
APPENDIX C:

***ADVISORY/RESOURCE
INFORMATION***



**BALL STATE
UNIVERSITY.**

*Coordinated by Ball State University
with funding provided by Central
Indiana Corporate Partnership*

December 10, 2003

INDIANA MANUFACTURING EDUCATION AND TRAINING INITIATIVE

Advisory/Resource Members and Meeting Minutes



BALL STATE
UNIVERSITY.

*Coordinated by Ball State University
with funding provided by Central
Indiana Corporate Partnership*

I-MET ADVISORY GROUP

Mr. Al Degner, Commissioner
Indiana Department of Workforce Development (DWD)
Indiana Government Center South
10 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dr. Jeff Gunsher, Associate Director
Office of Industry Research and Technology Programs
Hovde Hall, 610 Purdue Mall
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Mr. Pat Kiely, President
Indiana Manufacturers Association
One American Square, Suite 2400
Box 82012
Indianapolis, IN 46282

Mr. Robert Plummer, Vice President
Human Resources
Rolls-Royce Corporation
P O Box 420, Speed Code S-28
Indianapolis, IN 46206-0420

Mr. Jay Schiestle, Director
Advantage Product Supply
Roche Diagnostics Corporation
Roche Patient Care
9115 Hague Road, P O Box 50457
Indianapolis, IN 46256

I-MET Advisory Group
Page 2
April 8, 2003

Dr. John Schneider, Assistant Vice President
(Meetings were attended by Dr. Jeff Gunsher)
Office of Industry Research and Technology Programs
Hovde Hall, 610 Purdue Mall
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Mr. Del Schuh, President
Business Modernization and Technology Corporation (BMT)
10 West Market Street, Suite 450
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Mr. Terry Thurman, Director **(Did not attend meetings)**
UAW Region 3
5850 Fortune Circle West
Indianapolis, IN 46241

Mr. Rex Ward, Director
Apprenticeship and Workforce Development
Ivy Tech State College - Central Office
One West 26th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46208

Mr. Kent Weldon, Deputy Commissioner
(Meetings were attended by Ken Sauer)
Indiana Commission for Higher Education
101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1971

I-MET Advisory Group
Page 3
April 8, 2003

Mr. Jim Wheeler, Executive Vice President
TechPoint
6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 175
Indianapolis, IN 46278

RESOURCE/PRACTITIONER GROUP

AL DEGNER

Indiana Department of Workforce Development (DWD)
Indiana Government Center South
10 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: 317-233-5661
Email: adegner@dwd.state.in.us

T.R. JACKS

National Manufacturing Technology Center – Indianapolis (NMTC-I)
50 South Meridian Street, Suite 302
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: 317-615-0018
Email: trjacks@mtci.org

VERN LUDDEN

The Possibility Network (IWU)
10150 Lantern Road
Fishers, IN 46038
Phone: 317-806-7800
Cell: 317-408-2033
Email: vern.ludden@indwes.edu

DEL SCHUH

Business Modernization and Technology Corporation (BMT)
10 West Market Street, Suite 450
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: 317-635-3058
Email: dschuh@bmtadvantage.org

REX WARD/SCOTT NEAL

Director of Apprenticeship and Workforce Development
Executive Director of Corporate & Community Services – Region 8
Ivy Tech State College - Central Office
One West 26th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46208
Rex's Phone: 317-921-4773
Email: ward@ivytech.edu
Scott's phone: 317-921-4772
Email: sneal@ivytech.edu

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

Project staff held one-on-one interviews and discussions with the following individuals. These meetings included in depth discussion of their involvement in workforce development program operation, policy development and implementation, and site visits to training and education facilities. Discussion also included a focus on their views of the resources, strengths and needs of manufacturing education and training in Central Indiana. Some individuals were contacted more than once for additional information and discussion.

Name	Affiliation	Position
Jim M. Kluemper	Apex Precision Technologies	Production Manager
Gerald W. Lung	Ball State University, Center for Organizational Resources	Assistant Director
Tim Martin	Office of Workplace Literacy (Department of Workforce Development)	Director
Howard W. Wills	Central Nine Career Center	Workplace Training Coordinator
Graham S. Toft	Hudson Institute	Senior Fellow
Del Schuh	Indiana Business Modernization and Technology Corporation	President
Dietra Rosenkoetter	Indiana Business Modernization and Technology Corporation	Business Development Director
Johnnie Vaught	Indiana Business Modernization and Technology Corporation	Project Director
Suzanne Wheeler	Indiana Business Modernization and Technology Corporation	Manager Career Awareness Services
David W. Holt	Indiana Chamber of Commerce	Director, Education Policy and Congressional Affairs
Kent Weldon	Indiana Commission for Higher Education	Deputy Commissioner
Tim Monger	Indiana Department of Commerce	Director, Region 7
Alan D. Degner	Indiana Department of Workforce Development	Commissioner
Brian Borden	Indiana Manufacturers Association	Vice President
Patrick J. Kiely	Indiana Manufacturers Association	President
Kathy Clayton	Indiana State AFL-CIO	Labor Institute for Training, Program Manager
Ken Zeller	Indiana State AFL-CIO	President
LaVerne Ludden	Indiana Wesleyan University, The Possibility Network	Director
Terry R. Fields	Indiana Workforce Development	State Director, Vocational and Technical Education
Rex E. Ward	Ivy Tech State College	Director, Apprenticeship and

		Workplace Learning
Scott Neal	Ivy Tech State College	Executive Director, Corporate and Community Services
T.R. Jacks	MTC Indianapolis	President
Cynthia L. Tomovic	Purdue University, School of Technology, Organizational Leadership and Supervision	Department Head
David Frantz	Purdue University, Organizational Leadership and Supervision	Associate Professor
Jim Wheeler	Techpoint, Inc.	Executive Vice President
Bob McCorkle	UAW/Rolls Royce Corporation	Educational Counselor
John Ludlow	Vincennes University	Statewide Director, Business and Industry Training

**INDIANA – MANUFACTURING EDUCATION & TRAINING
RESOURCE GROUP MINUTES
Chamber Room at the Westin Hotel
Indianapolis, IN
March 25, 2003**

Members present: Al Degner (DWD); T.R. Jacks (NMTC); Vern Ludden (The Possibility Network – IWU); Scott Neal (Ivy Tech);
Del Schuh (BMT)

Project Team Members: John Hoops, FutureWorks; Suzie Jones, Ball State University; Dan Miller, Thomas P. Miller & Associates; and Bill Minnis, Minnis & Associates

Bill Minnis thanked all those for attending and noted that everyone invited to the meeting agreed to attend. He opened the meeting with a description of I-MET for the Resource Group. He described the origins of the project and the overall goal of providing CICP with a model of improved delivery of education and training for manufacturing in Central Indiana. An important goal of the project is to recommend a bridging activity or market mechanism to enhance the connection between providers and employers.

Bill outlined the reasons for asking a “Resource Group” to meet and to provide feedback on the project and on the development of the recommendations. He said it was important to have practitioners in the system involved because of their knowledge and to help the research group shape a workable and implementable set of recommendations. Bill stated that the reason we asked the group to participate is to ask for their help in making the outcomes a success.

Bill asked Dan Miller of Thomas P. Miller & Associates (TPMA) to describe part of the research. Dan outlined the four parts of the data collection and research carried out by TPMA:

- Employers. Originally planned as a survey process, now the research is seeking to form a “user group” of employers who are active in the education and training system as consumers. This group will provide information about what works and what doesn’t for them and what they would like to see in an effective Education and Training service system.
- Vendors. One or more focus groups and a survey instrument will be developed to catalog area training and education providers and services as well as assess the relative success and roadblocks to providing services to employers and workers.
-

-
- Temp Agencies. These will be surveyed to assess the readiness of the workforce and major training needs found by temp agencies as they place workers in temporary or permanent positions.
 - Workforce. With the cooperation of companies in the user group, the research will survey workers to assess their interest in and experiences with education and training.

John Hoops, Futureworks, then presented a description of three additional areas of research in the project.

- National Practice Scan. This scan looks at four different types of Education and Training services to glean promising directions and practices that might be incorporated into the recommendations: (1) sponsored programs (e.g. WIA); (2) government-industry partnerships; (3) employer sponsored programs; and (4) brokerage models.
- Indiana Training Brokers. In addition to the vendor research, we will focus on organizations carrying out training brokerage. The purpose is to understand in detail what is working and what the barriers are to effective brokerage.
- Model Development and Recommendations. Using the information gathered from all parts of the research we would make recommendations to CICP for implementation. These will focus on the connection between providers and employers. However, it will, no doubt, not be a single recommendation and will be built on the existing infrastructure or services and organizations involved in training.

Bill Minnis then opened the meeting for discussion, questions, and suggestions from the resource group.

T.R. Jacks opened the discussion by making a distinction between education and training. He stated that education in Indiana was effective while skills training was not. He encouraged the research to principally focus on training. Manufacturers are focused on skills not so much on degrees for their front-line and production workforce. TR also raised the question of whether manufacturers fully believed in the effectiveness and returns on training. This needed to be demonstrated better in order to develop a market for training.

Del Schuh encouraged the group to think about the future workforce and what the educational and training needs will be. He stated that change in manufacturing in Indiana was on the horizon and we needed to incorporate change into a model of education and training. He questioned whether institutions and providers were prepared to adapt to change and to offer what the economy needed.

The group discussed how training was provided in the region. Scott Neal, Ivy Tech, described the process for customization of training by Ivy Tech. He stated that schools needed to go further in this area and needed better tools for assessing and designing customized training.

Vern Ludden, described the possibilities of the Possibility Network as a means of customizing education for individuals and self-management of the training process.

Al Degner discussed the potential for changing the ways training was supported by the state and cautioned that wholesale change was not likely but that his department and some elements within the state were anxious to look at ways of improving the system.

The group discussed some needs and mechanisms for increasing industry and occupational relevant training and teaching. These included:

- Recognition and planning for the fact that Indiana manufacturing has a need for trained workers who do not require college degrees.
- Mismatch in the perception and reality of the need for a college degree to enter a career.
- Finding good teachers among workers and managers who are now in industry.
- Helping academic teachers understand the requirements of industry and career preparation.

Bill Minnis concluded the discussion by thanking all concerned and asking for additional time and help in preparation of the recommendations.

**INDIANA – MANUFACTURING EDUCATION & TRAINING
ADVISORY GROUP MINUTES
Chamber Room at the Westin Hotel
Indianapolis, IN
April 29, 2003**

Members present: Al Degner (DWD); Jeff Gunsher (Purdue); Pat Kiely (IMA); Ken Sauer (ICHE); Del Schuh (BMT); Rex Ward (Ivy Tech)

Members not present: Robert Plummer (Rolls-Royce Corp); Jay Schiestle (Roche); John Schneider (Purdue); Terry Thurman (UAW); Kent Weldon (ICHE); Jim Wheeler (TechPoint)

Project Team Members: Delaina Boyd & Suzie Jones, Ball State University; John Hoops, FutureWorks; Dan Miller, Thomas P. Miller & Associates; and Bill Minnis, Minnis & Associates

Delaina Boyd thanked all those for attending and noted that a few people who expressed an interest in the project were not able to attend. She opened the meeting with a description of the I-MET project for the advisory board. She described the origins of the project and the overall goal of providing CICIP with a model of improved delivery of education and training for manufacturing in Central Indiana. A most important goal of the project is to recommend a bridging activity and/or a market mechanism to enhance the connection between education/training providers and employers.

Bill Minnis outlined the reasons for asking an advisory group to meet in order to provide feedback on the project and on the development of the recommendations. He said it was important to have stakeholders involved because of their involvement in the current system and the constituencies, which they represented: education, industry services, business, and labor. The group's participation was essential to project success.

Bill stated that this group could help the I-MET initiative with several key areas the project addressed: (1) sustainability of the action steps which may be endorsed by the CICIP; (2) understanding the market for and marketing of education and training services; (3) barriers and problems of implementation; and (4) need for and receptivity to assessment tools for the workforce.

Bill asked Lee Lewellyn of CICIP to give his perspective on the project and what CICIP hoped to see as outcomes of the research. Lee reviewed the genesis of the project in coming from concerns that the educational level of the Indiana manufacturing workforce was not keeping pace with the requirements of manufacturing. He stated that for manufacturers to remain competitive and to remain within Indiana, it was the view of the

CICP that training and education delivered to the manufacturing workforce needed improvements. This project, he stated, was designed to look at the connecting mechanisms between employers with needs for training and education and training providers. He stated that the CICP was interested in recommendations on how the current, but especially, the future education and training needs of the manufacturing workforce would be identified and met.

Bill noted that this work was underway and that sometime in August the consulting team would submit a report to CICP. The goal was to recommend a model or steps that would be “implementable” within a reasonable period of time.

Bill then asked Dan Miller of Thomas P. Miller & Associates (TPMA) to describe part of the research. Dan outlined the parts of the data collection and research carried out by TPMA. Dan outlined the research completed to date and presented key findings from focus groups of education and training providers, surveys of employment agencies, and preliminary interviews with a targeted group of employers.

- Vendors/Providers: Dan stated that vendors/providers stressed the hands-on role they play with companies concerning the identification of need, design of training, and securing funding. Relationship building through repeated interactions was viewed as a key to working with smaller firms. They noted that working with larger companies was sometimes complicated by the tendencies for training decisions to be made out-of-state by corporate headquarters.
- Temporary Agencies: Dan noted that temp agencies reported that one of their fastest growing business areas was training in technical skill areas.
- Employers: Dan stated that in-depth interviews with a selected group of employers were just beginning, and it was too soon to generalize results.

John Hoops, Futureworks, then presented a description of additional areas of research in the project. He described the best practices scan and presented an overview of some of the results to date noting trends within four different categories of programs. These trends included: (1) a closer linkage between training and economic development; (2) a focus on either regional or industry specific training services; and (3) a focus on brokering as a value added service of industry support groups.

John also stated that Futureworks would be collating the research and drafting recommendations within the project report. He stated that this work would begin in June.

Bill Minnis then opened the meeting for discussion, questions, and suggestions from the advisory board.

Members discussed the research findings and focused on the need for identification of metrics of value for training and return on investment. Some group members felt the project should focus on understanding the objectives for training and the ways manufacturing companies measured outcomes.

Members noted that the study was timely since more and more emphasis was placed (from universities to government to industry associations and standards) on the

importance of workforce training. Now, technology development and a skilled workforce to utilize the technology are viewed as two components of the same process.

Advisory group members also stated that the range of brokering institutions contained a number of different actors, including the regional offices of the Local Economic Development Officials whose job included locating resources for training.

Members noted that the project research had not included discussion of the current or future demographics of the workforce and the ways in which changes in manufacturing would affect the types of training. Dan Miller noted that the focus groups touched upon the increasing requirements for (and difficulties in finding) advanced technical training for the existing workforce. Bill Minnis noted that demographic information was available from other sources and this would be incorporated into the final report.

Advisory group members discussed the related needs of assessments (evaluative and for workers) to help companies and educators understand needs and the value of credentials and certifications after a training program had been implemented. They noted that although many employers did not place much value on either credentials or assessments (preferring instead more performance-based and job-based considerations to defining training and skills), the group felt that in the long run it was important to develop these tools as a way to define careers. Pat Kiely noted that sufficient data was available on job characteristics and wages to construct a good picture of careers and career levels in manufacturing.

In summary, the advisory board raised the following concerns and suggestions:

- Increase representation from business and labor in the advisory group and study data;
- Assess the degree to which manufacturers really feel the need for additional training and training services; and
- Assess the processes and bottlenecks of finding and getting training---the perception of the system now is one of lags, delays, unclear schedules, and problems in forecasting the availability of training resources.

Bill Minnis concluded the discussion by thanking all concerned and asking for additional time and assistance in preparation of the recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned.

Indiana – Manufacturing Education and Training Initiative

Reaction and Feedback Purdue Summit May 20, 2003

1. Please place yourself in one of the following categories.

55 forms completed

- 6 (11%) Owner/manager of a manufacturing company
- 2 (4%) Employee of manufacturing company
- 1 (2%) Owner/manager or employee of private, non-manufacturing company
- 6 (11%) Independent consultant
- 9 (16%) Government official
- 12 (21%) Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution
- 2 (4%) Employee of private, for-profit education or training company
- 17 (31%) Other

2. Please indicate on the following scale (from a low of 1 to a high of 10) how useful you found this presentation.

Average response 7.8

Comments:

Government official

- I better understand the components of the Alliance.

Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution

- Great information pertaining to my job
- Well structured and presented
- Need to do follow-up with my organization to see if there is something that would add value to our members

Other

- Concrete steps or actions not provided
- Can't wait to see the "next steps"

3. Please indicate on the following scale (from a low of 1 to a high of 10) how accurately the research findings here reflect your own firm's experience.

Average response **7.8**

13 Responded not applicable

1 Did not respond

Comments:

Owner/manager of a manufacturing company

- Did not focus on second level of workers (e.g. SAP (erp))
- As a medical company, we have strong internal training programs

Owner/manager or employee of private, non-manufacturing company

- It needs a wider audience

Independent consultant

- One key piece for successful initiatives is an identified business need. A need to implement skill and infrastructure to support initiative.

Government official

- Our agency does most of its training in-house.
- The findings on training "intentions" on part of companies is consistent with findings from our survey (completed February 2003) of 1300+ businesses (as part of statewide e-Commerce infrastructure study) – Jennifer Kurtz, IDOC
- We have training funds to award and we need employers to apply – Workforce Development Employee
- Accurate to an extent—but I know Indiana has jumped in the number of degrees attained (www.census.gov, March 2003 press release); unions are more involved than you think—look at HB1962 from 2001 for a great example; our agency handles many of these types of services at a state level, but we are implementing a plan to market these services as we speak. - Angie Nussmeyer, DWD

Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution

- Right on target

Other

- 1995 data?
- Based on my knowledge

4. If you are with a manufacturing firm, does your company use external education and training services?

- 12 Yes
- 2 No
- 34 Responded not applicable
- 7 Did not respond

Comments:

No written comments provided.

5. Please describe on the following scale how difficult (from a low of 1 to a high of 10) it has been for your company to find the “right” education and training services.

- Average response **5.1**
- 30 Responded not applicable
 - 5 Did not respond

Comments:

Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution

- How to break through to reach students/participants to really connect them to the learning—Key is hands-on and applied training!!!

Other

- It is very dependent upon the type of training they need.
- Much of the training is done in-house
- Still do most “technical” training in-house
- As reported here today, some firms are having a difficult time identifying training and training providers!
- Being in a more rural community (Starke County) makes it even more difficult and expensive to find the right education and training services

6. When looking for education and training for your company's employees, does your company frequently use a "broker" as described in this presentation?

- 6 Yes
- 14 No
- 32 Responded not applicable
- 3 Did not respond

Comments:

Owner/manager of a manufacturing company

- Ivy Tech

Other

- Commerce uses other state programs and universities to find programs
- We developed our own training programs for the blue collar worker
- Depends, we do a lot of training in-house, but outsource other education and training functions

7. To what extent are the employees of your company involved (from a low of 1 to a high of 10) in important decisions about training – what kind of training and who provides it.

- Average response **5.3**
- 27 Responded not applicable
 - 4 Did not respond

Comments:

Owner/manager of a manufacturing company

- UAW involved

Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution

- Faculty are continually trying new methods/techniques/designs to match the needs of the participants

Other

- Not at all, unless through individualized Tuition Assistance Programs

8. If an Indiana Manufacturing Skills Alliance (along the lines of that presented here today) were to be created, how interested (from a low of 1 to a high of 10) in exploring membership would your firm be?

Average response **7.7**

17 Responded not applicable

7 Did not respond

Comments:

Owner/manager of a manufacturing company

- It depends on the training provided and at what level. It seems more applicable to large manufacturers.

Owner/manager or employee of private, non-manufacturing company

- I like the notion of making education needs to be a part of our employee's job descriptions and employers need to support it.

Independent consultant

- We would like to explore further (Gene Recker)

Government official

- Our agency acts as a broker by awarding grants to companies for training
- To my mind, it makes a lot of sense for IDOC regional offices to be a part of this Alliance – Jennifer Kurtz
- DWD – Business & Information Development Division would complement – Angie Nussmeyer

Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution

- As a training provider, we'd be a part of it hopefully. – Mike Federspill, Ivy Tech
- Need to define membership in terms of industry and skill set
- The Possibility Network could be the linkage to support the proposed model – Laverne Ludden

Other

- Commerce and the state would want to be involved
- I would be interested in being on a committee for AMSA or advisory group – Jennifer Lewellen
- Probably not very much since we provide most training internally
- Great idea – please include the Indiana Department of Workforce Development- Brenda Johnson
- Not a company representative, but feel the Alliance is very much needed

9. If you are agreeable to being contacted for further discussion of the issues and ideas presented here today, please give us your name and e-mail address.

Owner/manager of a manufacturing company

- S. Michael Hudson mikehudson@iquest.net
Recently retired from Rolls-Royce North America where we had extensive training programs.
- Crisis state requires more radical thinking, discussion focused on research methods more than open, frank discussion about the issues. Need to link more rigorously with the key issues. Seemed like a marketing pitch for “brokers”.
- Tony L. Buck tlb@doughmakers.com
Small manufacturing company struggling with capital to fund the amount of training you know is needed.
- gale.maupin@Honeywell.com
- Tim Shoup tshoup@osv.com
- Umegh Patel Patel@cookbiotech.com
We create very innovative medical products. It is not like any manufacturing process in the area. “Soft-type” training and quality system training would be most useful.

Employee of manufacturing company

- Tim Engle, Director, Human Resources tingle@redgold.com 765-754-7527, 1123
- In some cases, top level positions need more training in how to run the organization than the direct labor pool.

Owner/manager or employee of private, non-manufacturing company

- Paul Lorinczi paul.lorinczi@bitwisesolutions.com
My firm has speced out a tool that could manage the process of tying employers and providers

Independent consultant

- Gene Recker, Basadur Applied Creativity grecker@basadur.com
I want to reflect more on information presented. My first thought is that it is an intriguing concept.
- S. W. Baranyk sbaranyk@att.net
Among private/small manufacturers the strong emphasis on union participation will cause strong resistance.

Government official

- Jennifer Kurtz (Indiana Department of Commerce)
jkurtz@commerce.state.in.us
Very intriguing study – very important to move the state forward so that Indiana can “be in a State of Progress”. The state needs to be considered within the model construct. I strongly suspect that state

training programs “inform” the types of training “designed” for employees.

- Angie Nussmeyer anussmeyer@dwd.state.in.us
- Doris Sims dsims@commerce.state.in.us
As a state employee who promotes training to Indiana companies, I am very interested in seeing how this concept progresses.
- Manasi Watts mwatts@commerce.state.in.us
Are 20 companies enough of a sample size to draw these conclusions from reliably? Otherwise this research and findings is most timely/necessary.
- Diana Sandlin dsandlin@dwd.state.in.us
We currently provide these services free of charge to employers. Our unit (Business & Information Development) has 10 staff so we don't have the resources to market our services. But we can cluster companies with like training needs and have them apply for funds. We also assist companies individually.

Employee of public or non-profit education or training institution

- Mike Federspill mfedersp@ivytech.edu
Great information, thanks. I'd love to see the surveys.
- Henry Kraebber, P.E. Kraeb@purdue.edu
Professor of manufacturing operations, quality, manufacturing systems in the Purdue School of Technology – preparing new grads to enter manufacturing leadership and technical skills in manufacturing and operations management. We are interested in technology “booster shot” programs for workers in industry – offering hands-on with S.O.P. technology for manufacturing. Great concept! The providers have a lot to offer
 - will require plans to restructure what we do on campus, but we should do this to meet needs anyway.
 - key should be effective education/training that meets defined needs

Keep the communication lines open!

Need more research and discussion with the education and training providers.

You may find a model at University of Dayton/Sinclair CC in Dayton—NCME and AIM Center and their work with Dayton Area Manufacturers and the modular curriculum. Robert Mott, Professor Emeritus @ University of Dayton

James Houdeshell sp? At Sinclair CC

Monica Pfair sp? At AIM Center (Sinclair CC)

Distance Education/Technology is a set of tools that makes sense to me.

-

-
- Harvey Abramowitz, Department of Engineering, Purdue University Calumet, Iron and Steel Professor Harveya@calumet.calumet.edu
As related to training engineers – BS and graduate level courses and/or certificates. I am personally involved with the steel/metal industry, would also be working with Ted Soeka of Purdue University Calumet.
 - Mark L. Brenner (Vice Chancellor for Research & Graduate Education, IUPUI) Mbrenner@IUPUI.edu
 - Robert C. Brown chamberpres@myVine.com
 - Karen White kfwhite@purdue.edu
Student (MS level) in OLS, Purdue studying recruitment and training issues specific to encouraging young women to enter technical jobs and study.
 - Jim Humphrey jhumphrey@goodwill-indy.org
 - Carolyn Roper cdroper@tech.purdue.edu
I am currently on the Purdue School of Technology faculty, but was formerly Director of Business and Industry at Ivy Tech. A major problem is motivation to learn by workers, who may have finished a H.S. diploma decades ago. They may lack basic skills and self-esteem. To me that's a major problem to solve. Another is that since you predict no major increase in volume of training, it will be very difficult to get education and training providers to be cooperative instead of competitive.
 - Lisa Robertson, Director of Development for Indiana Horse Council lrobertson@in-motion.net
I would be happy to provide copies of a recently published Equine Survey for Indiana. The equine industry is valued at \$4.6 billion/year in Indiana. Advanced Manufacturing is very important and strategic to our industry.
 - Dr. Laverne Ludden vern@indianalearn.com
Go to www.IndianaLearn.com
- Employee of private, for-profit education or training company
- Karen Zwick, Owner of 1st Class Solutions kzwick@1stclass.com
My company provides technical training services to manufacturing and other organizations.
 - James Weston, President Westech Consulting Group
leanconsultant@aol.com
Lean Enterprise, six sigma, Global 8D, leadership development
- Other
- Mark Leslie mleslie@greenbushindustries
Our company is a non-profit organization that employs adults with disabilities (sheltered workshop). I attended to try to see how organizations like ours will fit in to the future manufacturing.
 - Jennifer Lewellen jlewellen@techpoint.org
I have a number of thoughts and questions if you are interested.

-
- Laura Sheets lsheets@cinergy.com
I currently serve on Regional WIB Board and have a keen interest in this for our local economy that has a heavy union workforce
 - Brenda Johnson bjohnson@dwd.state.in.us
Development Specialist with the Indiana Department of Workforce Development specializing in training grants to Advanced Manufacturing firms. Director is Brett Wineinger sp? bwineinger@dwd.state.in.us and Deputy Commissioner is Arin Mathies amathies@dwd.state.in.us
 - Eric Culp eculd@dwd.state.in.us
Employed by Workforce Development and active with Advance Indiana Program and CTAs and Incumbent worker training
 - Merlin Gonzales merlin@mriindy.com
 - Gerald Scheff, HR Manager/Director of Training, MPI International, Inc. Indiana Fineblanking Division GSCHEFF@MPI-INT.com
We would be interested in participating in the survey

**INDIANA – MANUFACTURING EDUCATION & TRAINING
ADVISORY GROUP MINUTES
Cameral Room at the Westin Hotel
Indianapolis, IN
June 30, 2003**

Members present: Al Degner (DWD); Jeff Gunsher (Purdue); Pat Kiely (IMA); Lee Lewellen (CICP); Robert Plummer (Rolls-Royce Corp); Jay Schiestle (Roche); Ken Sauer (ICHE); Del Schuh (BMT); Rex Ward (Ivy Tech); Kent Weldon (ICHE); Jim Wheeler (TechPoint)

Members not present: John Schneider (Purdue); Terry Thurman (UAW);

Project Team Members: Delaina Boyd & Suzie Jones, Ball State University; Brian Bosworth & John Hoops, FutureWorks; Dan Miller, Thomas P. Miller & Associates; and Bill Minnis, Minnis & Associates

Dan Miller indicated the data collection and research components were nearly complete and that the summary report would be finished soon.

John Hoops shared that the Best Practice Scan was progressing and they were gathering valuable data. He said they are looking closely at two programs – The New Century Careers Program in Pittsburgh and the Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership in Milwaukee.

Brian Bosworth presented a condensed version of the PowerPoint presentation from the Purdue Advanced Manufacturing Summit. He stated that the model was well received based on the comments provided on the *Reaction and Feedback* instruments completed by the participants (summary provided). He reiterated the important role the Advisory Board plays in providing guidance and feedback to the team.

Brian provided an overview of the research findings. Dan mentioned that a survey of employees would not be conducted as none of the companies contacted were interested in participating in this part of the study.

Brian described the Pittsburgh and Wisconsin program models and summarized the lessons learned:

1. Industry leadership is critical
2. Train for the future
3. Enable relationships through collaboration
4. Commitment is gained through a real organization, not just a program name

Brian continued with a description of the brokering process and indicated that there is certainly not a shortage of brokers in Indiana. Several recommendations for improving the existing brokering system were made, but he added that there is no reason to believe this will result in more training.

The brokering system only takes into consideration the employers and the education and training providers. Brian suggested we should think more broadly and bring in the needs of the employees to form a new model. The concept of a Regional Skills Alliance was outlined and components for a Central Indiana Skills Alliance were summarized:

- Formal organization of businesses, labor, business organizations, and education with the mission to increase the quantity and quality of education and training services delivered to the advancing manufacturing community and its workforce.
- Inclusive model of organization with a cohesive mission and vision for workforce development.
- Focuses resources that organize and deliver high quality workforce development
- Distills and articulates the workforce development needs of many employers into a consistent message.
- Develops a “brand” awareness of services for workforce development that presents a consistent positive image of manufacturing occupations.

Brian indicated that Indiana has a critical requirement of this model already in place. He explained that Certificates of Technical Achievement (CTAs) represent a module approach to credentialed skill development and could serve as the “currency of skills”. He concluded the presentation with an overview of the steps necessary to begin forming a skills alliance and asked the group for reactions to the presentation and model.

It was mentioned that incumbent worker training doesn’t always occur when the employee needs it, which reinforces the need for a focus on just-in-time training delivery.

Several members of the group agreed that the model would provide a much-needed forum for dialogue.

The group concurred that an important element for success will be cohesiveness between the education and training providers and the establishment of non-competitive relationships.

The group was pleased with the credentialing aspects of the model, particularly articulations in technical areas.

There was agreement that very little worker assessment is being conducted. It was mentioned that the state is encouraging the use of Work Keys.

The team was cautioned about the message being sent and to be clear about the problem being solved. Stay focused on the training and education needs of workers.

Brian concluded the discussion by thanking the group members for their time and consideration. He added that they would be asked to respond to a more detailed report near the end of the project.

The meeting was adjourned.

**INDIANA – MANUFACTURING EDUCATION & TRAINING
ADVISORY GROUP MINUTES
Board Room at the Westin Hotel
Indianapolis, IN
September 29, 2003**

Members present: Brian Burton (IMA); Pat Kiely (IMA); Lee Lewellen (CICP); Del Schuh (BMT); Rex Ward (Ivy Tech); Kent Weldon (ICHE); Jim Wheeler (TechPoint)

Members not present: Al Degner (DWD); Robert Plummer (Rolls-Royce Corp); Jay Schiestle (Roche); Ken Sauer (ICHE); John Schneider (Purdue); Jeff Gunsher (Purdue); Terry Thurman (UAW);

Project Team Members: Delaina Boyd & Suzie Jones, Ball State University; Brian Bosworth & John Hoops, FutureWorks; Dan Miller, Thomas P. Miller & Associates; and Bill Minnis, Minnis & Associates

The meeting was opened with introductions and an overview and update of the project by Delaina Boyd. Appreciation for the Advisory Group's input was expressed as well as their commitment to the State's improved workforce education.

The Advisory Group had an advanced opportunity to review an outline of the report. Brian Bosworth led an in-depth discussion of the findings and the report content. A major issue in Indiana is the manufacturing workforce preparedness for the future. The Indiana workforce is not as well educated as other States. A second concern was voiced about the term "Central" Indiana Skills Alliance. The project team made an argument for the "Regional" Alliance model. The defense for the regionalized approach was based primarily on issues of proximity and scope. Participating manufacturers need to be able to efficiently connect with training and education programs and statewide is too cumbersome. Statewide policy should encourage regional skill alliances and DWD is supporting those types of initiatives currently. With this as an introduction to the discussion, Brian continued through the outline.

Review of Research Findings

Many of the findings from the extensive research offered few surprises but as the findings were brought together there were a number of major focus areas that became clearer.

- The providers of education and training services were not in short supply and were deemed prepared to provide most of the services required. One area of shortage in education is in the technical skills areas. Many of the manufacturers have programs in place to provide for training. Much of the training is being conducted by suppliers of new equipment. Concern that the institutions of higher education need to come together to develop curriculum to support the manufacturers' needs was expressed rather than selling only what curriculum they have currently.
- The number of brokers (150+) was also a larger than expected discovery. The brokers receive no consistent training and/or orientation to available services. A certificate program of brokers was discussed to support and improve collaboration among and between brokers and educational/training resources.
- A major finding was the importance of bringing the workforce themselves into the model. The model was designed to enhance the importance and attention to the self-motivation of the workforce. Benchmarking the skills of the current workforce needs to be established to help the workforce understand better the value of the training. Changes in the perceived value of the training would encourage greater participation.
- Considerable discussion regarding the various approaches to service assessment and delivery pursued. The need for portability and certification emerged as important elements of the new programs. BMT is using US Dept of Commerce 360 degree view certification and concern regarding the design of conflicting models was voiced by Del Schuh.

Project Team Recommendations

The project team presented two sets of recommendations: (1) for improving the existing elements of education and training for manufacturing workers; and (2) for implementing a new skills alliance model.

a. Improving the Existing Elements

-

-
- Utilize common needs assessment instrument (DWD Work Keys project).
 - Develop accessible database of capable training providers.
 - Move grant application process on-line.
 - Train and certify training brokers.
 - Create a single “brand” of workforce education programs to unify the image of an educated workforce.
 - Create a web site as a resource for employers, employees, and providers.
 - Use the web site as and ongoing assessment tool for customers.
 - Increase usage of DWD’s Certificates of Technical Achievement and link to college degree programs.

b. New Model Implementation: Central Indiana Skills Alliance

- A formal organization of businesses, labor, business organizations, and education whose mission is to increase the quantity and quality of education and training services delivered to the advancing manufacturing community and its workforce in Central Indiana.
- An independent education management system focused on integrating needs and capabilities of employers, workers, and providers.
- An occupational “college” packaging and improving the offerings of all education and training organizations that choose to participate
- An “overlay” institution to support the advancement of manufacturing in Indiana by increasing skill levels and educational attainment of the manufacturing workforce
- Not an alternative to better brokering, but goes farther
- An inclusive model of organization with a cohesive mission and vision for workforce development.
- A skills alliance focuses resources that organize and deliver (directly and/or through partners) high quality workforce development services.
- An alliance distills and articulates the workforce development needs of many employers into a consistent message.
- An alliance targeting manufacturing can develop “brand” awareness of services for workforce development that presents a consistent positive image of manufacturing occupations.

Points of the Implementation Process

- Need for a *champions* steering committee. A small group of manufacturers and community leaders should be developed to champion the CICP initiative and sustain momentum.
- Visit existing models (New Century Careers, Pittsburgh). The steering committee should be informed and inspired by existing successful models.
- Disseminate report to develop support among stakeholders. The report (or a short CICP white paper) should be disseminated to other leaders.
- Identify likely funding streams. The steering committee should take the lead in securing expressions of support from private and public funders.
- Issue RFP for program development and operation. A request for proposals should be issued outlining the specifications and expectations of the model program.

Issues with Implementation

Who is going to champion the CISA effort? What is the role of CICP after the implementation? Although organizations have been approached about their interest, much more discussion will be required to identify the leading/coordinating entities. There are many organizational barriers around funding and geographic coverage. The discussion then focused on the importance of collaboration among entities/corporations potentially involved.

A second strength of the CISA model could be the dispelling of the perceptions that Indiana's workforce has low skills and is poorly educated. This may assist in bringing new investment and maintaining existing investment in manufacturing to Indiana. Funding support for the implementation will need commitments beyond manufacturer's commitment of about \$4 million to give CISA the capacity it needs. DWD and DOC are receptive to investing in the regional model.

Business Plan

A business plan has been developed as a implementation tool for the CISA. This will be part of the final report which will be given to Lee Lewellen for review.

Visit to Best Practice Location

A visit to a best practice operation was recommended. The scheduling of the visit will be planned for in the future. The program in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania - New Century Careers Program was identified as most beneficial. The arrangement

would be made by the consulting team and invitations to representatives from higher education, IMA, DOC, DWD, BMT, and CICP would be identified.

Closing Summary

The open discussion identified many of the problems facing manufacturing in Indiana pertaining to training and education. The meeting closed reviewing the many positive resources available in the state. The educational resources, the brokerage system, and the workforce certificate programs are in place. There was also a clear urgency pointed out by Brian Bosworth to act upon the CISA proposal. The real and perceived problems of the workforce have to be addressed as well as the lack of collaboration and coordination across the state.

Delaina Boyd expressed the consulting team's appreciation for the time and input provided by the Advisory Board.

The meeting adjourned.