**Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council Meeting Minutes**

**September 20, 2022 – Present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Councilmembers\*** | **Title/Affiliation** |
| **Brian S. Cavey** | **- Chairman/Employee Representative**  |
| **Ryan Sackett** | **- Public Representative** |
|  |  |
| **Allen B. Clinedinst III****Norbert R. Klusmann, Sr.****Neil E. Wilford, Jr.** | **- Employee Representative****- Employee Representative****- Employee Representative** |
|  |  |
| **David J. Wilson, Sr.** | **- Employee** |
|  |  |
| **Stephanie Anderson** | **- Employer Representative** |
| **Leon W. Bromley** | **- Employer Representative** |
| **Michelle L. Butt** | **- Employer Representative** |
| **Grant Shmelzer** | **- Employer Representative** |

 ***\*Employer Representative David Smarte, Public Representative Dr. Shaunta Chapple and U.S. Department of Labor Office of Apprenticeship Consultant to the Council Nicholas Burdick notified Director Chris MacLarion that they were unable to attend before the meeting convened.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Other Attendees** | **Title/Affiliation** |
| **Leza Griffith** | **- Assistant Attorney General, Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Christopher D. MacLarion** |  **- Director, Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program (MATP)** |
| **Jeffrey Smith** | **- Manager, MATP** |
| **Coral Crawford** | **- 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** |
| **Andre James** | **- Maryland Department of Labor**  |
| **Randy Rice** | **- United Union of Roofers, Water-Proofers and Allied Workers Local Union No. 34 JATC** |
| **Ray Baer** | **- United Union of Roofers, Water-Proofers and Allied Workers Local Union No. 34 JATC** |
| **Kathy Gress** | **- Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Cumberland Valley Chapter** |
| **Melissa Johnson** | **- Beitzel Corporation & Pillar Innovations, LLC** |
| **Michael McCarthy** | **- Beitzel Corporation & Pillar Innovations, LLC** |
| **Gary McLaughlin** | **-** **Constellation Home**  |
| **Brian Miller** | **-** **Local 219 - Eastern Millwright Regional Council**  |
| **Thomas Cole** | **- Eastern Millwright Regional Council** |
| **Tina Lewis** | **- Berkeley Springs Instruments, LLC** |
| **Ernie Lewis** | **- Berkeley Springs Instruments, LLC** |
| **Justin Tang** | **- Triumvirate Environmental** |
| **Megan Rehak** | **- Triumvirate Environmental** |
| **Gary** **Murdock** | **- Steamfitters Local No. 602 JATC** |
| **David Springham** | **- IBEW Local Union 24** |
| **Cynthia Etheridge** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Amy Damon** | **- Summit Anchor** |
| **Raiff Margerum** | **- Summit Anchor** |
| **Daniel Mensah** | **- Summit Anchor** |
| **Chip Williams** | **- Lywood Electric Incorporated** |
| **Josh Rush** | **- Rush Services, Inc.** |
| **Carl Blaylock** | **- Ring Container Technologies** |
| **Holly Combs** | **- Ring Container Technologies** |
| **Karla Quintero** | **- Schuster Concrete Construction** |
| **Ronn Blaney** | **- Harford County Electrical Contractors Association** |
| **Elias Yassin** | **- KSE Consulting Group, LLC** |
| **Kameran Evans** | **- KSE Consulting Group, LLC** |
| **Joseph M. Salacki** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Megan Calhan** | **- Associated Builders and Contractors Chesapeake Shores** |
| **Joe Hemberger** | **- Washington Area New Automobile Dealers Association** |
| **Tracy Queen** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Jeff Richmond** | **- Howard Community College** |
| **Jacqueline Anna** | **- Howard Community College** |
| **Monica Taylor** | **- Labella Pet Boutique** |
| **Vaughn Taylor Jr.** | **- Labella Pet Boutique** |
| **Kari Pompilii** | **- Maryland Department of Labor** |

**Chairman Cavey called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. at Maryland Department of Labor at Anne Arundel County Career Center, 613 Global Way, Linthicum, Maryland 21090.**

**I. OPENING COMMENTS AND ROLL CALL**

 Chairman Cavey called the meeting to order, welcomed Council members and guests to the Anne Arundel County Career Center, and invited Andre James, the venue host, to speak. Mr. James welcomed those in attendance to the venue. Mr. James said he was the Labor Exchange Administrator, and he was involved with Title I and Title II partners, some of whom worked from the facility. Mr. James said the goal was to connect job seekers to employment opportunities, including apprenticeship. Mr. James said facility staff serviced two primary groups, job seekers and businesses to create career opportunities. Mr. James said apprenticeship was one of the most tried and true opportunities for an individual to grow into a career.

 Chairman Cavey thanked Mr. James then asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.

 Chairman Cavey welcomed all Councilmembers and guests and thank them for attending.

**II. Minutes of the July 12, 2022 Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council meeting.**

A motion to approve the July minutes was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

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

**III. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

1. Mr. MacLarion said Maryland Department of Labor Secretary Tiffany Robinson and Assistant Secretary James Rzepkowski were unable to attend because of scheduling conflicts, but both offered well wishes for a good and productive Council meeting. Mr. MacLarion said Deputy Assistant Secretary Erin Roth was on maternity leave and was expected to attend the November meeting. Mr. MacLarion said U.S. Department of Labor Office of Apprenticeship Consultant to the Council Nicholas Burdick was also unable to attend because of travel constraints.

**B.**  Mr. MacLarion said, to address concerns with hearing and acoustics from previous meetings, a microphone was made available at this meeting. Mr. MacLarion said staff would use the microphone during presentations and asked anyone who had problems hearing to please inform any speakers so the microphone could be used.

**C.** Mr. MacLarion said staff was happy to take part in the Council meeting at an American Job Center. Mr. MacLarion said many members of the Council also served on Local Workforce Boards across the State of Maryland. Mr. MacLarion said he had recently worked with Mr. James to prepare justice-involved individuals for apprenticeship opportunities. Mr. MacLarion thanked Mr. James for his support.

**D.** Mr. MacLarion offered an Apprenticeship Training Fund update:

* Total Fund Balance as of August 31st, 2022 after all obligations was $1,220,549.25
* July contributions: $11,708.44
* August contributions: $21,449.

**E.** Mr. MacLarion said all Council members should have received an email from him stating that Chairman Cavey had a new position at his union and a new email address. Mr. MacLarion said Chairman Cavey’s new title was International Vice President, Mid-Atlantic States Conference International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators & Allied Workers. Mr. MacLarion asked the Council to inform him if they did not have the new email address so he could forward it.

**F.** Mr. MacLarion said National Apprenticeship Week was coming November 14 to November 20. Mr. MacLarion said staff was compiling a calendar of events, and asked Council members and guests to inform staff of any events they’d like placed on the calendar.

**G.** Mr. MacLarion said that the Apprenticeship Maryland Program, AMP also known as youth apprenticeship, was off to a great start with the new school year. Mr. MacLarion said 21 of 24 school systems were participating in AMP. Mr. MacLarion said the 2022 school year completed with 186 youth apprentices, and the 2023 year was beginning with 184. Mr. MacLarion said staff expect many more youth apprentices to be registered since the school year was just beginning.

**H.** Mr. MacLarion said he was happy to announce that for the first time in State history, Maryland exceeded 12,000 apprentices registered in the State. Mr. MacLarion said this was as of August 31, 2022, and this was the highest number in State history. Mr. MacLarion thanked the Council, staff and sponsors for working to grow apprenticeship in Maryland.

 A motion to accept the Director’s Report was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

 **A. PROGRAM REVISIONS:**

**1.** Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Chesapeake Shores Chapter (Jane Sinclair) – Request to reactivate the occupation of Roofer. (item 1)

 A representative of the sponsor was not able to attend the Council meeting so this item was tabled until the September Council meeting in order for a representative of the sponsor to be in attendance at this Council meeting.

Chairman Cavey said both item 1 and item 57 were related to the same sponsor and both items should be presented in consecutive order.

Ms. Sinclair said she was joined by Megan Calhan, the sponsor’s apprenticeship coordinator.

A motion to approve this reactivation was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**2.** Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Chesapeake Shores Chapter (Jane Sinclair) – Sponsor requests to include an updated list of related instruction locations. (item 57)

Mr. Shmelzer asked if the intent of the sponsor was to offer 10-plus occupations at all locations. Ms. Sinclair said this item was meant to update addresses and locations. Mr. Shmelzer said in the previous Council meeting, there were challenges related to multiple educational locations. Mr. Shmelzer said his biggest concern was related to rural areas that were challenged with having enough density to keep programs up and running. Mr. MacLarion said that ultimately it was up to the sponsor to determine which occupation would be offered at each site. Mr. MacLarion said it was staff’s responsibility to monitor classes to assure cohorts were not being combined.

 Mr. Klusmann asked how monitoring would occur. Mr. MacLarion said each occupation’s status as active or inactive would be determined by when apprentices were registered. If any occupation went a year without a registered apprentice, it would become inactive and remain inactive unless the sponsor asked the Council to reactivate.

A motion to approve this list was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**3.** United Union of Roofers, Water-Proofers and Allied Workers Local Union No. 34 JATC. (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Request to revise the schedule of on-the-job training work processes and the apprentice wage progression schedule. (item 2)

 A representative of the sponsor was not able to attend the Council meeting so this item was tabled until the September Council meeting in order for a representative of the sponsor to be in attendance at this Council meeting.

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Randy Rice, apprenticeship coordinator, and Ray Baer, business manager, for the sponsor.

 Mr. Shmelzer said the old standards had 3,600 hours of on-the-job training (OJT) and 576 hours of related instruction. Ms. Runkles said the revision changed the OJT from 3,600 to 4,000 hours. Mr. Shmelzer said this was four years of related instruction but only two years of OJT. Ms. Runkles said that was correct. Mr. Shmelzer said this wasn’t normal and asked for more details. Ms. Runkles said the program was previously approved with even less OJT in 2013. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor was located in western Maryland and because of extreme weather, apprentices often did not work full time year-round. Mr. MacLarion said other sponsors and other occupations were approved for non-traditional hours. Mr. MacLarion said this program was built to meet the demands of the occupation related to weather conditions and other regular constraints for employers.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

 **A. NEW PROGRAMS:**

**1.** Eastern Millwright Regional Council (Faith Ramsburg) – Occupation of Millwright. Related instruction to be provided by the sponsor at their Charles City Training Facility in Virginia. Request for registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices. (item 3)

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Thomas Cole, the prospective sponsor’s training director.

Ms. Ramsburg said there was an error on Page 18, Appendix B which stated “OSHA 10” but should have stated “OSHA 30”. Ms. Ramsburg said a corrected page was provided to councilmembers at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Shmelzer said this was a big change for apprentices who were previously attending instruction at another site. Mr. Shmelzer asked if this change caused any adversity for apprentices who were already in the program. Mr. Cole said this was a pre-existing program but the previous building was sold. Mr. Cole said this affected roughly 30 apprentices, but he did not receive any “push back” from any apprentices related to the change.

A motion to approve the new program and related Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**2.** KSE Consulting Group, LLC (Faith Ramsburg) – Occupation of Cybersecurity Technician. KSE Consulting Group, LLC will be providing the training onsite with remote options. Request for registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices . (item 4)

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Cameron Evans, president, and Elias Yassin, CEO for the prospective sponsor.
Mr. Shmelzer asked about the optional remote learning. Ms. Ramsburg said classes would be held primarily in person, but virtual options were available to apprentices who missed in-person classes or could not attend in-person.

 A motion to approve the new program and related Affirmative Action Plan was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Chairman Cavey welcomed the new sponsor and a sponsor’s representative said thank you.

**3.** Triumvirate Environmental (Faith Ramsburg) – Occupation of Hazardous-Waste Material Technician. Related instruction will be provided at their training center located at 1500 Carbon Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland. (item 5)

 Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Justin Tang, talent acquisition manager, and Megan Rehak, operations manager for the prospective sponsor.

 Mr. Wilford said he thought he was likely one of the only Council members who worked in a chemical plant. Mr. Wilford asked if 2,000 hours was enough time to learn to carry 55-gallon drums of potentially deadly materials. Mr. Wilford said he worked at a site in south Baltimore where a valve cracked and this nearly caused an evacuation of half the city. Mr. Wilson said 2,000 hours was more than enough time to train to handle hazardous materials. Mr. Wilson said he received training as an assistant fire chief and hazmat technician. Mr. Wilson said the initial training for firefighters was 40 hours, and there was another 80 hours available to receive a higher level of training and a higher technician level. Mr. Wilson said there were no firefighters in Prince George’s County who had more than 1,000 hours of such training. Mr. Wilson said he thought the apprentices in this proposed program would receive a significant amount of training. Chairman Cavey said he was a hazardous material trainer as well, and 40 hours of training was standard. Chairman Cavey said he thought the key to this program would be the experience of the journeyworkers.

 Chairman Cavey said this occupation might not be recognized as a prevailing wage occupation so apprentices might have to earn a journeyworker rate on government contracts. Chairman Cavey asked about the requirement to be able to wear a respirator, and the costs related to meeting this requirement. A sponsor’s representative said costs related to the respirator requirement would be covered by the sponsor.

 A motion to approve this new program was made by Mr. Wilson and seconded by Mr. Shmelzer, Mr. Wilford opposed, and all other Council members voted yea (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Chairman Cavey said thank you and good luck to the new sponsor.

**4.** Berkeley Springs Instruments, LLC (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Occupation of Electromechanical Technician. Related instruction to be provided by Allegany College of Maryland. (item 6)

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Tina Lewis, apprenticeship coordinator, and Ernie Lewis, trainer and shop manager for the prospective sponsor.

 Mr. Shmelzer said to the prospective sponsor that it was the sponsor’s responsibility to collect updated attendance reports from the related instruction provider.

 A motion to approve this new program was made by Ms. Butt, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Chairman Cavey thanked the new sponsor and offered good luck.

**5.** Ring Container Technologies (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Occupation of Industrial Maintenance Technician. Related Instruction to be provided by Blue Ridge Technical and Community College. (item 7)

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Holly Combs, plant manager and development manager, and Carl Blaylock, training manager for the prospective sponsor.

 Mr. Shmelzer said the prospective sponsor was responsible for collecting records from the related instruction provider.

 A motion to approve this new program was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Chairman Cavey thanked the new sponsor for attending. Ms. Combs thanked the Chairman and Council for approval.

**6.** Rush Services, Inc. (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Occupation of Electrician. Related instruction to be provided by Garrett Community College using the Mike Holt Curriculum. Request for registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices. (item 8)

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Josh Rush, owner of the prospective sponsor.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked for the attendance policy of the related instruction provider. Ms. Runkles said the college had make up days built in. Mr. Shmelzer said it was the sponsor’s responsibility to collect attendance and other records from the related instruction providers. Mr. MacLarion said to qualify Mr. Shmelzer’s comment, that Mr. Shmelzer was referring to seat hours. Mr. MacLarion said the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program had an agreement with the 16 community colleges in the State of Maryland that the colleges would supply seat hours. Mr. MacLarion said there was not such an agreement with neighboring states.

 A motion to approve this new program and related Affirmative Action Plan was made by Ms. Butt, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Chairman Cavey thanked the sponsor for attending.

 After the vote on this item, Mr. Shmelzer advised the sponsor to be sure their apprentices obtained their apprentice licenses from the Maryland State Board of Electricians and wished the sponsor good luck.

**7.** Summit Anchor (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Occupation of Ironworker. Related instruction to be provided in-house using the NCCER curriculum. (item 9)

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Amy Damon, CFO and apprenticeship coordinator, Raiff Margerum, vice president and COO, and Daniel Mensah, shop manager and trainer for the prospective sponsor.

 Mr. Sackett asked if the apprentices would earn any certifications through this program. Ms. Runkles said apprentices would earn welding and NCCER certifications. One of the sponsor’s representatives explained that more than one welding certification was available to apprentices. Mr. Sackett thanked the prospective sponsor’s representative for the explanation.
Mr. Klusmann asked if the prospective sponsor would bring in contractors to offer the welding certifications to apprentices or if the sponsor had journeyworkers who were able to offer welding certifications. The prospective sponsor’s representative said the prospective sponsor had journeyworkers who were able to offer the certifications.

 Ms. Runkles said that an OSHA certification was also included in the program.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked for details on the related instruction schedule. A sponsor’s representative said that six-hour sessions would be set aside during workdays and the apprentices would be paid for this time.

 A motion to approve this new program was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 **B. PROGRAM REVISIONS:**

**1.** Baltimore City Police Department (Ginamarie Best) – Request to add Baltimore City Community College as an additional related instruction provider. (item 10)

Chairman Cavey said the sponsors related to item 10 and item 11 were unable to attend this meeting. Chairman Cavey entertained a motion to table items 10 and 11 to the November 2022 Council meeting.

A motion to table item 10 and item 11 to the November 2022 Council meeting was made by Mr. Shmelzer and seconded by Mr. Klusmann. Chairman Cavey said there were no objections (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**2.** IBSS Corporation (Ginamarie Best) – Revision to amend the program from time based to competency based. (item 11)

 *See item 10.*

**3.** Mid-Atlantic Carpenters’ Training Centers’ – Baltimore (Ginamarie Best) – Revision to relocate their related instruction classes to Prince George’s County, Maryland. (item 12)

 Mr. Smith presented for Ms. Best who was unable to attend because of a scheduling conflict. Mr. Smith said this revision was caused by the sale of a property where instruction was previously provided.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if the apprentices experienced any hardships because of this move. Mr. Smith said he was not aware of any issues. A sponsor’s representative said the sponsor helped to cover expenses for apprentices who were negatively impacted by the move.

 A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved. (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent)

**4.** Steamfitters Local No. 602 JATC (Ginamarie Best) – Revision to Section XI, items no. 1 and no. 4 which relate to the progressive wage schedule for the program. (item 13)

 Mr. MacLarion presented for Ms. Best who was unable to attend because of a scheduling conflict. Mr. MacLarion said he was joined by Gary Murdock, the sponsor’s training director.

 A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent)

**5.** Schuster Concrete Construction (Faith Ramsburg) – Increase in the journeyworker hourly wage rate and revised progressive wage schedule for the occupation of Construction Craft Laborer. (item 14)

 Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Karla Quintero, claims administrator for the sponsor.

 Mr. Wilford asked if there was a difference between a Laborer and A Construction Craft Laborer. Mr. MacLarion said Construction Craft Laborer was more comprehensive and had more tasks than Laborer. Mr. MacLarion said, in his opinion, Construction Craft Laborer was a subset of Carpenter and was a lower-level occupation.
Mr. Shmelzer asked when the occupation was approved by Council. Ms. Ramsburg said the occupation was reactivated by Council in July. Mr. Shmelzer asked when a review for this sponsor was due. Mr. MacLarion said he believed the most recent review was conducted eight months prior to this meeting, so the next review would be due in roughly 16 months.

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

 Mr. MacLarion asked the sponsor to add extra layers of support since this was a challenging occupation with high cancellation rates.

**6.** Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Cumberland Valley Chapter (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Request for an updated Affirmative Action Plan and an updated Entry Math Test for the program. (item 15)

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Kathy Gress, the sponsor’s representative.

 Mr. Wilford asked if the entry level math test would be administered to all of the sponsor’s occupations. Ms. Runkles said yes, the sponsor was already administering the test to all occupations, but the test was being updated, and a sample test was presented to Council.

 A motion to approve these revisions was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**7.** Beitzel Corporation & Pillar Innovations, LLC (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Revisions to add the occupation of HVACR Technician with related instruction to be provided by Garrett Community College using the NCCER Curriculum and to add an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices. (item 16)

 Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Melissa Johnson, HR recruiter, and Michael McCarthy, the sponsor’s representatives.
Mr. Shmelzer advised the sponsor to be sure to work with community colleges to collect records related to seat time.

 A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Bromley, and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**8.** Howard Community College (Jeffrey W. Smith) – Revision to the work processes for the occupation of IT Field Support Specialist, Level 1. (item 17)

 Mr. Smith said he was joined by Jeff Richmond, the sponsor’s representative.

 Mr. Clinedinst asked if the school was the sponsor and asked for details about the employers. Mr. Smith said the school was a group non-joint sponsor and 15 Maryland businesses were participating employers. Mr. Smith said all the businesses were in the IT or cybersecurity sector and AT&T was one example of a participant. Mr. Clinedinst asked who was responsible for tracking OJT hours. Mr. Smith said employers collected that information and shared it with the sponsor.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if the revisions in this item were reflected in the minutes of the committee related to this apprenticeship occupation. Mr. Smith said yes.

 A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**9.** Howard Community College (Jeffrey W. Smith) – Revision to add the occupation of Help Desk Technician with apprentice selection procedures for that occupation. (item 18)

 Mr. Klusmann said the qualifications in the standards included a valid driver’s license. Mr. Smith said this could be changed to state reliable transportation to the worksite. Mr. Klusmann asked the sponsor to make this revision.

 Mr. Shmelzer said the qualifications stated the residence as Maryland. Mr. Smith said the original standards were approved in 2018 and listing Maryland as the residency was a common practice at that time. Mr. Smith said the qualifications could potentially be changed to N/A to be more in line with practices as of the date of this meeting. A sponsor’s representative indicated the changes to reliable transportation and the residency change to N/A were acceptable.

 Mr. Wilford asked if Help Desk Technician was a new apprenticeship occupation for this sponsor. Mr. Smith said that was correct, this was a new occupation. Mr. Smith said his occupation created a second entry point that would broaden access to higher-level occupations. Mr. Wilford asked how the 20-plus journeyworkers in the occupation were trained. Mr. Smith said he suspected it was the more traditional community college pathway.

 Mr. Klusmann asked if this was an entry level occupation and if there was an incentive to move up to a higher-level occupation. Mr. Smith said what the occupation learns was a portion of other higher-level occupations as well.

 Mr. Sackett asked if the sponsor would consider addressing discrepancies in the progressive wages between apprenticeship occupations. Mr. Smith said staff would offer technical assistance to the relative apprenticeship committees to address these discrepancies.

 Mr. Sackett asked about the cause for creating this occupation. Mr. Smith said there was demand for this occupation within the employer community, and this was a result of evolving needs.

 A motion to approve this revision including updates to the qualifications for transportation and residency requirements as detailed above was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Sackett and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Chairman Cavey called for a 10-minute comfort break before moving onto program reviews.

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

**1.** Finishing Trades Institute of Maryland, Virginia, Washington, D.C and Vicinities
(Ginamarie Best). (item 19)

Mr. Smith presented for Ms. Best who was unable to attend because of a scheduling conflict.

Mr. Clinedinst said they have eight different occupations. Mr. Smith said there were eight occupations but only five were active.

A motion to approve this review was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**2.** Miller & Long Company, Inc. (Ginamarie Best). (item 20)

 Mr. Smith presented for Ms. Best who was unable to attend because of a scheduling conflict.

 Staff recommended quarterly monitoring to assist with recruitment of female apprentices.

 Chairman Cavey asked how many Form Builder apprentices were registered and how many completed through the life of the program. Mr. MacLarion said 52 total were registered in the Form Builder occupation and the first three recently completed. Mr. MacLarion said a number of Form Builder apprentices were still active. Mr. MacLarion said there were 36 cancellations. Mr. MacLarion said the occupation generally had extremely low completion rates. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor participates in a considerable number of workforce development opportunities.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if quarterly monitoring would include discussions on retention. Mr. MacLarion said he thought the sponsors “outreach was great.” Mr. MacLarion said the monitoring would focus on equal employment opportunity. Mr. MacLarion said the low completions were a result of the occupation, not the quality of the program. Mr. MacLarion said the Council had recently formed a committee to address issues related to this occupation and others with very low completion rates.

 Ms. Anderson said that there had been no apprentices registered in the occupation of Operating Engineer since 2018. Ms. Anderson asked if this occupation was inactive. Mr. Smith said this occupation was inactive.

 Mr. Shmelzer said they didn’t have any applications on file for the occupation of Form Builder even though they had registered apprentices in the occupation. Mr. Smith said this was the one set of records that was missing. Mr. Shmelzer asked if staff “had no idea how many applied.” Mr. Smith said this was the case. Mr. Shmelzer asked if this would be addressed in the quarterly monitoring. Mr. MacLarion said staff recommended quarterly monitoring and another full review be conducted in one year.

 A motion to approve this review including staff recommendations to monitor the program quarterly and conduct a review in one year was made by Ms. Butt, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**3.** Access to Wholistic and Productive Living (Coral Crawford). (item 21)

 Ms. Crawford said staff was unable to complete an adequate review but exceeded its goal for registering female and minority apprentices. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor was not able to register apprentices in a timely manner and there was no process in place for tracking on-the-job-training and related-instruction records. Ms. Crawford said staff continued to offer technical assistance to the sponsor to update its processes for gathering and maintaining records, including payroll records.

 Ms. Crawford said the sponsor had outstanding completion requests to file and had potential to reach 100 percent completion for the years 2020 and 2021 once records were in order.

 Ms. Crawford said staff recommended approval of this review contingent upon the sponsor participating in next steps training which was scheduled the same date as this Council meeting, and the sponsor’s ability to develop processes within 60 days for tracking OJT and collecting RI records, as well as timely submissions of apprenticeship agreements, cancellations, employer agreements and completions, with the next review scheduled for the regular two-year period.

 Mr. Wilford asked if the related instruction records were in order. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor was trying to collect RI records but was “receiving push back from the related instruction provider.” Mr. Wilford asked who provided the related instruction. Ms. Crawford said Salisbury University.

 Ms. Anderson asked if the ratio was an issue considering there were 13 journeyworkers and 24 registered apprentices. Ms. Crawford said there were a number of completions and the paperwork wasn’t up to date, but in reality, there were enough journeyworkers to support the one-to-one ratio. Ms. Crawford said updating these records was part of the monitoring and technical assistance provided by staff. Ms. Anderson suggested conducting a review before the two-year period recommended by staff.

 Mr. Shmelzer said he was uncomfortable with conducting a review in two years. Ms. Crawford said staff was offering intensive technical assistance to help get the sponsor’s records in order.

 Mr. Wilford asked if the sponsor would have 60 days to become compliant. Ms. Crawford said yes, and staff was offering as much assistance as needed, including the next steps training that was scheduled the same day as this Council meeting. Ms. Crawford said this training included everything the sponsor needed to know to maintain proper files.

 Mr. Clinedinst asked who directed the program. Ms. Crawford said Dr. Bettye Muwwakkil was the director. Mr. Clinedinst asked if Dr. Muwwakkil accepted responsibility for this. Ms. Crawford said she did and Dr. Muwwakkil was working directly with staff.

 Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor received a provisional review during the COVID-19 Pandemic, and at the time the sponsor was able to provide most, but not all of the records required for a review. Mr. MacLarion said one of the challenges was related to working with a four-year university rather than a community college. Mr. MacLarion said staff recommendations regarding the timing of reviews was also challenging. Mr. MacLarion said Dr. Muwwakkil worked for a nonprofit, and was familiar with workforce development, but had limited staff. Mr. MacLarion said general guidance to such “smaller units” was to put someone in charge of the apprenticeship program by hiring a full time apprenticeship director despite challenges in funding this position.

 Mr. MacLarion said this program far exceeded the requirements for licensing of this occupation, and the related instruction contained far more than what the license required. Mr. MacLarion said, “this is truly what we want in apprenticeship as a voluntary system.” Mr. MacLarion said there was “a balancing act” between offering technical assistance and mandating that the sponsor come within compliance.

 Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor was receiving intensive technical assistance. Mr. MacLarion said staff also created a checklist to present to new sponsors going forward to alleviate such issues moving forward.

 Mr. Clinedinst recommended that the sponsor come before Council at the next meeting.

 Chairman Cavey asked when the sponsor would receive notice to come within compliance within 60 days. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor had not received the notice to come within compliance in 60 days, but that might be a result of Council action on this item.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if Ms. Crawford had seen progress in the roughly two months since the review was conducted. Ms. Crawford said Ms. Best was working with the sponsor and would be the best person to answer the question, but Ms. Best was not present because of a scheduling conflict. Ms. Crawford said Ms. Best was meeting with the sponsor to offer next steps training on the day of this Council meeting, and it took some time to schedule this meeting because Dr. Muwwakkil wanted to be sure all relevant managers and other stakeholders could attend to learn the processes.

 Mr. Shmelzer made a motion to conduct a two-year review dependent on the result of the sponsor’s training that was scheduled to occur the day of this Council meeting. Chairman Cavey said that the next meeting would occur before the sponsor had 60 days to come within compliance. Mr. MacLarion said he was confident staff could work with the sponsor to provide an update at the November 2022 Council meeting. Mr. Shmelzer amended his motion to bring an update before Council at the November 2022 meeting and for staff to conduct a review within one year; Mr. Wilford seconded Mr. Shmelzer’s amended motion and this was unanimously approved by Council (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 Mr. Wilford asked after the vote, if there was an issue with gathering related instruction information from four-year universities, what could the Council do or what could the state do? Mr. Wilford also asked for more details about the next steps training. Mr. Wilford asked if the next steps training should be offered to current sponsors when their staff changes.

 Mr. MacLarion said next steps training would be a good idea in cases when a sponsor’s staff changes, but the challenge would be receiving notification when the staff change occurs. Mr. MacLarion said past staff changes in the Maryland Apprenticeship Training Program also created challenges. Mr. MacLarion gave examples of programs with longtime staff that have consistently maintained a quality apprenticeship program vs. programs that have had constant staff turnover that have struggled to maintain quality programs.

 Ms. Butt said the issue with collecting related instruction details from four-year universities was related to the Privacy Act and suggested that perhaps apprentices could sign a waiver that would enable the schools to release the information to sponsors.

**4.** Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Cumberland Valley Chapter (Coral Crawford). (item 22)

 Mr. Sackett asked if there was any provision to seek a new employer when an apprentice was affected by an employer closing. Mr. Sackett asked if there was a way to assure an apprentice would continue the apprenticeship. A sponsor’s representative said the sponsor made a good faith effort to work with the employer to maintain the apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said the Standards of Apprenticeship require that the sponsor try to place the apprentice with other employers if other employers are available.

 A motion to approve this review was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Bromley, Mr. Clinedinst abstained, and all other Council members voted yea (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 After the motion but before the vote, Mr. MacLarion said in this review, staff implemented instructor and apprentice interviews, and this would be included in reviews going forward. Mr. MacLarion said this was an extremely time-intensive process and the interviews were conducted during evening hours as much as possible.

**5.** Baltimore Washington Laborers Joint Training Fund (Coral Crawford). (item 23)

 Ms. Crawford said this sponsor was under a corrective action plan recommended by the Council in 2021, and the plan included monthly monitoring and a review was to be conducted within 12 months, with the Council determining if more monthly monitoring would be required dependent on the results of the review.

 Ms. Crawford said deficiencies remained, including the registration and cancellation of 22 apprentices.

 Ms. Crawford recommended approval of this review contingent upon yearly compliance reviews in light of continued deficiencies and for staff to assist the sponsor with other recommendations for progress with future registrations.

 Chairman Cavey asked if there were no apprentices at the time of the meeting. Ms. Crawford said there were no apprentices at the time of the meeting. Chairman Cavey recommended monthly monitoring should the sponsor register new apprentices in addition to the staff recommendation to conduct another review in one year.

 Mr. Wilford asked if the sponsor conducted exit surveys to determine the issues with retention. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor was supposed to include the reasons for cancellation on the standard cancellation form. Ms. Crawford said the common reason was apprentices were finding other jobs. Mr. MacLarion said the cancellation rate for the lifetime of the program was 97 or 98 percent. Mr. MacLarion said the employers didn’t necessarily need the apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said there was no leverage in this program’s system to retain and complete apprentices.

 Chairman Cavey asked if there was any other training occurring at the facility besides apprentices in this particular occupation. Mr. MacLarion said it was a “well equipped” facility and other trainings were occurring while staff was present for monitoring.

 Mr. Klusmann asked if there was any way to address if this occupation should continue as an apprenticeable occupation. Chairman Cavey said a subcommittee was formed to address this and related issues and occupations.

 A motion was made by Mr. Wilford to review this program within a year with monthly monitoring to be conducted if the sponsor registered new apprentices; this motion was seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**6.** Johnson Controls Fire Protection (Coral Crawford). (item 24)

 A motion to approve this review was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**7.** Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department (Coral Crawford). (item 25)

 A motion to approve this review was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Ms. Anderson, Mr. Wilson abstained, and all other Council members voted yea (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**8.** Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative JATC (Jane Sinclair). (item 26)

 A motion to approve this review was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

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

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

a. Martin Marietta Materials – Occupation of Electrician
(Coral Crawford). (item 27)

b. Kleppinger Electric Company, Inc. – Occupation of Electrician
(Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 28)

Mr. Shmelzer said he asked Mr. MacLarion to request that staff confirm with Delaware schools that apprentices were receiving appropriate seat time.

**2.** The following program review was performed and the program was found to be in need of technical assistance in the administration of the program:

1. Carter Enterprise Solutions – Occupations of Security Control Assessor, System Security Analyst and Technical Support Specialist (Coral Crawford). (item 29)

Chairman Cavey asked if technical assistance was being offered to this sponsor. Mr. MacLarion said technical assistance was ongoing.

 **E. PROVISIONAL REVIEWS:**

IBBS Corporation (Coral Crawford). (item 30)

Mr. Clinedinst asked for clarification on the progressive wage. Mr. MacLarion explained the details. Mr. Clinedinst thanked Mr. MacLarion and Ms. Crawford.

A motion to approve this provisional review was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

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

**1.** Sens Mechanical, Inc. effective June 28, 2022. (item 31)

 A motion to approve this voluntary cancellation was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**G. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**1.** Mid-Atlantic Carpenters’ Training Centers, Washington, D.C. - Request for after-the-fact re-registration and completion of an apprentice Carpenter (Ginamarie Best). (item 32)

 Mr. MacLarion presented for Ms. Best who was unable to attend because of a scheduling conflict. Mr. MacLarion said he was joined by Bob Eaton.

 A motion to approve this after-the-fact registration was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**2.** Constellation Home – Request for registration of 19 apprentice HVACR Technicians with credit beyond the fifty percent (50%) level for on-the-job training and/or related instruction (Faith Ramsburg). (item 33)

 Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Gary McLaughlin, the sponsor’s technical training instructor.

 Ms. Anderson asked how this request was verified since no certifications or test results were provided to Council. Ramsburg said they were already employees of the sponsor and they had previous work experience and training.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked for more specific metrics.

 Mr. McLaughlin said the sponsor always had an apprenticeship-like process, including a third-year test to achieve journeyworker. Mr. McLaughlin said he formerly participated in a five-year apprenticeship, and when he became the sponsor’s technical training instructor, he suggested that the executive leadership team formalize its training process through apprenticeship. Mr. McLaughlin said before formalization a cohesive training system was already in place, but it became more structured through formalized apprenticeship. Mr. McLaughlin said the majority of the apprentices related to this agenda item were preparing for the third-year test before the program was formalized and he didn’t want to punish them by making them step back to the first or second year.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked about the related licensing requirements for the occupation. Mr. MacLarion explained the licensing requirements and that Mr. McLaughlin’s explanation was inline with these requirements. Mr. Shmelzer said he was concerned there were no metrics presented to Council to show satisfactory completion of three years of training, and this was simply his personal opinion. Mr. MacLarion said the metric was provided, and there was a difference between a new sponsor and an established sponsor. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor’s process of evaluating and registering apprentices as a new sponsor was inline with regulations and the Standards of Apprenticeship. Mr. Shmelzer asked if the would-be apprentices in question received consistent training. Mr. McLaughlin said the training was consistent among the apprentices, but through formalization of the apprenticeship, the schedule for training became more standardized. Mr. Shmelzer asked if every single employee has documentation that they received the same trainings. Mr. McLaughlin said the apprentices had sign-in sheets and related documents in their files.

 Mr. Sackett asked about the wage schedule. Mr. Sackett asked if any of the apprentices were negatively impacted by the formalized apprenticeship. Mr. McLaughlin said the sponsor tended to overpay and he estimated 90% of the apprentices were paid above the progressive wage.

 Ms. Anderson asked why some of the apprentices had received more than 8,000 hours of training. Mr. MacLarion said this reflected meticulous record keeping on behalf of the sponsor. Mr. MacLarion said he preferred to see more than enough hours and there were various reasons why an apprentice might have more hours than necessary.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if this sponsor would make another similar request in the future or if the issue would be resolved moving forward. Mr. MacLarion said this agenda item was a reflection of staff working with the sponsor to assure uniformity among its employees, so all of its employees would participate in apprenticeship as opposed to one class of employees not being registered and another class of employees being registered even though they worked in the same occupation.

 Mr. Shmelzer said he predicted that similar issues would arise in the electrical trades because of new licensing requirements. Mr. Shmelzer said he applauded the sponsor for registering these apprentices, but he wanted to be sure this was a standardized process. Mr. McLaughlin said he wanted to assure all the sponsor’s employees were obtaining licenses.

 A motion to approve this request was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**3.** Baltimore JATC for the Electrical Industry – Request for registration of three apprentice Telecommunications Installer-Technicians with credit beyond the fifty percent (50%) level for on-the-job training and/or related instruction (Jeffrey W. Smith). (item 34)

Mr. Smith said he was joined by Mr. Wilford.
Mr. Shmelzer asked if he was missing a page because he didn’t see the names of the apprentices in question. Mr. Smith said the names were on file at the office along with all the necessary forms. Ms. Butt asked if the names should be provided before approval. Mr. MacLarion said there were challenges to accessing files in July, August and part of September related to the closure of the Baltimore office that was caused by issues with the elevators and HVAC system. Mr. Wilford said the apprentices in question were Jason Harrison and Adam Rodriguez. Mr. Smith said all of the necessary documents were on file.

 A motion to approve this request was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann, Mr. Wilford abstained, and all other Council members voted yea (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**4.** Lywood Electric Incorporated – Request for registration of an apprentice Electrician with credit beyond the fifty percent (50%) level for on-the-job training and/or related instruction (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 35)

 Mr. Zimberoff said he was joined by Chip Williams, the sponsor’s representative.

 Chairman Cavey asked if there was a difference between items 35 and 36. Mr. Williams said the request in question in item 35 was for credit beyond 50 percent but the request in item 36 was for after-the-fact completion.

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

**5.** Lywood Electric Incorporated – Request for registration of an apprentice Electrician with credit beyond the fifty percent (50%) level for on-the-job training and/or related instruction (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 36)

Mr. Williams clarified that this item was a request for after-the-fact completion. Mr. Williams said he verified the hours for the would-be apprentices related to this item (item 36), and the above item (item 35). Mr. Williams said the cause for the requests in items 35 and 36 was that the sponsor acquired another company and in both cases, the would-be apprentices thought they were participating in a formalized apprenticeship with the previous company but were disappointed when the new sponsor informed them they were not formally registered by the previous company.

Mr. Shmelzer asked Mr. Zimberoff to verify seat hours obtained by apprentices from Delaware schools going forward. Mr. Shmelzer said he would not penalize the sponsor or apprentices related to items 35 and 36, but Mr. Shmelzer had found evidence that apprentices were falling short of required hours at Delaware schools.

 Mr. Williams said that there were two other apprentices not related to items 35 and 36 who worked at the former company and became employed by this sponsor when the company was acquired who were registered as apprentices through ABC Chesapeake, but the two apprentices in question in items 35 and 36 were not formally registered. Mr. Williams said the two apprentices in question in items 35 and 36 were told by the previous company that they were registered as apprentices, but in fact, they were not. Mr. Williams said the sponsor took eight months to verify the skill sets of the apprentices in question in items 35 and 36, and he was confident they had obtained the level of competency required for the requests before Council.

 Mr. MacLarion said this was another example of why it was important for staff and sponsors to communicate to employers that all employees in training should be registered as apprentices, especially in cases where licenses were at stake. This would enable monitoring and protections and put “everybody in the same lane.”

 A motion to approve this after-the-fact completion was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**6.** Recommendation for deregistration of Apprenticeship Standards for the defunct apprenticeship program of Quality Metal Products, Inc. (MATC No. 1790). (Kelton Addison). (item 37)

Mr. Wilford made a motion to combine items 37, 38, 39 and 40 in one vote. This motion was seconded by Mr. Bromley and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

 A motion to deregister the programs in items 37, 38, 39 and 40 was made by Mr. Bromley, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**7.** Recommendation for deregistration of Apprenticeship Standards for the defunct apprenticeship program of Anchor Electric (MATC No. 2247). (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 38)

*See item 37.*

**8.** Recommendation for deregistration of Apprenticeship Standards for the defunct apprenticeship program of Myers Electrical, LLC (MATC No. 2228). (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 39)

 *See item 37.*

**9.** Recommendation for deregistration of Apprenticeship Standards for the defunct apprenticeship program of Stroika Construction Solutions, Inc. (MATC No. 2199). (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 40)

*See item 37.*

**10.** Request for approval of Labella Pet Boutique to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Kelton Addison). (item 41)

Chairman Cavey asked Mr. Shmelzer for comments on youth apprenticeship items (items 41 through 56).

 Mr. Shmelzer said the Council was at a little bit of an impasse with its partners at the Maryland State Department of Education. Mr. Shmelzer said he mentioned in previous Council meetings that a youth apprenticeship policy issuance was coming soon.

 Mr. MacLarion said the policy issuance process was put on hold by the Maryland Department of Labor Division of Workforce Development and Adult Learning so Assistant Secretary James Rzepkowski could meet with his counterpart at MSDE. Mr. MacLarion said there was a gap in how DWDAL and MSDE believed related instruction for youth apprentices should be delivered. Mr. MacLarion said some school systems delivered instruction concurrently with work processes, but other school systems might look backwards to apply past classes. Mr. MacLarion said Mr. Rzepkowski was hoping to hold a meeting with an MSDE representative within 30 days of this Council meeting. Mr. MacLarion said most of the youth apprenticeship items up for approval at this Council meeting had related instruction that was offered concurrent with the work processes. Mr. MacLarion said the Governor’s Workforce Development Board had the CTE Review Committee which was reviewing occupations related to the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future. Mr. MacLarion said Chairman Cavey was part of the CTE Committee as well. Mr. MacLarion said the policy issuance for youth apprenticeship should occur this year.

 Mr. Shmelzer said he hoped everyone would get in the same lane. Mr. Shmelzer said he had reservations about continuing to approve youth apprenticeship eligible employers in a block format. Mr. Shmelzer said he would prefer to set a higher expectation level and accountability level.

 Charles Wallace, of MSDE, said another challenge related to the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future, was that school systems were supposed to achieve 45% of students graduating with an industry recognized credential or certification by 2030. Mr. Shmelzer said he was aware of this concern. Mr. Shmelzer said his continued concern was safeguarding all apprentices, not just youth apprentices. Mr. Wallace said he noticed a trend in multiple trainers. Mr. Shmelzer said he also saw one item with 26 course options for youth apprentices. Mr. Shmelzer said this was concerning. Mr. Shmelzer said he would prefer to approve items individually rather than approving youth apprenticeship items as a block, until the new policy was adopted.

 Mr. MacLarion said he disagreed. Mr. MacLarion said staff’s job was to assure the employer was safe, to work with school system, employers, unions or groups to assure the related instruction was provided properly. Mr. MacLarion said staff’s job was also to assure that the wages were correct, that youth apprentices would earn at least minimum wage, and that youth apprentices had time to complete the minimum of 450 hours of OJT. Mr. MacLarion said at no point was there a requirement for staff to go back to the school system and mandate that the school system provide evidence that the apprentices were receiving concurrent education, but staff was doing this to the best of their ability. Mr. MacLarion suggested that concurrent instruction be included on a checklist, and if an educational provider checked the box no, then an explanation as to why would be required. Mr. MacLarion said, regarding the youth apprenticeship items on the agenda for this Council meeting, if each item were heard individually and the question was if the instruction was occurring concurrently, the answer would be, “to the best of our knowledge, yes.” Mr. MacLarion said this was part of the vetting process for each item.

 Mr. MacLarion said staff’s preference was for instruction to be offered concurrent with OJT. Mr. MacLarion said, for example, ninth grade English should not count toward an 11th grade youth apprenticeship opportunity, but staff would have to trust that the schools were offering concurrent instruction. Mr. MacLarion said there might be rare circumstances when going backwards to attach education to a youth apprenticeship opportunity might be acceptable, but this would be based on specific circumstances.

 Mr. Shmelzer said, in his opinion, the majority of youth apprenticeship opportunities should have an adult apprenticeship opportunity tied to them upon graduation.

 Mr. Sackett said if there is some kind of industry-recognized certification tied to a youth apprenticeship opportunity that helps to define a career path, then that should help to qualify that opportunity as youth apprenticeship rather than just a job. Mr. Sackett said in adult apprenticeship, usually the apprentice will stay with the company upon completion, but this would not always be the case with youth apprenticeship.

 Mr. Wallace said he agreed with Mr. Sackett. Mr. Wallace said the Council was helping to set a precedent that would enable school systems to better understand what the Council was looking for. Mr. Wallace said not every district was following the same process.

 Mr. Sackett said 24 school systems were looking at ways to provide as many opportunities as possible, and the Council might have to look at ways to review them individually, but that would make the meetings much longer.

 Chairman Cavey said he saw some of the instruction as credit for previous experience. If youth apprentices took classes earlier, that this could be credit for previous experience, but if this was the case, the classes would have to be provided on a list, it would have to be exact, not close.

 Mr. MacLarion said there was only one school system that said it went backwards to tie classes to youth apprenticeship opportunities. Mr. MacLarion said, despite this, there were circumstances where youth apprentices were already in a CTE program before becoming youth apprentices, but the previous CTE classes were relevant to the work opportunity. Mr. MacLarion said this could become an entry point for apprenticeable occupations.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if groomer (item 41) was an apprenticeable occupation according to the U.S. Department of Labor. Mr. MacLarion said probably.

 Chairman Cavey said a signatory employer in his program hired a youth apprentice as an estimator, project manager. Chairman Cavey said this occupation was not part of the adult apprenticeship program, and the employer didn’t have the occupation as an adult apprenticeship opportunity, but the employer offered a scholarship to go to a community college to get an associate degree, and the person still worked for that employer.

 Mr. Shmelzer said he thought it was the Council’s job to assure there was a “career ladder” available to youth apprentices.

 Mr. Klusmann said youth apprentices should be able to transition into a full adult apprenticeship.

 Mr. Shmelzer said school systems also offered work-based learning and internship opportunities, and not every program had to be tied to youth apprenticeship. Mr. Shmelzer said, in many cases, credentials could be tied to these opportunities through community colleges.

 Mr. MacLarion said one of the core functions of the Council was to determine the apprenticeability of trades within the State of Maryland. Mr. MacLarion said, four or five years ago, IT trades and health care trades were not viewed as apprenticeable, but today they are. Mr. MacLarion gave the example of registering GNA and CNA occupations as a component of a higher-level occupation in the health care field. Mr. MacLarion said it was a task of staff to screen occupations for apprenticeability before bringing them to Council.

 Mr. Wallace said flexibility was necessary to accommodate 24 school systems.

 Mr. Sackett said there were competing priorities. Mr. Sackett said MSDE would only approve so many completer programs within a school system, so school systems need to find unique ways to tie education to youth apprenticeship opportunities. Mr. Sackett said youth apprenticeship potentially offered career opportunities to students beyond completion programs that would normally be approved by MSDE. Mr. Sackett said youth apprenticeship offered an added benefit to capture more students. Mr. Sackett said youth apprenticeship increased the diversity of career opportunities through a regimented training program.

 Mr. Klusmann asked, for petting grooming, where was the adult apprenticeship opportunity? Mr. Klusmann said this might be a “dead-end” program. Mr. Sackett said in this case, perhaps the metric is determined by industry need, rather than the availability of an adult apprenticeship opportunity. Mr. Sackett said even without an adult apprenticeship opportunity, perhaps there was a career pathway to a sustaining wage.

 Mr. MacLarion said the Coast Guard item (item 56) was traditionally an internship, and the employer was working to activate a full adult apprenticeship opportunity. Mr. MacLarion said, with pet grooming, if there wasn’t a career path, it would not have been brought before Council. Mr. MacLarion said perhaps an adult apprenticeship for pet care could be created I in the future, but this would be determined by industry need.

 Mr. MacLarion proposed to Council to give Mr. Rzepkowski an opportunity to meet with MSDE to address the issues related to the timing of related instruction.

 Mr. Wallace said at a past meeting the occupation of food runner was brought before Council and rejected. Mr. Wallace said the employer came back and complete revamped the opportunity, made it more robust and made it better.

 Chairman Cavey said all the school systems should know that the related instruction should be concurrent to the OJT. Chairman Cavey suggested that there should be a review process like adult apprenticeship. Leza Griffith, assistant attorney general and counsel to the Council, said she wasn’t certain the Council had the authority to conduct such reviews. Mr. MacLarion said such reviews were included in the draft policy issuance. Ms. Griffith said this policy was not yet issued. Mr. Shmelzer said this was the fundamental problem. Chairman Cavey said, without having the review process, there was no way to assure instruction was concurrent, besides a simple check box when staff brought new employers before Council.

 Chairman Cavey said he would like to see a robust career path in lieu of an opportunity for a youth apprenticeship to be coupled with an adult apprenticeship opportunity.

 Mr. Wilford said he agreed with Mr. Shmelzer on a number of his points. Mr. Wilford said the biggest hurdle was to get the policy completed, and Mr. Wilford was a member of the policy committee. Mr. Wilford said if school systems want to become partners in the apprenticeship business, then they need to follow the rules of the apprenticeship business. Mr. Wilford said from what he’s seen in the policy meetings, the schools want the Council to change apprenticeship rules to comply with their educational offerings. Mr. Wilford said youth apprenticeship was basically like a pre-apprenticeship, an opportunity to get an education, a little bit of work experience and pay, and to determine if the occupation was the chosen career path for the future. Mr. Wilford said until the new policy was put in place, the Council was “between a rock and a hard place” because the Council could approve employers but couldn’t enforce or police the programs.

 Mr. MacLarion said staff and the schools were still operating under the original policy and guidance. Mr. MacLarion said Department of Labor staff didn’t monitor the youth apprentices unless they were also registered as adult apprentices through the school-to-apprenticeship pathway. Mr. MacLarion said staff enforced what it could under the old policy guidance. Mr. MacLarion said the draft new policy issuance contained language for more cohesive monitoring. Mr. MacLarion said staff screened eligible employers according to the current rules and all the youth apprenticeship items on the agenda for this meeting met the rules. Mr. MacLarion said staff received assurances for all the youth apprenticeship items on the agenda for this meeting that the instruction would occur concurrent to the OJT.

 Mr. Shmelzer said staff had a right to visit any job site where youth apprentices were employed. Mr. Shmelzer said he was aware of youth apprenticeship programs where the instruction was not occurring concurrent to the OJT. Mr. Shmelzer said the requirement by 2030 for 45% of students to obtain credentials and certifications before graduating was on everyone’s mind of all school systems. Mr. Shmelzer said he wanted to better this system during his tenure on Council.

 Chairman Cavey said youth apprenticeship shouldn’t simply be a means to “just get to numbers” or to reach the 45% goal. Chairman Cavey said youth apprenticeship should be a pathway to a sustainable career. Mr. Wallace said this was also a task of the CTE committee, and the first meeting of the CTE committee was planned for October.

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if business should be conducted as usual or if these issues should be addressed during this meeting. Mr. Shmelzer said these were complex issues and he held no fault with staff. Mr. MacLarion said only a few years ago there were seven youth apprenticeship opportunities, now there’s more than 100. Mr. MacLarion said these issues were a reflection of extreme growth, and it takes time to adjust without watering down the system.

 Chairman Cavey said instead of introducing youth apprenticeship items individually, were there any particular items that had questions. Mr. Shmelzer said he had the same question for all the youth apprenticeship items and that was if the instruction was being offered concurrent to the OJT. Mr. MacLarion said the answer would be the same for each item, to the best of staff knowledge, the instruction would be offered concurrently to juniors and seniors who were registered as youth apprentices.

 Mr. Klusmann said he agreed with Mr. Wilford. Mr. Klusmann said if schools were joining the apprenticeship community, they would have to offer the apprenticeship model. Mr. Shmelzer used the Allan Myers item (item 42) as an example. Mr. Shmelzer said five different classes were paired with the youth apprenticeship opportunity, but these classes were occurring during the daytime. Mr. Shmelzer said a solution would be for the school to partner with a community college to make the related instruction schedule more tenable. Mr. MacLarion said the students would work the entire summer before or after their junior or senior year, they would then work an A Day, B Day schedule during the school year, and receive eight hours of work every other day and get the education on the other days. Mr. Shmelzer asked if this would include math or reading requirements. Mr. MacLarion said yes. Mr. Shmelzer said he stood corrected.

 Mr. Sackett said he was concerned the Council was worried about the wrong things. Mr. Sackett said the Council should be more focused on eligible employers that lacked structure in their models. Mr. MacLarion said all the employers are intensely vetted before coming before Council.

 Mr. Wallace said the idea of youth apprenticeship was for the youth apprentices to enter into a full-time job with a career path, and/or an adult apprenticeship opportunity, upon graduation. Mr. MacLarion said staff was working with employers and sponsors to increase adult apprenticeship opportunities for youth apprentices and grow a more robust system.

 Chairman Cavey asked if the items should be heard one at a time.

A motion to approve items 41 through 56 was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Mr. Bromley, Mr. Shmelzer and Mr. Sackett abstained and all other members voted yea (Dr. Chapple and Mr. Smarte absent).

**11.** Request for the approval of Allan Myers to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Ginamarie Best). (item 42)

*See item 41.*

**12.**  Request for the approval of Benfield Electric Company to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Sheila Jackson). (item 43)

*See item 41.*

**13.** Request for the approval of the Howard County Public School System Information Technology to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Sheila Jackson). (item 44)

*See item 41.*

**14.** Request for the approval of Lloyd Plumbing Corporation to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Sheila Jackson). (item 45)

*See item 41.*

**15.** Request for the approval of Graphcom to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jennifer D. Runkles). (item 46)

 *See item 41.*

**16.** Request for the approval of Mid Atlantic Plastic Surgery to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jennifer D. Runkles). (item 47)

 *See item 41.*

**17.** Request for the approval of Pediatric Movement Center to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jennifer D. Runkles). (item 48)

 *See item 41.*

**18.** Request for the approval of Air Combat Effectiveness Consulting Group to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 49)

 *See item 41.*

**19.** Request for the approval of HMS Enterprises, LLC d/b/a Leonardtown Collision to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 50)

 *See item 41.*

**20.** Request for the approval of ICF to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 51)

 *See item 41.*

**21.** Request for the approval of Koons Toyota of Annapolis to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 52)

 *See item 41.*

**22.** Request for the approval of ProPlumb, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 53)

 *See item 41.*

**23.** Request for the approval of Render Security Engineering, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 54)

 *See item 41.*

**24.** Request for the approval of Stanley Engineering Company, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 55)

 *See item 41.*

**25.** Request for the approval of the U.S. Coast Guard Yard to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 56)

 *See item 41.*

**VI. CLOSING COMMENTS**

Mr. Wallace said the goal was to get as many business partners as possible for youth apprenticeship while following the guidelines and rules. Mr. Wallace said MATP staff and the Council were making youth apprenticeship better through their scrutiny.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Cavey entertained a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Bromley made a motion to adjourned that was seconded by Ms. Butt and the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher D. MacLarion

Secretary

Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council