

**STATE PAINTING & DECORATING APPRENTICESHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Milwaukee Painting & Allied Trades Training Center  
S68 W22665 National Avenue  
Big Bend, Wisconsin 53103

April 5, 2016

**Draft Minutes**

<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Organization/Employer</b>
Arnold, Jeff	IUPAT DC7
Braun, Pete	Wall-Tech
Jazdzewski, Joseph J.	IUPAT DC7
Macejkovic, Jim	Building Service, Inc.
Merhoff, Jeff	IUPAT DC7
Schwiesow, Charles	Porta Painting, Inc.

<b>Members Absent</b>	<b>Organization/Employer</b>
Niemiec, Tony	State Painting Co
Owsianowski, Robert A.	IUPAT DC7
Rintamaki, Gerald	Painters/Decorator Local 934
Wolf, Greg	Schmelzer Paint Co Inc

<b>Consultants &amp; Guests</b>	<b>Organization/Employer</b>
Ahmad, Hafeezah	Milwaukee Area Technical College
Alt, Meredith	Bureau of Apprenticeship Standards
Anderson, Cindy	Bureau of Apprenticeship Standards
Cook, Jim	Madison Area Technical College
Smith, Owen	Bureau of Apprenticeship Standards

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Charles Schwiesow, Committee Co-Chair, in conformance with the Wisconsin open meeting laws.
2. A roll call was conducted. A quorum was present. A sign-in sheet was circulated.
3. The committee reviewed the current roster for vacancies; terms that will soon expire; industry and geographical representation; and the accuracy of members' contact information. The committee noted that the Employee side of the committee may change as a result of upcoming union elections.

4. **Old Business**

**a. Review follow-up items from the previous meeting.**

The committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting as written. Owen Smith advised that all other follow-up items will be addressed throughout the agenda.

**b. For action: determine statewide minimum scores for the Accuplacer and ACT**

Owen explained that, as a follow-up item from the previous meeting, the local committees were to discuss several recommendations of the Bureau for assessing applicants and recommend a course of action to the state committee at this meeting. The recommendations were to continue using current assessments except mechanical-spatial assessments proven discriminatory; accept the ACT as an assessment; and establish uniform subjects, cut-scores and maximum timeframes for scores for all assessments.

Members of the state committee reported that their local committees did not discuss the recommendations.

Owen then asked the members for their initial thoughts on the recommendations. A general discussion followed. Proponents argued that accepting the ACT would help the trade attract applicants between the ages of 18-23. Opponents argued that many older applicants would not have access to the ACT. Owen reminded them that applicants who did not take the ACT in high school would be able to take the assessment currently used by local committee, such as the Accuplacer.

Opponents then asked what led the Bureau to propose the recommendations. Owen explained that the Bureau recommends local committees accept the ACT because the Department of Public Instruction has required all high school juniors to take it in order to graduate, beginning this year. In addition, the Bureau is recommending local committees use this as an opportunity to establish uniform assessment subjects and cut-scores to eliminate the potential for affirmative-action and equal employment opportunity complaints.

Proponents agreed that using the ACT and the current assessment made for an efficient process. Opponents continued to question whether to accept the ACT, largely because it may test applicants on material unrelated to the work of the trade.

The committee had the most discussion over whether to establish uniform cut-scores for all assessments. Owen confirmed that a uniform cut-score would be statewide and no local committee would be permitted to use a higher cut-score. For example, if the statewide cut-score for ACT Math was 14, a local committee could not use a cut-score of 15. If an individual is applying to the same apprenticeship program for the same occupation, it can be difficult to justify why the requirements are greater in the southeast portion of the state than in the northwest portion of the state.

Representatives of local committees then briefly compared the subjects and cut-scores they currently require of applicants, although they could not recall all of the information.

The committee recommended that the local committees needed additional time to review their current processes and discuss the Bureau's recommendations.

***Action:** the state committee advised that the Bureau convene a focus group of local committee representatives and the training coordinator, Adam Holmes, to review the recommendations and propose a course of action to the state committee*

#### **c. Apprenticeship Completion Award Program**

The committee reviewed the cumulative statistics of the ACAP program as of March 15. The Bureau has approved \$417,000 in reimbursement awards and denied \$2 million in reimbursement requests. Owen explained that the large sum of denied funds is due to two reasons.

First, apprentices who successfully qualify for the completion award of 25% of total costs up to \$1,000 submit all of their costs as part of the required documentation. The difference of their total costs and their reimbursement is technically "denied." Second, many apprentices fail to submit a receipt along with their request. Many provide an invoice instead. The Bureau requires a receipt because it proves the apprentice incurred the cost. In contrast, an invoice proves that the apprentice owes a particular amount.

Owen asked the committee for feedback on how ACAP was working for its apprentices and sponsors. One member asked how an employer would know if an apprentice was eligible. Owen explained that once an apprentice becomes eligible, the Bureau database automatically generates an eligibility notice to the apprentice, which is copied to the sponsor.

The committee said it was aware of a few apprentices who received reimbursements, but had nothing overall to report.

#### **d. American Apprenticeship Grant / WAGES**

The committee received an update on the American Apprenticeship Grant activities from grant manager Meredith Alt and outreach coordinator Cindy Anderson. The pair reviewed the objectives of the grant that pertain to the construction sector: supporting pre-apprenticeship programs and youth apprenticeship programs. Meredith explained that the Bureau would award grant funds to local workforce development boards to create and promote pre-apprenticeship programs, and would help develop stronger links between the youth apprenticeship program and registered apprenticeship programs.

A lively discussion followed. Several members of the committee expressed strong concern that the youth apprenticeship program in construction was not feasible because of job-site safety issues. One member voiced concern that the program may be setting youth apprentices up to fail, which would reflect poorly on the registered apprenticeship program. Opponents elaborated that job-sites are hazardous, and contractors may not be willing to hire youth apprentices due to insurance concerns.

Owen emphasized the Department of Workforce Development has concluded that no insurance laws prohibit youth apprentices from working on a job site, although student learners may be restricted in the tasks that they can perform by child labor laws.

Several members voiced support for the Bureau's efforts to increase the skill level of high school students. The members stated that the trade will need more and more younger workers in the future.

#### **e. WI Apprenticeship Summit**

Owen informed the state committee that the first action items from the WI Apprenticeship Summit have been accomplished. The Bureau formed an employer consortium to advise on employer-to-employer outreach strategies and material. The Bureau and consortium recently implemented a statewide survey

of the perceptions of registered apprenticeship among sponsors, former sponsors, and non-sponsors. Former sponsors are companies that do not currently sponsor apprentices but have done so within the past five years. Non-sponsors are companies that have never sponsored apprentices. The Bureau asked several contractor and industry organizations to share the survey with their members. The results will inform future outreach initiatives. The final analysis is still pending.

The committee did not have comments or questions.

**f. Other**

No additional topics were raised.

**5. New Business**

**a. BAS Personnel Update**

Owen reiterated that the Bureau hired two new personnel to implement the WAGE\$ grant, Meredith Alt and Cindy Anderson.

**b. Proposed revision to CFR 29.30**

Owen reported that the Bureau is alerting state committees that the U.S. Department of Labor will likely issue revisions to the federal affirmative action and equal employment opportunity regulations that govern registered apprenticeship by the end of 2016, although no specific date has been mentioned. Significant changes are likely, and the draft released for public comment raised many concerns because much of the language was borrowed from AA/EEO regulations for federal contracts, which differ substantially from registered apprenticeship.

Public comment period closed in January. The Bureau submitted its input through the Advisory Council. The DOL is reviewing the comments, but is prohibited by law from discussing the revisions at this time.

**c. Other**

Owen noted that the Bureau revised its homepage to be more easily navigable. Upgrades include scrolling feature articles; a top navigation bar and bottom navigation bar that appear on every page; a link to the youth apprenticeship website; and a single page for all events, links, data, and legal references.

The committee suggested that the website could include links to major sponsors, too.

**6. Review program participants.**

Program participants with contracts in active or unassigned status on March 29, 2016, include 61 apprentices and 21 employers. Owen reviewed that the committee had expressed concern that prior reports included non-union participants even though the non-union program has not operated for several years. He noted that the Bureau corrected the error. The prior contracts had not been cancelled in the database when the program closed.

7. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Monday, September 12, 2016, at 10:00 a.m. at the IUPAT Local 802 in Sun Prairie.

8. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

---

*Submitted by Hafeezah Ahmad and Owen Smith,  
Bureau of Apprenticeship Standards*

DRAFT