workers earn at least a living wage. But at the present time, we have no collective voice or power to move toward that goal. So we will be happy to move in the direction of requiring living wages when the labor movement joins us to help solve the economic stranglehold that keeps ECE workers in poverty. We will stand with you 100% once you engage in helping to solve the national childcare crisis that's keeping millions of workers, women in particular, from engaging in the world of work.

The other issue is again nuanced. In the face of the national childcare crisis, there is a movement toward making it a requirement that industries wanting to receive particular federal funding must provide workers with childcare. It sounds like that makes sense. I'm thinking about the childcare workers, right? People come to me and ask, can you help us with this? No, I'm not going to set up a shop that's going to pay people poverty wages in order to help other people make more money. That's the history of childcare in this country, and it's on the backs of low-income women of color. We know that. With that said, it makes sense that we need to provide quality childcare in order for everybody else to go to work. How are we going to make sure that the ECE workers who are relied on to provide that quality childcare for the other workers are also receiving family-sustaining wages, apprenticeship opportunities, and the benefits that come with being part of a union? To fight for the members who are organized, but not the workers who staff the essential industries that enable those members to take those unionized jobs, is to perpetuate an inequitable, discriminatory, and unjust economic and social system.

Here's the bottom line with all sincerity and good intention: I invite and challenge the labor movement to fight for all workers to earn living wages, to benefit from collective bargaining agreements, and to be treated as worthy, respected workers deserving of representation. But until that time, I want you to understand that the proposals you're advancing, which understandably make sense in your universe, likely will undermine the efforts of those of us developing quality rigorous registered apprenticeships for industries that are not yet organized.

**Eddinger:** Thank you, Randi. I want to make a notation on time. We're pushing 12:15 p.m. I would say we will do four more comments and then we need to stop. Then I will ask either one of my Co-Chairs to make a motion to determine whether we're ready for that next vote. Because I can't make a motion from here so I'm going to ask one of you to do it.

**Karbowsky:** I'll be very quick. In order for apprenticeship systems to work, you need employers and employees. The letter signed today was all by employees and we need employer buy-in. We live in a capitalistic society with choices. There needs to be a cognitive morality choice for that



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

employer to make the decision that their employees come first. To train the employees first. That is a morality issue. That is a mindset issue that's hard to legislate. As somebody who's worked for congressional staff, to change mindsets to legislation is very, very hard if not difficult and have maybe the adverse problem. So if you're in a system that doesn't have employer buy-in that funds your programs, whether that's private or public, that needs to be an education part onto your public sector partners. Whether this needs to be a livable wage or a family-sustaining wage, that needs to be pressed upon them to make the adequate investments into your programs.

**Scott:** This is Traci Scott, from the National Urban League, and my comments are reflective of the National Urban League. First, they're saying that this is nothing new under the sun and, honestly, this conversation isn't new when we talk about wages itself. It also means that the solutions aren't new either. We know what works. We know what doesn't work. We know the consequences if we don't do anything through inaction. We know the consequences if it is anemic in our reaction, but we also know what happens when we get it right. So while I do absolutely support and think that we should be thoughtful in the solution itself, understand there's one thing that we really don't have the luxury of. On behalf of the people, and I'll speak again for the National Urban League, we don't have time. We really don't have time to be academic. This is time where academics and what we call blue-collar folks roll up their sleeves and get it done. To put a bit of historical context on it, when I say this is nothing new, when it comes to labor and suppressed wages, they're sharecropping. While it does work in an immediate sense for employers, it absolutely did not help workers in themselves. We also know that leading up to the Great Depression, wages were lower, people had no purchasing power, and that was one of the contributing factors to economic collapse. We also know that the first organized union for African American workers were railway porters. It's because they were being paid so low and yet they had such high expectations of work themselves. The only reason why these things changed is because of a federal action itself. It was not because of employers. That's not meant to undermine the importance and the influence of employers and the pressures when it comes to the actual cost of projects and cost of work itself.

We're bringing it back to today. I just want to lay down history. David, I appreciate what you did mentioning stackable credentials in healthcare, but there's one caveat that wasn't really mentioned that I want to add to the table here. While you do have the process of home health aide, CNA, LPN, and RN, what we don't talk about is that overwhelmingly African American women occupy those jobs. What we don't talk about is that it has the highest turnover rate. In the space that we work in, we see that wages are a huge contributing factor to it. Because why would someone work for less than 15 dollars when they can get 15 dollars in retail? That's really a shame, because healthcare is an amazing career pathway and apprenticeable pathway.





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

The final bit that I will mention is, because of the historical missteps that we have made, whether intentional, because of the prejudices this country has historically gone through, women and those who are vulnerable actually do not have the money or time for inaction. They don't have enough money to wait for us for another year. They need to be making wages so that they can support their families. That's really what this is about. Jared, I totally appreciate when you're talking about this is a capitalist society, but as I just mentioned, historically, capitalism has been built on the back of low-wage workers themselves and vulnerable workers themselves. So, yes, this is important, but we cannot forget really why we are here both historically and also in this moment. Thank you.

**Ruesing:** I've got a hundred notes, but I'm not going to read them all. Brent started us off by talking about how we're here representing ourselves as individuals and not our organizations, so I've taken my union hat off. Although I'm a union guy, and I'll just say to Randi, we stand up for all workers, and we would love to help you stand up for those workers. But I'm going to take my union hat off like I was asked to do.

This is an advisory committee, not a rulemaking committee, so we're not advocating for a rule that's going into effect. What we're advocating for is, we're making a recommendation to the Secretary of Labor to use when engaging in the rulemaking process, so there is time for public comment, there is time for studies, there is time to go through all of those nuances that we don't have the time to do here. We could spend the next 2 years on this committee debating this issue, finding studies, engaging in studies, and we're going end up at the same point where we are right now. We have to advocate for the people who can't advocate for themselves. We're here representing ourselves, but we're really here representing apprentices. Donna said it at the last meeting. Ray was talking about it at this meeting. We're here representing the people who are going through apprenticeship programs. The Department represents workers, unions do represent workers, but DOL is here to represent workers and make sure that workers are taken care of and uplifted and that they're not abused. We're either advocating for poverty here or we're advocating for living wages. I don't think we uplift workers by advocating for poverty. I don't think that continuing to push the can down the road, come up with more studies, and do all of that gets us anywhere. I think we need to take a stand as a committee and say this is the right thing to do for those apprentices, this is the right thing to do for registered apprenticeship. Leave that in the Secretary's hands. Leave that in the Department's hands through the rulemaking process. Then all these letters, all the public comments, all of those other pieces are going to come back and we have time to sort through those. That's the time to engage in that process. It's not to do it here on this committee. As far as the process piece, now's the time for us to act on this committee. There'll be time for all those other pieces.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

To my friend Tim here, as far as employer buy-in, there are not any employers on this list, but I'll get you 200 by the end of the week that would be more than happy to stand up and sign off on this and say this is the right thing that we should do. I could probably get you more, but I could guarantee 200. Again, this is on behalf of myself. I could almost guarantee you my organization would also stand behind me and say this is the right thing to do, but we are here representing ourselves, and that's my thoughts and comments.

**Eddinger:** Donna has the last comment, then I would ask one of my Co-Chairs to help to shape a motion as to whether we have enough information to move forward to the next vote.

**Lenhoff:** I just want you to know that getting the last comment, although it's a great honor and victory, it's not really what I wanted to come out of this meeting. I have three points. One is to the question of stackable apprenticeships versus stackable certifications. To David's point about not getting small wins if you don't have stackable apprenticeships, you get small wins with the certifications as well. Each certification that you gain as you go through the program can be viewed as a small win and should be viewed as a small win, because each certification puts you that much closer to a journey-level career at journey-level wages. The problem for me was, to just say stackable apprenticeships, there's no guarantee that there will be room in the apprenticeships. So when the person finishes the CNA apprenticeship, now she wants to apply for the LPN apprenticeship, well maybe there's no openings and there's no guarantee she would get into it. If it were one apprenticeship, where she got in at the beginning, and she moved to the end and ended up with her RN, then she would know when she started that she would get to the RN.

I think both Noel and David, you were talking about NASTAD, and I felt that you were a little bit overstated when you said NASTAD said they weren't ready to take a position and that was why they were abstaining. What they say was that the issue wasn't vetted sufficiently, so that's why they were abstaining. It was not a comment on readiness or lack of readiness. I would also like to point out that Josh Laney, who was NASTAD's representative in March when we were in San Francisco, said that in fact his state of Alabama has adopted a living wage standard. They've talked about it, they thought about the impact on new and emerging industries, and they've decided to do that anyway. So we know about one state that's considered it and what they ended up doing.

Finally, I do want to talk about the overall issue of this being posed as a choice between expanding into new and emerging industries and apprentice protections. I think it's a false choice. We are not advocating for there not to be apprenticeships in new and emerging industries. We're advocating for there to be strong worker protections in those apprenticeships in new and emerging industries. Val just talked about how that can be done. Several people have asked, how



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

do you get businesses to understand that this is in their interest too? Prisma Health in South Carolina gets it, so it is possible. Let's not convince ourselves that this is always a choice and that we're not going to be able to expand apprenticeship if we do this. Thank you.

**Eddinger:** Thank you. I'm going to call this particular portion of our agenda to a close. Thank you to all of you who spoke up. Thank you for those who have submitted papers. They are worth reading a second and third time. Now I'm going to call on the help of my Co-Chairs to shape of motion for me.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** I'm happy to make a motion. I do want to take a quick moment to reinforce one point that Donna made, which is that the Biden administration's greatest priority has been to create jobs, but not just jobs, good jobs. They were very explicit in saying that. So I believe that it is part of this committee's responsibility to think about that when making these recommendations in support of DOL and OA's mandate. With that, the motion on the table is, do we as a committee have sufficient information to feel ready to vote on the issue of living wages? Not that we understand all of the potential implications, but simply are we ready to take a vote on living wage as it pertains to registered apprenticeship?

**Eddinger:** So we have a motion on the floor. Noel has seconded. At this point, the normal process would be to entertain comments, but I have to note that for the last hour and a half, all of you have commented. I'd like to ask for no comments unless it's burning. I'm going to ask we take a roll call on this. You have the normal range of choices for your roll call. You can say yes, no, or abstain. Let me repeat the motion. You are voting on whether you have enough information as a member of this committee to entertain a vote on whatever the language is going to be proposed on the wage standard. This is part one of two. If you decide that, yes, we have enough information to go on, then we will entertain the next motion. If you decide that we do not have enough information to go on, then we will not entertain the next motion. It keeps us from going back and forth and lets us drill down on what needs to happen. I would like to do a roll call to record the vote.

**Ginsburg:** No

**Braden:** No

**Tripathi:** No

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** Yes

**Malone:** No



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

***Oberg:*** No

***Richardson:*** Yes

***Boyd:*** Yes

***Bustillo:*** Yes

***Gibson:*** Yes

***Harris-Kuiper:*** Yes

***Irwin:*** Yes

***Oathout:*** Yes

***O'Leary:*** Yes

***Oliveira-Rivera:*** Yes

***Ruesing:*** Yes

***Riesberg:*** Yes

***Polk:*** Abstain

***Worth:*** Not present

***Johansson:*** Yes

***Lenhoff:*** Yes

***Melton:*** Yes

***Scott:*** Yes

***Willis:*** No

***Wolfe:*** No

Yes: 17

No: 7

Abstain: 1

Not present: 1



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Eddinger:** I'm assuming that I've covered the entire membership of the ACA. What is being reported back is that we have 17 yes, 7 no, and 1 abstention, plus 1 not present. At this point, I would like for us to go get some lunch, come back to the table, and do the second motion if that would be okay with everyone? That motion is passed that we will entertain the second motion to vote on whatever language is going to be presented.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** Can we just go ahead and do the vote?

**Eddinger:** I think we might want to pause for a minute.

**Oathout:** I think it'd be better to continue on and close it.

**Eddinger:** Okay, so if we do this now and there's discussion, this is going to go way beyond 1:30, 2 o'clock. I need to pause. Let's pause for about 3 minutes. I need to stop. I need to know what the implications of this are.

**Ladd:** I think the assumption is that there's not only one proposal on the table. So there could be other proposals to consider.

**Lenhoff:** I move that the ACA adopts the living wage resolution that I presented earlier.

**Eddinger:** So there's a motion on the table to accept the proposal that was presented in the document as well as in discussion.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** It's been seconded.

**Eddinger:** And we have a second. Now here's the tricky part, because this is going to open for discussion and there may be amendments. I'm not so sure that this is a simple vote, but there's a motion on the table and it has been seconded. The Chair now entertains discussion if there's any.

**Irwin:** When you have a move and it's seconded, it needs to be voted on by everyone.

**Eddinger:** Let me recall process; we had a discussion, a motion was on the table that was moved by Bernadette and seconded by Noel. The motion on whether we have enough information to move on. The answer is yes. That piece is done. There's a motion on the table now that asked if we would accept the proposal on living wage. That has been seconded. I'm calling for discussion. Then there was a call to move the question and that was seconded. What we can do now is vote on that. You have the ability to vote up or down. If we take a vote on the question, that will decide whether or not you go into this further discussion.

**Ladd:** If we take a vote on the question, that will decide whether or not you go into this further discussion. It sounds like we need to take a vote on the question.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Eddinger:** So if we take a vote on the moving of the question, and it's yes, we move the question, then there will be no more discussion. If the vote is no, we're not going to move the question. Then you engage in the discussion. Is that clear for everyone? So again, this coming vote is going to be a yes vote on this, we cut off discussion.

**Ginsburg:** No

**Braden:** No

**Tripathi:** No

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** No

**Malone:** Yes

**Oberg:** No

**Richardson:** Yes

**Boyd:** Yes

**Bustillo:** Yes

**Gibson:** Yes

**Harris-Kuiper:** Yes

**Irwin:** Yes

**Oathout:** Yes

**O'Leary:** Yes

**Oliveira-Rivera:** Yes

**Ruesing:** Yes

**Riesberg:** Yes

**Polk:** No

**Worth:** Abstain

**Johansson:** Yes

**Lenhoff:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Melton:** Yes

**Scott:** Yes

**Willis:** No

**Wolfe:** No

Yes: 17

No: 8

Abstain: 1

**Eddinger:** So we've reached a point where we're back to the original motion. The motion on the floor is to accept the proposal that was made in the document as well as in discussion. The second came from Donna. There was a call for the question, and there's been a vote that there will be no discussion. The question is called.

**Lenhoff:** I made the motion and Marty seconded it.

**Eddinger:** Thank you. Are we ready to do the last round of voting?

**Ginsburg:** I'm assuming then that there should be no amendments?

**Eddinger:** Correct, because the question has been called. I say it again, that we are an advisory committee, none of this is a mandate. This is information for DOL and for OA to have part of this input. It will not stand alone. We still have the subcommittee reporting. Let's not jump the gun. This is a vote on the acceptance of the proposal that you all have read and Donna has presented earlier in the meeting. Shall I call the roll?

**Ginsburg:** No

**Braden:** No

**Tripathi:** No

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** No

**Oberg:** No

**Malone:** Abstain

**Richardson:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

***Boyd:*** Yes

***Bustillo:*** Yes

***Gibson:*** Yes

***Harris-Kuiper:*** Yes

***Irwin:*** Yes

***Oathout:*** Yes

***O'Leary:*** Yes

***Oliveira-Rivera:*** Yes

***Ruesing:*** Yes

***Riesberg:*** Yes

***Polk:*** Abstain

***Worth:*** Yes

***Johansson:*** Yes

***Lenhoff:*** Yes

***Melton:*** Yes

***Scott:*** Yes

***Willis:*** No

***Wolfe:*** No

Yes: 17

No: 7

Abstain: 2

***Eddinger:*** Let's break for lunch.





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

### LUNCH

1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

### SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING REPORT OUTS

**Eddinger:** The next portion of our time together is going to be devoted to the subcommittee report outs. I think we want to walk through them. Then what we need to do for each one of them is not only a summary of the final issues, but to talk about if anything changed between your March presentation and the current presentation. Then I would like to conduct any kind of open discussion you wish. Then we need a full committee vote on each one of these papers. What I would like to ask you to keep in mind is that these papers be evaluated for their primary strategies. We have just spent 2 hours discussing the wage standard issue. So when you look at these papers, some of them have the wage issues embedded in them. Since we vetted that piece already it would be much simpler for us to be able to look at the major strategies that the topics were about originally. That's what I really would like to vote on, and I would like to not do a roll call on these unless you have serious objections. This is the last piece of work that we're going to be doing together, and I would like to be able to observe that we're very unified in most of the work that we're doing. I'm so proud to be in service with you, and this is a nice piece of work to be doing together.

### Promoting DEIA in Registered Apprenticeship

**Malone:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the committee on behalf of DEIA. It is a privilege to serve on the subcommittee and has been a pleasure to serve on it for the past 2 years. The recommendations of the DEIA subcommittee took into consideration all of the available data; perspectives from employers, public, and labor; the comments of our fellow committee members on other subcommittees; as well as the insights that were provided during our ACA site visits. Our recommendations reflect the collective view of our subcommittee. I won't rehash all of the benefits of a registered apprenticeship. What I think we can all agree on is that registered apprenticeships are an essential vehicle to providing talented individuals with a good job and career path. They are win-wins for registered apprentices and for those who have completed it. They are excellent talent pipelines for employers. I think there's a lot to be said about the traditional path that we've heard that everyone must go to college, but the beauty of the apprenticeship program is that it offers opportunities for those who choose to go to college and those for whom college is not the preferred path. For us who are employers, it does offer us an opportunity to have a skilled labor force that is diverse and that's committed. One thing that



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

continues to resonate is that registered apprenticeships also offer and address economic disparities and inequalities. They have long been an effective way to raise one's income, in terms of the ability to afford a home and the impact that it's had on a family.

From a DEIA perspective, we focused on making this opportunity available to everyone, particularly those in marginalized and underserved communities. Over the last 2 years, we've made numerous recommendations. In particular, in the May 2022 report, we recommended that DEIA be embedded in all aspects of the apprenticeship program. I just want to thank all of the subcommittees who heard that recommendation. As our subcommittee read through your reports, we saw DEIA was a cross-cutting issue and embedded in your reports.

As we look at our final recommendations, it really is about data and how we harness the power of data, particularly in the times in which we are in today. If you think about the technological advancements and the data that is available to us to assess apprenticeships and to continuously improve them, today many of the current metrics are really lagging indicators. They are focused on things that have already occurred. They are employer centric. They are really focused on individuals who are already in the apprenticeship system. What we're proposing in our final recommendation is that we use our data, not just the data we have today, but that we procure third-party data. Also, to create a survey focused on leading indicators. We think that if we can focus on leading indicators, it will proactively support a healthy culture of inclusion.

So let me talk a little bit about how we are proposing that we do this. As a subcommittee, we spent a lot of time debating which data we should capture. We spent a lot of time debating and discussing what those leading indicators might be. I'm here to say to the committee today that we did not come up with all the answers and that we believe that what we're asking this committee to vote on is really a focus on leading indicators and a shift. It is the work of future ACAs to figure out what data is available to us and what those leading indicators might be. In reality, we may not even know some of those leading indicators. If you think about the power of data today, using your existing data, augmented by data you've captured, and available third-party sources, using the power of predictive analytics, we believe that there are some things in terms of leading indicators and in terms of measures and metrics that will be revealed to us. So we are employing and asking this committee to vote on that recommendation to get a little bit more specific about it. If you think about what we capture today, we believe there is a significant missing piece. That is the data that represents the apprentice's experience, not just the current apprentice, but throughout the lifecycle of an apprenticeship from the outreach to the onboarding to the actual apprenticeship and post apprenticeship, in terms of successful career pathways. I think what we're all so moved by often is when we have the opportunity to meet and discuss and have conversations with the apprentices.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

What we are trying to focus on here and in our second recommendation is to initiate systemic assessments that are focused on the people as well as the programs. To have a data source and the mechanism that brings that apprentice experience from cradle to grave, right into our ability to report, assess, and continuously improve. We are proposing an apprentice survey that will literally look at not just those folks who are in the apprenticeship program, but those who we made outreach to and decided or declined to become apprentices. We are proposing that we send surveys out to those who have completed apprenticeship programs and are on career paths or not and really look at that data. We understand that leading indicators alone are not enough.

Our second proposal is that we take our survey, our leading indicators, and we establish data-driven feedback loops to measure progress and implement change. If you think about the way we generally in all of our businesses really go after and solve problems and solutions, it really starts with the data. Anecdotal is great for hypothesis, but it really starts with the data. We can use that data and capture that data in a way that identifies current issues, validates what our beliefs are, but also allows us to do root-cause problem-solving. We believe as a subcommittee that if we can do those things and we influence our registered apprenticeship system, that we will not only be able to create a culture of inclusion, we will have data-driven access to the barriers that prevent us from achieving our goals in terms of outreach and in terms of the successful completion of apprenticeships. Not just for one demographic group, but for all of the demographic groups where we are seeking to increase participation in apprenticeships, particularly those in underserved communities. I know that each and every one of you have weighed in and reflected on the need for data and leading indicators because I've read it in your reports.

Our last recommendation is to tie it all together. These leading indicators, this apprenticeship survey, hangs with all of the conversations we've been having today in terms of how you infuse this data to gauge the health of the apprenticeship program. If you think about the conversation we had today, the leading indicators are going to be critical to understanding how we are bringing people along in career pathways. What does that wage look like? Do we have stackable credentials? Do we have stackable apprenticeships in the way that we would like them in order to deliver on the promise of an apprenticeship, particularly that of a living wage? I would say in conclusion, what we are proposing is not new, but we are calling for action. In terms of the survey component of it, we do have examples from states that are running these surveys and have already started to see the benefits. I'll turn it over to Donna for her component, or if there are any questions we can entertain those questions either now or when Donna completes her component.

**Eddinger:** In terms of procedure, I have an update and an ask. Whoever is the subcommittee member that headed up this particular paper ought to make the motion. I think that's appropriate,



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

and whoever wishes can second it. There is a call from one of our members to make this a specific roll call and I will comply with that.

**Malone:** So are we making a motion on the issue paper itself?

**Eddinger:** Yes, just to the issue paper itself.

**Malone:** I'll make that motion.

**Eddinger:** I hear a motion. I figured we make the motion and discussion follows, right? Do I have a second? We have a second. Do we have any questions from committee members?

**Oliveira-Rivera:** I first want to congratulate the subcommittee on your incredible work. Clearly, this is an area that we all feel strongly about, and so I want to commend the amount of thought and effort that you've put into coming up with this. There are a couple of questions that I would have, and I want to acknowledge that you made it clear you don't have all the answers, that this is something that you're putting forward for the next ACA to think about further. We do in the construction industry have multi-employer-sponsored programs, meaning an apprentice's experience can be very different, because they don't stay with one particular employer throughout the entirety of their apprenticeship. I'm wondering if that was something that was given any thought to and would obviously make the suggestion that this be something that be considered in terms of any kind of surveying or data collection and analysis methodology. The other part is on what happens if you are only receiving a small number of participant surveys and the surveys that you are receiving only reflect an unpleasant experience that someone may have had? How do you balance that with making decisions on program improvement and potential systemic changes that you might be considering?

**Malone:** As with any data collection in any survey or any metrics, you need to make sure that you have a statistically valid sample size. Then, as you look at your statistically valid sample size, it really does come down to degrees of confidence and sort of what your error ratio is. I would say it's a complicated question, because you'd really have to look at what are you trying to achieve? We would strongly propose that we have a statistically valid sample size, but as you drill down into each one of your findings, the confidence rate or error rate may vary. So I think the bottom line here is, we would always strive for a statistically valid sample size in terms of what we would seek to act upon, or recommend that the Department acts upon, and take into consideration those times when we don't have a statistically valid sample size. It might highlight a hypothesis that we would suggest that the Department investigate. On the second question, in terms of the just varying experiences of all apprentices, our objective would be to collect as much data as we can. It's not intended to lead to concerns by an employer that the data we collect would lead to an investigative nature. That in and of itself is not how I would think about leading



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

indicators. I would simply say you're going to collect the data. We would suggest that that data be analyzed and augmented. It is an anonymous survey. I don't know if that completely answers your question. Donna, you may want to weigh in.

**Lenhoff:** I think you pretty much said everything. The thought would be that this would be administered by the Department and SAAs, possibly by the Department in every state with the participation of the SAAs. That would obviously have to be worked out, because if the sponsor is administering the survey, we were afraid that there would be fear of retaliation, that the apprentices wouldn't want to say what they really thought and would think that they might be identifiable even though they're anonymous surveys. What we're looking for is aggregate data, so that the Department can identify trends and decide we have a leading indicator that's showing that in the Northeast there's a problem with not enough related instruction. I don't know, I'm just making that up. So maybe we better look at that, maybe we should be spending some of the investments to shore up that part of the system. The thought was that it would probably be administered by a contract survey company, which would do the sampling necessary to get to the statistically valid sample. Also, they would devise questions that would reflect the apprentice's experience across the board, including those that have multi-employer experiences.

**Louissaint:** A couple of comments. One, I echo Bernadette's comments around the nice work that this subcommittee has done. Brilliant read and piece of work. I have been in an analytics world for quite some time, and one of the things that is oftentimes troublesome when you get the result of an anonymous survey, is not being able to really isolate the demographics. For example, if you had low-performing apprentices describing an environment that is different than a high-performing apprentice. To what degree could we make the data semi-anonymous so you could take certain demographic data along with the survey responses that makes the actions a little bit more precise?

The second point was, I also think we oftentimes focus, particularly in DEIA initiatives, on the individual, where it's also their ecosystem around them that is really important to focus on. Actually doing the survey where we're able to extract data from mentors or supervisors could be helpful in telling the whole story to then figure out what the key actions are. Building on that same point around the ecosystem, some of the education I thought was brilliant, but I think it would be helpful to lay out who would be the stakeholder group? There is different education for different stakeholder groups and value in being able to lay those things out from those particular stakeholders.

Lastly, are back-to-back surveys giving a vehicle for how the data will come back to the individuals who actually give data? We oftentimes get into survey fatigue as individuals, because we submit information and have no idea what actually happens to it. So a feedback loop that



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

shows we've heard you and then here are the actions that are taken. I think it's important to continue to get the data and openness.

**Malone:** I think those are all excellent points. Thank you very much. We will find a way to make sure that that is passed along because I wholeheartedly agree with every point you made.

**Eddinger:** On that terrific note, are we ready to take a roll? I see hands.

**Willis:** I just wanted to say how commendable it is, the research and the expertise you all have around these items and recommendations for registered apprenticeship program improvement. I think I sat through one of Donna's courses some time ago on EEO rules and affirmative action plans. All of these requirements of programs that may or may not currently exist in programs, I appreciate your recommendations there. But I'm wondering about the opening two pages that promote your views on family-sustaining wages and how that applies to the rest of the issue brief? How are we supposed to vote on this issue brief and the next three? Is it agnostic of any family-sustaining wage mentioned, et cetera, because the first two pages are not the issue?

**Eddinger:** I have prefaced at the beginning the way that today's agenda was structured for a reason, because we knew that the elephant in the room was the family-sustaining wage or the wage standard issue. So we've had 2 hours' worth of discussion and the group, through roll call, has made their wishes clear. As we go through these papers, because some of the papers involve the wage standards issue, and since that piece has been discussed, we're asking that when you vote, you focus on the key strategic points about the topic versus I don't like this family-sustaining wage thing or I do like this family-sustaining wage thing. We've talked about that already. What I don't want to do is to have that so entangled into the main points of these papers that we end up not approving anything, which I think will be an insult to our committee members who have done such hard work on this.

**Lenhoff:** Point of clarification on this particular paper. It was structured so that you could sort of remove the parts related to family-sustaining wages. So what you're voting on is item number five to the end, but forget everything before that.

**Eddinger:** I think our subcommittee leads took time to make sure that the slides in front of you are the other succinct pieces that we ought to focus on. Hopefully that will help.

**Ginsburg:** Would it make sense based on the discussion we had before to amend what was inserted by all the other groups to align with the vote that we took? So it's not changing the bulk, but just recognizing that that is a settled position.

**Eddinger:** There is a part of me that is so mindful of details and cleanliness, but when you look at the practicality of it, if we're to leave this room today as a body believing that the main points



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

of these papers, which is the heart of these papers outside of the wage standard pieces, are acceptable and should be carried forward for the information for OA, I suggest that we don't do a whole lot of playing with it, because once you start doing that, everything then needs to be clean and neat. All of us are fixers, and all of us ought to be clean and need it in that way. We have prefaced this particular discussion in the vote by saying the family-sustaining or the living wage issue has been addressed in another part of this meeting. We all have a common understanding and the voting of these are on the succinct, topically oriented pieces of the recommendations as shown on the slides. Can we live with that? Okay. Are we ready to vote on this one? Because I'm ready to call roll.

**Braden:** I love survey research, but I think we have too much of it. I want qualitative research, because I think that I'm kind of new to the field of apprenticeship and tech. I want to understand the nuances of DEIA, what's going on in the system, and more of a white paper approach, qualitatively being able to assess a case representation. Good, bad, or indifferent is really what I need to learn from. So I'm advocating for more qualitative research.

**Eddinger:** The other comment I would make is that just because we voted on it, it doesn't mean that you can't comment on it. The site is open if you have burning desires to give further instructions. I'm beginning to learn that this group is really good at that. Let me do the roll call.

**Ginsburg:** Yes

**Braden:** Yes

**Tripathi:** Yes

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** Yes

**Malone:** Yes

**Oberg:** No

**Richardson:** Yes

**Boyd:** Yes

**Bustillo:** Yes

**Gibson:** Yes

**Harris-Kuiper:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

*Irwin:* Yes

*Oathout:* Yes

*O'Leary:* Yes

*Oliveira-Rivera:* Yes

*Ruesing:* Yes

*Riesberg:* Yes

*Polk:* Abstain

*Worth:* Yes

*Johannson:* Yes

*Lenhoff:* Yes

*Melton:* Yes

*Scott:* Yes

*Willis:* Yes

*Wolfe:* Yes

Yes: 24

No: 1

Abstain: 1

*Eddinger:* Congratulations. Let's move on to the next group, the Apprenticeship Pathways group. Again, we're going to ask for a summary of your final papers that's on the screen, highlight any changes from the March meeting, and then we'll open for discussion.

### **Apprenticeship Pathways**

*Karbowsky:* We focused on six key points. The first one is to overcome bias toward college and classroom learning to the exclusion of work-based and experiential learning. In particular, the expectation that everyone will earn a 4-year degree limits opportunity, especially for people of color, women, and other marginalized groups. We recommend that DOL work with other federal agencies, especially with the Departments of Education and Commerce, and intermediaries to develop strategies to award high school or college credit for students who participate in RA





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

programs with predefined, occupation-specific competency assessments. Then we also urge employers, including federal and state governments, to recognize the value, skills, and competencies attained through experiential learning versus classroom-based learning.

The second one was removing barriers to registration to help improve program access to apprenticeship systems. While I think quality youth apprenticeship is an options multiplier, unlocking that potential requires helping high-quality programs access and participate in that space.

The third one was to identify and address special considerations for youth participants in apprenticeships. The greater need of supportive services. Youth tend to need more touch points than adults in order to be to succeed as an apprentice. Out-of-school youth may face different challenges than in-school youth, like access to internet or devices for remote learning. Both groups have special considerations around mentorship, transportation, and privacy. Supportive services can address many of these special considerations.

Our fourth point was retool data and reporting to provide a fuller and more accurate picture of youth apprenticeships. RAPIDS and other data sources lack robust information about youth. We recommended the ability to disaggregate youth apprentices from the general population of apprentices to support the analysis of youth outcomes specifically. Within youth performance data, add a success metric that reflects not only the top line numbers of exiters and completers, but how many apprentices exited in the probationary period to help differentiate program quality. We recommended OA make investments in policy or programmatic efforts to automate the collection of wage data for our partners, thereby relieving industry, education and training providers, intermediaries, grantees, and others from having to manually track or enter this information. We also recommended that OA invest in and coordinate efforts to align reporting systems, align reporting requirements across multiple systems, or both.

Our fifth point is clearly defining youth apprenticeship will help support expansion by clarifying requirements. We recommended DOL provide definitions of youth apprenticeship programs generally and school-based youth apprenticeship programs specifically. Under these definitions, youth apprenticeship is programs meeting all your requirements that serve youth ages 16 to 21 at enrollment, require a high school diploma or equivalent for completion, may satisfy some on-the-job training hours with pre-apprenticeship activities to help onboard youth, and may offer a part-time rather than full-time work schedule.

Then our sixth point is recognizing DOL as an accreditation agency to save apprenticeship programs time and money. The Department of Labor's Office of Apprenticeship should be recognized by the Department of Education as an accreditation agency for the purpose of accrediting registered apprenticeship programs. This recognition should also apply to SAAs



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

recognized the Department of Labor and the registered apprenticeship programs already demonstrating to the Department of Labor that they meet accredited criteria. Duplicating the evaluation process for the Department of Education requires an expenditure for resources that could be put to better educating apprentices.

**Eddinger:** Thank you for the summary of your report. Would you care to make a motion? I'm sorry, you're not quite done.

**Harris-Kuiper:** I want to thank everyone for being here and the wonderful work, the important work that we've done. In terms of highlighting changes from our March meeting, throughout our issue paper we really worked on clarifying references to post-secondary education in college. This was directly in response to the feedback that this subcommittee received in terms of our draft issue paper in the terms that it could be read as meaning that, one, registered apprenticeship must end in a secondary degree and, two, post-secondary institutions would provide and only provide RTI. We clarified that.

Secondly, we added language about DEIA as it pertains to our issue and background section and recommendations on data, definitions, and investment. Directly in relationship to feedback that the subcommittee received that DEIA strategies around youth apprenticeship should be made more explicit and embedded throughout apprenticeship programs. You'll see in our miscellaneous recommendations on page five, bullet four, based on feedback we noted community-based organizations' role in youth apprenticeship and recommended more funding for them and other stakeholders. This was in response to feedback that the draft issue paper did not identify community-based organizations as potential partners.

Off script, moving forward, this is a commentary in terms of the work that was not completed. That work needs to be addressed in terms of looking at our opportunity youth 18 to 24, as well as our incarcerated youth who have distinct and specific needs that are not the same as in-school youth, because in-school youth have partnerships and opportunities at hand. Whereas our opportunity youth, hard-to-reach youth, and incarcerated youth do not have the same access, do not have the same services. Certainly, we would be encouraged moving forward with the ACA that we take a really deep dive into the needs of these young adults 18 to 24.

We removed specific numbers from recommendations around instructor to student ratio. This was in response to feedback that the proposed ratio of 20 to 1 for classroom learning, and 10 to 1 for OJT and lab learning, could be challenging to implement, because there are so many variables to consider, one of which is definitely safety. We added recommendations that registered apprenticeship programs include a progressive wage scale for all work, including in-school youth apprenticeships; result in a living wage at completion; and lead to long-term financial growth and stability. This was in response to OA's guidance that subcommittees should



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

consider the wage issue in developing their final issue papers. We removed recommendations related to stackable apprenticeships, and I want to thank the work that was read out today in terms of stackable credentials and stackable apprenticeships. We did this in response to feedback that stackable apprenticeships could have difficulty meeting current requirements for apprenticeability.

**Wolfe:** Question. The bullet in there about family-sustaining wages for youth apprentices we'll ignore when voting on this issue paper?

**Harris-Kuiper:** Let me put that on the record, added recommendation that RAPs include a progressive wage scale for all work, including in-school youth apprenticeships; result in a living wage at completion; and lead to long-term financial growth and stability.

**Wolfe:** But my question is in voting on this report, we're disregarding that bullet, is that correct?

**Harris-Kuiper:** I would say so, yes.

**Eddinger:** Are we clear to move on to the next slide? So now I will entertain a motion. Okay, so there's a motion. I need a second. I have a second. Any further discussion? Bernadette?

**Oliveira-Rivera:** I just have a couple of questions. I'm not sure I heard Jared correctly when he spoke on the age. I did hear Stephanie say 16 to 24. I thought Jared said 16 to 21, and I was wondering which one of the two it is that we're using as the definition? If it's only 16 to 21, why was that choice made? What's more common is 16 to 24. Then I have a question on one of the bullet points.

**Ginsburg:** The 16 to 21 was a response to the discussion that we had back in Denver about how people view themselves as youth within this model. The definition of in-school youth can extend to 21, and therefore for the purposes of youth apprenticeship in school, it was 16 to 21. For opportunity youth, that's a broader window. That's why I think you're seeing the two different numbers, 16 to 24, because that then includes opportunity youth as well.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** A follow up question I would have is there are several instances in which you have a transitional year, that fifth year of high school, an early college enrollment if you will. The kids are still in high school, but they're already working toward their college degree. Did you consider that even for the in-school youth, in terms of a potential impact at age, and should we consider having 16 to 24 to have that broader umbrella?

**Ginsburg:** Based on the discussion that we had, again back in Denver, it was to narrow the definition. So that is a reflection of that. I think there's a general sense that once you were out of high school, registered apprenticeship or an adult apprenticeship is equal to and appropriate as



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

well. It's really just tightening it down to what is most relevant and sends a message to a young person that this is a pathway that has equal dignity to that of post-secondary education as well.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** My follow-up question had to do with one of the bullet items on the first slide that just addressed the need to remove barriers for registration of youth apprenticeship programs, or apprenticeship at large. I wasn't quite sure. I was hoping that you could elaborate a little bit more, or the subcommittee could elaborate more, on the types of barriers that you are hoping to remove and how you're intending to do that.

**Karbowsky:** One of the barriers is having employer buy-in to youth apprenticeship. They may not see the value of youth apprenticeship programs. So by trying to remove some barriers to registration, we felt that it was necessary in order to get the younger group of high school students potentially into it, but also working with your local education agencies and your state education agencies as well, to ensure there's an alignment of credentialing. You're getting your youth, your school-based credentials, the high school diploma, GED, and also getting credits to your apprenticeship program as well. So there may be some crossing over of the Departments of Education and Labor that may create more barriers for the employers not to buy in.

**Braden:** In the tech field, I see a trend with employers doing internships a lot with younger folks, whether it be high school or just out of high school. It could be 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 young people and then maybe bring 3 or 4 on for full-time employment. There's a lot of confusion around apprenticeship. What's an apprenticeship? What's an internship as it pertains to technology and technology job opportunities? Did the subcommittee explore that at all? That's a segment that is very beneficial to growth. I'm wondering if you had any comments about that specifically.

**Ginsburg:** I think in general we believe internships have their place and they're valuable, but they are different than a registered apprenticeship within the tech industry. We lean toward registered apprenticeship obviously, as opposed to internship. We've seen today youth in apprenticeships that graduate getting paid 60-, 70-, 80,000 dollars upon the completion of their registered apprenticeship. We don't address internships. They have their place, but that's not our place to weigh in on. We have the examples of how well it works with a young person that's a digital native entering into apprenticeship, either in the 11th or 12th grade, and being highly successful.

**Polk:** I wanted to ask a question on the very last bullet point, in reference to the requirements around youth apprenticeship. This is a Wisconsin question, because our youth apprenticeship program is pretty robust with a record-breaking number of 8,300 youth apprentices. Is this in reference to youth participating in registered apprenticeship? Or the youth apprenticeship ecosystem when it comes to those particular requirements?



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Ginsburg:** It's those participating in registered apprenticeship.

**Louissaint:** If it's helpful, just a quick comment to Richard's question. My last firm did internships to co-ops to pre-apprenticeships to apprenticeships. They all could coexist. In some cases, you may have a student who goes through that funnel as a pathway. In other cases, one might dabble from one end and skip to another.

**Eddinger:** I think we've gone around the table and there is a motion. If there are no further comments, I'm going to go through the roll call. Here we go.

**Ginsburg:** Yes

**Braden:** Yes

**Tripathi:** No

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** Yes

**Malone:** Yes

**Oberg:** Yes

**Richardson:** Yes

**Boyd:** Yes

**Bustillo:** Yes

**Gibson:** Yes

**Harris-Kuiper:** Yes

**Irwin:** Yes

**Oathout:** Yes

**O'Leary:** Yes

**Oliveira-Rivera:** Yes

**Ruesing:** Yes

**Riesberg:** Yes

**Polk:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Worth:** Yes

**Johannson:** Yes

**Lenhoff:** Yes

**Melton:** Yes

**Scott:** Yes

**Willis:** Yes

**Wolfe:** Yes

Yes: 25

No: 1

Abstain: 0

**Eddinger:** Thank you very much, congratulations.

### **Industry Engagement in New and Emerging Sectors**

**Eddinger:** Next, we have IENES. I don't know if you folks have two groups or is this a combined report?

**Willis:** It's just me. Thank you, Chair Eddinger. Our issue brief is focused on career pathways and highlights the need to further explore the intersection of registered apprenticeship programs and career pathways, specifically with the intention of supporting historically marginalized community members through career pathways that integrate education, skills training, applied learning, work experience, and credentials. We want to thank the rest of the ACA as well as the DOL and ICF teams for reviewing our draft and providing feedback. This is just a snapshot of some of those edits that we made based on your feedback. So thank you.

First off, we removed references to wages and instead included those in our addendum. We updated the pathways framework tool recommendation based on your feedback to include training guidance for a wider audience. We updated the recommendation on when and where to market the registered apprenticeship system and career pathways.

This is recommendations continued. Marketing has been a recurring and cross-cutting theme across a lot of the issue briefs. We included some specifics around marketing apprenticeship pathways and programs in our issue brief. We recommend that the Department invest in the research and development of an apprenticeship pathway framework tool. We recommend that



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

DOL determine the data component that will track current and future pathway programs. We highlighted the need to achieve definitions and agreement on key terms surrounding registered apprenticeship and career pathways. We also highlighted a public transit registered apprenticeship program as a best practice in career pathways, where completers of the apprenticeship have priority when applying for higher wage positions. Lastly, we highlighted the need to develop a national qualifications framework system in the United States.

**Eddinger:** Thank you for that presentation. I would like to entertain a motion so we can get into the discussion, please. Okay. I need a second. Okay. Now it's open for discussion and comments. If there are no further comments, I will go through the roll call.

**Ginsburg:** Yes

**Braden:** Yes

**Tripathi:** Yes

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** Yes

**Malone:** Yes

**Oberg:** Yes

**Richardson:** Yes

**Boyd:** Yes

**Bustillo:** Yes

**Gibson:** Yes

**Harris-Kuiper:** Yes

**Irwin:** Yes

**Oathout:** Yes

**O'Leary:** Yes

**Oliveira-Rivera:** Yes

**Ruesing:** Yes

**Riesberg:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Polk:** Yes

**Worth:** Yes

**Johannson:** Yes

**Lenhoff:** Yes

**Melton:** Yes

**Scott:** Yes

**Willis:** Yes

**Wolfe:** Yes

Yes: 26

No: 0

Abstain: 0

**Eddinger:** Congratulations. We have an accepted paper. Let's move onto our last papers on modernization.

### **Apprenticeship Modernization**

**Riesberg:** Thank you. We broke our paper into three discrete topics, so there's really 3 papers there, if you will. The first one being on quality standards. We did a number of things and made a number of suggestions about what the quality of an apprenticeship would look like and how to define the quality. Really what we're looking for is DOL to offer some guidance about what in fact is an apprenticeship. We gave a number of recommendations in there about what that could be, from the valuable outcomes to the transparency for both the employers and the employees. The numbers of ratios, that was brought up earlier, and specifically on ratios, we are saying it should be dependent on the occupation itself. In the construction industry, maybe we need more, because there's more of a safety need than perhaps doing programming, the ratio should be looked at that way, sector-based strategies. The last one that received some comment just in the last day or so was on compliance and the idea of a quality seal for registered apprenticeship programs. What I just pointed out there is that I believe the Modernization subcommittee was looking at not making a new requirement but having a means of recognizing the people who excel in the programs already. That was the idea on the quality seal.

The marketing of apprenticeship was talked about in the earlier papers, we provided some ideas of getting us past the idea of being the best kept secret. I think we've all talked about that and





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

what can we do in the way of using technology and some of the newer things, even a chat box. The recommendation being that hopefully DOL and those that give DOL some money, to make an appropriation, that we can have an impact on all three, the employers, the job seekers, and the school staff. Talking to the different audiences, we don't necessarily want to limit our conversation to just the potential apprentices. We have to, in many cases, think about their parents. We have to think about the school counselors and having our marketing going to each of these smaller segments of who we are trying to recruit.

The last piece, as we're moving to more new areas for apprenticeship, is to streamline the onboarding process. Things like digitizing the applications, standardizing expectations across no matter what occupation it is, and then really using our RAPIDS data to identify what has been successful or what perhaps needs a little bit of work. Those were the three recommendations.

We can take you quickly through what we changed since the March piece. We address some of that occupational segregation, how things might need to be different for different industries. New methods for wage information, we've talked about all that. We added a section on sector-based, again. Based on feedback we got from other subcommittees, we added DEIA there, we added marketing and outreach to community organizations, colleges, and high schools, getting out as broadly as we possibly can. Then we included youth and adult apprenticeship that could make college more affordable. The onboarding, we really didn't make any changes there.

**Eddinger:** Thank you for the presentation. At this point, I would like to hear a motion. Can I have a second? We have a second. Let's open for discussions and questions.

**Oberg:** I just want to say that I really appreciate the amount of work that got put into this paper. I know because I was on the subcommittee with you. The desires that we put in to maintain a certain level of excellency when we're carrying out apprenticeship is great. However, by creating this quality seal that the Department is doling out, it gives an appearance of a two-tiered system, which begs the question of why are you registering apprenticeships that are not quality? I've really struggled with this piece. Some of the metrics that we recommend I know are going to be particularly difficult based off of state requirements or state allowances that maybe the state has an apprenticeship that DOL would not recognize as a completed apprenticeship. You run into issues where quality programs can't be recognized as quality due to situations outside of their control. I would like to vote yes on the other two issue papers. I really struggled with this quality seal paper. I think that more work needs to be done to consider a better way. Or maybe we should abandon it entirely and just focus on using the registration process we currently have in place.

**Eddinger:** I appreciate having that on record, so folks can look back and do more work on it. Any more comments?



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Lenhoff:** I have a question, not a comment. As I remember it from whenever I read this initially, and I don't think you mentioned this, Marty, I wanted to see if this was still part of it, the idea of recognizing quality programs was that it should be a carrot to get programs to the next level. Part of the carrot would be that programs that received the quality seal, or whatever it was, would be eligible for funding that other programs would not be eligible for. Is that correct? Is there anything that you can say that explains that a little further?

**Riesberg:** I think that was the intent of the subcommittee and the discussion was utilizing the power of the federal purse, if you will. That you'll get programs to try and achieve the next level of success with that stuff. That was what was discussed about specifically. And there was a second part to your question I know I'm missing.

**Lenhoff:** Whether programs that didn't get the quality seal could still be eligible for some funding or is that yet to be determined?

**Riesberg:** I think that the specifics were left to the Department. We didn't have anything really specific there other than to say we wanted to recognize those that were doing a quality job and seeing what could be done, I think much in the same way that's been happening in the infrastructure work right now, through the utilization of apprenticeship being a part of that funding.

**Eddinger:** Other further questions on the floor?

**Costa:** I'm a little confused. Do we get more money for quality or less?

**Riesberg:** Yes.

**Costa:** Yes more money for quality?

**Eddinger:** Is that a question or a comment?

**Riesberg:** Yeah, I think it was tongue in cheek, so I don't know what exactly. . .

**Costa:** No, it's a question. I'm just wondering what's the difference? What do we get in the difference?

**Riesberg:** I believe the intent was to give you advanced standing or points. All of these grants are operating on a point system. I think there was the intent that some points be awarded for the recognition of a quality apprenticeship program.

**Eddinger:** Any other questions?



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Braden:** I love your report, especially about marketing apprenticeships. I think the key to success of marketing is target, target, target, target. Make sure you have the right people. If I had a dollar to spend on apprenticeship marketing, 98% of it would go to employers. We all know it's all about pull-through. They create the demand. In my experience, tech apprentices will line up as far as the eye can see if you offer them an opportunity. I would say 98% has to be directed to employers and my market, not just generally. There's a lot of information out there about apprenticeships. We put it in Google, you got 10,000 hits. It's not very well organized. It's not very useful information. Another report isn't going to solve that you really have to target employers, in my opinion.

**Eddinger:** One more question.

**Ginsburg:** I don't want to reiterate or repeat what Tim said earlier. I just want to give it a +1 because I think it's important and should be considered by DOL when they look at the findings.

**Eddinger:** If there are no further questions, then I will proceed with a roll call for this paper.

**Ginsburg:** Yes

**Braden:** Yes

**Tripathi:** No

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** Yes

**Malone:** Yes

**Oberg:** We're voting on all three? Then, no.

**Richardson:** Yes

**Boyd:** Yes

**Bustillo:** Yes

**Gibson:** No

**Harris-Kuiper:** Yes

**Irwin:** Yes

**Oathout:** Yes

**O'Leary:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

***Oliveira-Rivera:*** Abstain

***Ruesing:*** Abstain

***Riesberg:*** Yes

***Polk:*** Yes, with a matter of dissent around the quality badge.

***Worth:*** Yes

***Johannson:*** Yes

***Lenhoff:*** Yes

***Melton:*** Yes

***Scott:*** Yes

***Willis:*** Yes, with the same dissent.

***Wolfe:*** I say what Tim says. Yes, except an abstention on the quality frame.

Yes: 21 (with three dissents on the Quality Standards issue paper)

No: 3

Abstain: 2

***Eddinger:*** Do we have a majority vote? Yes, with a number of abstentions and comments. Congratulations, you have a substantive paper. With that, we have concluded voting of the papers. I think we're absolutely deserving of a break. We get a full 15 minutes.

2:30 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.

**BREAK**

2:45 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

### **BIENNIAL REPORT: FULL COMMITTEE**

***Eddinger:*** For the presentation on the biennial report to the full committee, I'm going to ask John to walk us through the components of this report, so that you have in your head the table of contents to make sure that everything you believe is important is contained in the report. This is



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

our transmittal vehicle both to the Department but also for the next iteration of the ACA. It's part of the reasons why we've been so mindful about capturing documents, comments, and votes. We want folks to have a sense of comfort that the main portions of our discussions are being communicated wholesale.

**Ladd:** We had to anticipate a little bit ahead of time what the range of possibilities might be at this point, but I think we can eliminate the first option here on the slide. The point of the exercise here today is to ultimately vote yea or nay on the biennial report, which is going to be essentially the interim report that you all approved last year with the addition of the strategic framework statements, which you approved at the last meeting. Any or all, and we're fortunate that we'll be able to approve all, so we'll add all issue papers into this biennial report. That's what this big document represents. It is a complete record of the interim report, the strategic framework statements, and all the approved issue papers. For those of you who are online, or have a copy of it, you'll see that the strategic framework statements are added up front to the report, which is what we intended to do. So on page one there is the strategic framework statements that were all approved. I think this is really a big addition and a helpful addition to have these broad framing statements at the beginning of the report that provides context as you read the bulk of the recommendations. These are taken verbatim from what you all approved at the last meeting. Then what follows after that is the balance of the interim report, and the issue papers then become addendums to the interim report.

In the table of contents, you'll see after page 144 the first Addendum A. I think this is the area that we'll probably have the most conversation around. Since we voted today to approve the recommendation as approved on a living wage earlier, our recommendation for how to embed this now into the report is to use the extracts of the subcommittee perspectives that we provided to you earlier. There's an Addendum A that has the version of the paper that was sent around earlier. It extracts all of the subcommittee text around wages, puts that in as the foreword, the background to the paper. It goes on for about 5 or 6 pages. It then concludes with providing all supplemental information that's been provided. We would provide links to all of the additional papers that were provided that you all had a chance to review today. That would ultimately be four papers, the resolution itself, and additional papers from NASTAD, Randi, and the DEIA group. That would be listed as part of that report. It would then conclude with the recommendation that was approved by the committee and the vote. It'd be a simple repackaging of all the information that's been provided and then clearly identifying the recommendation that was approved. That would all be packaged together as one addendum around wages. Does that make sense?

**Lenhoff:** It seems to me that starting it as background framing with what the subcommittees wrote about the issues could be confusing because they were writing about a previous vote,



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

motion, or resolution, which used the term family-sustaining wage and didn't define it. It seems to me that it would be better to start with what we actually adopted and make that clear. Then say if you want some more background or context on this, you could look at that.

**Ladd:** I understand that idea. Obviously, we didn't have the advantage of knowing what would be proposed or passed ahead of time. This is more like a chronological flow of the process, more than a traditional issue paper that frames the issue and provides the background. We're working at a little bit of a disadvantage to try to have something before you ahead of time that you could review and approve. It was more of a factual recounting of the discussion and the outcome versus trying to frame it as a traditional issue paper.

**Eddinger:** If I may add, we are sending this document to the next iteration of ourselves as a transmission of information. It also comes with the minutes of the meetings that we've been conducting as part of the documentation. It also comes with an entire OA staff. John and his team will be the continuity into the next committee. What we did not have, because we have not had this committee for so long, 2 or 3 years, is that when we first got started, there was really no framing other than here's a bunch of really key issues, go at it. I'm really thinking that the next iteration of ourselves would be much more focused because the framing of some of the important issues is already done. I urge you to think about the fact that this is not the only connective tissue we have. We have the connective tissue of staff and the work that has been done before and some of you will return.

**Ladd:** From a logistics perspective, I don't think we have time to craft a paper and have the opportunity to review it. This was our best take at a way to present how the issue evolved and present the final recommendation.

**Lenhoff:** I have another question. The interim report is on the web; will this also be on the web, publicly available?

**Ladd:** Yes.

**Oliveira-Rivera:** This may be the exact same question that Donna just asked. I was reading through the slides. What I'm understanding is that we will not include any reference to the vote that was taken today and the motion that was passed in the biennial report. Or they are going to include that? Okay.

**Ladd:** We're only doing that bottom option.

**Oberg:** I'm confused a little bit. It kind of feels like it's redundant. Are we voting on the things we've already voted on, but as a whole?



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Ladd:** It would be a vote to approve the biennial report.

**Oberg:** So if I voted no on one issue paper, it would be inconsistent for me to vote yes?

**Eddinger:** I'm hoping that we have done all the work on the ground level on every single foundational piece so that this particular vote will be a unifying one. Whatever it is that you've objected to, it's already on record, or what you have voted for, it's already on record. This is saying, as a committee we've done 2 years' worth of work, here's documentation for that. We've all looked at it closely, and we have weighed in on it. There's nothing strange in there you haven't seen.

**Ladd:** Then the balance of the paper is all the individual issue papers we just voted on. So there's five sets of issue papers that are addendums to the report. Wages and then the four subcommittees.

**Eddinger:** Any questions for John at this point? If not, I would entertain a motion to accept this report. Seconded. We're at the point of discussion. I would like to begin the discussion by thanking every single one of you. You are some of the best faculty meetings I have ever had. Everybody has the apprentice in mind and that's the focus of all of our work. Even though we may disagree on some things or agree on other things, it will always stay with me how unified we are in being dedicated to the programming and to a better future. Thank you, it has been a pleasure. I will consider the question called and I will do a roll call.

**Ginsburg:** Yes

**Braden:** Yes

**Tripathi:** No

**Karbowsky:** Yes

**Louissaint:** Yes

**Malone:** Yes

**Oberg:** Yes

**Richardson:** Yes

**Boyd:** Yes

**Bustillo:** Yes

**Gibson:** Yes



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Harris-Kuiper:** Yes

**Irwin:** Yes

**Oathout:** Yes

**O'Leary:** Yes

**Oliveira-Rivera:** Yes

**Ruesing:** Yes

**Riesberg:** Yes

**Polk:** Yes

**Worth:** Yes

**Johannson:** Yes

**Lenhoff:** Yes

**Melton:** Not present

**Scott:** Yes

**Willis:** Yes

**Wolfe:** Yes

Yes: 24

No: 1

Not present: 1

**Eddinger:** Congratulations, ladies and gentlemen, you've got a report. On that wonderful note, I'm going to come back to John again.

*3:30 p.m. – 3:50 p.m.*

### **THE ROAD AHEAD AND NEXT STEPS**

**Ladd:** This is an incredible body of work. It's going to be a critical body of work to the Department as we move forward. We've got folks who have been in previous iterations of the ACA, Bill, Bernadette, and others. You know that the pace we went through on this committee is





## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

unlike anything previous iterations of the ACA have ever seen. The breadth and scope of the issues that you've tackled is really impressive. I want to thank you again for all the patience and willingness to give your time to help advance the discussion around these issues. Thank you for all your dedication and commitment to registered apprenticeship. I'll just close, and after running behind all day in terms of our agenda, I think we're actually going to get out a little bit early here. I do want to provide a little bit of a flavor of the road ahead and what you can all expect. Going to talk about the charter renewal process, membership nominations, and just a little bit of what we expect for the road ahead.

We've gone through the entire interim report, identified every single recommendation, and have done our own initial assessment on those recommendations. Our preliminary analysis is that we can move forward on the vast majority, again, close to 97% of the recommendations that you provided. We are moving forward on those recommendations. We've been able to complete quite a number of them already, but many more are obviously in process; 26 are complete, 91 are in process, and there are about another 26 there that will take some longer term action or need some further review. Obviously, the regulation could be part of that as well. Again, a high-level view of where these recommendations are and where they are going. Again, preliminary, and we do want to consult with our Acting Secretary before finalizing this. I'll give you a high-level snapshot and some of our greatest hits of some of the recommendations that have already been put in place. A lot of these, as they are implemented, we'll get that word out to you, but we wanted to make sure we captured some of them here. Might call on my team here to amplify some of this.

On the DEIA front, we've been fortunate to add significant numbers of staff, about 30 more staff, to OA. This was a consistent recommendation, not just for DEIA, but there was a particular emphasis in DEIA around increasing our staff capacity, specifically to be able to increase that oversight and enforcement function of our office. That is in process and has been happening over the past year. Just recently, we launched a national apprenticeship readiness initiative partnership with NABTU and the National Urban League, to really put a big focus on the role pre-apprenticeship programs can play in expanding DEIA, especially in the construction industry, as we ramp up in anticipation of major investments coming down the road, obviously the Infrastructure Law, the Inflation Reduction Act, and others. We've launched demographic dashboards, interactive dashboards that you can go to on our site, [Apprenticeship.gov](https://www.apprenticeship.gov). You can see not only the national picture, but you can drill down, by geography, by industry, even by occupation. This is a really powerful tool that's out there and people can start looking at it and being able to see demographics and other trends across the country and across industry. We've automated reminders to sponsors regarding their EEO obligations. We continue our partnership



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

and work with the Jobs for the Future DEIA technical assistance center. So, again, just some major highlights. There's certainly other activity going on as well.

On the Pathways side, these are more in progress than completed, but we are working to update the pre-apprenticeship TEN, which was a recommendation. We're really strengthening the partnership and connections with the Department of Education, particularly around CTE. We're exploring some really interesting opportunities to expand youth apprenticeship in the federal government. We're close to being able to disaggregate youth data and identify those who are in-school versus out-of-school youth. Obviously, putting more information on Apprenticeship.gov, particularly the section that's dedicated to educators themselves.

I'm going pause here for a minute to see if folks on my team want to amplify any of the things on this slide or if folks have questions.

**Louissaint:** Question, just as you've been scaling the staff, have you considered adding an apprentice in the office?

**Ladd:** Yeah, absolutely. For the Modernization subcommittee, building off of the demographic information on Apprenticeship.gov, we are now able to put all RAPIDS data out on these data dashboards. We'll have all SAA data in those systems by the end of this year. This is a big milestone for us on the data side to have a complete picture of the entire national apprenticeship system in one place. We continue to update and launch new tools, continue to enhance the standards builder, and we're bringing online an apprenticeability request tool that will automate that process as well. The big one in this bucket is around the regulatory work that we talked with you about at our last meeting.

For the IENES subcommittee, there's a lot to focus here; Cierra Mitchell has been instrumental in this work. We've launched Apprenticeship Ambassadors back on our last National Apprenticeship Week. We relaunched and refreshed ApprenticeshipUSA. We refreshed the whole Apprenticeship.gov platform based on user experience. We're continuing to expand our industry intermediaries. Cierra and her team launched the Industry Liaison Model where we now have individual staff who are targeted to work with particular industries and to build up their subject-matter expertise. We were also able to establish formula funding for states. We've moved to a more annual formula approach as well; those grants are out on the street right now. This is just a snapshot of the things that we've been able to act on that are in alignment with what you all have recommended. So there's significant progress here and there's going to be more progress over the coming months and the year ahead. Cierra? Leads? Add anything I've missed.

**Mitchell:** You captured it, John, nothing to add.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Ladd:** Any questions? Next slide, quick rundown of the road ahead. There are some steps we have to take internally, the first of which, later this month, will be a renewal of the charter. It does expire in a couple weeks. Following that we'll put out a solicitation for membership. We ask those of you interested in re-upping to submit your materials. Note that we are moving to an electronic process, so you'll be submitting your information online. We anticipate that we'll be doing membership announcements later in the summer and early fall. We'll start again with the next meeting of the ACA hopefully in the early fall. Any questions? Turn it back to you, Pam? Closing remarks?

**Smith:** Hi, Lauren Smith, I'm a co-lead on the Pathways team, and I just wanted to share with the committee that one of things we are doing on a regular basis, to keep apprentices in the OA family and in the office, is that all of the new employees coming on board are trained to go through our apprenticeship program for approximately a year. We do have apprentices in the office, although they're also employees of our office. It just makes sense. I wanted to share for the person asking about apprentices in the office.

**Berch:** I do apologize for not being there with you. David Polk is my delegate and Josh Laney was as well. On behalf of the other portion of OA, the SAAs of 31 states and territories, I want to thank especially ICF for their work with our subcommittees as well as the OA staff for their work. We've fleshed out a lot of stuff amongst all our subcommittees in my opinion, in our opinion. We look forward to continuing a lot of this work. There has been very minimal disagreement; it's just like a family. I am very grateful to be part of this committee. I wanted to thank the contractor staff, the OA staff, and all of the subcommittee members as well as the ACA members who are my friends and partners going forward.

**Ladd:** Thanks, Todd. I would echo again my appreciation to my team and all the tremendous work they have done over the past 2 years. This was a huge lift when there's a lot of other activity going on in our office at the same time. They've been amazing and I know they've been really helpful for you in your deliberations in this entire process. I'm thankful to have the team that I have. Thank you for all the work over the past 2 years.

**Ginsburg:** I would like to thank our Chair for leading us over the last 2 years; you do it with grace.

*3:50 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.*

### MEETING WRAP-UP

**Ladd:** We did not receive request for public comment by the deadline.



## Secretary's Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

**Parton:** A couple final words. I echo the thanks to Bernadette for working with the team here at LIUNA to host us today. Again, what John went through says it all. A lot of reports get produced in the federal government that just sit on shelves. The interim report is not that case. The truth is what you've already seen. This interim report is out there and now I can say there's a biennial report out there. It's a roadmap, we make it a roadmap and use it. The team has taken the interim report seriously, we will take everything here seriously, and I want you to know that you should keep us accountable to that. How we approach things, the conversations we had today, there aren't a lot of places in our country where you can have really serious discussions about important issues with respect, with passion, but in the open, so thank you for that. It does justice for the reason we are all here, which is for apprentices.

Maybe as an honor to the fact we came together with former Secretary Walsh, I'll conclude with a story that maybe Pam has heard before. When we were first talking about the committee, what he told me is that there is someone he knows in Boston who went through pre-apprenticeship and actually came out of incarceration and was connected with a pre-apprenticeship program that had direct entry into a registered apprenticeship. Secretary Walsh, then Mayor Walsh, stayed in touch with this person. A couple months go by, he got a phone call from someone mentoring this person, saying he's doing pretty good but kind of spacing out, I'm having trouble keeping him motivated. Walsh called him and said sometimes at the job you're looking out the window instead of learning and working. The young man said every now and then I have to stop, look out the window, and be in amazement as to where I am. That sums up how Secretary Walsh viewed this committee; it sums up how Acting Secretary Su puts people first in everything we do. That's what this is all about in here. There's a lot we can do to expand those moments for young people, for more workers, for men, women, people of color, returning citizens, everything, to get access to these opportunities; that's our job. I hope you'll come back to keep putting in the work, but if you don't, you have our commitment to keep the work going and, more importantly, there's going to be a lot of people in this country years down the road that benefit from it. So, again, thank you, and safe travels home, wherever you are going.

**Eddinger:** With that, ladies and gentlemen, I will take a motion to get on the bus.



Secretary's Advisory Committee on  
Apprenticeship (ACA)

**CERTIFICATION**

As the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship, I hereby certify the accuracy of the May 10, 2023 ACA Meeting Minutes.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Pam Eddinger".

---

Dr. Pam Eddinger  
ACA Chairperson