DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 328 CE 076 066

AUTHOR	Fusch, Gene E.
TITLE	Policymakers and the Players: An Overview of United States and Canadian Vocational Education and Workforce Training Schemes.
PUB DATE	1994-00-00
NOTE	41p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Advisory Committees; Board of Education Policy; Boards of Education; College Governing Councils; Comparative Analysis; Comparative Education; Educational Administration; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Federal Aid; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; *Job Training; *Policy Formation; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; State Aid; State Government; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada; *United States

ABSTRACT

Key players in U.S. and Canadian vocational education and workforce training resemble each other. Motives from cultural values, ethics, or personal gain drive players' interaction. The U.S. government is increasing availability of grant funding but influencing policy by stipulating conditions on grant monies. In Canada, the federal government is increasing its share of funding and making stipulations. States have been identified as key policymakers, but the federal government, bureaucrats, and special interest groups have significant roles. Canadian provinces and territories have more autonomy over vocational education than the states. Policymaking and influence of state and provincial school boards show substantial deviation, since members or superintendents may be elected or appointed. In the United States and Canada, the judicial branch retains the ultimate policy power. The policymaking authority of school boards is limited to establishing policy and procedure at the local level to implement federal, state, and provincial policies. Other players include the following: superintendents; administrators; principals; teachers; parents; business; labor; community; special interest groups; university and community college boards; college presidents, deans, and administrators; college faculty; and college business and labor training relationships. (Appendixes contain 36 references and an overview of U.S. and Canadian work force schemes.) (YLB)

POLICYMAKERS AND THE PLAYERS: AN OVERVIEW OF UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE TRAINING SCHEMES

by

Gene E. Fusch
University of British Columbia

Contents

Abstract

Throughout the United States and Canada there are numerous pilot projects and workforce training models. The Annex reviews the principle workforce training schemes in the United States and Canada. Beginning with an overview of higher level education and training for the professional (i.e., Doctors, Lawyers, Professional Engineers, etc.) in public and private universities, this paper illustrates training programs for adults and young people and culminates in training models for persons with special needs.

Examining the overview of United States and Canadian vocational education and workforce training from a global perspective one may conclude that both systems are very similar. This perception would most likely identify the federal governments as the primary policymakers. Depending on current media events, U. S. residents would principally identify the federal government or their state as the policymaker. (Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt 1989, Matthews, Swanson, & Kerker 1991). Most Canadian residents credit the provincial government for education and training. (Hodgson, 1988).

Marshall, et. al. (1989) found that the cultural influence from religious, social, and, ethnic values create paradigms that emphasize patterns, values, and rules of behavior for policymakers. They point out that educators, citizens, politicians, and scholars ask questions about federal and state policymaking. The questions range from 'Who is in charge?' to 'How do our policy activities compare to other states?'

The overview of the vocational education and workforce training schemes left these questions unanswered:

1) Who are the vocational education and workforce training policymakers and players in the United States and in Canada?

2) Who influences the policymakers?

This paper reveals the vast political arena to identify key policymakers, players and dominant influences in the business of vocational education and workforce training.

The Players

The funding for education and training accounts for the largest expenditure in the federal, state, and provincial budget in the United States and Canada. (Matthews, et. al. 1991. Hodgson, 1988.).

Marshall, et. al. (1989) research at the state level in six U. S. States ranked this taxonomy of the key policy influentials:

A. The core policymakers and influentials they identified as "insiders," indicating they are in the inner circle of the decision process:

1) Individual members of the legislature
2) The state legislature as a whole

B. Those having strong influence is classified as the "near circle":

3) Chief State School Officer
4) Combined education interest groups
5) Teacher Organizations
6) Governor and executive staff
7) Legislative staff

C. The next group having less influence they described as the "far circle":

8) State board of education

D. With further diluted influence they listed as "sometimes player":

9) School boards' associations
10) Administrators' associations

E. They concluded the taxonomy of key players by identifying the "often forgotten players"

11) Courts
12) Federal government
13) Non-educator groups
14) Lay groups
15) Education researcher organizations
16) Referenda
17) Producers of educational materials

Marshall, et. al. (1989) conducted their research at the state policymaking level and indicated that positioning on the list varied from state to state due to current cultural and political influences.

While several states are reducing funds for vocational education and workforce training dollars, the U. S. government is increasing availability of grant funding. The federal government is influencing education and training policy by stipulating conditions on grant moneys. (Skilbeck, Cornell, Lowe, & Taib. 1994).

Players at the local K-12 school level, (i.e., school boards, superintendents, principles, teachers, parents, business and community groups) influence and make policies at the local level. Universities and community colleges add trustees, presidents, deans, administrators, faculty, staff, steering committees and teams, community and business advisory committees, labor and apprenticeships, and business partnerships to the political policymaking arena. (Matthews, et. al., 1991. Decker & Romney, 1992. Alfred & Carter, 1993. U. S. Department of Education, 1991).

In the Canadian political arena, the provincial governments are credited with providing education and training, and the federal government is often perceived as hindering the provinces. In fact, the federal government funds over 50% of education and most of the training. The constitution as interpreted today charges the provincial governments with implementing educational policy and the federal government to fund its share of education through the provinces and provide workforce training. (Hodgson, 1988).

Canada does not have a Federal Department of Education (Hodgson, 1988). However, Canada has a Ministry of Human Resources Development, Canadian Labour Force Development Board, and the Economic Council of Canada that provide vocational education and workforce training schemes. Each province has a provincial board of education to establish policy. (Martin, 1982).

Canadian players at the local K-12 school level, (i.e., school boards, superintendents, principles, teachers, parents, business and community groups) influence and make policies at the local level. These appear to resemble the players at the K-12 level in the U. S.. However, Canadian school boards are independent corporations liable to public and private laws. In all provinces except British Columbia, many of the school boards are under denominational control adding religious ethics and values to the policymaking process.

The Economic Council of Canada (1992) identified education policy makers as departments and principals, and the training partners and players as teachers and counselors,

social services, parents, volunteer organizations, workers and labor unions, employers, and students.

Similar to the U. S., Canadian universities and community colleges add associations such as the Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the various associations of Deans as policy influentials. The universities and colleges also add trustees, presidents, deans, administrators, faculty, staff, steering committees and teams, community and business advisory committees, labor and apprenticeships, and business partnerships to the political policymaking arena. (Martin, 1982).

The political and policymaking paradigms are in a constant state of flux, from federal, state, provincial, regional, and local influences from religious, social, and ethnic values. The remainder of this paper will explore the practices and relationships of the key players in vocational education and workforce training policymaking.

The Federal Government Role

Marshall, et. al. (1989) stated that the U. S. constitution charges the individual states with administering public education workforce training. With the exception of Supreme Court decisions and conditional grant monies, the federal government shares in the general funding of education.

In the past, the federal government's role in vocational education and training policymaking received little attention. (Marshall, et. al. 1989). However, studies and reports such as Gardner's *A Nation at Risk: The imperative for Education Reform* (1983) and Dale Parnell's book *The Neglected Majority* (1985) led to Dertouzos et. al. (1989) *Made in America: Regaining the Productive Edge,* the Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages* (1990), and the SCANS report *Learning a Living: A Blueprint for High Performance* (1992). These studies aroused policymakers, influential players, and concerns of the populus. The bicameral legislature responded by increasing funding for vocational education and training through *The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act.* (1990).

Dertouzos, et. al. (1989) MIT study resulted in publication of the book *Made in America: Regaining the Productive Edge* which led to the PBS video: *Challenge to America.* This created

considerable public awareness and political pressure on the federal government. Dertouzos stated "The task of upgrading the primary and secondary schools is probably the single most important challenge facing the country." The study called for the federal government to adopt programs for K-12 education that leads to greater technological literacy.

During the Bush administration, President Bush responded to the studies and growing business pressure. He utilized the media and growing global economic concern to influence federal legislative policymakers and the populus concerns through America 2000: an Education Strategy. (1991).

Perkins Act (1990) provides states, colleges, schools, and consortiums additional funding at a time when most states were reducing educational funding. With present fiscal constraints, schools and institutions of higher learning are expected to do more with less. Subsequently, the attainment of Federal monies in the form of grants has been promoted more so than in the past. Sexton (1982) points out that educational programs are rarely self-sufficient and that successful grant activity is necessary for institutions to continue certain programs or expand existing ones. She notes that "grant writing continues to be a valuable source of revenue for educational institutions."

However, the new funding comes with federal mandates and conditions. Both legislative houses, and the Department of Education required the increase in conditions on grant monies. The federal government has developed strategic policymaking role through increasing federal conditions on this Act and for grant monies through other federal granting departments.

President Clinton's Welfare-to-Work plan, the U. S. Joint Training Partnership Act (JTPA), training programs funded through the Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, Department of Defense, National Science Foundation, and other federal granting agencies are mandating policy and stipulations for grant funding for educators.

Skilbeck, et. al. (1994) summarized that there are notable moves by the federal government to develop a more conscious vocational orientation within schooling and to integrate vocational and academic education.

The 1985 Yearbook of the American Vocational Association identified federal policy and mandates for workforce training programs such as the Co-operative Extension Service, Joint Training Partnership Act (JTPA), and Title II and Title III Grants (programs such as economically

disadvantaged workers, retraining for dislocated workers, training for upgrading, advance career training, literacy and bi-lingual training, high school equivalency, basic skills training, and on the job training).

Therefore, since the Marshall, et. al. (1989) study, the U. S. government no longer has a "often forgotten role" in policymaking. With media attention and catering to new concerns of the populus, the federal government is now an active player in policymaking and influencing education at a local level.

When Canada became a nation in 1867, the British North America Act (BNA Act) and the constitution gave educational autonomy to the provinces and training responsibility to the federal government. (Gregor, et. al. 1992). Since 1867, interpretation of the constitution has been in a state of flux. The impossible separation of education and training has resulted in conflict between the provincial and federal governments. (Hodgson 1988).

The federal government develops the policy for numerous training programs such as Canada Manpower Centre activities, Canadian Job Strategies, post-secondary education grants, bilingualism grants, 4-H clubs assistance, and young offender programs. (Gregor, et. al. 1992, Hodgson 1988).

Funding for education was shared equally between the federal and the provincial governments. However, in some provinces the federal share is approaching 60% which makes provincial autonomy misleading. The federal government is stipulating conditions with the additional monies. (Hodgson 1988). In addition, federal policymakers are looking for alternative funding policies and educational reform to prepare Canada's workforce. (Axworthy 1994).

Unlike the media and public attention the U. S. government received for programs such as Tech-Prep, America 2000, Welfare-to-Work, and School-to-Work programs, the Canadian provincial leaders assume credit for most training programs, creating an obscure public perception for the federal government in Ottawa. The federal politicians want visibility and credit for their efforts. Consequently, Ottawa requires conditions on almost all funding. One predominate condition on grant funding is public acknowledgment of Ottawa's contribution. Most written dissemination's must credit Ottawa for funding the research or program, all project promotion identifies Ottawa as providing the service, etc. Although the federal government funds province's

with two non-conditional grants, (i.e., Provincial Revenue Equalization and Post-Secondary Education Transfer Payments) other funding comes with mandates attached. (Hodgson 1988).

To affirm federal policy over provincial autonomy the government utilizes the start-stop funding method. This method provides seed money for schools and colleges to start vocational education and workforce training programs under federal conditional policies. The schools and colleges with propensity for training funds accept the federal policies and implement the programs. After the program is implemented and receives attention from interest groups, the government does not renew the funding, and utilizes the money for new grant offerings. The reduction in funding forces the schools to reduce or streamline programs. Research identified that pressure from interest groups prevented schools from eliminating the program established with federal policies and, infact, the school administrators elected to eliminate programs that do not adhere to Ottawa's policies. (Hodgson 1988).

Gregor, et. al. (1992) summarizes the federal influence on post-secondary education in stating "the federal government exerts a significant indirect influence; for example, through provision of research funding, through massive purchases of places in community colleges for adult retraining and other labour market adjustment initiatives, and through contributions under the Official Languages in Education Program."

The role of the federal government and provincial autonomy is still in transition, though Ottawa definitely intends to be active in the vocational education and workforce training policymaking arena.

The State and Provincial Role

The United States constitution charges states with education and training. The federal government funds K-12 and post-secondary education in partnership with the states. Acquiring conditional policy power through funding, the federal government allows states to have additional policy influence through state block grants. The state politicians and bureaucrats recognize this as additional funding to serve their constituents and accept the federal conditions.

Mitchell and Encarnation's (1984) taxonomy identified these state education policy responsibilities:

1) School organization and governance,
2) personnel training and certification,

3) school program definition,
4) curriculum materials development and selection,
5) student testing and assessment,
6) revenue generation, and
7) resource allocation.

In addition to the U. S. Supreme Court decisions on education, the federal bicameral legislature pass policies and laws regarding issues such as the school lunch program funded by the U. S. Department of Agriculture. (Marshall, et. al. 1989)

Marshall, et. al. (1989) point out the many federal and cultural paradigms influencing state education policymakers. Their research identified individual members of state legislatures and the complete state legislative body as the most powerful policymakers and influentials. Following these 'insiders' for policymaking in chronological order are chief state school officers, combined education interest groups, teacher organizations, the governor and executive staff, legislative staff, and with less influence, the state board of education.

Policymakers at the state level encounter a multitude of obstructions and influences from their own political agendas, attitudes and values to the formal offices, rules, and ritualized behaviors, from other politicians, bureaucrats, and special interest groups. In addition, policymakers confront boundary disputes between the legislature and state school boards. They meet many cultural paradigms as they sift through the multiple jurisdictions in the state educational and training policy arena. (Marshall, et. al. 1989)

Following paradigms such as: Never make a policy that has a negative effect on the States major city, policymakers at the state level must adhere to protocol and policymaking paradigms. Utilizing clashes and crisis, interest groups, and influentials force a political response from state policy makers. Amid perceived crisis, leaders develop a policy agenda in response to the stress. (Marshall, et. al. 1989)

Matthews, et. al (1991) study found in state legislative response in the decade since *A Nation at Risk* was published in 1983, that over 290 state commissions across the country were charged with developing educational reform. This was a result of influence from the Nation's businesses expressing concerns about the quality of education from K-12 schools to colleges and universities.

Although Marshall, et. al. (1989) identified the individual state legislatures and the state legislative body as the key policymakers, the federal government and other influencials have significant roles in the U. S. policymaking arena.

Canadian provinces and territories have more autonomy over vocational education than the American states. (Martin & Macdonell, 1982). The Canadian government provides training programs through federal agencies and funding through grant programs. Although the federal government is maneuvering to gain an assertive role, apprenticeship training falls under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. (Newton, et. al. 1992) The apprenticeship training is offered through public and private community colleges and technical institutes. The provincial government regulates policy for these schools.

There are only two private universities in Canada. The provincial government policies are hostile toward initiating new private universities. Public universities receive predominantly unconditional funding from the provincial government. (These funds include both the federal and provincial governments contributions.) The provincial government sets financial policies for student tuition and fees, targeted funding for particular activities and programs and financial administration, auditing, and reporting. Other than financial policy, universities receive autonomy and enjoy probably the greatest freedom of universities in the world. (Gregor, et. al. 1992)

With provincial autonomy, the Canadian government has not set standard nation wide standards and policies. Across provincial boundaries, there are policy differences. Quebec and Saskatchewan do not use grade levels. Quebec utilizes a system based on age and subject promotion, where Saskatchewan divides their model in four levels each having three subdivisions. Most provinces have 12 grades; Quebec has 11 and Ontario has 13. (Martin & Macdonell, 1982) For efficiency, this paper references primary and secondary education in Canada as K-12.

Martin and Macdonell (1982) identified three types of policy and control over Canadian K-12 schools:

1) Federal schools that are operated by the Department of Indian Affairs for aboriginal people living in their own communities and remote areas, the Department of Defense for dependents of military personnel, and Northern

Development Administers Schools that follow curriculum similar to provincial schools. These schools are in remote areas in the territories.

2) Private schools that are under direct control of religious organizations or other administrative bodies. Quebec has additional categories for private schools.

3) Public schools that are under provincial control. These schools are operated by local school boards and funded through the provincial government.

The provincial politicians and bureaucrats dictate policy to the public schools. Not unlike the U. S. state policymakers, provincial policymakers and influential players sustain pressure and influence from interest groups and the public.

Certification for the workforce from apprenticeship through higher education in Canada is under provincial control. (Newton, et. al. 1992) With the exception of the federal red seal program for some apprenticeships, workers, from trades persons to professional teachers and medical doctors, find it difficult to be certified to work in another province. To be certified to work in another province, one may need to complete that provinces training program.

The State School Board

The U. S. state school boards or departments policymaking influence, power, and authority vary from state to state. The board composition is a major influence on the board's participation as a player in the policymaking arena. Boards may be led by one individual, such as a superintendent of public instruction, or a committee. Superintendents may be elected or appointed by the governor or legislature. Likewise, committees may be elected, appointed, or a combination of elected and appointed. School boards may administer the K-12 and post-secondary state school system, or there may be two or more separate boards for K-12 schools, community colleges, technical colleges, vocational schools, and universities. (Marshall, et. al.) As in the American states, Canadian provinces utilize different provincial school boards or departments in each province. (Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

This creates cultural paradigms for state and provincial school boards. If an elected politician or elected committee of politicians leads the board, the officials have a million plus constituents to satisfy. Board leaders may spend their efforts in political rhetoric and avoid controversial decision and policymaking. If the superintendent or board was appointed, the

bureaucrats may work for the governor, minister, or legislature. In this type of position public officials elect to promote the agenda of their elected superiors. (Marshall, et. al. 1989, Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

Some school boards or state superintendents are charged to solely administer policy, where others are charged with developing and implementing policy. Some boards maintain high credibility with legislature and government policymakers, where others receive little recognition. Many boards and superintendents lobby and influence state policymakers. However, in some states, boards and superintendents fail to work within the political paradigms and lose creditability and influence. (Marshall, et. al. 1989, Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

There is a substantial deviation in the spectrum of the policymaking and influence of state and provincial school boards. The commonality of the boards is the responsibility to administer policy and regulation to the local school boards, universities, and colleges (or college districts).

The Judicial Role

The courts interpret the constitution, legislative law, and direct referenda. The U. S. State District, Appeals, and Supreme Courts, and Federal District, Appeals, and, ultimately the Supreme Court, constitutes law practitioners that bring many cultural, ethical, and personal perceptions to their appointments. At times judiciaries tend to dictate controversial policy and create excessive burden on states and local school boards. Notable controversial U. S. Supreme Courts include:

1) The finance equity decision mandating states to spend large amounts of money to provide equal access to educational services to all. This included billions of dollars spent for two decades to transport intercity youth to educational facilities in suburbs while transporting suburban youth to the inner cities. Recently, the Supreme Court reversed the busing mandate.

2) The case of United States vs. the State of Texas mandated that states provide free education and services to all youth residing in the state. States with large numbers of illegal immigrant migrant workers were required to provide service without receiving any additional tax revenue to cover the cost.

3) The court excluded religion and prayer from schools. This perception by many state courts and policymakers emanated in elimination of the Flag Salute from schools, which contains the phrase "One Nation under God".

Marshall et. al. (1989) describe judicial influence as immediate and direct, but not continuos. However, when the court wields its power, legislative policy is often overturned.

The Canadian judicial system interprets the constitution and policymaker mandates, establishes court precedence, and implements quasi-judicial decisions that schools must abide by.

Martin & Macdonell (1982) describe the judicial function as: To maintain or interpret distinctions, and at times must interpret legislative and executive policy. These policies may involve federal, provincial, or local interest. All court decisions are binding by the lower echelon and may only be overturned by a higher court.

Therefore, in the U. S. and Canada, the judicial branch retains the ultimate policy power and school boards, administrators, teachers, and students must abide by court decisions.

The Local School Board

Local school boards in the U. S. are comprised of local citizens, elected by the populus, to administer the school district. The school board is a legal agent of the state and is responsible for implementing state and federal mandates. In addition, the school board must be responsive to the needs of its constituents and students. (Houston, et. al. 1994)

School boards are funded by the state, and can receive additional funding through federal, state, and private grants. In addition, school boards in several states receive funding from bonds repaid from property taxes. In the property tax models, school boards, superintendents, administrators, and school personnel often take political roles to promote passage of new taxes by the voters in general elections.

Houston, et. al. (1994) points out school board responsibilities include developing district policy for curriculum development, financial matters, personnel issues and training, and administering educational programs. To implement policy, the school board empowers the superintendent and evaluates performance.

Local school boards in Canada operate as corporations abiding by public and private corporate law. Members are elected, appointed, or a combination of elected and appointed. As a

corporate entity, school board members can be subject to legal liability for actions that conflict with mandated policies and the boards statutory provisions. (Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

Like their U. S. counterparts these school boards must implement federal and provincial policy. Boards are charged with developing policy and procedures to carry on the functions of the local school system.

In contrast to the U. S., Canadian school boards often promote religious agenda in the schools. British Columbia is the only province with a single public school system as in the American states. Denominational schools in B. C. are organized as private schools and do not receive provincial support. All other provinces have two or more public school systems in which local school boards are denominational, i.e., Roman Catholic, Protestant Denominational, and Anglican. In these cases, the school board must also implement policy in respect to the religious affiliation. (Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

The policymaking authority of U. S. and Canadian school boards is limited to establishing policy and procedure at the local level with respect to implementing federal, state, and provincial policies.

The Superintendent, Administrator, and Principal Role

Every superintendent, administrator, and principal role in the U. S. and Canada is different. This is due to the interpersonal ability of all these players and the managerial style of the local school boards.

As the key district manager, superintendents are responsible for developing and implementing policy as required by the school board. (Houston, et. al. 1994, Martin & Macdonell, 1982). Hersey & Blanchard (1993) identified management styles and strategies in their situational leadership model from autocratic to total delegation. An autocratic or participating school board may dictate policy to the superintendent, where as a delegating school board may give total policymaking responsibility to the superintendent. A strong superintendent develops strategies to influence school boards, where as a less dominating superintendent may rely on the school board to make decisions.

Many administrative positions from assistant superintendent to vocational director to technical coordinators are charged with different levels of policy making and implementation in local school districts. (Matthews, et. al. 1991, Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

Principals are charged with implementing policy and procedures at the individual school level. Principals are the first line managers over the teachers and instruction. Gittell, et. al. (1973) stated "building principals participate in, and effect decisions about every single aspect of education at the local level."

Like the superintendent and school board interaction, there may be similar interaction between principals and administrators and superintendents. Some school boards, superintendents, administrators, and principals have implemented Total Quality Management (TQM) where a number of individuals and committees, from the school board members to teachers, share in policymaking. (Gittell, et. al. 1973)

In sum, interactions between local school boards, superintendents, administrators, and principals are in constant state of flux. Individuals managerial and interpersonal strengths and weaknesses determine their effectiveness in policymaking and as an influential player in the local policymaking arena.

The Front Line "Teachers"

Maxwell, et. al. (1989) summarized the teacher as "the backbone of the educational system, bearing responsibility for transmitting to children and young adults the knowledge, the skills, and -- to a large extent -- the values identified by society as being most important for them once they leave school."

Teachers have influence on the policymakers individually and through teacher organizations in the United States and Canada. There is currently still conflict over the teacher's role in curriculum development and school policymaking. Following workforce management models, some principals and administrators are empowering teachers and teacher committees with local policy decisions. (Matthews, et. al. 1991, Martin & Macdonell, 1982).

Parents, Business, Labor, Community, and Special Interest Influence

Politicians tend to respond to public pressure. This was apparent when the United States legislature reacted to Gardner's (1983) study *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform* and all the subsequent studies by creating *The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act.* (1990) This is also demonstrated by Canada's policymakers reaction to the studies such as Axworthy's (1994) *Agenda: Jobs and Growth. Improving Social Security in Canada* and Maxwell, et. al. (1992) *A Lot to Learn: Education and Training in Canada.*

Many special interest groups such as teacher associations, community environmental groups, businesses and business associations, etc. have full time paid lobbyists to influence policymakers at the federal, state, and provincial levels.

Marshall et. al. 1989 pointed out that parent teacher associations (PTA's), local business, and local community groups are "some times players" and "often forgotten players" in influencing policymakers. However, when these groups develop a coherent and dynamic strategy that awakens the populus, they become active influentials in the policymaking arena.

University and Community College Boards

Universities in the U. S. predominately have one governing board consisting of members appointed by the state (usually a governor appointment). Commission on Colleges (1992) identify university board requirements as consisting of "a governing board which has the authority to carry out the mission of the institution. The board has at least five voting members, a majority of whom have no contractual, employment, or personal financial interest in the institution." This requirement covers all public and private universities and colleges in order for accreditation. Boards charge the president with administering federal and state policy, as well as developing institutional policy.

Gregor, et. al. (1992) point out that all but three Canadian Universities have bicameral structures. The predominant university structure consists of a supervisory board comprised of government appointees, selected faculty, students, and representatives of some constituents, and the Academic Senate comprising faculty, administrators, and students. The other three universities combine the supervisory board and Academic Senate. These governing boards direct the President.

The United States and most Canadian provinces utilize a governing board for 2 and 4 year community colleges. These boards are appointed by the state or province and may include business, labor, faculty, and student representatives. The other provinces administer the colleges directly from the provincial government. In addition, community college boards have less authority than university boards. Although community college boards have some policymaking authority on the local scale, they are charged with administering policy through the president. (Gregor, et. al. 1992, Alfred & Carter 1993).

Utilizing state or provincial board associations, the boards are sometimes influential players with legislative policymakers. (Marshall, et. al. 1989).

College Presidents, Deans, and Administrators

In the United Sates and Canada, university presidents share policymaking authority with boards, faculty, and student senates. In contrast, the community college presidents exercise greater authority over decision making. Community colleges utilize program advisory committees composed of industry management and labor. (Gregor, et. al. 1992, Commission on Colleges, 1992)

Alfred and Carter (1993) show a management shift from the autocratic top down approach, wherein the president's personal vision leads the college to a shared vision approach. The shared vision approach utilizes committees of administrators, faculty, staff, and students to develop institutional policy.

Presidents, deans, and administrators utilize situational leadership styles ranging from directive to delegating to the new team approach. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). With the diversity of personalities and abilities of university and college personnel, the vice president, dean, administrator, or a faculty member may be the pivotal player in the institutional policymaking. Therefore, institutional policymaking and influential roles reflect the individuals within the institution.

College Faculty

The Commission on Colleges (1992) requires universities and colleges utilize faculty involvement in formation of institutional policies. The Commission stipulates that all U. S.

universities and colleges must have communication vehicles established to enlist faculty participation in policymaking.

Canadian University structures utilize faculty senates, incorporating faculty into institutional policymaking. Community college faculty traditionally come directly from the workforce. Community colleges utilize their industry connections and advisory committees to assist in program planning and policymaking. (Gregor, et. al. 1992).

College Business and Labor Training Relationships

Vocational education and workforce training faculty have a close relationship with industry, through advisory committees and industry partnerships. (Gregor, et. al. 1992, Carnevale, et. al. 1990) These bonds facilitate student enrollment, institutional recognition, and donations of equipment and funds. Carnevale, et. al. (1990) stated "Four year colleges and universities are just beginning to recognize their training roles and to capitalize on potential opportunities for linking with employers."

Through close relationships with colleges and universities, business becomes influential in curriculum development and program policymaking. For their investment in time and money, business can benefit from a highly trained workforce. (Carnevale, et. al. 1990).

Conclusion

In the world of vocational education and workforce training policymakers and players in the United States and Canada, there is no singular group. There are numerous groups influencing the policymakers. Many characters are players, influencing and making policy.

Amidst the politics of federal and state legislators and bureaucrats positioning for power, lobbying of interest groups, public pressure, and local administration, there is vast entanglement of interpersonal relationships continually manipulating the framework of the policymaking arena. The strengths of individuals positioning for power in this world of policymaking create a perpetual shift in paradigms. From the federal government to the teacher in the classroom, policymakers and influential players promote personal interest. Motives from cultural values, ethics, or personal gain drive the interaction of the players.

Key players change from state to state and province to province with all the players involved, when necessary, either in a policymaking or influential role. "This approach also offers an understanding of the multifaceted wonder of an effective, but not always efficient, democratic political system." (Marshall, et. al. 1989).

ANNEX

Abstract

This overview examines leading workforce training schemes in the United States and Canada. Beginning with an overview of higher level education and training for the professional (i.e., doctors, lawyers, professional engineers, etc.) in public and private universities, this paper illustrates training programs for adults and young people and culminates in training models for persons with special needs.

A review of U. S. Land Grant Colleges advances to a portrayal of the over 3,000 Cooperative Extension stations that play a vital role in assisting rural populations with lifelong learning skills through agricultural, vocational, and home economics education and training. (Cooperative Extension, 1989).

The comprehensive community college model offers academic programs for transfer to four year colleges, vocational and technical training, and instruction for persons with special needs. The technical college, similar to the community college directs its efforts to offer workforce preparation, workforce upgrade instruction, apprenticeship training, and customized industry instruction. Examination of apprenticeship models identifies the partnerships and players.

An overview of employer training schemes identifies work-based training programs and schemes that alternate training between school-based learning and the workplace.

The SCANS 2000 report, reviewed in the Annex of this paper, led to the development of programs for young people, e.g., 'School to Work' and 'Tech-Prep'.

Professional Training

Education and training for the professions (i.e., doctors, lawyers, professional engineers, etc.) is offered in the U. S. through both public and private universities. The public universities receive funding from both the state and federal government. The individual states administer the funds dispersed from the federal government. In addition, the universities receive funding for research and special projects from the many federal government agencies. Utilizing ambitious foundation fund drives these universities receive additional assistance through corporate contributions and philanthropy.

The private sector includes predominately non-profit universities and a small percentage of for-profit universities. These universities rely on tuition fees, corporate contributions, and philanthropy to administer their programs. Many of the non-profit private universities compete with public universities for federal grant funding.

The small percentage of private for-profit universities rely on corporate training partnerships and tuition fees to operate. Some specialize their education and training to specific levels, e.g., baccalaureate, masters, or doctorate degrees. Many have developed dynamic educational alternatives in fields such as education, sociology, psychology, and business through crediting experience for prior learning, telecourses and distance learning.

In some states with liberal regulations, for-profit universities have sold degrees or offered degrees for coursework far below that of other public and non-profit private institutions. This has made it difficult for the honorable for-profit institutions to receive accreditation from one of five U. S. accreditation associations. In addition, the selling of degrees has created a negative stigmatism on private for-profit institutions.

In Canada, public universities provide professional education and training. The federal and provincial government fund these institutions as in the United States. In this model, the individual provincial government administer the federal and provincial funds to the universities. In contrast to the U. S., Canada has only two small religious-affiliated private universities, one in Ontario and one in British Columbia. (Gregor, et. al. 1992).

Land Grant Colleges

Contrary to current circumstances, the United States was not always a nation of predominantly skilled or semi-skilled workers. The U. S. was founded upon agricultural pursuits, with a substantial number of its workers centered in agricultural labor and the majority of its population living in rural areas. For proof, one has only to look at the number of large land holdings amongst the populace, as well as notice the country's extensive agricultural export base of the sixteen and seventeen hundreds. In 1916, the U. S. rural population peaked at 32.5 million. (Smith, 1990).

To prepare America's workforce during the agricultural era, Congress established the Federal Department of Agriculture in 1862 (now the U. S. Department of Agriculture). The Act

states the mission of the department: "to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of the word." (Cooperative Extension, 1989).

Seven weeks after establishing the Federal Department of Agriculture, Congress passed and President Lincoln signed the first Morrill Act, often referred to as the "Land Grant Act." This Act provided for the establishment of Land Grant Colleges to teach agriculture and mechanical arts. This was the most significant advance in the U. S. history of higher education. Prior to the Morrill Act only the elite of the population obtained the opportunity to receive higher education. Now the entire populace had access to higher education. (Cooperative Extension, 1989).

In 1914, Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act and established the Cooperative Extension Service. The Land Grant Colleges administer the Cooperative Extension Service Programs to rural areas through-out the nation. (Cooperative Extension, 1989).

As the name infers, the Land Grant Colleges received large amounts of land from the government to conduct research and education programs. Today the Land Grant Colleges, also known as A&M Colleges and Universities, are pivotal in the technological advancement of agricultural science. (Cooperative Extension, 1989).

In addition to the college and university education and training offerings on campuses and satellite research stations, rural and urban communities benefit from the various educational and training programs of the Cooperative Extension. (Cooperative Extension 1989).

Cooperative Extension

The Cooperative Extension is a partnership between the land grant institution, the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and the local county (or municipal) government. These partners share in the planning and financing for the Extension education, training, and community programs. The land grant institutions administer the Extension educational and training programs.

Approximately one third of the Extension's nation wide effort educates farmers. In most areas, the Extension concentrates effort into four program areas. (Cooperative Extension 1989).

I. Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)

ANR educational programs teach scientific knowledge and processes to improve farm, ranch, and forest income through proper management of resources while

minimizing the effect on the environment and efficiently markets food and fiber products.

II. Family Living (FL)

FL educational programs are designed to help citizens resolve personal growth and development, nutrition and health, housing and home management, family resource, and related individual and community programs.

III. 4-H Youth

4-H youth educational programs offer young people opportunities to acquire practical knowledge, useful skills sensitivity to issues and people with a focus on natural resources, economics and business, animals, home economics, plants, mechanics, and social and personal development. Volunteer adult and teen leaders are a vital part of the program.

IV. Community Resource Development (CRD)

CRD educational programs provide education to help individuals and groups of differing social and economic levels to achieve rational, informed participation in and sensitivity to public affairs and other public concerns that affect the quality of community life.

Although not publicized in mainstream education and training publications, over 3,000 Cooperative Extension stations play a vital part in assisting rural youth and adults in developing lifelong learning skills through agricultural, vocational, and home economics education and training.

Community and Technical Colleges

Throughout the U. S. comprehensive community colleges offer academic programs for transfer to four year colleges. In addition, they provide vocational and technical training, retraining, and upgrading skills. Students weak in basic skills or knowledge necessary for entrance or completion of programs receive opportunities for support services such as:

1) (ABE) Adult Basic Education: for students below the 8th grade level in general academic knowledge.

2) (GED) General Education Development: for students below the 12th grade level in general academic knowledge.

3) (ESL) English as a second language: for immigrant students who are weak in reading, writing, or speaking English.

4) (ITP) Individualized Tutorial Program: specific subject areas where a student might need improvement.

5) (SN) Special needs instruction: for socially disadvantaged and handicapped students.

The community college also offers a variety of personal interaction skills, lifelong learning skills, and professional development classes needed by the local community.

The community college, by design, offers opportunities for students who cannot attend a university due to economic conditions, or a second chance for adults or young people who were not successful in secondary school. Due to inflating university tuition fees in most States, only the financially elite class, students receiving scholastic scholarships, or ethnic and low income persons eligible for Federal and State financial aid can afford to attend the university. Therefore, the community college with lower tuition fees has provided the working class opportunities for a quality academic, vocational, or combination of academic and vocational education.

Most community colleges offer the two year Associate of Arts, Associate of Arts and Sciences, and Associate of Science university direct transfer degrees. They also offer two year Associate of Applied Science and Associate of Technology non-transferable degrees. In addition, they offer many specialty certificates of completion for vocational training of less than two years.

In Alaska and British Columbia, Canada, community colleges have deviated from the conventional two year institution and developed a new model that combines several community colleges together as a community university offering extended four year baccalaureate degrees.

Similar to the community college are the two year technical colleges. Although some technical colleges offer university transfer degrees, their mission is to prepare students for success in the workforce. Utilizing industry advisors and community members, and through developing partnerships with business, the technical college offers competency based training, retraining, and upgrade skills.

Technical colleges offer preparatory (initial job training), supplemental (retraining or upgrading skills), apprenticeship instruction (instruction with respect to labor unions), customized industry training, and place special emphasis on vocational training for the socially disadvantaged.

As in the community college, technical colleges assist students weak in basic skills or knowledge necessary for entrance or completion of programs with support training in ABE, GED, ESL, ITP, and SN.

Technical colleges initiate, implement, and maintain programs to fulfill the needs of society, industry, and students. Each program has an advisory committee of industry representatives, divided equally of management and labor, pertaining to the craft. The advisory committee works closely with the program. The members project labor force needs, conduct student placement analysis, and write yearly specifications for the school, indicating whether the program should be expanded, curtailed, maintained, or abolished.

The technical college offers specialized training. Communicative, numerical, scientific, and human relation skills are embedded in practical instruction. Only relevant training that leads to mastery of skills, job placement, and retention is offered.

Instructors are masters of their craft with several years experience in their particular fields. Instructors are appointed directly from industry and remain current with the industry, via an advisory committee, industry upgrade training, or back to industry training. This assures that students receive the best possible knowledge and training for the job.

Most technical colleges utilize a format Monday - Friday, five - six hour contact day, and one or two instructors to a group of students. These instructors assist the students through a combination of classroom theory and practical hands-on application. In addition to the vocational instruction, most colleges require students to successfully complete courses in technical math (usually offered in an applied atmosphere), technical writing and composition, speech and interpersonal communications, and human relations.

Technical colleges are noted for their part time industry upgrade offerings and the customized training courses they develop for businesses to offer specific industry upgrade programs.

In the United States, most technical colleges and many community colleges develop training partnerships with the Joint Apprenticeship Training Committees (JATC's -- comprising equal membership from management and labor, usually union affiliated) to offer apprenticeship training.

In Canada, the community college, in partnership with the employer, union, and governing board, offers the apprenticeship training.

Preparing today's workforce for tomorrow's job challenges is both a group and an individual effort for the many educational facilities. As a group, the community and technical colleges are striving to meet these challenges.

Vocational Technical Institutes

In many states, vocational technical institutes are equivalent to technical colleges.

There are several vocational technical institutes that are expanding their educational and training offerings to offer two and four year degrees. The Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) in the United States and the British Columbia Institute of Technology (BCIT) in Canada are two examples of highly recognized institutes.

One must be careful to distinguish OIT and BCIT, which prepare students for the workforce, from schools like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), a research and engineering school equivalent to a university. There are also schools, such as the Union Institute, that are best portrayed as private liberal arts universities.

Schools change their missions without always changing their names. Thus, in the United States, the technical college, business college, institute, college, and university are hard to differentiate from name alone.

Apprenticeship

Apprenticeship training in the U. S. is limited mostly to the building trades. As per most training in the U. S., apprenticeship training is controlled at the state level. Most States have a State Apprenticeship Coordinating Board charged with approval and assessment of apprenticeship programs. These boards comprise of members from industry management and labor (almost exclusively union representatives).

Most States fund the apprenticeship training through the technical or community colleges with additional funds from each Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee (JATC's -- comprising equal membership from management and labor, usually union affiliated). The JATC produces revenue by assessing funds from the employer, journeypersons, and apprentices.

The technical and community colleges develop training partnerships with the JATC to offer apprenticeship training. There are two training models utilized in the State of Washington that are

similar to models offered in other states. Washington executes the principal model by way of colleges employing the instructors (often journeypersons recommended by the JATC) to train the apprentices 144 - 260 hours per year. The apprentices attend classes from 1-2 nights per week, Saturdays, or full time a 4-5 weeks annually for a duration of 2-5 years.

Although the second model is funded through the college, the JATC hires the instructors and trains the apprentices at their training facility. It is most prevalent in this model for the apprentices to receive training full time for 4-5 concurrent weeks annually.

Most of the few apprenticeship trades in the U. S. are affiliated with labor unions. The unions allow journeypersons opportunities to travel from State to State to acquire gainful employment. In contrast, Canada has 169 apprenticable occupations (considerably more than the U. S.), though there are not more than 100 in any one province. Canada has the Red Seal program, allowing 44 of the trades mobility to seek employment in other provinces. (Canadian Labor Force Development Board 1994)

In comparison to the United States, Canada has a larger percentage of union labor force and, therefore, a larger emphasis on apprenticeship. The community college or vocational institute, in partnership with the employer, union, and Provincial Apprenticeship Board, offers the apprenticeship training. Training is usually 6-8 months full time, prior to entering the workplace. Apprentices then receive classroom training part time as required by their apprenticeship agreements.

In British Columbia, the Provincial Apprenticeship Board is working to expand the quality and scope of apprenticeship through ongoing committees in apprenticeship, equity, and development. Furthermore, the Board has set up special task committees in compulsory certification, flexible learning alternatives, enhancement of trade advisory committees, scope of work experience and hours of work experience, cooperative education, expansion of apprenticeships and new trades and occupations, and secondary school apprenticeships. (Foxcroft, 1995)

Through cooperative education, the Provincial Apprenticeship Board is working diligently to place students from grades 11 and 12 into apprenticeships through training partnerships with schools and employers. British Columbia is the second province in Canada to offer secondary

school apprenticeships. The goals are to reduce youth unemployment and enhance the skills of the Canadian workforce. (Foxcroft, 1995).

Alternating Training

The Ford "Asset" corporation initiated program in the U. S. is similar to the modified apprenticeship model in U. K., the school-based "alternance" in France, and employer-based hospital nursing training in Canada. In the Ford "Asset" model the community or technical college promotes the program and initiates a group interview between prospective trainees and participating Ford and Lincoln automotive service agencies. After a three way partnership agreement between the trainee, the service agency, and the college is administrated, the service agency employs the trainee. The trainee participates in classroom instruction for approximately 9-12 weeks, alternating with another 9-12 weeks of full time paid work experience for a period of two years. Although the trainee is responsible for college tuition as well as fees, books, and tools, the Ford Motor Company has assisted students with scholarships. The two year alternating training culminates with the trainee receiving an Associate of Applied Science Degree from the college, in addition to full time employment as a Ford automotive technician. (Ford Motor Company, 1994).

General Motors has developed a similar alternating training plan and other corporations are also considering this type of training scheme.

Employer Based Training

Due to the competition in today's global economy, state tax reductions, grant incentives, contract requirements, and ISO 9000 accreditation requirements, many employers are taking a second look at the benefits of offering employer based training.

Employers are appointing training coordinators to implement in-house training, contracting with training consultants or training companies, and developing partnerships for customized training with colleges and universities to upgrade employee knowledge and skills. Their training schemes cover seven distinct training areas:

1. **Basic skills assessment and training.** Some employers, when negotiating with labor, have difficulty at first in offering educational assessment. However, with the media

attention on the global economy and plant closures, many employers are becoming successful in motivating employees to undertake basic skills assessment and training.

2. **School to work, co-op or Tech-Prep.** Many employers across the nation have developed partnerships with schools in order to offer on-the-job training for high school students and co-op work experience for technical and community college vocational students.

3. **Special groups.** Employers are benefiting from tax relief and grant funding for training entry level workers from special interest groups, e.g., welfare recipients, dislocated workers, rehabilitated workers, etc.

4. **Apprenticeship training.** Primarily the building trades utilize apprenticeship training in partnership with the JATC's.

5. **Technical upgrade training.** Employers are implementing skills upgrade programs to meet the changing needs in today's high-tech workforce.

6. **Professional level skills.** Utilizing universities, employers are developing upgrading programs for their professional personnel.

7. **Interpersonal skills.** Employers are preparing their employees through "Total Quality Management" (TQM), group dynamics, and interpersonal skills in order to succeed with the new "lean" corporation model.

In Canada, as in U. S., it is difficult to assess the level and quality of employer based training. According to Canada's 1991 National Training Survey, employers' records do not clearly identify the scope of their employer-based training. The Canadian Labour Force Development Board Task Force on Transition into Employment recommended that the Board research and develop a standard approach to recording employer based training activities. (Canadian Labour Force Development Board. 1994).

K-12 Skill Centers

Across the U. S., several secondary school districts or consortiums of districts operate skill centers, providing entry level vocational training for their students. These skill center offerings go beyond the standard high school industrial arts or auto shop class to offer specific training in fields such as electronics, welding, cosmetology, culinary arts, and business computer applications.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational & Applied Technology Act and the Tech-Prep movement enhances the funding for programs in these K-12 skill centers. In addition, the U. S. Joint Training Partnership Act (JTPA) mandates policy for funding secondary and post-secondary training. (Employment and Training Administration 1995).

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act

"It is the purpose of this Act to make the United States more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of all segments of the population. This purpose will principally be achieved through concentrating resources on improving educational programs leading to academic and occupational skill competencies needed to work in the technologically advanced society." (The Carl D. Perkins Vocational & Applied Technology Act. 1990).

Monies provided by this Act through state block grants and directly from the U. S. Department of Education has aided vocational education. Funding covers seed and operations money for a multitude of vocational training schemes. The following outlines provisions of this Act: (U. S. Congress, 1990)

Title I - Vocational Education Assistance to States
- Part A - Allotment and Allocation
- Part B - State Organizational and Planning Responsibilities

Title II - Basic State Grants for Vocational Education
- Part A - State Programs
- Part B - Other State Administered Programs
- Part C - Secondary, Post-secondary, and Adult Vocational Programs

Title III - Special Programs
- Part A - Community Based Organizations
- Part B - Consumer and Home-making Education
- Part C - Comprehensive Career Guidance and Counseling Programs
- Part D - Business Labor Education Partnership for Training
- Part E - Tech-Prep Education
- Part F - Supplemental State Grant for facilities and equipment and other program improvement activities
- Part G - Community Education Centers and Lighthouse Schools
- Part H - Tribal Controlled Post-secondary Vocational Institution

Title IV - National Programs
- Part A - Research and Development
- Part B - Demonstration Programs
- Part C - Vocational Education and Occupational Information Data Systems

Part D - National Council on Vocational Education
Part E - Bilingual Vocational Training
Part F - General Provisions
Title V - General Provisions
Part A - Federal Administrative Provisions
Part B - State Administered Provisions
Part C - Definitions
Title VI - Miscellaneous
Part A - Correctional Education
Part B - Study of the Dual System of Vocational Education in the Republic of Germany

School to Work

The U. S. school-to-work scheme is administered by the individual states and has taken many directions and titles. The generic scheme involves partnerships between businesses and schools for training students from grades 11 and 12 in the workplace for entry level employment. This is facilitated through youth apprenticeships, cooperative training, and on the job training from the employer. Many secondary schools and colleges have combined the school-to-work scheme with Tech-Prep, offering career pathways.

As discussed under "Apprenticeships", two Canadian provinces have developed schemes to place students from grades 11 and 12 into apprenticeships through training partnerships with the school, employer, and the Provincial Apprenticeship Board. (Foxcroft, 1995).

A SCANS REPORT FOR AMERICA 2000

In 1992, the U. S. Department of Labor Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills published *Learning a living: A blueprint for high performance. A SCANS Report for America 2000.* This report identified workplace knowledge and skills that young people need for success in the workplace. This report was instrumental in development of many training schemes for young people. Therefore, this paper includes a summary of the SCANS Report.

This comprehensive report identifies the SCANS workplace know-how and learning models. The SCANS workplace know-how acknowledges the need for young people to earn a decent living in the global economy of today and tomorrow. The report calls for restructuring America's schools, government interaction and support to bridge the gap between school and the

high performance workplace, as well as employers incorporating the SCANS workplace know-how into the human resource agenda.

As *A Blueprint for High Performance* indicates, the report emphasizes methodology to accomplish the goal of the SCANS workplace know-how. Integration of workplace know-how into all instruction requires the restructuring of K-12 schools, change in teacher attitudes, teaching styles, and development of relationships between schools and employers.

This report indicates that training for all young people must include these five workplace competencies and three foundation skills, referred to in the report as the workplace know-how: (The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary skills, 1992)

Workplace Competencies -- Effective workers can productively use:

- Resources -- they know how to allocate time, money, materials, space, and staff.
- Interpersonal Skills -- they can work on teams, teach others, serve customers, lead, negotiate, and work well with people from culturally diverse backgrounds.
- Information -- they can acquire and evaluate data, organize and maintain files, interpret and communicate, and use computers to process information.
- Systems -- they understand social, organizational, and technological systems; they can monitor and correct performance; and they can design or improve systems.
- Technology -- they can select equipment and tools, apply technology specific task, and maintain and troubleshoot equipment.

Foundation Skills: -- Competent workers in the high-performance workplace need:

- Basic Skills -- reading, writing, arithmetic and mathematics, speaking and listening.
- Thinking Skills -- the ability learn, to reason, to think creatively, to make decisions, and to solve problems.
- Personal Qualities -- individual responsibility, self esteem, and self management, sociability, and integrity.

The report elaborates on methodology to reinvent K-12 education to meet what the workplace requires of schools.

In the new model, the teacher role changes from the often autocratic lecture method to a facilitator or "coach" teaching style. Teachers will utilize a new assessment design tied to learning goals to enhance student skills. Student assessment changes will identify student know-how through analysis of student portfolios and learning projects. Through integrating academics and applied instruction, students learn in order to do, rather than in order to know.

The report offers examples of the SCANS perspective for different subjects in the classroom. Among these methods, instruction changes from the teacher planning the activity, to

the student and teacher planning and negotiating the activity, from students working alone to students working routinely with teachers, peers, and community members, and from theoretical and "academic" thinking to problem solving, reasoning, and decision making.

Restructuring the schools from kindergarten through college, redesigning work-base learning, and embedding the workplace know-how skills with lifelong learning, provides successful workplace opportunities for disadvantaged young people with different learning styles, with limited English-speaking abilities, or from low income families.

In addition, this report describes a "2+2" training system where students, who have obtained the SCANS fundamental skills by age 16, enter the workplace, community, or technical college.

Through building partnerships and working relationships between education, businesses, associations, government employers, and labor organizations, young people receive work-based learning which provides opportunities for developing workplace competencies.

In addition, this report offers examples and identifies the need for employer involvement in developing schemes for workplace upgrade and SCANS skills for adults currently in the workplace.

If educators and employers follow *A Blueprint for High Performance*, the workplace needs quoted in the report by Demming, Peter Drucker, MIT Commission on Industrial Productivity, the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, and other experts on organizational improvement, will be met with a high-wage, high-employment economy.

Tech-Prep

Daniel Hull, President of the Center for Occupational Research and Development, and Dale Parnell, President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and Professor at Oregon State University, are credited as the fathers of the Tech-Prep movement. In Parnell's book, *The Neglected Majority*, he defined the need for major changes in the U. S. secondary educational system. Parnell stated that in most high schools 25% of the students are in the college prep track and will go on to some college, 25% of the students are involved in vocational courses that prepare them to enter the workforce, and the remaining 50% are receiving "general education" and are prepared neither for college nor for work. Parnell refers to these students as the "neglected

majority" and explains that in many high schools the neglected majority may be closer to 70% of the young people. (1985)

In *The Neglected Majority*, Parnell introduced the 2+2 Tech-Prep/Associate Degree program. In 1991 Parnell and Daniel Hull edited the *Tech Prep Associate Degree: A Win/Win Experience*. Parnell has traveled around the country speaking to educators and policy makers advocating Tech-Prep.

The SCANS report identified the need for and advantages of Tech-Prep. Utilizing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology ACT, the federal government used state block grants to fund Tech-Prep programs throughout the country. Most states allow individual consortiums, comprising technical or community colleges, high schools, community members, and business representatives, to determine the strategy for their Tech-Prep training.

In addition, corporations have assisted the funding for Tech-Prep and the school-to- work transitions. In the State of Washington, Boeing has awarded over four million dollars in direct grants to various districts to help develop applied academic coursework. The State will receive 1.94 million dollars from the federal government for Tech-Prep in the 95-96 school year. (Washington State Board for Community and Technical College. 1995)

Most Tech-Prep programs offer applied academic courses in the high schools, lifelong learning skills, teach the SCANS know-how, and utilize career pathways. One dynamic model currently running in Whatcom County is developing county wide portfolios covering skills students have mastered from any of the county schools. High school students are prepared with the firm academic and technical foundation required for transition to employment. Students are able to articulate their knowledge and skills into the county's technical or community college. Students earn college credit through approved high school Tech Prep courses. (Whatcom County Tech Prep Consortium, 1995).

Whatcom County Tech Prep Consortium and many other communities are working toward a new vision as quoted from the Spring 1995 newsletter:

> Envision a comprehensive high school that enriches education for all students with better integration of vocational and academic.
>
> Envision school as an entity serving the needs of all students in a geographic area, rather than being defined as a physical facility - a school that may be under more than one roof and which uses the community as an extension school.

Envision a school that operates as a learning community, and where learner outcomes, the learning process, school organization, staffing, and partnerships with other organizations and agencies are all fully aligned.

Envision a school with an environment so rich in discovery opportunities that learning is a naturally occurring, self-motivating phenomenon.

This vision represents a synthesis of education's best practices. And is reachable. School-To-Work Transition/Tech Prep is the system which allows the vision to become a reality.

School-To-Work is the school. It is a "process" rather than program or product. Tech Prep is a series of concepts that provide an opportunity for School-To-Work Transition to develop.

Skills Now

In British Columbia, the Colleges and Technical Programs Branch of the Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour released a request for proposal on May 29, 1995 for "Skills Now - Real Skills for the Real World." Although the program is in the development stage, it calls for work-based training, school, industry, labor, and community partnerships, and looks to resemble the U. S. Tech-Prep model.

Welfare to Work -- Jobs Program

President Clinton developed the Welfare-to-Work program wherein welfare recipients will receive up to two years of training through colleges, on the job training, or a combination of both. Employers receive tax incentives to hire and offer training. Recipients are assisted through the Allowance For Dependent Children (AFDC) program. This program is administered by state welfare departments. Furthermore, participants receive career and guidance counseling to assist their transition to the training program and to the workplace. Likewise, Canada implements similar training schemes through the Ministry of Social Services.

Dislocated Timber Workers

After the U. S. Congress passed federal timber regulations displacing thousands of timber workers, the executive branch of the government funded for the retraining of displaced timber workers. The funds were dispersed through state block grants to highly impacted areas. However, the funds fell short of intended goals. For example, in Whatcom County, Washington State, the

Bellingham Technical College received 167 applications from displaced loggers and funding for one year of training for 44 displaced loggers. Due to the political climate and environmental issues, the government has not allocated additional funds for this program.

Dislocated Workers

The dislocated workers training program is implemented when there is a large reduction in local workforce or when a company closes, leaving several workers unemployed and needing retraining for employment. The program covers up to two years of training in a technical or community college, covers specialty work clothes, tools, and vehicle expenses to prepare dislocated workers to re-enter the workforce. In addition, guidance counseling helps participants prepare for transition to the training program and to the workplace. In addition, this program utilizes both state and federal money and is administered through state employment agencies. Utilizing the Federal Human Resource Development Canada Employment Centers and provincial agencies such as the Ministry of Skills in British Columbia, similar programs assist dislocated workers.

Veteran Training

This program funds training for dislocated and disabled veterans. Each veteran's needs are analyzed on an individual basis and funding of up to $12,000 is available to cover the cost of training, special clothing, tools, and vehicle expenses. Participants receive career and guidance counseling to assist their transition to the training program and to the workplace. This program is federally funded and administered by the Veterans Administration.

Rehabilitation Programs

Federal, state, and private insurance company rehabilitation programs cover training expenses to assist disabled and rehabilitated persons prepare for the workforce. Most programs analyze each case individually and assist as needed with safety clothing, tools, vehicle expenses, and sometimes child care. As in the previous special needs programs, guidance counselors assist the participant in preparing for the training program and the workplace. Many of these programs fall short of effectively preparing people for the workforce by placing a maximum of $5,000 to $6,000 on funds. These programs are administered by numerous state agencies, private insurance

companies, private rehabilitation clinics, and private industry counsels (PIC). The U. S. Joint Training Partnership Act (JTPA) mandates policy for many federal programs administered through local Service Delivery Areas (SDA's). (Employment and Training Administration 1995). Canada implements similar programs through the Workers Compensation Board.

Conclusion

With the many players in the American education and training landscape, Canada and the United States endeavor to identify premium models for the global economy of today and tomorrow. Throughout the vast political arena, any and all schemes meet opposition and political debate from numerous interest groups. Regulation at the federal level is insurmountable in United States, due to the constitutional authority of the states. Likewise, the Canadian province's are opposed to relinquishing jurisdiction to the federal government.

Therefore, the ideology introduced in the SCANS 2000 report supports efforts to ascertain competency of persons leaving vocational education and workforce training programs, through restructuring K-12 teaching styles and assessment methods at all levels.

Bibliography

Alfred, R. L. & Carter, P. (eds.). (1993). Changing Managerial Imperatives. *New Directions For Community Colleges, 84.*

American Vocational Association. (1985). *Adults in the changing workplace.* Arlington Virginia: American Vocational Association, Inc.

Axworthy, L. (1994). *Agenda: Jobs and growth. Improving social security in Canada: Discussion paper summary.* (Cat. No. SC-036-09-94). Canada: Human Resources Development Canada.

Carnevale, A. P., Gainer, L. J., Villet, J., & Holland, S. L. (1990). *Training partnerships: linking employers with providers.* Prepared by The Society for Training and Development under a research grant from the U. S. Department of Labor.

Commission on Colleges. (1992). *Accreditation handbook.* Seattle: Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

Cooperative Extension. (1989). Unpublished Manuscript.

Decker, L. E. & Romney, V. A. (eds.). (1992). *Educational restructuring and the community education process.* Alexandria, VA: University of Virginia.

Dertouzos, M. L., Lester, R. K., Solow, R. M., & The MIT Commission on Industrial Productivity. (1989). *Made in America: Regaining the productive edge*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Employment and Training Administration, (1995). *JTPA financial management.* U. S. Department of Labor.

Ford Motor Company (1994). *Asset.* Promotional brochure distributed by Ford Motor Company.

Foxcroft, E. (1995, February). *Provincial Apprenticeship Board.* Paper presented at the meeting on Apprenticeships - A Training Scheme of the Past for the Labour Market of the Future? Vancouver, BC.

Gardner, D. P. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Gittell, M., Berube, M. R., Demas, B. H., Flavin, D., Rosentraub, M., Spier, A., & Tatge, D. (1973). *School boards and school policy.* New York: Praeger.

Gregor, A. D., et. al. (Ed.). (1992). *Higher education in Canada.* (Cat. No. S2-196/1992E). Canada: Association for Canadian Studies for the Research and Information on Education Directorate of the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Simon & Schuster

Hodgson, E. D. (1988). *Federal involvement in public education.* Toronto: Canadian Education Association.

Houston, P. D., et. al. (1994). *Roles and relationships: School boards and superintendents.* Arlington, Virginia: The American Association of School Administrators.

Hull, D. M. & Parnell, D. (eds.). (1991). *Tech Prep Associate Degree: A win/win experience*. Waco, Texas: The Center for Research and Development.

Matthews, J. M., & Swanson, R. G., Kerker, R. M.. (eds.). (1991). *From politics to policy: A case study in educational reform.* New York: Praeger.

Marshall, C., Mitchell, D., & Wirt, F. (1989). *Culture and education policy in the American States.* Bristol, PA: Falmer.

Martin, W. B. W. & Macdonell, A. J. (1982). *Canadian education.* Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall.

Maxwell, J., et. al. (1992). *A lot to learn: Education and training in Canada.* (Cat. No. EC22-182/1992E). Canada: A statement by the Economic Council of Canada.

Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour, Colleges and Technical Programs Branch. (1995). *Skills Now: Real skills for the real world.* Unpublished request for proposal.

Mitchell, D. & Encarnation, J. (1994). Alternative state policy mechanisms for influencing school performance. *Educational Researcher, 13,* (5). (pp. 4-11).

National Center on Education and the Economy. (1992). *A human resources development plan for the United States.*

Newton, K., et. al. (1992). *Education and training in Canada.* (Cat. No. EC22-188/1992E). Canada: A research paper published by the Canada Communication Group.

Parnell, D. (1985). *The neglected majority.* Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. (1990). *America's choice: High skills or low wages.* Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Report of the Task Force on Transition into Employment. (1994). *Putting the pieces together: Toward a coherent transition system for Canada's labour force.* (CLFDB Report No. 17). Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Labour Force Development Board.

Secretary of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy.* Washington: U. S. Department of Education.

The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, U. S. Department of Labor (1992). *Learning a living: A blueprint for high performance.* Washington: U. S. Government.

Sexton, D. L. (1982). Developing skills in grant writing. *Nursing Outlook,* 30(1), 31-38.

Skilbeck, H. et. al. (1994). The 'schooling' and 'working life' models. In *The Vocational Quest: New directions in education and training.* (pp. 62-105). London: Routledge

Smith, D. T. (1990). *Americans in agriculture portraits of diversity.* Washington, DC: Department of Agriculture.

U. S. Congress. (1990). *The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act.* Washington, DC: Department of Education

Washington State Board for Community and Technical College. (1995). *Tech Prep in Washington State.* Olympia, WA

Whatcom County Tech Prep Consortium. (1995). *Tech Prep: Whatcom County.* Bellingham, WA

A

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Policymakers and the Players: An Overview of United States and Canadian Vocational Education and Workforce Training Schemes	
Author(s): Gene E. Fusch	Written in 1994
Corporate Source: DNA	~~Publication~~ Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ ☑	Level 2A ↑ ☐	Level 2B ↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Gene E Fusch	Printed Name/Position/Title: GENE E. FUSCH Ph.D. Student UBC	
Organization/Address: 6710 Grandview Road Arlington, WA 98223-8643	Telephone: (360) 435-4085	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: fusch@whidbey.net	Date: 4-9-98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: DNA - [illegible]
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name: DNA - [illegible]
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Associate Director for Database Development
ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: