**Present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Councilmembers\*** | **Title/Affiliation** |
| **Brian S. Cavey** | **- Chairman/Employee Representative** |
| **Shaunta Chapple**  **Lateefah Durant**  **Harry Preston** | **- Public Representative**  **- Public Representative**  **- Employee** |
|  |  |
| **Norbert R. Klusmann, Sr.**  **Terreia Smalls**  **Neil E. Wilford, Jr.** | **- Employee Representative**  **- Employee Representative**  **- Employee Representative** |
|  |  |
| **Stephanie Anderson**  **Michelle L. Butt** | **- Employer Representative**  **- Employer Representative** |
| **Tasha Cornish**  **Grant Shmelzer**  **Minah Woo** | **- Employer Representative**  **- Employer Representative**  **- Employer Representative** |

***\**** ***Before the meeting convened, Public Representative Shaunta Chapple notified Director Chris MacLarion that she would arrive late to and would likely leave before the meeting ended.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Other Attendees** | **Title/Affiliation** |
| **Jason Perkins-Cohen** | **- Deputy Secretary for Workforce Development and Adult Learning (DWDAL), Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Erin Roth** | **- Assistant Secretary, DWDAL** |
| **Lloyd Day** | **- Director Office of Workforce Development, DWDAL** |
| **Leza Griffith** | **- Maryland Assistant Attorney General** |
| **Christopher D. MacLarion** | **- Director, Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program (MATP)** |
| **Ginamarie Best** | **- Program Manager, MATP** |
| **Coral Crawford** | **- MATP** |
| **Roslyn Edson** | **- MATP** |
| **Heather Gee** | **- MATP** |
| **Kevin L. Hunt** | **- MATP** |
| **Sheila Jackson** | **- MATP** |
| **Faith Ramsburg** | **- MATP** |
| **Jennifer D. Runkles** | **- MATP** |
| **Jane Sinclair** | **- MATP** |
| **Robert J. Zimberoff** | **- MATP** |
| **Charles Wallace** | **- Maryland State Department of Education** |
| **Jennifer Griffin** | **- Maryland State Department of Education** |
| **Lynn Stone** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Molly Mesnard** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Aneta Lefterov** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Noah Gentry** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Logan Dean** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Teresa Mena** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Jacqueline Trieu** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Ann Gunning** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Jim Hoos** | **- Insulators Local 24 JAC** |
| **Keith Sydnor** | **- Laurel City Council** |
| **James Rzepkowski** | **- Howard Community College** |
| **Jeff Richmond** | **- Howard Community College** |
| **Jackie Anna** | **- Howard Community College** |
| **Michele Rich-Ianieri** | **- R.C. Fabricators** |
| **William Sheehan** | **- R.C. Fabricators** |
| **Susan Torpey** | **- Heidelberg Materials** |
| **Cristina Ramirez** | **- Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission** |
| **Boni King** | **-Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission** |
| **Sydney Cropp** | **-CroppMetcalfe** |
| **Stevie Keeley** | **- Badger Electric, Inc.** |
| **Jerome Miller** | **- IBEW Local 24** |
| **Nick DiMartino** | **- IBEW Local 24** |
| **Emily Grindstaff** | **- Goodrich Fire LLC** |
| **Richard Kozel** | **- Goodrich Fire LLC** |
| **Loraine Taylor** | **- Carter Machinery** |
| **Damon Nicholson** | **- Deep Creek Lake HVAC** |
| **Melissa Nicholson** | **- Deep Creek Lake HVAC** |
| **Charlotte Marz** | **- Calvert Internal Medicine** |
| **Todd Haynes** | **- GSK** |
| **Landon Marttinen** | **- AUI, Inc.** |
| **Selina Allen** | **- Maryland Department of Transportation** |
| **Mark Burkhardt** | **- Maryland Department of Transportation, Maryland Transit Administration** |
| **Brandee Gross** | **- Maryland Department of Transportation** |
| **Kylee Parker Sr.** | **- Maryland Department of Transportation, Maryland Transit Administration** |
| **Michael Genevro** | **- Parker Plastics** |
| **Louis Monk** | **- Baltimore City Mayor's Office of Employment Development** |
| **Bevlyn Best** | **- Baltimore City Mayor’s Office of Employment Development** |
| **Stephanie Strianse** | **- Dr. Masica Jordan, LLC** |
| **Carrie Aaron** | **- Hub Labels** |
| **Rilee March** | **- Hub Labels** |
| **Laura Bart** | **- Maryland Office of the Attorney General** |
| **Marco Chiarabelli** | **- Ficep Corporation** |
| **Doreen Shahan** | **- ABC Metro Washington** |
| **Olivia Obuadey** | **- Albeniz Care Agency** |
| **Carl Kushinsky** | **- Anne Arundel Workforce Development Corporation** |
| **Tasha Cornish** | **- Cybersecurity Association of Maryland, Inc.** |
| **Dolly Bermudez** | **- Howard County Office of Workforce Development** |
| **Yesenia Barrera** | **- Baltimore Mayor’s Office of Employment Development** |
| **Nancy Palardy** | **- Anne Arundel County Government** |
| **Shane Wolf** | **- Anne Arundel County Government** |

**Chairman Cavey called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. at Insulators Local Union No. 24, 901**

**Montgomery Street, Laurel, Maryland.**

**I. OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman Cavey thanked outgoing Council members for their years of faithful service to this Council, the State of Maryland and to Registered Apprenticeship. Chairman Cavey said as part of the Council they helped oversee the growth of apprenticeship from 7,000 to 8,000 apprentices to a high of more than 12,000 apprentices.

Chairman Cavey said the outgoing Council members were David Wilson, employee; Allen Clinedinst III, employee representative; David Smarte, employer representative; Leon Bromley, employer representative; and Ryan Sackett, public representative.

Chairman Cavey said former Maryland Department of Labor Assistant Secretary James Rzepkowski put a lot of effort into improving the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program as well. Chairman Cavey said Mr. Rzepkowski was present at the meeting. Chairman Cavey asked for a round of applause for the outgoing Council members and Mr. Rzepkowski.

Chairman Cavey welcomed the new Council members. Chairman Cavey said it was great to have the new Council members at this meeting and he looked forward to working with the new Council members to help expand apprenticeship to even greater levels through the next several years. Chairman Cavey introduced the new Council members:

* Employee Harry Preston, Baltimore City Public Schools and the Baltimore Teachers Union;
* Employee Representative “T” Smalls. Chairman Cavey said he never referred to Mr. Smalls by his full first name. Mr. Smalls told Chairman Cavey to “just stick with T.” Chairman Cavey said Mr. Smalls was Business Manager at Plumbers Local 5;
* Employer Representative Tasha Cornish, Executive Director, Cybersecurity Association of Maryland;
* Employer Representative Minah Woo, Vice President of Workforce, Innovation & Strategic Partnerships, Howard Community College;
* Public Representative Lateefah Durant, Vice President of Innovation, City Works D.C.

Chairman Cavey invited Deputy Secretary for Workforce Development and Adult Learning (DWDAL) Jason Perkins-Cohen to speak. Mr. Perkins-Cohen apologized in advance and said he would depart this meeting at roughly 10 a.m. Mr. Perkins-Cohen said he looked forward to joining Council meetings in full in the future. Mr. Perkins-Cohen thanked the Council for its dedication to apprenticeship and welcomed the new Council members. Mr. Perkins-Cohen thanked the Chairman and the Council members for their dedication and passion for growing apprenticeship in Maryland while still maintaining the integrity of the program. Mr. Perkins-Cohen said the Council members maintained a delicate balance on the Council and in their professional lives. Mr. Perkins-Cohen thanked the Council members again and said he looked forward to working with them in the future. Chairman Cavey thanked Mr. Perkins-Cohen for his remarks.

Chairman Cavey congratulated Erin Roth on her recent promotion from DWDAL Deputy Assistant Secretary to DWDAL Assistant Secretary and invited Ms. Roth to speak. Ms. Roth said she worked closely with this Council for the past decade. Ms. Roth said it was a privilege and an honor to work with the Council. Ms. Roth said she was excited to continue to grow apprenticeship with the Council.

Chairman Cavey said he was the Apprenticeship Director and the Business Manager at Insulators Local Union No. 24, the host of this meeting. Chairman Cavey welcomed the Council, staff and guests. Chairman Cavey said this was his home and it was great to host the Council meeting. Chairman Cavey said the facility recently expanded. Chairman Cavey thanked the host’s current Business Manager Mike Moneymaker for his hospitality and for hosting the meeting. Mr. Moneymaker welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for attending.

Chairman Cavey said the City of Laurel, where this meeting occurred, was a great partner. Chairman Cavey said Insulators Local 24 partnered with the City of Laurel to host apprenticeship readiness programs. Chairman Cavey invited Laurel City Councilmember Keith Sydnor to speak. Mr. Sydnor welcomed everyone in attendance to Laurel on behalf of the Mayor and City Council. Mr. Sydnor thanked the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council, staff and stakeholders for their work. Mr. Sydnor said he had a military and law enforcement background. Mr. Sydnor said apprenticeship was an important potential pathway for young adults who reside in Laurel. Mr. Sydnor said he was running for Mayor of Laurel.

Chairman Cavey asked Council members, staff and attendees to introduce themselves.

**II.**  **Minutes of the May 16, 2023 Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council meeting.**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

Chairman Cavey asked Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program Director Chris MacLarion to present the Director’s Report.

**III. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**A.** Mr. MacLarion thanked Council members, staff and guests for attending. Mr. MacLarion thanked Mr. Moneymaker for hosting yet another Council meeting.

**B.**  Mr. MacLarion thanked and recognized the new Council members for serving at their first meeting. Mr. MacLarion said in his opinion this Council was one of the most productive councils in the State of Maryland and perhaps the entire country. Mr. MacLarion said he did not say this lightly nor in jest. Mr. MacLarion welcomed the new Council members to call him and program staff if they ever were to have any questions or concerns. Mr. MacLarion said Council agendas tend to be very long and full of very exciting things. Mr. MacLarion said the role of the Council is to advise the Division and the Maryland Secretary of Labor on apprenticeship, establish subcommittees where needed, make recommendations on apprenticeship policy, make recommendations on registration of new programs and registration of apprentices, and most importantly make recommendations which safeguard the welfare of apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said this was an important role and one that this Council embraced and performed to the highest standard. Mr. MacLarion welcomed the new Council members and thanked them for volunteering.

**C.** Apprenticeship Training Fund update:

* Total Fund Balance as of June 30, 2023, after all obligations was $1,336,395.90
* May contributions: $14,416.12
* June contributions: $14,556.64
* Payments from the fund totaled $16,812.45 which were refunds to a contractor who inadvertently made payments to the fund that were not from prevailing wage projects.

**D.** Mr. MacLarion said Youth Apprenticeship, formally known as the Apprenticeship Maryland Program or AMP, was preparing for a new school year. Mr. MacLarion said all 24 school systems were participating and staff anticipated having youth apprentices for all of those systems. Mr. MacLarion said staff also expected to see continued growth of youth apprentices who dually signed up as Registered Apprentices via School to Apprenticeship and there were sponsors on this meeting’s agenda seeking approval for that pathway. Mr. MacLarion said staff was planning to host a training session in the month following this meeting for local school system partners that would be conducted in partnership with the Maryland State Department of Education. Mr. MacLarion said the new Youth Apprenticeship Policy would take effect August 1, 2023. Mr. MacLarion said creating the new policy was a lengthy process and he thanked the many stakeholders who participated in creating the new policy.

**E.** Mr. MacLarion said, as an update from the May 2023 Council meeting, the East End Driving and Placement Service was sent the required notice of the Council’s action. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor did not respond to the first notice, and a second notice of deregistration was sent as required by regulation. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor replied to the second notice and requested a hearing with the Office of Administrative Hearings. Mr. MacLarion said the hearing was in process and staff would update the Council as soon as more information was available.

**F.** Mr. MacLarion said the apprenticeship system in Maryland continued to grow. Mr. MacLarion said the program continued to maintain more than 11,000 apprentices registered, working and learning. Mr. MacLarion said this was especially exciting because there were more graduations in the last fiscal year than in previous years with nearly 2,000 apprentices completing their programs.

**G.** Mr. MacLarion said National Apprenticeship Week 2023 was fast approaching, from November 13 to November 19, 2023. Mr. MacLarion asked anyone in attendance who was planning an event or knew of an event to please let staff know. Mr. MacLarion said staff was interested in publicizing or attending these events.

**H.** Mr. MacLarion said he would be happy to answer any questions.

A motion to approve the Director’s Report was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. NEW PROGRAMS:**

**1.** Calvert Internal Medicine Group (Jane Sinclair) - Occupation of Certified Clinical Medical Assistant. Related Instruction to be provided by the College of Southern Maryland, Request for registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures, goals, and timetables for minority and female apprentices. (Item 1)

Ms. Sinclair said this item was presented previously at the May 2023 meeting. Ms. Sinclair said she was joined by Charlotte Marz, the prospective sponsor’s representative.

Mr. Klusmann said it looked like the concern he had was addressed and thanked staff and the sponsor’s representative.

A motion to approve this new program and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**2.** Parker Plastics (Jennifer D. Runkles) - Revisions for the addition of two new sites for the delivery of Related Instruction classes (Hagerstown Community College and Blue Ridge Community and Technical College). (Item 2)

Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Michael Genevro, plant manager and the sponsor’s representative.

Mr. Klusmann asked if labs were provided at the worksite or at the community college. Ms. Runkles said labs were provided at the community college.

Mr. Wilford asked for clarification of which educational providers would be added if approved. Ms. Runkles said Tooling U was previously approved, and Hagerstown Community College and Blue Ridge Community and Technical College would be added if approved. Mr. Wilford asked if the instruction in Hagerstown would be in person. Ms. Runkles said the instruction at Hagerstown would be in person.

Mr. Shmelzer said the Tooling U instruction was sequential. Mr. Shmelzer asked if the instruction with the new providers would be sequential as well. Ms. Runkles said the instruction with the new providers would be sequential. Mr. Shmelzer asked if the sequence could be provided and Ms. Runkles answered yes.

A motion to approve these revisions was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. NEW PROGRAMS:**

**1.** Town of Berlin (Robert J. Zimberoff) - Occupation of Electrical Line Worker & Electric Meter Technician. Related Instruction to be provided by Northwest Lineman College both online and in-person. (Item 3)

Mr. Zimberoff said a representative from the prospective sponsor was not present and asked Chairman Cavey to consider hearing this item if a representative arrived. Chairman Cavey asked if any Council members objected, and hearing none, Chairman Cavey said the Council would hear this item if a representative arrived.

Later in this meeting, after the comfort break and before Item 19 was heard, Chairman Cavey said Mr. Zimberoff informed him that a representative had not arrived. Chairman Cavey, after hearing no objections from Council, tabled this item to the next Council meeting.

**2.** Goodrich Fire & Life Safety (Ginamarie Best) - Occupations of Sprinkler Fitter. Related Instruction to be provided in-house by the sponsor in-house online at their site in Hyattsville, Maryland. (Item 4)

Ms. Best said she was joined by Richard Kozel, president and the prospective sponsor’s representative.

Ms. Anderson asked how much of the annual training would be in person. Ms. Best said the instruction would occur on Tuesday and Thursdays for the entire year. Ms. Anderson asked if the total hours were six hours per week and Ms. Best answered yes.

A motion to approve this new program and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**3.** Deep Creek Lake HVAC (Jennifer Runkles) - Occupations of HVAC/R. Related Instruction to be provided in-house by the sponsor in-house online at their site in Garrett County, Maryland. (Item 5)

Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Damon Nicholson and Melissa Nicholson, owners and the prospective sponsor’s representatives.

Mr. Shmelzer said his biggest concern was the program’s long-term sustainability. Mr. Shmelzer asked for the educational provider’s plan to maintain all four years consistently. Ms. Runkles said she was working closely with Garrett Community College’s apprenticeship coordinator. Ms. Runkles said the college was working to form its next cohort, and was working on a cohort for the following year as well. Mr. Shmelzer asked if the college was committed to running classes even though there might only be two or three apprentices in two or three years. Ms. Runkles said she asked college representatives that specific question and they were committed to maintaining classes.

Ms. Anderson asked if classes were conducted in person, and Ms. Runkles answered yes.

A motion to approve this new program and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**4.** R.C. Fabricators, Inc. (Faith Ramsburg) - Occupation of Structural Metal Worker "lronworkers" and Welders & Fabricators. Related Instruction to be provided by The New Castle County Vocational and Technical School Districts Adult Education. (Item 6)  
  
Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Michele Rich-Ianieri and William Sheehan, the prospective sponsor’s representatives.

Mr. Klusmann asked the difference between the occupations of Ironworkers, and Welders and Fabricators. Ms. Ramsburg said the two occupations were included in Standards of Apprenticeship improved in the State of Delaware. Mr. MacLarion said Ironworkers worked in the field at construction sites. Mr. MacLarion said Welders and Fabricators worked in fabrication in a shop or manufacturing setting. Mr. Klusmann said in the shop or in the field, the work was the same. Mr. MacLarion said these were two distinct occupations.

Mr. Wilford asked if this was the same program that was registered in Delaware. Ms. Ramsburg answered yes.

Mr. Klusmann asked if the sponsor intend to do site work in Maryland and Ms. Ramsburg answered yes.

Ms. Anderson said this was the first time she saw a Delaware company located in Delaware seeking approval to register Standards of Apprenticeship in Maryland. Ms. Anderson asked if potential apprentices lived in Maryland or if the prospective sponsor intended to do site work in Maryland. Mr. MacLarion said sponsors located in other states was fairly common, including Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, D.C. and West Virginia. Mr. MacLarion said sometimes out-of-state businesses register in Maryland because of Prevailing Wage projects, or simply to have a program registered in Maryland. Chairman Cavey said, as an illustration, that Insulators Local 24 was registered in both Maryland and Washington, D.C.

Mr. Shmelzer asked the prospective sponsor’s representatives if they were satisfied with the instruction they were receiving from Delaware schools. The sponsor’s representatives said they received consistent feedback from the instructional providers and they were satisfied with the instruction they were receiving in the classroom correlating with the on-the-job training. Mr. Shmelzer asked the prospective sponsor’s representatives if they had any trouble in the past in obtaining records such as attendance, grades and classroom performance. Mr. Shmelzer said collecting such records from Delaware institutions caused issues for multiple sponsors of multiple occupations in the past. A sponsor’s representative said she had an established point of contact for collecting such records who regularly contacted the prospective sponsor with up-to-date information including apprentices who did not meet attendance requirements.

Ms. Durant asked with the training provided in Delaware, what was the plan for apprentices who reside in Maryland to attend in-person instruction at the New Castle, Delaware, facility. A prospective sponsor’s representative said she wanted employees to have an opportunity to choose their career pathways including the apprenticeship pathway. The prospective sponsor’s representative said Maryland residents who become apprentices would likely live near the Maryland/Delaware border and near the facility.

Mr. Smalls ask specifically where the facility was located. The prospective sponsor’s represented said in Wilmington, Delaware, near Interstate 495. Mr. Smalls asked if the sponsor intended to open a location in Maryland. The sponsor’s representative said there was no intent to open a Maryland location, but many Maryland employees worked at the Wilmington facility.

A motion to approve this new program and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**5.** Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) (Jane Sinclair) - Occupation of Bus Maintenance Mechanic(A-Repairman). Related Instructions to be provided by CCBC and MTA. (Item 7)

Ms. Sinclair said she was honored to be joined by Brandee Gross, program manager of workforce development in the human resources office at the Maryland Transportation Authority; Kylee Parker, the MTA bus maintenance apprenticeship program JAC chairman, and repairman; and Selina and Mark Burkhardt of the Maryland Department of Transportation.

Mr. Klusmann asked if a Class C driver’s license was a regular driver’s license. Ms. Sinclair answered yes. Mr. Klusmann said the standards stated that apprentices must be able to obtain a commercial driver’s license and Mr. Klusmann asked if CDL training was included in the apprenticeship program. Ms. Sinclair said CDL training was included in the apprenticeship program. Mr. Klusmann asked if costs were covered by the prospective sponsor and Ms. Sinclair said the costs were covered by the prospective sponsor.

Mr. Shmelzer said under section 8, hours of work for apprentices, he was concerned that this section stated that no apprentice would work overtime, and Mr. Shmelzer asked what would happen if an apprentice were to work overtime. Ms. Gross said that because this was a union shop, opportunities for overtime would be provided to the most senior employees and closely monitored. Ms. Gross said that overall working hours were closely monitored and apprentices would not work overtime even if they were in the middle of a job. Ms. Gross said that if apprentices or other workers were in the middle of a job, they would be granted time during regular hours to brief an incoming work crew so the incoming crew could continue the work, even in an emergency situation. Mr. Shmelzer said the standards reflected rules and regulations and he was not entirely comfortable with putting this in writing just in case apprentices ended up working overtime hours. Chairman Cavey said his interpretation of Ms. Gross’ statement was that there was a collective bargaining agreement which allowed for journeyworkers, but not apprentices, to work overtime; Ms. Gross said Chairman Cavey was correct. Ms. Gross said the shop operated 24 hours per day with ongoing shifts. Mr. Shmelzer said, “life happens,” and he remained concerned.

Ms. Durant said the on-the-job training appeared to be taking place in a Baltimore facility and the related instruction was provided by the Community College of Baltimore County. Ms. Durant asked if the prospective sponsor planned to eventually expand the on-the-job training to more facilities and if CCBC was the only possible educational provider. Ms. Gross said the training would occur at a specific location in Baltimore City, but the apprentices would work at various sites throughout Baltimore City.

Referring to Mr. Shmelzer’s earlier concern about this item and overtime, Mr. Smalls asked if the practice of not allowing new employees in training to work overtime was always the case. Ms. Gross said this practice was in place for a long time prior to seeking approval for this apprenticeship program.

Mr. Wilford asked if the 24-hour shop schedule would create challenges for apprentices related to attending the instructional portion of the apprenticeship. Ms. Gross said the apprentices will be paid for the instructional hours and the educational provider was planning classes for daytime and evening hours.

Mr. Wilford asked if CCBC was willing to maintain the courses even if enrollment diminished through the length of the program. Ms. Gross answered yes, the school would maintain the courses despite potential for diminishing enrollment.

A motion to approve this new program and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Ms. Anderson, Mr. Shmelzer abstained and all other Council members voted yea (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**B. PROGRAM REVISIONS:**

1. Carter Machinery (Chris MacLarion) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to add the occupations of Technical Sales Representative and Marine Shop and Field Technician. Related Instruction is to be provided in­ house by the sponsor. (Item 8)

Mr. MacLarion thanked Mr. Perkins-Cohen for attending this meeting as Mr. Perkins-Cohen departed seconds before Mr. MacLarion presented this item.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

1. AUi, Inc. (Faith Ramsburg) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to add Affirmative Action plan, change occupation name and correct the business name. (Item 9)

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Landon Marttinen, training manager for the sponsor.

Mr. Klusmann said there was a clause in the Standards of Apprenticeship saying that an apprenticeship opportunity would be provided to employees after 90 days of employment. Mr. Klusmann asked how apprentices were selected. Mr. Klusmann said without open enrollment, this appeared to be a very selective group of potential apprentices. Mr. Klusmann asked how this work. Mr. Klusmann said, “how do you become employed then become an apprentice? I thought you had to become an apprentice to be employed.” Mr. Klusmann asked for an explanation. Ms. Anderson and Mr. Klusmann said the language in question appeared on page 357 of the Council’s packet. Mr. MacLarion said this was an unusual requirement, but he had seen similar 90- to 100-day requirements in other programs. Mr. MacLarion said this was allowable, but he personally felt this was not a best practice. Mr. MacLarion said that if the sponsor made use of the ranking system as detailed in the Standards of Apprenticeship, this was an allowable practice. Mr. MacLarion said he would personally prefer to see the 90-day period eliminated, but the period was allowable. Mr. MacLarion asked the sponsor’s representative for clarification. The sponsor’s representative said this was a prerequisite, and most of the 90 days was dedicated to a pre-apprenticeship that taught basic skills that were not included in the Standards of Apprenticeship for the four-year apprenticeship program. Mr. Klusmann said, “so essentially, this apprenticeship is four years and three months.” Mr. Klusmann said his issue remained how apprentices were selected for the program. Mr. Klusmann asked if the sponsor selected apprentices or if the apprenticeship program was available to everyone. The sponsor’s representative said the apprenticeship was available to everyone.

Mr. Wilford said that apprentices wouldn’t be registered until they were already employed for 90 days, but the Standards of Apprenticeship stated that the apprentices would receive CDL training after 45 days. Mr. Wilford asked why the Sponsor didn’t register the apprentices immediately instead of waiting until they were employed for 90 days. The sponsor’s representative said after 45 days, the employees were placed on a more regimented schedule and in the next 45 days, CDL training began. The sponsor’s representative said the CDL training began within the 90-day period being questioned by Mr. Klusmann and Mr. Wilford.

Mr. Small asked if wages increased once the employees received a CDL. The sponsor’s representative said a wage increase was not included in the apprenticeship program, but the employees received a pay raise upon obtaining a CDL.

Ms. Woo asked if employees who completed the 90-day training but were not selected for the apprenticeship program would remain employed. Ms. Woo said this might not be a fair practice and a fair opportunity. Mr. Klusmann said the 90-day training, “doesn’t make sense.” Chairman Cavey asked for a response to Ms. Woo’s question; Chairman Cavey asked what would happen if someone completed the 90-day training but was not selected for the apprenticeship program. The sponsor’s representative said the employees in training were reviewed based on their core values, how they treat co-workers and their ability to learn. Chairman Cavey asked if this was how they were selected for apprenticeship or brand new employees. The sponsor’s representative said this was for brand new employees. Chairman Cavey asked, after 90 days, if they would go through another interview process, and the sponsor’s representative answered no. Chairman Cavey asked for details on the first 90-days and the apprentice selection process. The sponsor’s representative said they spend the first week at the shop location then they go out on the job. The sponsor’s representative said they train as pre-apprentices in the first 90 days.

Mr. MacLarion said he was confused. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor’s EEO plan was a rating system. Mr. MacLarion said the rating system detailed a score of one (1) to one hundred (100) with a minimum score of 70 needed to qualify for the apprenticeship program. Mr. MacLarion asked at what point the ranking system was used. Mr. MacLarion said if the sponsor was not using the ranking system then the sponsor was not using its EEO plan. Mr. MacLarion explained the outreach and recruiting methods that were included in the EEO plan. Mr. MacLarion said he was uncertain if the ranking system was being used and at what point the employees/apprentices were ranked. The sponsor said the ranking system was used to select apprentices after the 90-day training. Mr. MacLarion asked what happened to employees who weren’t selected for apprenticeship on the 91st day. The sponsor’s representative said the employees would remain employed after 90 days. Mr. MacLarion asked if employees who were not selected would remain on a ranking list to be considered for apprenticeship in the future and the sponsor’s representative answered yes. Mr. MacLarion asked the sponsor’s representative if he was aware that staff would conduct a review and request documentation related to hiring and the ranking system for employees who were and also were not selected to become apprentices, and the sponsor had to maintain these files; the sponsor’s representative answered yes that he was aware of this.

Mr. Wilford asked how long this sponsor had been registered. Mr. MacLarion said this sponsor was registered on September 14, 2021, and three active apprentices were registered at the time of this meeting.

Mr. Smalls asked the sponsor’s representative if, as a new employee, he participated in the training process, including the 90-day training period, and the sponsor’s representative answered no. Mr. Smalls asked if the sponsor’s representative went through a similar process. The sponsor’s representative answered yes, and said he was on the job working in the first 90 days, received training including CDL assistance, but after the 90 days, he did not become a formalized apprentice.

Mr. Klusmann said his questions remained unanswered and he was not comfortable with the 90-day period. Mr. Klusmann said the 90-day period appeared to be a gatekeeping item, that the apprenticeship opportunity did not include open enrollment, and the apprenticeship appeared to be for employees only.

Mr. Wilford asked how the issue with the 90-day period could be addressed. The sponsor’s representative said in some cases the sponsor would be able to waive the 90-day period. The sponsor’s representative said in some cases, individuals who were unable to receive a CDL would still be able to participate in the apprenticeship program. Mr. Wilford recommended enrolling apprentices immediately rather than after the 90-day training period and then removing apprentices from the Registered Apprenticeship program if they were unable to obtain a CDL.

Mr. MacLarion said if registered apprentices were able to participate in the program without a CDL, then the CDL requirement should be removed from the program. Mr. MacLarion said, “it’s all or nothing. … if you require the CDL, you require it. If you don’t, you don’t.” Mr. MacLarion said this would remove parody and potential for unfair treatment, intentional or otherwise. Mr. MacLarion suggested removing the CDL requirement, removing the 90-day pre-apprenticeship period, registering apprentices immediately and cancelling apprentices who were unable to complete the program after 90 days. Mr. MacLarion said the probationary period was 2,000 hours, or one year, so the 90-day period was well within the probationary period. Mr. MacLarion said operating in this way would be more within the sponsor’s Standards of Apprenticeship.

The sponsor’s representative said an entire section of learning in the 90-day period was not documented within the Standards of Apprenticeship. The sponsor’s representative said this would add many hours of training to the Registered Apprenticeship program. Mr. MacLarion suggested including the 90-day period in the Standards of Apprenticeship and registering apprentices upon hire in such a way that this would not impact the overall length of the program which was 8,000 hours or roughly four years.

Mr. Preston asked if the costs of CDL training were included in program. Mr. Preston said the program stated that the costs of the training were covered, but the hours dedicated to the training were not paid. The sponsor’s representative said the roughly $4,000 cost of CDL training was covered by the sponsor as needed. Mr. MacLarion clarified and asked the sponsor’s representative if apprentices or employees training in the 90-day period were compensated for their seat-time hours for the CDL. The sponsor’s representative said they were paid for their hours as CDL learner drivers, and if they passed the test they were compensated for the time it took to take the test as well.

Mr. Shmelzer asked Mr. MacLarion if a review of this program was scheduled in the near future. Mr. MacLarion said the review was already scheduled and it was to occur within a month of this meeting date.

Mr. Shmelzer made a motion to table this revision to the next Council meeting pending the results of the compliance review of this program; Mr. Klusmann seconded and the motion was unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

Chairman Cavey stated that Dr. Chapple arrived at this meeting, and her arrival should be recorded.

1. Badger Electric (Faith Ramsburg) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to add an Affirmative Action Plan. (Item 10)

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Stevie Keeley, office manager and the sponsor’s representative.

Mr. Smalls asked if the 13 potential apprentices were already employed by the sponsor. Ms. Ramsburg answered yes. Mr. Smalls asked how the 13 employees were classified. The sponsor’s representative said they were registered as apprentices in Delaware and this revision would enable the sponsor to register them in Maryland as well. Chairman Cavey asked if the 13 employees were in various points in the program. The sponsor’s representative answered yes. Chairman Cavey informed the sponsor’s representative that any apprentice to be registered with more than 50 percent credit would have to come before this Council. The sponsor’s representative said she was aware of this requirement.

A motion to approve this revision to add an Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Smalls and unanimously approved.

1. Baltimore Washington Laborers Joint Training Fund (Ginamarie Best) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship for update to wage progression. (Item 11)

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved.

**5.** CMH, Inc. DBA CroppMetcalf (Ginamarie Best) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to update the progressive wage scale. (Item 12)

Chairman Cavey asked if this revision was intended to get in line with Prevailing Wage. Ms. Best answered no, this revision was simply to update the journeyworker rate.

Mr. Wilford said one of the pay progressions appeared to be substantially lowered, from 94 to 88 percent. Ms. Best said the percentage was lowered, but overall, the pay was higher than previous years since the hourly journeyworker pay rate was raised.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved.

**6.** Dr. Masica Jordan, LLC (Ginamarie Best) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship for the add the occupation of Community Health Worker. Related instruction to be provided in-house/online at the sponsor's location in Upper Marlboro. (Item 13)

Dr. Chapple said she looked at the age requirement and was curious to know if the program would consider adding youth. The sponsor’s representative said she would consider adding youth.

Ms. Anderson asked if the related instruction occurred in person and Ms. Best answered yes.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Dr. Chapple and unanimously approved.

**7.** Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Ginamarie Best) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to update the age requirement. (Item 14)

Mr. Shmelzer asked if the occupations as designated for School to Apprenticeship were electrician, HVAC and plumber, and that this question was relevant to an agenda item to be heard later in this meeting. Ms. Best answered yes, and the sponsor was considering automotive for Youth Apprenticeship.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved.

**8.** NLP (Ginamarie Best) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to update the progressive wage scale. (Item 15 NLP)

A motion to approve this revision was made by Ms. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved.

**9.** GSK (Ginamarie Best) – Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to add a new occupation. (Item 15 GSK)

Mr. Shmelzer said, for clarification, that the education would be offered at numerous sites.

Mr. Wilford asked if the occupation was maintenance electrician or electrician. Ms. Best said the occupation was electrician.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Ms. Butt, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved.

**10.** Albeniz Care (Jennifer Runkles) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship for the addition of Affirmative Action Plan and revised Related Instruction. (Item 16)

Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Olivia Obuadey, CEO and the sponsor’s representative.

Mr. Wilford asked, for clarification, where the training would occur. Ms. Runkles explained training would occur at different facilities based on the occupations.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Dr. Chapple and unanimously approved.

**11.** Hub Labels (Jennifer Runkles) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to update the related instruction. (Item 17)

Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Carrie Aaron, general manager and apprenticeship coordinator, and Rilee March, HR specialist, and the sponsor’s representatives.

Mr. Klusmann said he requested at a previous Council meeting that the qualification to be within 50 miles of the work location be removed, but this qualification did not appear to be removed. Ms. Runkles said that the sponsor had no objection and this qualification would be updated when the revision in this item was filed.

A motion to approve this item with the condition that the 50-mile qualification be removed from the Standards was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved.

After the vote, Chairman Cavey asked Mr. MacLarion to check the minutes of a previous Council meeting in which Mr. Klusmann asked for the qualification to be removed.

**12.** IEC (Sheila Jackson) - Request for revision of the Standards of Apprenticeship to add additional locations. (Item 18)

Ms. Jackson said she was joined by Mr. Shmelzer, executive director, Council member, and the sponsor’s representative.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Ms. Butt, Mr. Shmelzer recused himself, and all other Councilmembers voted yea.

Chairman Cavey called for a five-minute comfort break before Item 19 was heard.

**C. PROGRAM REVIEWS [Five (5) or More Apprentices]:**

**1.** Baltimore County Police (Coral Crawford). (Item 19)

Dr. Chapple asked if the sponsor had a plan to address minority and female representation, since the sponsor’s outreach was not documented. Ms. Crawford said this was a difficulty since the sponsor’s staff who maintained the apprenticeship program did not have control over recruiting and outreach. Ms. Crawford said, to her knowledge, there was not a firm plan in place. Ms. Crawford said she could investigate, but a different section of the sponsor’s organization was responsible for recruiting and outreach. Dr. Chapple said she thought it was important for the sponsor to have, “a solid plan in place,” in order for the Council to approve of the continuation of this Registered Apprenticeship program, perhaps starting at the high school level. Ms. Crawford said, if the Council so wished, she could ask the sponsor’s staff who handled apprenticeship to contact the employment section to collect more details on female and minority outreach; Ms. Crawford said such information was not provided during the review. Chairman Cavey said if the Council were so moved, this would not be a request but a requirement. Chairman Cavey said this was a sponsor’s responsibility regardless of how the sponsor’s departments were organized. Mr. Klusmann said he would at least like to see some documentation of the effort toward recruiting female and minority apprentices. Mr. Smalls said he generally agreed with the sentiments stated by other Council members. Ms. Durant asked if the Council could request an action plan for future outreach. Mr. Shmelzer asked Mr. MacLarion if the changes in Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) policy were relevant to the conversation on this item. Mr. MacLarion said the policy was still in the approval process, but EEO regulations concurrent to the time of this meeting remained in place, including meaningful outreach requirements. Mr. MacLarion said if the sponsor was conducting regular outreach, it should have produced a list of such outreach. Mr. MacLarion said, to Ms. Durant’s point, even if the sponsor provided a list but there was no improvement in minority and female participation, then a corrective action plan might be put in place. Mr. MacLarion said minority and female participation appeared to decrease in the past two years. Mr. MacLarion said it was up to the Council to decide how to act on diminishing participation among females and minorities. Mr. Wilford suggested approval of this review pending the sponsor’s ability to provide documentation of outreach and documentation of a future plan for outreach.

Mr. Klusmann made a motion to approve this review with the condition that the sponsor provide documentation of outreach to the minority and female community as well as documentation of a future plan for outreach; Dr. Chapple seconded this motion; Chairman Cavey asked for questions on the motion; Mr. Preston asked when this documentation would be required to be provided and Chairman Cavey said the Council would require this documentation to be provided in 60 days; the motion was approved unanimously.

**2.** International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 10 (Coral Crawford). (Item 20)

Ms. Crawford said staff recommends that this sponsor create a spreadsheet to document outreach activities to include the activities, dates, attendance and outcomes. Ms. Crawford said staff recommends that the sponsor enlist members of their organization of minority backgrounds as well as females to assist with outreach activities. Ms. Crawford said staff recommends that the sponsor target organizations for outreach to minority and female prospects particularly when future vacancies arrive for apprentices.

Mr. Shmelzer said he was disappointed because he did not see proactive outreach to females and minorities in the community. Mr. Shmelzer said this was particularly concerning considering the soon-to-be new policies related to Equal Employment Opportunity, as well as concerns from the COVID pandemic being increasingly in the past. Mr. Shmelzer said the community outreach effort appeared to be minimal. Mr. MacLarion said he generally agreed with Mr. Shmelzer but there were other causes for the low minority and female participation. Mr. MacLarion said that not only should regular outreach occur, but regular outreach should also produce better results over time. Mr. MacLarion said he would be happy to instruct this sponsor to conduct more outreach, but he thought the intent of the Council was to communicate to the sponsor that more outreach should also produce better results. Mr. MacLarion said perhaps the qualifications to enter this program as an apprentice were onerous when compared to other programs. Mr. MacLarion said, “is there a test, for example, that’s eliminating a large portion of the population, that could be resolved by bringing everybody in through a pre-apprenticeship?” Mr. MacLarion said this was simply an example of a nuanced barrier to the program. Mr. Shmelzer said he agreed with Mr. MacLarion’s point but from what he could see, the sponsor’s outreach was very limited.

Ms. Durant said she saw a limited communication and marketing strategy. Ms. Durant said she saw that the sponsor sent sixty fliers to school systems, but those fliers might not have drawn much attention. Ms. Durant said, “saying you sent out a flier is not a strategy.” Ms. Durant asked rhetorically how the Council can address this to ensure the sponsor has a cohesive outreach strategy. Chairman Cavey suggested sending a certified technical assistance letter. Mr. MacLarion cited examples of the Council sending such letters in the past and the resulting action of those letters.

Mr. Smalls said he worked personally with this sponsor and he partnered with the sponsor to conduct outreach and host outreach events. Mr. Smalls said Mr. MacLarion might be correct in identifying the entry exam as a barrier to apprenticeship. Mr. Klusmann said that the effort was there but the results were not. Mr. Klusmann said he would prefer that the Council send a letter to demand results because this was the law. Ms. Griffith said the regulation states that if the Council finds that if the sponsor was not operating in accordance with the EEO regulations, Council shall notify the sponsor in writing of the results of the review and make a reasonable effort to secure voluntary compliance on the part of the sponsor prior to undertaking sanctions.

Mr. MacLarion said, in response to Mr. Smalls comments, that though he was aware that the sponsor participated in past events in partnership with Mr. Smalls, the sponsor was responsible for documenting such participation, and this documentation was lacking. Mr. MacLarion said that the entry-tests, in his view, were creating barriers to entry, including a test to identify tools of the trade that were very specific to elevator work. Mr. MacLarion stated other potential barriers to the program.

Dr. Chapple asked what other support was available to apprenticeship programs to address issues related to recruitment of minority and female apprentices. Dr. Chapple asked if any support could be offered in conjunction with a letter from Council, especially considering disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor was allowed to change it’s program to allow more opportunities for apprentices, “to get right in.” Mr. MacLarion said the Council would not be able to mandate such changes, but could include this in a recommendation, as well as other potential remedies, such as pre-apprenticeship training. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor could also propose its own remedies.

Chairman Cavey asked if this letter would end with an offer of support; Mr. MacLarion answered that the letter would absolutely include an offer of support and similar past letters offered support as well.

Mr. Klusmann said programs with joint apprenticeship committees such as this program, the JACs have control over curriculum and entrance exams, and the committee can make adjustments to address equity issues, and this would not be a long process. Mr. Klusmann said that to the best of his knowledge, this program made minimal changes to the entry exams in the past 40 years.

Mr. Wilford asked for clarification as to what the motion would be. Ms. Griffith said the motion would be to secure voluntary compliance with the regulations. Ms. Griffith said if the sponsor did not take voluntary action, the Council could then take further action including sanctions. Ms. Griffith said the relevant regulations were stated in COMAR 09.12.42.08.

Ms. Durant asked what would occur after the sponsor receives this letter. Mr. MacLarion said generally staff receives replies to such letters very quickly. Mr. MacLarion said staff would send the letter by email and by mail, and his sense was the sponsor would be responsive and take appropriate voluntary action. Chairman Cavey said the Council would allow the sponsor to take voluntary action before the next compliance review.

Mr. Wilford asked if Mr. MacLarion would present an update on this item at the next Council meeting. Mr. MacLarion answered yes and said he would be disappointed if had not met with the sponsor before the next Council meeting occurred. Mr. MacLarion said ideally the sponsor will have formed a basic framework for a voluntary corrective plan by the time the next Council meeting occurs.

A motion to send a letter to request that this sponsor voluntarily comply with regulations according to COMAR 09.12.42.08 was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved.

**3.** International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 99 (Coral Crawford). (Item 21)

Chairman Cavey said, in relation to the discussion on the previous two items at this meeting, this program showed increases in minority and female participation. Mr. MacLarion said this was a good example of a program that documented outreach to minorities and females.

A motion to approve this review was made by Ms. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved.

4. lronworkers Local 5S JATC (Coral Crawford). (Item 22)

Ms. Crawford said staff recommended this sponsor conduct and record outreach with the intent to recruit as outlined in the sponsor’s Affirmative Action Plan. Ms. Crawford said staff recommended that the sponsor consider adding support to assist apprentices in completing the program. Ms. Crawford said staff recommended that another compliance review be conducted in one year.

Ms. Woo said she was concerned about the very low completion and very high cancellation rate. Ms. Woo acknowledged she was new to the Council, and asked if the Council could recommend action in addition to the staff recommendation to review this program in one year. Chairman Cavey said staff recommended that the sponsor add support to apprentices to bolster completion. Ms. Woo asked if Council could request that the sponsor provide a plan to support apprentices. Chairman Cavey said staff, in essence, recommended that the sponsor initiate a plan and then review the program in one year to determine if a plan was put in place and to see if the plan created positive results. Chairman Cavey said the Council’s motion would have to include acceptance of staff recommendations if this was the Council’s intent.

Mr. Klusmann said this program, and programs with the same occupations, historically has had low completion numbers because of the nature of the work. Mr. Klusmann said iron work was, “a really, really, really tough occupation.” Mr. Klusmann said female participation and completion were both challenging, historically, for this occupation.

Mr. Preston asked if data was available to compare completion rates among various occupations. Mr. MacLarion said the U.S. Department of Labor previously supplied nationwide completion rates for many occupations on a regular basis, but USDOL did not provide this data as frequently as in the past. Mr. MacLarion said staff would likely be able to provide this data to the Council through USDOL. Mr. MacLarion said he recently met with the USDOL Office of Apprenticeship to discuss occupations with historically low completion rates and how this might be addressed. Mr. MacLarion said low completion rates when taken alone generally was not a good cause to take punitive action against a program. Mr. MacLarion said the scope of work as, Mr. Klusmann previously mentioned, contributed to low completion rates. Mr. MacLarion said this related to the scope of work for a first-year plumber, and HVAC, as well. Mr. MacLarion said trends in employment such as job hopping also contributed to low completion rates. Mr. Smalls said a 19 percent completion rate might be really high for one occupation but really low for another. Mr. Klusmann said it was not uncommon for ironworkers to change to other trades such as plumbing or sheet metal work. Mr. Wilford said its possible apprentices used apprentices as a pathway to other higher-paying occupations. Mr. MacLarion shared some anecdotes that supported Mr. Wilford’s point.

A motion to approve this review including staff recommendations was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved.

**D. PROGRAM REVIEWS [Fewer Than Five (5) Apprentices]:**

**1.** The following program reviews were performed and the programs were found to be conducted in a satisfactory manner. [No Council Action Required]:

a. NLP Enterprises, lnc.(Coral Crawford). (Item 23)

b. Technology Security Associates, Inc. (TSA) (Jane Sinclair). (Item 24)

c. Paquin Design (Robert J. Zimberoff). (Item 25)

Chairman Cavey said no Council action was required for Item 23, Item 24 and Item 25.

**E. PROVISIONAL REVIEWS:**

1. Classic Motor Museum of St. Michaels, Inc. (Robert J. Zimberoff). (Item 26)

A motion to approve this provisional review was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**F. VOLUNTARY REQUEST FOR CANCELLATION OF STANDARDS OF APPRENTICESHIP:**

1. A.E.C.S. Inc. (Ginamarie Best) - Request for Voluntary Cancellation. (Item 27)

A motion to approve this voluntary cancellation was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

**G. OTHER BUSINESS:**

1. Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 486 (Faith Ramsburg) - Request for posthumous completion. (Item 28)

A motion to approve this posthumous completion was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

1. Associated Builders and Contractors - Metropolitan Washington Chapter - Request for registration of one apprentice Plumber with credit beyond the fifty percent (50%) level for both On-the-Job Training and Related Instruction (Ginamarie Best). (Item 29)

A motion to approve this credit was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Ms. Durant and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

1. Washington, D.C. Electricians JATC, I.B.E.W. Local 26 - Request for registration of one apprentice Electrician with credit beyond the fifty percent (50%) level for both On-the-Job Training and Related Instruction (Ginamarie Best). (Item 30)

A motion to approve this credit was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

1. Howard Community College - Request for registration of After-the-Fact registration and completion for two apprentices. (Sheila Jackson). (Item 31)

Mr. Shmelzer asked if any similar requests would be brought before Council by this sponsor in the near future. Ms. Jackson said she was confident this would be the last request for the foreseeable future.

A motion to approve this registration was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann, Ms. Woo abstained and all other Council members voted yea (Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

1. Request for the approval of AUi, Inc. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 32)

Chairman Cavey said items 32 through 63 were all requests for employer approval to participate in the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth Apprenticeship). Chairman Cavey said Council members had questions on some of these items. Chairman Cavey said he would open the discussion on these items with his own questions.

* Chairman Cavey said he had a question about ratios. Chairman Cavey said, with adult apprenticeship, the Council was often presented with information related to the one-to-one journeyworker to apprentice ratio, how many journeyworkers were available to train apprentices, especially when compliance reviews were presented to Council. Chairman Cavey said there were three Apprenticeship Maryland Program employers up for approval on this agenda in items 32 to 63 that were interested in employing six, ten, and fifteen youth apprentices respectively. Chairman Cavey asked how proper safety and training would be assured since the Council was not provided information about the number of journeyworkers on staff at these employers. Mr. MacLarion said the original Youth Apprenticeship guidelines which were to be replaced by new policy beginning August 1, 2023, and the new policy requires that the employer must meet a one-to-one journeyworker-to-youth-apprentice ratio. Mr. MacLarion said if the Council wanted staff to collect ratio information from Youth Apprenticeship employers, staff would be happy to do that. Chairman Cavey said he wanted to ensure that children employed as youth apprentices would work in a safe environment. Chairman Cavey said two of the Youth Apprenticeship eligible employers that were interested in hiring numerous apprentices and were up for approval at this meeting were approved to participate in adult Registered Apprenticeship earlier in this meeting. Mr. MacLarion said, according to policy, the one-to-one ratio did not allow an individual journeyworker to train an adult apprentice and a youth apprentice concurrently because this would be a one journeyworker to two apprentice ratio. Chairman Cavey said, for the record, he was referring to items 42, 43 and 50 on this agenda, for the employers interested in hiring numerous youth apprentices. Mr. Shmelzer asked Mr. MacLarion to explain how Maryland Department of Labor staff would work to safeguard youth apprentices relevant to Chairman Cavey’s ratio concern. Mr. Shmelzer asked Mr. MacLarion how staff would collect information related to the ratio, and how regularly staff would collect this information. Mr. MacLarion said staff could list this information in the memorandum that is presented to Council when new Youth Apprenticeship employers apply to join the program, such as items 32 to 63 on this meeting’s agenda. Mr. Shmelzer asked how the ratio would be tracked to years later when compared to adult apprenticeship program reviews which were typically conducted every two years. Chairman Cavey said there was not an audit process in place for Youth Apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said the August 1, 2023, policy required individual school systems to audit employers. Mr. MacLarion said some of this could possibly be included in regular updates and communication between numerous stakeholders including the Maryland State Department of Education and local school systems. Mr. MacLarion said monitoring adult apprenticeship programs that also participated in youth apprenticeship would likely be easier. Mr. Shmelzer said he thought it was in the Council’s best interest to monitor developments related to the ratio and youth apprentices.
* Chairman Cavey said there were four programs on this agenda asking to register, “a youth assistant apprentice.” Chairman Cavey said these were items 48, 50, 53 and 57. Chairman Cavey asked, “what is a youth assistant apprentice?” Mr. MacLarion said if he remembered correctly, one was a plumber and one was a painter. Chairman Cavey asked the difference between a youth assistant and a youth apprentice. Mr. MacLarion said if the word “assistant” was removed, then the occupations were plumber youth apprentice and painter youth apprentice. Mr. MacLarion said he addressed such issues with staff just a few days before this meeting. Mr. MacLarion said if there was a relevant occupation with a better defined occupation title, going forward the better defined title should be included on Youth Apprenticeship eligible employer applications. Mr. MacLarion gave examples of machinist, tool and die maker, and painter.
* Chairman Cavey said he had a question about item 37. Chairman Cavey asked for details on the occupation of field service tech. Ms. Ramsburg said this was a machinist occupation. Chairman Cavey said the application did not include the actual trade.
* Chairman Cavey asked for details on the occupation for item 38. Ms. Ramsburg said the occupation was construction craft laborer. Mr. MacLarion said identifying occupations for the sake of Youth Apprenticeship can be a struggle for staff. Mr. MacLarion said the occupation of playground constructor appeared to be a combination of many occupations but the closest match was construction craft laborer. Chairman Cavey said the application listed construction apprentice and there were roughly 15 trades under construction.
* Chairman Cavey said item 45 had 16 classes associated with the occupation. Mr. MacLarion said Anne Arundel Public Schools was attempting to expand Youth Apprenticeship into all its high schools, not just their CTE schools. Mr. MacLarion said classes varied from school to school, so the employer considered offerings from all the schools and accepted the classes listed with the application. Mr. MacLarion said, generally, the more schools that participate the more divergent the class offerings would be. Chairman Cavey predicted that expert review teams would soon consider instructional and occupational pairings related to Youth Apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said he hoped the expert review teams would work in partnership with apprenticeship program staff. Charles Wallace said expanding beyond CTE schools would help local school systems meet their Blueprint for Maryland’s Future goals. Mr. Shmelzer said he was less concerned with Blueprint goals and more concerned with the success of the youth apprentices themselves. Mr. Shmelzer said he didn’t “feel good” about 15 classes being listed for one occupation, especially when compared to the adult apprenticeship model. Mr. Shmelzer said this was very concerning and among the 15 classes, many did not appear to be well aligned with the occupation. Mr. Shmelzer said he felt classes generally needed to be better aligned with the training in the workplace and well aligned instruction was a foundation of apprenticeship, youth or adult. Mr. Klusmann said he agreed with Mr. Shmelzer. Mr. Shmelzer said the system would be approved dramatically if instruction was better aligned with on-the-job training. Mr. MacLarion said in this case overall, the classes appeared to be well aligned with the occupation. Mr. MacLarion said he thought program staff did a good job of working with the school system and the employer to ensure the instruction was well aligned with the occupation.

Mr. Shmelzer said the ultimate goal was to dual register individuals as both youth and adult apprentices and Mr. MacLarion said he agreed with Mr. Shmelzer’s premise. Mr. Wilford said, overall, he felt the Maryland Department of Education (MSDE) did not support dual registration. Mr. MacLarion said MSDE did not have control over eligible employer approvals like items 32 to 63 on this agenda. Mr. Wilford said he understood MSDE was not directly involved in the employer approval process but that MSDE would not encourage local school systems to look for opportunities to dual register apprentices as both adults and youths. Mr. Wilford said he was concerned MSDE and local school systems were focused on youth apprenticeship and neglecting the intent to model youth apprenticeship after adult apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said, as an example, that 24 independent school systems in Maryland were operating very much like 24 individual businesses. Mr. MacLarion said with Youth Apprenticeship the school systems had a fair amount of autonomy and MSDE acted as more of a guide, and the instruction paired with Youth Apprenticeship opportunities from the individual school systems was diverse. Mr. MacLarion said when he or apprenticeship program staff met regularly with MSDE staff, MSDE staff continually supported adult apprenticeship, the school to apprenticeship pathway and dual registration. Mr. Wilford said he was concerned the schools were operating “by their rules, only by their rules. That’s the problem.” Mr. MacLarion said, “it has to be our rules. It has to be.” Mr. Wilford said he remained concerned about local school system policies that were not supportive of the traditional apprenticeship model. Mr. Wilford said this Council had very little control over daily operations related to Youth Apprenticeship at local schools. Mr. MacLarion said this was a challenge faced by apprenticeship program staff, and if there were concerns staff would not present the relevant eligible employer application to Council.  
Mr. Wallace said another goal of Youth Apprenticeship was for youth apprentices to continue to work in full time jobs with the employers after graduating from high school.  
Mr. Wilford said he was concerned about the certificate youth apprentices received when they completed their youth apprenticeships. Mr. Wilford said the Youth Apprenticeship certificate could be misleading in some cases. Mr. Wilford shared an anecdote from one of his experiences in administering and adult apprenticeship progrma in which he had to explain to a young person and the person’s mother that the young person did not complete a formal adult apprenticeship program. Mr. Wilford illustrated that members of the general public might think the Youth Apprenticeship certificates carry more weight than they really do, especially if youth apprentices were not dual registered into adult programs. Mr. Wilford suggested changing the wording on the Youth Apprenticeship certificate. Mr. MacLarion said he would make note of Mr. Wilford’s concern.

* Chairman Cavey said the employer in item 58 was a registered apprenticeship sponsor that offered adult apprenticeship in three trades. Chairman Cavey asked if the employer intended to hire youth apprentices into all three trades. Ms. Best answered that the employer intended to hire youth apprentices into all three trades as well as another trade. Mr. Shmelzer said this was not clearly stated in the paperwork presented with item 58. Ms. Best said the application was general.
* Chairman Cavey said item 62 listed the occupation as marine tradesperson and asked for more details on the occupation. Chairman Cavey asked if a marine tradesperson worked was an outboard mechanic. Mr. Zimberoff said the marine tradesperson would be trained to obtain outboard mechanic certifications but the scope of work contained more than outboard marine repair, with such tasks such as structural boat repair. Mr. Zimberoff said this item was brought before Council because the employer was previously approved, but the business was under new ownership and a youth apprentice was already on staff. Chairman Cavey asked if the adult apprenticeship listed the occupation as marine trades. Mr. Zimberoff said the employer did not participate in adult apprenticeship.
* Mr. Wilford asked if item 32 should be tabled since the item was related to another item that was tabled earlier in this meeting. Mr. MacLarion said the Youth Apprenticeship opportunity was not related to the adult Registered Apprenticeship item that was tabled. Mr. MacLarion said the instructional alignment for Youth Apprenticeship with the job opportunity in item 32 “is perfect,” when compared to the issues that were raised in this discussion on items 32 to 63. Mr. Wilford if the issues related to the 90-day period discussed in the other relevant item, item 9, would impact youth apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said youth apprentices could be brought on regardless of the issues relevant to item 9, but youth apprentices could potentially enter directly into the adult apprenticeship program or be dual registered through the school-to-apprenticeship (STA) pathway. Mr. Wilford said he thought the Council should wait to approve item 32 until the issues with item 9 were resolved. Mr. MacLarion said he thought item 32 should be approved since the Youth Apprenticeship opportunity was not necessarily tied to the adult apprenticeship program. Mr. Wilford said he respectfully disagreed with Mr. MacLarion, and Mr. MacLarion said such disagreements would occasionally occur.
* Mr. Shmelzer said item 50 had roughly 15 classes tied to the occupation of painter and asked if the classes were indeed relevant to the occupation. Ms. Runkles said by working with the Youth Apprenticeship coordinator at the local school system, she learned the school system intended to connect all the high schools to the job opportunity and many classes were listed as educational pathways to the job opportunity. Mr. Shmelzer said this was “disappointing.”
* Chairman Cavey asked how the Council would like to move forward. Mr. Wilford said he felt the Council made its feelings clear and he asked Mr. MacLarion and program staff to move forward accordingly in the future.
* Ms. Butt requested that, going forward, the memos included with Youth Apprenticeship eligible employer packets presented to Council members such as items 32 to 63 on this meeting’s agenda could include specific information on potential career pathways. Ms. Butt cited the memo included with item 63 which stated potential career pathways for successful youth apprentices. Ms. Butt asked that such information be included in future memos. Ms. Butt said she worked in construction most of her life and such information would be helpful as she makes determinations as a Council member moving forward.
* Ms. Durant said that the Youth Apprenticeship policy was set to change August 1, 2023, and she asked if Council members could be provided with the new policy as well as details on the more substantial changes from the old policy to the new policy. Mr. MacLarion said he would provide this information to Council members.
* Mr. Wallace said, for the sake of new Council members, that in past meetings, usually Youth Apprenticeship items were not discussed. They were bundled together and voted as one item. Mr. Wallace said it was good the Council was debating the items at this meeting. Mr. Wallace said he agreed some of these items should be reviewed, much like some adult apprenticeship items were scrutinized. Mr. Wallace said this discussion was important and stakeholders including Council members needed to be prepared for more discussions.
* Ms. Durant asked if there was a standard in the policy for future reviews of Youth Apprenticeship programs and how the results would be presented to apprenticeship program staff and this Council. Mr. MacLarion said future reviews were required but, to the best of his knowledge, there was no template for the reviews or clearly defined reporting requirements. Mr. MacLarion said he would double check the policy and follow up with the Council. Mr. MacLarion said stakeholders were also looking into various ways to successfully track the impact of Youth Apprenticeship and the success of youth apprentices themselves. Ms. Durant stated various reasons why it was important to track youth apprentices after they graduated high school. Chairman Cavey said there was a Youth Apprenticeship subcommittee, members of this Council were members of this subcommittee along with other members, and tracking Youth Apprenticeship data was discussed at a recent meeting of the subcommittee. Chairman Cavey said Ms. Durant’s points were very similar to what was discussed at the recent meeting of the Youth Apprenticeship subcommittee.
* Mr. Shmelzer left this Council meeting at this point in the conversation and did not vote on the relevant items.
* Mr. Wilford raised concerns about the CTE Committee formed at a result of Blueprint for Maryland’s Future, and said determinations from that committee would be final despite a lack of input from this Council.
* Chairman Cavey said expert review teams would soon review Youth Apprenticeship programs, and consider such items as related instruction and industry-recognized credentials. Chairman Cavey said he believed the expert review teams would conduct audits. Chairman Cavey said he suggested to stakeholders that the expert review teams work in conjunction with this Council. Chairman Cavey asked how the Council would like to move on items 32 to 63, if they should be bundled together or considered as separate items. Mr. Klusmann suggested voting on all the items together since the new policy was set to take effect soon. Mr. Klusmann said the Council should move forward as it has at past meetings but should consider changing future methods based on the future impact of the new policy and future data on outcomes. Mr. Klusmann said the on-the-job training was 95 percent of apprenticeship, including Youth Apprenticeship, but the Council most often discussed the 5 percent which is the instructional portion of apprenticeship. Mr. Klusmann said he would like to see if future youth apprenticeship data shows success through on-the-job training. Mr. Klusmann said, “what kind of work experience are they getting? That’s what I really want to see.” Mr. Klusmann said he hoped to see the youth apprentices were receiving meaningful experiences through work.

Mr. Klusmann made a motion to include items 32 to 63 together in one vote; this motion was seconded by Ms. Durant and unanimously approved (Employer Representative Grant Shmelzer and Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

A motion to approve items 32 to 63 was made by Ms. Durant, seconded by Mr. Klusmann, Mr. Wilford voted nay, Mr. Smalls abstained, and all other Council members voted yea; Chaiman Cavey stated the motion carried (Employer Representative Grant Shmelzer and Public Representative Shaunta Chapple absent).

1. Request for the approval of Bel Air Glass to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 33)

*See item 32.*

1. Request for the approval of Calvert School to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 34)

*See item 32.*

1. Request for the approval of Chesapeake Care Resources to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program {Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 35)

*See item 32.*

1. Request for the approval of Chesapeake Commercial Contracting, Inc. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 36)

*See item 32.*

1. Request for the approval of Ficep Corporation to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 37)

*See item 32.*

1. Request for the approval of Hunt Valley Contractors, Inc to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 38)

*See item 32.*

1. Request for the approval of Little Darlings Childcare Learning Center to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 39)

*See item 32.*

**13.** Request for the approval of Maryland Screen Printers, Inc to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 40)

*See item 32.*

**14.** Request for the approval of Metal Mechanics, LLC to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 41)

*See item 32.*

**15.** Request for the approval of Primus Aerospace(Formerly Raloid Corporation) to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg) (ltem 42)

*See item 32.*

**16.** Request for the approval of R.C. Fabricators, Inc. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth} (Faith Ramsburg) (Item 43)

*See item 32.*

**17.** Request for the approval of Edison Electric to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jane Sinclair) (Item 44)

*See item 32.*

**18.** Request for the approval of Gable Signs and graphics, Inc to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jane Sinclair) (Item 45)

*See item 32.*

**19.** Request for the approval of Infrared Tools LLC to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jane Sinclair) (Item 46)

*See item 32.*

**20.** Request for the approval of YA Signtastics to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jane Sinclair) (Item 47)

*See item 32.*

**21.** Request for the approval of Brechbill and Helman Construction Co. Inc. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 48)

*See item 32.*

**22.** Request for the approval of Complete Car Care to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth} (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 49)

*See item 32.*

**23.** Request for the approval of Crown Incorporated of Hagerstown MD to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 50)

*See item 32.*

**24.** Request for the approval of Free Range Cafe, LLC to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 51)

*See item 32.*

**25.** Request for the approval of NFI Industries to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 52)

*See item 32.*

**26.** Request for the approval of Platinum Hair Salon to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 53)

*See item 32.*

**27.** Request for the approval of TUC LLC to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Jennifer Runkles) (Item 54)

*See item 32.*

**28.** Request for the approval of Kindred Learning Center to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Sheila Jackson) (Item 55)

*See item 32.*

**29.** Request for the approval of Quantum to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Sheila Jackson) (Item 56)

*See item 32.*

**30.** Request for the approval of The Hair Station to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Sheila Jackson) (Item 57)

*See item 32.*

**31.** Request for the approval of Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Ginamarie Best) (Item 58)

*See item 32.*

**32.** Request for the approval of Callahan's Gas Inc. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff) (Item 59)

*See item 32.*

**33.** Request for the approval of Eastern Shore Entrepreneurship Center to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff) (Item 60)

*See item 32.*

**34.** Request for the approval of Micky Fins to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff) (Item 61)

*See item 32.*

**35.** Request for the approval of Richardson's Marine Repair, Inc. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff) (Item 62)

*See item 32.*

**36.** Request for the approval of Shore United Bank. to be an eligible employer for the Apprenticeship Maryland Program (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff) (Item 63)

*See item 32.*

**VI. CLOSING COMMENTS**

Chairman Cavey invited Mr. Wallace to speak. Mr. Wallace said a delegation of 300 from Maryland attended the SkillsUSA competition in Atlanta at the end of June 2023. Mr. Wallace said 160 students competed in 95 events and 24 students won medals. Mr. Wallace said half of the Maryland delegation finished in the national top 10.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Cavey entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wilford made the motion to adjourn and the meeting adjourned at approximately 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher D. MacLarion

Secretary

Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council