DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 010 CE 048 078

AUTHOR Glover, Robert W.; Shelton, Elaine
TITLE Alternance Training in Texas: A Preliminary Overview.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Center for the Study of Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY Texas Coll. and Univ. System, Austin. Coordinating Board.
PUB DATE Aug 87
GRANT 87-1000-1-B-3
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Apprenticeships; *Community Colleges; *Cooperative Education; Internship Programs; Postsecondary Education; Practicums; Questionnaires; State Surveys; Technical Education; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Alternance Training; *Texas

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to identify and evaluate state-of-the-art practices in alternance training used in community and junior colleges and technical institutes throughout Texas. Various arrangements combining alternating periods of study and work, including apprenticeships, cooperative education, internships, clinical experience, and practicums, were examined. Community colleges and technical institutes across Texas were surveyed by telephone to identify all programs that offered a worksite component as part of their regular curriculum during the 1986-87 academic year. More specific information regarding the programs was then collected from a survey mailed to all heads of programs with a worksite component. Almost 40 percent of the 1,998 programs of postsecondary technical and vocational education offered a worksite component as part of their training. Cooperative education was the most common type of worksite training (accounting for 335 programs or 43 percent). Students were paid wages in about half of all programs. In clinical programs, however, payment of wages to learners has been prohibited since 1973. Every campus originally surveyed had at least one worksite training program. However, educational practices varied widely among individual programs, and there was little communication or agreement on terms among practitioners associated with different programs. (Appendixes include the survey forms used for the phase 1 telephone survey and phase 2 mail survey and the preliminary interview guide that is to be used for the phase 3 field visits.) (MN)

ALTERNANCE TRAINING IN TEXAS: A PRELIMINARY OVERVIEW

by

Robert W. Glover
and
Elaine Shelton

August 1987

Center for the Study of Human Resources
107 West 27th Street
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712
(512) 471-7891

The authors are research associates at the Center for the Study of Human Resources at the University of Texas

This report was funded under contract 87-1000-1-B-3 from the Community College and Technical Institutes Division, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. The findings and views expressed in this report are totally the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the positions of the Coordinating Board or the University of Texas at Austin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STUDY OBJECTIVES

This study aims to identify and evaluate state-of-the-art practices in alternance training used in community/ junior colleges and technical institutes across Texas. The term "alternance training" is widely used in the European Economic Community to designate programs of occupational training which combine alternating periods of work and study, including apprenticeships, cooperative education, internships, clinical experience, and practicums. Each one of these training schemes involves learning-by-doing in a worksite component as a regular feature of training for all learners. Most of these forms of training incorporate productive work as a regular part of the student's curriculum.

As a method of occupational preparation, alternance training has many particularly attractive features. It brings training and jobs closer together. It helps assure that training is provided on up-to-date equipment and technology actually used on the job. This is a particularly important factor in industries with rapidly changing, expensive technologies. Alternance training offers pedagogical advantages of blending theoretical and practical learning. Certain learners can be more effectively motivated through training conducted in a workplace setting than through classroom learning offered alone. Many types of alternance training schemes offer trainees the opportunity to earn while they learn.

On the other hand, alternance training commonly encounters problems of its own. For example, conflicts between productivity pressures and learning often arise in a workplace setting. Since most students are paid for their work on the job, there arises the possibility that the employer may follow a natural tendency to not rotate students off of tasks once they become proficient. There is also a danger that the training offered by an employer may be firm-specific, i.e., not transferable to jobs with other employers. Coordinating related training in the classroom with the on-the-job portions of training is often difficult. If employers select those to be trained, the handicapped, minorities, and groups with other barriers to employment tend to be avoided. Finally, since all forms of employment-based training require jobs to be available for the training to occur, maintaining training during economic downturns can be a problem.

How these conceptual advantages and potential problems apply in practice to alternance training programs in Texas is a major concern of our study. A key focus is to determine how training is best structured at the worksite. We also want to know what types of employers participate, what

sort of advisory structures the programs use (or in the case of jointly-sponsored apprenticeship programs, sponsoring committees), and what functions and roles these committees have. We will note the extent to which alternance training programs are competency-based, and we will conduct a comparative analysis of the competency objectives of each program, by occupation. The project will examine how alternance training programs conduct task analysis to determine training competencies that are widely tranferable across employers. We will ascertain what procedures the programs use for making certain that their curriculum is up-to-date and relevant to the labor market. We will assess the extent to which programs serve learners with special needs such as the economically disadvantaged, displaced workers, handicapped, women, and minorities. We will examine provisions (if any) for articulation with high school training. We will look for techniques programs can use to individualize instruction and offer training on an open-entry, open-exit basis. Also, we will examine the extent to which the programs incorporate remedial instruction in basic skills in their training.

Previous studies regarding specific forms of alternance training exist. For example, each year since 1973 programs of cooperative education in Texas colleges and technical institutes are surveyed as part of a national inventory of postsecondary programs of cooperative education by the Cooperative Education Research Center at Northeastern University (1986). Within Texas, a sampling of programs of cooperative education in two-year postsecondary institutions was recently studied for the Texas Education Agency by Hines (1986). In the area of apprenticeship, a guide to apprenticeship for women in Texas recently was published (Peace, Lovelace and Engelbrecht 1986). Likewise, statistics on registered apprentices in Texas are available from the new "National Apprenticship Statistics" computerized data series operated by U.S. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Information on clinical education practices in Texas is collected by the various accreditation bodies associated with the American Medical Association and other professional groups in health care.

However, to date no one has undertaken a comprehensive examination of community college programs involving a worksite component in Texas. No base line information is available. Thus, as a first step to conducting an effective study of worksite training in Texas, programs must be identified.

Our project is being conducted in three phases:

Phase I: Program Inquiry/Identification

In this phase, a telephone survey was conducted of all community colleges and technical institutes across Texas to identify all programs which offered a worksite component as a part of their regular curriculum during the 1986-87 academic year.

Phase II: Program Profile

During this phase, more specific information was collected regarding the programs identified in Phase I from two sources: (1) records maintained by the Coordinating Board and (2) results of a survey mailed to all heads of programs with a worksite component.

Phase III: Identification/Assessment of Promising Practices (alias Field Survey or Program Assessment)

During this phase, visits will be made to colleges which apear to have exemplary programs or who offer worksite training that appears to have some exemplary or transferable feature.

The present report summarizes research conducted in Phase I, under a contract entitled "Alternance Training in Texas" for the Community College and Technical Institutes Division of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. This paper reports on the results of the initial phase of our work and presents the preliminary findings from a telephone survey conducted with officials on each of the 70 community college campuses and 4 technical institutes in Texas. We compared our results with the best available listing of programs of postsecondary technical and vocational education offered during the 1986-87 school year, commonly known among the staff as "The Vardeman File" after staff member Brady Vardeman who tediously compiled the listing from college catalogs (Coordinating Board 1986).

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS TO DATE

☐ Worksite training is much more important prevalent than commonly recognized and more prevalent than the national average. Almost 40 percent of all 1998 programs of postsecondary technical and vocational education offered a worksite component as part of the training.

Our survey uncovered more "learning by doing" in a worksite setting than any previous survey. For example, the most recent national survey of cooperative education undertaken by Northeastern University (1986) identified 33 two-year postsecondary institutions in Texas offering any type of cooperative education. We located cooperative education on 40 of the 74 campuses of two-year postsecondary institutions in Texas..

☐ Cooperative education was identified as the most common form of worksite training. It comprised 335 programs (or 43 percent) of all programs. Next most common was clinical practicums which were found in 191 programs.

☐ In about half (47 percent) of the programs, all students are paid wages. In clinical Since 1973, clinical programs have prohibited payment of wages to learners.

☐ Worksite training is not only common. It is widespread across all occupational categories and in all regions.

☐ While every campus had at least one program of worksite training, there were large concentrations of worksite training programs on a few campuses. In fact, five campuses accounted for about a quarter of all the programs identified in Texas.

☐ There appears to be some communication across campuses among individuals associated with one form of alternance training. That is, ccordinators of cooperative education talk with one another. Apprenticeship training directors associate with one another. Clinical education staff have contact with one another. However, little if any communication exists across the various types of alternance training. Like academic disciplines, few leave the confines of their own system to gain a perspective on what others are doing. Parochial viewpoints are fostered and maintained.

☐ In many respects, there appears to be little agreement as to the defintions of terms. The terms, especially "internship," "practicum," and

"cooperative education" are widely used interchangeably. In our telephone survey, we noted that the words "internship," "clinical experience," "practicum," "apprenticeship," and "cooperative education" are often used interchangeably without distinction. We believe that these words indicate separate models of worksite training and we perceive the need to derive relatively standard defintions so that we can all speak essentially "the same language" and so comparisions can be properly made.

☐ Students in postsecondary alternance training programs appear to be older than average.

☐ Although extravagant claims are made by advocates of the various types of worksite training, little "hard" evidence is available for a definitive evaluation .

☐ Much variation exists in practices. State guidelines are not always followed. This does not mean that programs do not abide by standards:

- Registered apprenticeship normally follows the national standards established for apprenticeship in 29 CFR 29 and 29 CFR 30, as well as any national standards set for the trades by national industry groups.

- Clinical practices are governed by regulations of accrediting agencies associated with various professional associations.

- The largest variation in practices is found in programs of cooperative education, internships, and practicums outside the health care field. On one hand, such variation has positive aspects in that it permits flexibility to accommodate local variation. On the other hand, it permits a situation where lack of minimum standards can prevail and programs can operate quite loosely.

☐ Few programs appear to be competency-based, in the sense that a carefully developed systematic analysis of the occupation is conducted and students are expected to demonstrate physically in performance-based activities.

Appraisal forms used to assess student proficiencies achieved at the worksite appear to emphasize personality traits and work behaviors (such as punctuality and absenteeism) rather than focussing on job skills. The forms are best described as general employee appraisals rather than ratings of occupational job skills. Some of the forms have space for job skills to be added but it is not clear how much this is done in practice in the field.)

☐ Most schools appear to use the same standardized forms for developing training plans and appraising student performance at the worksite. The forms appear to be slightly modified decendents of a form mandated for use by the Texas Education Agency prior to implementation of H.B. 243 and H.B. 72 which required specification of "essential elements" in cooperative education. Introduction of the essential elements and limiting cooperative education to 104 occupations has effectively tightened up the performance of cooperative education at the secondary level and thrust it into more of a standardized, competency-based mode.

To date, no such external pressures have been operating at the postsecondary level, however, so that there is considerable variation in objectives and competency aims of worksite training across several institutions in the same occupation.

☐ Worksite Training is only one of several ways that schools can link with industry. This study can be considered as part of a broader set of concerns under the topic "effective business-industry linkages." Offering training at the worksite is one form of school-employer collaboration. Others include advisory committee relationships.

In the "Master Plan for Vocational Education" adopted earlier this year for the state of Texas, "providing work sites as training sites for future workers" was considered one of the purposes and the outcomes of encouraging, expanding, and facilitating partnerships between the private sector and postsecondary institutions (Texas Education Agency 1987, p. 43).

☐ Our study covers only part of the worksite training picture. Alternance training in two-year community colleges and technical institutes represents only part of the alternance training underway in Texas. Cooperative education is widely used in Texas high schools for students in their junior and senior year. Cooperative education is also well established among four year colleges and universities -- especially in engineering programs. Clinical education is a required part of the training for nurses (RNs) at the bachelor level and for training physicians at the graduate level. In addition, several proprietary schools in Texas use alternance training in the form of paid internships and practicums in part as a marketing ploy to attract students.

Also, our preliminary results likely understate the frequency of worksite training due to underreporting by our telephone respondents. Several officials at several colleges frequently used their institution's catalogues when listing alternance training programs, while some simply relied on memory. Our investigations have revealed that th- availability of

worksite training is not consistently cited in college catalogues and the memories of even the best administrators are not perfect.

Therefore, the information presented in this report should be considered as preliminary. In all likelihood, the numbers of identified worksite training programs will increase as more in-depth information is collected and compiled in Phases II and III.

COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS

- As previously noted, cooperative education was identified as the most prevalent form of worksite trasining, accounting for 43 percent of the programs found. By contrast, except for programs classified in the "other" category (i.e., field experience, OJT, etc.) that represented only 3 precent of worksite training programs, the practicum was identified as the least prevalent form of alternance training (6 percent). Within this continuum, apprenticeships accounted for 10 percent of the worksite training programs, internships for 12 percent, and clinicals for 26 percent.

- The majority (65 percent) of jobs in alternance training programs pay all or some of their students. About half (47 percent) pay all of the students. Virtually all apprenticeship programs pay learners in their role as workers. In 18 percent of the programs, some of the students are paid wages or salaries at the worksite. The determining factor for whether a student is paid or not is often whether the student is already regularly employed at the same site where he/she is to receive worksite training.

Learners are unpaid in 34 percent of the alternance programs. These unpaid worksites were predominantly found in clinical practicums in the health field where compensation has been proscribed since 1973.

Note: These figures (47, 18 and 34) add up to only 99 percent because a few sites were unsure whether students were paid by employers or not.

- In 65 percent of the programs, the worksite experience is required for all students in the program. All apprenticeships and just about all clinical programs in health occupations require worksite training of all students.

In 35 percent of the programs, the worksite component is an optional offering, which appears to depend on the needs of the student or the availability of training stations.

• As cautioned earlier, the data collected in Phase I should be considered preliminary because of less than total recall of repondents. In comparing the most up-to-date listing of programs available at the Coordinating Board (1986) with data from our telephone survey, we found the highest percentage of worksite components identified to be in the category "other". We identified 83 percent (84 of 101) of the programs as having a worksite training component. This was due primarily to the fact that apprenticeship programs were included in the category "other" on the Coordinating Board listing.

According to the results of our telephone survey, 59 percent of the programs in Health Occupations identified by the Coordinating Board (1986) offered a worksite training component (192 of 325), as did 45 percent of the programs in the Business and Management category (145 of 321), 34 percent of the programs in the Agriculture category (23 of 68), 31 percent of programs in the Computer/Information Technology category (33 of 109), 28 percent of the programs in the Public Service category (47 of 204), and 22 percent of the programs in the Office Occupations category (58 of 260).

The aforementioned percentages probably understate the extent of worksite training offerings, especially in Health Occupations. Only 59 percent of the programs in Health occupations were found to have a worksite training component. Yet worksite training is a required element for program certification by the American Medical Association and other professional associations in the Allied Health field. Our phase II survey is being designed to uncover additional worksite training not identified in Phase I.

• Our telephone survey revealed 72 programs not listed in the Coordinating Board "Vardeman" file. Further, in addition to these 72 programs were 10 program titles cited by our respondents that were not included in the Vardeman files. Of the ten, four were programs at Galveston College beyond the associate degree which offered certificates for operating specialized medical "high tech" equipment.

• Across all eight occupational areas, the program most frequently identified was mid-management (N = 55). Auto technology and Real Estate were tied for second place with 51 programs each. Drafting, Licensed Vocational Nursing, and Welding tied for third with 50 programs.

• Of the eight Coordinating Board regions into which the State of Texas is divided, Region 2 appears to make the most use of alternance programs and Region 6 the least. Our preliminary results showed the following ranking of regions in terms of use of alternance training identified: Regions 2, 3, 4, 7, 5, 8, 1, and 6.

Apprenticeships

We identified eleven community colleges or technical institutes in Texas which offered apprenticeship training. Although there are a few exceptions, most apprenticeship programs in Texas are found in the building trades, such as bricklayers, electricians, painters, plumbers/pipefitters, and sheetmetal workers.

Altogther, we identified 76 apprenticeship programs, which accounted for 10 percent of all worksite training programs located in our telephone survey.

The worksite training component is a required element of all 76 apprenticeship programs. In other words, training without the worksite portion would simply not be apprenticeship. Also, as a rule apprentices are paid wages at the worksite. In only one of the 76 programs--a program for chefs at San Jacinto College-North--were apprentices not paid for their efforts on the worksite.

Among the 76 programs, 12 (or 16 percent) were part of a degree program, 28 (or 37 percent) were part of a certificate program, and 36 (or 47 percent) were offered as non-credit adult education courses.

Clinical Education

Our survey identified 198 clinical programs which qualified as alternance training. They represented 26 percent of the worksite training programs identified in our Phase I survey. These were primarily in the Health Occupations (186), although a few were interspersed among other occupational areas. Eight clinicals were offered in Office Occupations,* three in Public Services, and one in the "Other" category (interpreter training for the deaf). Of the 198 clinical programs, two ranked among the top fifteen in overall frequency -- Licensed Vocational Nursing (N = 50) and Associate Degree Nursing (N = 34)

---

* Note: The labeling of the eight Office Occupations as clinical may be an artifact of how sites define and interpret the term. We let each institution use its own interpretation of terms for the various types of alternance programs. This probably resulted in a less than uniform labeling of programs.

Students in clinical programs in Health Occupations cannot be paid for their worksite experience according to conventions established by the American Medical Association and allied health professional groups. In Texas, students were not paid in 190 of 198 programs. The exceptions were a few programs where "some or all were paid" for the following reasons: (1) two sites employed work/study students in mental health programs, (2) ophthalmic technology students can be paid, and (3) respiratory therapy students were paid at one site.

All but two clinical programs were identified as required. The two clinicals identified as optional for students were child development and ophthalmic technology.

The most notable characteristic of clinical programs in the Health Occupations is their high degree of standardized requirements. Thus, they appear to evidence the highest consistency among all alternance program types. The competency-based performance standards expected of students in the Health Occupations clinicals lend themselves to providing greater accountability for instructors, students, and the program itself.

Cooperative Education

Cooperative Education was the predominent type of worksite training offered in six of eight ocupational areas -- Agriculture (accounting for 65 percent of the programs), Business and Management (57 percent), Computer/ Information Technology (82 percent), Office Occupations (67 percent), Public Services (43 percent), and Science, Industrial and Engineering technology (76 percent). The only exceptions were the Health Occupations where clinical education prevailed and the category "Other" where apprenticeship predominated.

The 335 cooperative education programs represented 43 percent of all the worksite training programs identified across Texas. Cooperative Education was used by 40 (or 56 percent) of the 74 two-year postsecondary institutions. Of course, as is the case with the labels used for other types of alternance training, the definition of "cooperative education" seems to differ from institution to institution. At some institutions, the use of the term is restricted only to a certain type of program with narrowly defined characteristics. At other institutions, the term is much more broadly used, to include any educational program that collaborates or cooperates with

business or industry. For this reason, the use of the term may be clouded and its high frequency may be somewhat spurious.

Even with the foregoing cautions, certain patterns do emerge in programs offering cooperative education. Across two-thirds (67 percent) of the programs, all students are paid. Some students are paid in 26 percent of the programs. Cooperative education students are unpaid in only 7 percent of the programs. In one program, the respondent was uncertain whether the worksite employer compensated the students or not.

In most programs (66 percent) of cooperative education, participation in the worksite component remains an optional matter, depending on the needs of the student and the institution. In only a third (34 percent) of the cooperative education programs is worksite training required of all students.

Internships

Twelve percent of the alternance training programs identifed in our telephone survey were classified by their institutions as internships (N=92). Among the 92 programs, all students were paid in only 55 percent, some of the students were paid in 30 percent, and all students were unpaid in 13 percent of the programs. Pay status was unknown in one internship program.

On the required/optional continuum, worksite training was a required component in 70 percent of the internships identified and optional for students in the remaining 30 percent of programs.

The only occupational category not offering at least some internships was the "other" category. Seventeen percent of the programs in Agriculture were classified as internships, as were 31 percent of the programs in Business and Management, 9 percent of programs in Computer/Information Technology, 1 percent of the programs in the Health Occupations*, 10 percent of the programs in Office Occupations, 21 percent in Public Services, and 11 percent in the category "Science, Industrial, and Engineering Technology.

* We suspect that the two programs in health occupations which were labeled "internships" might just as well have been labeled "clinicals" because the two words were used interchangably.

Practicums

Only 6 percent of all the alternance programs identified in the Phase I Telephone Survey were characterized as practicums (N=46). Of these, all students were paid in only 13 percent of the programs and some students were paid in 28 percent of the programs. This left the majority of programs (57 percent) with students who were unpaid for thair practicum experience. Respondents were unsure whether or not students were paid in three practicum programs.

Practicums are required for all students in the programs in 80 percent of the programs identified.

Practicums were offered in all eight of the occupational areas. Their frequency, however, varied greatly across occupational areas, descending from a high of 26 percent in the Publice Services category, to 13 percent in Agriculture, to 8 percent in Busine.s and Management, 7 percent for Office Occupations, 6 percent for Computer/Information Technology, 5 percent for Science, Industrial, and Engineering Technology, 2 percent for programs in the category, "Other" and .5 percent for Health Occupations. This last category might not have even had .5 percent if some insititutions had not had a tendency to call clinicals "clinical practicums."

Other Worksite Programs

The category "other worksite programs" is a "catch-all" category for programs that were not characterized by respondents as one of the other categories. As previously indicated, the definitions used by the school respondents were neither standardized nor clear. Thus, some programs labeled "OJT" or "Field Experience" by one institution were termed " cooperative education" or "practicums" by respondents in other institutions.

Twenty-five programs (or 3 percent of the total) were classified as "other worksite programs" by the respondents. Among these, in only 20 percent were all students in the program paid. In 37 percent of the programs, some students were paid. And in 41 percent of the programs, students were not paid for their worksite experience. Worksite training was a required component for all students in 64 percent of the programs classified as "other." In the remaining 36 percent, participation in the worksite component was optional.

Of the worksite programs labeled "Other," one was Ranch and Feedlot Operations in the Agricultural area. It was characterized by the institution as an "on-the-job assignment."

Five worksite programs labeled "Other" fell under the Business and Management area. Two were termed "OJT," two were called "Management Training," and one was labeled "Field Experience."

"Field Project and "Field Experience" were the names of the two "Other" programs in Computer/Information Technology and Health Occupations respectively. Among programs in the Office Occupations area, one program was characterized as "OJT." Both "Other" programs in the Public Services Category were called "Field Experience."

The largest number of programs characterized as "Other" was in the area, Science, Industrial and Engineering Technology. Of these 14, six were called "OJT," three were entitled "Special Problems" and five were termed "Field Experience."

NEXT STEPS

Our study to date has revealed that worksite training is much more common in community colleges and technical institutes across Texas than previously recognized. Further, it is operated with considerable flexibility and variability. Such variability makes the next stages of our research interesting and potentially quite fruitful. Having conducted a telephone inventory of worksite training programs in Texas, we now plan to conduct a written survey of program characteristics and practices (Phase II) seeking exemplary practices, and then conduct a field review with schools identified with exemplary practices. We want to learn how worksite training is best structured in practical ways and how learning acheived on worksites is best evaluated. How can the various forms of worksite training be distinguished by definitions that are of practical use in the field? Further, how can worksite training best be incorporated into a training program that is competency-based?

A listing of the questions we plan to ask in our written survey (Phase II) and our field visits (Phase III) can be found in the appendices to this report.

References

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. 1986. "Postsecondary Technical and Vocational Education: Degrees and Certificates." Austin: Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System.

Hines, Donna. 1986. Effectiveness of Cooperative Training Component in Postsecondary Vocational/Technical Programs. Commerce, Tx: Occupational Curriculum Laboratory, East Texas State University.

Peace, Betty, Bill Lovelace, and Jo Ann Engelbrecht. 1986. A Women's Guide to Apprenticeship Programs in Texas. Denton: North Texas State University, Division of Occupational and Vocational Education.

Renetzky, Alvin. (ed). 1976. Directory of Internships, Work Experience Programs and On-the-Job Training Opportunities. Thousand Oaks, California: Ready Reference Press.

Statewide Advisory Committee for Texas Postsecondary Technical and Vocational Education. 1986. "Planning for Postsecondary Technical and Vocational Education in Texas: A Working Paper." Austin: Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. (April 23)

Texas Education Agency. 1987. Career Opportunities in Texas: A Master Plan for Vocational Education. Austin: Texas Education Agency.

Wilson, Richard L. 1986. Cooperative Education in the U.S. and Canada. Boston, MA: Cooperative Education Research Center, Northeastern University.

APPENDIX A

LISTING OF PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

LISTING OF PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Dr. M. Doyle Butler, Division Head
Vocational Industrial Teacher Education
Texas Engineering Extension
Texas A & M University

Mr. Claude Gray
Texas State Director
U.S. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training

Dr. Clay Johnson
Vice President for Instruction and President of Sweetwater Campus
Texas State Technical Institute

Mr. Mike Roark
Program Director, Technical and Industrial Program
Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System

Ms. Cecile Sanders
Division Chairperson, Health Technologies,
Allied Health Sciences
Austin Community College

Dr. Cliff Weaver
Associate Dean for Technical and Occupational Programs
North Lake College

APPENDIX B

SURVEY FORM USED FOR PHASE I TELEPHONE SURVEY

INSTITUTION _____ FICE _____ REGION _____

PROGRAM _____ OCCUPATIONAL AREA _____ CIP _____

Name of respondent _____ Telephone _____

Title _____

_____ Filled out by a different respondent

Address _____

_____ Telephone

City _____ Zip

PROGRAM CHARACTERTISTICS

Type of Program
(a) Internship
(b) Cooperative Education
(c) Apprenticeship
(d) Practicum
(e) Clinical
(f) Other _____

Is the worksite experience a part of
(a) A degree program?
(b) A certificate program?
(c) Both a degree and a certificate program?
(c) Noncredit training?

Is worksite component a required part of training for all students in the program?
(a) Yes
(b) Yes, for degree students only
(c) No

Are students paid while they are in training at a worksite?
(a) Yes, all are paid wages or salary
(b) Yes, all are paid training stipend
(c) Yes, some are paid wages or salary
(d) No

Comments: _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

SURVEY FORM TO BE USED FOR PHASE II MAIL SURVEY

Please return by October 12th, 1987 to:
Center for the Study of Human Resources
107 West 27th Street
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

PROFILE OF PROGRAMS INVOLVING AN ON-THE JOB COMPONENT (version 8)

INSTITUTION _____ FICE _____ REGION _____

PROGRAM _____ OCCUPATIONAL AREA _____ CIP _____

Name of respondent _____

Name of respondent (If filled out by a different person) _____

Telephone _____

Telephone _____

Title _____

Address _____

City _____ Zip _____

Type of Program
(a) Internship
(b) Cooperative Education
(c) Apprenticeship
(d) Practicum
(e) Clinical
(f) Other _____

Is the worksite experience a part of
(a) A degree program?
(b) A certificate program?
(c) Both a degree and a certificate program?
(c) Noncredit training?

Are students paid while they are in training at a worksite?
(a) Yes, all are paid wages or salary
(b) Yes, all are paid training stipend
(c) Yes, some are paid wages or salary
(d) No

Is worksite component a required part of training for all students in the program?
(a) Yes
(b) No

1. What is the primary objective of the worksite component in your program? (Check only one)

___To teach content and knowledge of new skills
___To teach students about the workplace "environments and ecology"
___To reinforce skills and knowledge already taught in school
___To introduce students to a work environment
___Other (specify)_____

2. What percentage of students in the program normally participate in worksite training? (Give percentage)

_____%

3. If the worksite component is optional (i.e. not a required part of training for all students in the program), how is it determined which students will participate in the worksite training and which will not? (Check all that apply)

___Not applicable--worksite training is required for all students in the program

___Worksite training is elective (at choice of student)
___Worksite training is required for students in degree program and optional for those in certificate program
___Worksite training is used only for students without previous work experience in that occupation
___Worksite training is for students who have jobs or who can arrange their own worksite training positions
___Worksite training is provided only to students who are selected by participating employers
___Worksite training is available to students who need money to stay in school
___Worksite training is available only to selected students who qualify (if so, the qualifications are as follows:_____
_____)
___Other (Describe)_____
_____

4. What is the key problem you have faced in establishing or operating the worksite training component in this program?

___ Lack of financing
___ Obtaining industry participation and support
___ Finding sufficient training positions during economic downturn
___ Placing handicapped or disadvantaged students
___ Coordinating academic training with worksite training
___ Other (Please explain)

_____
_____
_____

5. Is training in this program (Check an answer for each item)

Yes	No	
___	___	competency-based? (If so, attach a listing of competencies)
___	___	individualized?
___	___	self-paced?
___	___	offered on an open-entry, open-exit basis?

6. Is there any written agreement (or training plan) with participating employers to provide training ?

___yes (if so, attach a sample of a completed agreement or training plan)
___no

7. Is rotation across job tasks required as part of the agreement?

___yes
___no

8. Other than obtaining a written agreement or training plan from the employer, are worksites certified as appropriate training positions? (Check all that apply)

___No special certification is required. We rely on the training plan
___Coordinator or instructor visits site and talks with supervisor
___A worker fully competent in the occupation is required to supervise the learner
___Worksite is approved by external accrediting agency
___Other procedures are used (Specify)

_____
_____
_____

9. What particular competencies do you expect students to gain in their worksite experience? (If listing is available, attach a copy. If complete listing is too extensive, provide a sample.)

_____
_____
_____

10. What assurance do you have that competencies are gained on the job? Are tests administered to check attainment of competencies or performance levels? (Check whichever items are appropriate)

___Employer testifies to satisfactory performance at the worksite by providing pay raises
___Supervisory ratings (Attach a copy of rating or appraisal form used)
___Paper and pencil test
___Performance test administered by employer or training site supervisor
___Performance test administered by school personnel
___No tests are given
___Other -- Explain: _____

11. Are learners required to write reports, fill in check lists, or provide other structured feedback about their experience at the worksite? (Check all that apply)

___ No
___ Yes (If so, attach a copy of the standard format used, if one is available)
____Learners fill in check lists
____Learners write reports or term papers about their experience
____Learners maintain diaries or logs of their worksite experience
____Other--Explain:_____

12. What training or guidance (if any) is available for on-the-job instructors?

____None
____We make training materials available to them (Please specify below)
____We conduct an orientation session for participating employers/supervisors
____Our coordinator/instructors provide technical assistance
____Other (specify)

_____

13. In your opinion, which school operates the best or most exemplary worksite training programs in this program (occupational) area?

___in Texas_____ Don't Know ____
School Location

___in the nation_____ Don't Know ____
School Location

Why are they the best?

_____
_____

14. Briefly describe any innovative features or improvements in your own program that have worked well which you would like to share.

_____
_____
_____

REMINDER--PLEASE ATTACH

(1) Listing of competencies for the program, indicating those to be gained through training at the worksite. NOTE: If a list of competencies is not available for the entire program, attach a list (or sample) or competencies to be gained through worksite experience.

(2) Copy of a COMPLETED written agreement or training plan for worksite training

(3) Copy of format for appraisal used to rate learner proficiencies (and/or competencies obtained) in training on the job

APPENDIX D

PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW GUIDE TO BE USED FOR PHASE III FIELD VISITS

PHASE III INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR FIELD VISITS

Perspectives

1. Identify the advantages of having a worksite training component in this program? (indicate all that apply and mark the most important with an asterisk *)

Yes No

___ ___motivates students to learn
___ ___provides students income to help finance their education
___ ___acquaints students with up-to-date equipment actually in use on the job (that the school cannot afford to purchase)
___ ___provides students with an entry position that can be developed into a regular job after program completion
___ ___gives students access to more and/or better jobs
___ ___makes it more likely that students will work in a job related to their training after program completion
___ ___gives employers an opportunity to evaluate students before hiring them
___ ___improves our relationship with industry (employers)
___ ___helps keep instructors up to date
___ ___provides access to facilities or resources that can be shared with other training programs
___ other (specify)_____
_____

ASK FOR DOCUMENTATION AND ANECDOTES FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF THE REPONDENTS TO BACK UP THESE ANSWERS.

2. How specifically does having a worksite component enhance your training (i.e. what would be missing without it?)

_____
_____
_____

3. **Identify the <u>disadvantages</u> of having worksite training in this program? (indicate all that apply and mark the most important with an asterisk *)**

Yes No

___ ___ conflicts with productivity
___ ___ availability of employment-based training opportunities are curtailed during economic downturns
___ ___ worksite training can become too specifically tailored to the needs of an individual employer
___ ___ difficult to coordinate training in the classroom and on the job
___ ___ introduces difficulties in serving disadvantaged learners
___ ___ other (specify)_____

ASK FOR DOCUMENTATION AND ANECDOTES FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF THE REPONDENTS TO BACK UP THESE ANSWERS.

ALSO, IF DISADVANTAGES ARE ACKNOWLEDGED, ASK WHAT STEPS (IF ANY) ARE TAKEN TO MINIMIZE OR TO REMEDY THE DISADVANTAGES

4. **From your perspective, what is the difference between training provided in cooperative education, apprenticeships, internships, clinical experiences or practicums?**

___ no difference
___ the difference(s) are _____

5. **Does one type of worksite or on-the-job experience have any advantages over the others ? If so, which and why?**

6. **Which school operates the best or most exemplary worksite training programs in this program area?**

___in Texas_____ _____
school location

___in the nation_____ _____
school location

Why is it the best?

7. **Briefly describe any innovative features or improvemnets in your own program that have worked well which you would like to share.**

Program Characteristics

8. If the worksite component is optional (i.e. not a required part of training for all students in the program), how is it determined which students will participate in the worksite training and which will not?

____not applicable--worksite training is required for all students in the program

____worksite training is elective (at choice of student)
____worksite training is used only for students without previous work experience
____worksite training is for students who have jobs or who can arrange their own worksite training positions
____worksite training is provided only to students who are selected by participating employers
____worksite training is available to students who need money to stay in school
____worksite training is available only to selected students who quality (if so, the qualifications are as follows:_____
_____)
____other (describe)_____
_____

9. On what basis are decisions made to teach particular training content in an on-the-job setting as opposed to in the classroom?

_____
_____
_____
_____

10. How are worksite training positions developed? By whom? (check all that apply)

___students enter program with jobs that become training sites
___students develop their own training positions
___instructor assists students who encounter difficulties in developing their own training positions
___coordinator assists students who encounter difficulties in developing their own training positions
___instructor develops all worksite training positions
___coordinator develops all worksite training positions
___other (specify)_____

11. Are special in-plant workshops (conducted by employers) used for training sites or does the training occur exclusively in the production areas as part of the regular production process (i.e. trainees are expected to produce or contribute to the production process on the job in their training assignments)?

___special workshops not in regular production
___as part of regular production process

Comments_____
_____

12. How is training structured on the job?

___no attempt to structure on-the-job training. Substantial learning occurs naturally on the job informally
___the following structuring devices/procedures are used:
_____
_____

13. By whom is the on-the-job portion of training supervised?

___Instructor
___Coordinator
___Solely by supervisor assigned by employer
___Other (specify)_____

14. How is this supervision conducted?

___Monitoring visits to worksites
___School personnel are constantly at the worksite
___Assigned to a "master" worker
___Other (specify)

_____

15. How do you assure that qualified instructors are available on the job?

_____
_____
_____
_____

16. How many employers participated in offering worksite training for your program this past year?

#_____

17. Do the same employers participate as providers of worksite training from year to year?

___yes
___no (Comments)_____
_____
_____
_____

18. What types of employers participate? (QUESTION NEEDS WORK)

___public sector
___private for profit
___nonprofit

___large employers
___smaller employers

19. What implications does having a worksite training component have on the makeup and function of your advisory committee(s)?

____none, or no special implications
____we have to set up additional special advisory group
____ it adds the following functions for our advisory group(s)
____assist in developing worksite training positions
____certify employers to offer training
____help assess performance of learners on the job
____help select students to participate in worksite training
____other (specify)_____

Comments_____

_____

_____