

*“WHAT WORKS IN WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT”*

**AN ASTD/AJLMEP STUDY OF  
JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

**Written by  
Mark E. Van Buren, Ph.D.**



# **“WHAT WORKS IN WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT:” AN ASTD/AJLMEP STUDY OF JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

## **Introduction**

In the Spring of 2001, the U.S. Department of Labor commissioned the Association of Joint Labor-Management Educational Programs (AJLMEP) to conduct a study of the impact of the programs on workers, unions, and employers. The purpose of this study was to produce information and resources that will help public and private partnerships build on the strengths and accomplishments of existing programs, identify program design elements that are working, and replicate successful models that have demonstrated a proven track record of results.

AJLMEP along with its research partners, the Conference Board of Canada and the American Society for Training & Development (ASTD), embarked on a 16 month, multi-faceted study examining the investment strategies, the effective design elements of workplace training and education delivery systems, learning and workplace outcomes, and the resulting economic, organizational, and individual benefits to employers, unions, and employees in a cross-section of industries.

The Conference Board research consisted of detailed, in depth interviews with nine training cohorts from joint labor-management educational programs in the health care, information technology / telecommunications, and hospitality sectors. ASTD’s portion of the study consisted of a comprehensive survey conducted of over twenty joint labor-management educational programs representing a cross-section of industries. Both the Conference Board and the ASTD supplemented their respective research with a review of the research and literature in the field of workforce development pertaining to the impact of joint labor-management programs.

This report summarizes the evidence gathered by ASTD from its review of existing literature on the impacts of joint programs. Moreover, it presents the results of its survey, which yielded the most thorough statistical description currently available of joint education programs.

## **Review of Existing Literature**

### **THE RISE OF JOINT EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

During the 1980s, the nature of American industry and work were undergoing fundamental change. The need for increasing the training and education of incumbent and dislocated workers was addressed by a number of unions and employers who created joint labor-management educational programs through their collective bargaining agreements or other cooperative arrangements.

The UAW-Ford Education, Development, and Training Programs, (EDTP) negotiated in 1982, was among the first such efforts, and it pioneered many of the features that are now appearing in other collective-bargaining agreements. In their evaluation of UAW-Ford’s early joint training efforts, Tom Pasco and Dickinson pointed out in *Joint Training Programs: “A Union-Management Approach to Preparing Workers for the Future”* (1991) that EDTP was “hailed as a

prototype of the kind of cooperatively-run institutions desperately needed in America." This program offers both active and laid-off workers opportunities to upgrade their skills and pursue general education resulting in improved product quality, improved labor-management relations, improved quality of work life, and contributed significantly to Ford's competitive resurgence. A key to the success of UAW-Ford EDTP was its focus on meeting the career development and learning needs of participants and in the process promoting and creating a culture of lifelong learning.

Over the past two decades, joint labor-management programs have become significant providers of both general and work skills-related education and training to workers in a variety of industries, among them: steel; auto; aerospace and transportation; health care; public and private service industries; public service; telecommunications, construction, and other industries. Hundreds of thousands of workers have voluntarily participated in these programs engaging in a range of educational and training activities that have resulted in valuable outcomes for individuals, employers, and unions.

A recent survey of 377 employers by the Western Region of Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations provides a glimpse into the preponderance of joint education programs. The report, *Champions@Work: Employment, Workplace Practices and Labor-Management Relations in Western New York*, found that the most common types of joint labor-management committees were joint safety committees, located in about 80 percent of workplaces surveyed. Joint training committees were reported in about 50 percent of the workplaces. These joint programs represent but just a microcosm of the programs nationwide that offer education and training activities.

## **THE IMPACT OF INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

In order to make informed decisions regarding investments in workplace education and training, employers, unions, and employees need reliable information about the benefits and impact of training on key stakeholders – employers, workers, and unions. However, the benefits of investing in workplace education and training are not well understood. The question of how much to invest in workplace education and training has long confounded businesses and unions alike. The fact that few organizations or analysts can answer this question almost surely leads to under-investment in education and training. Employers aren't certain whether additional training investments improve profitability, employees don't believe that more training will serve their specific needs, and unions are not certain whether training investments improve the job security and welfare of their members.

Over the years, business leaders, human resource professionals and researchers have employed a variety of models, methods, and approaches in determining the value and benefits of education and training efforts. While "returns" from investments in training are difficult to calculate, recent breakthrough studies provide compelling evidence that a multitude of benefits result from workplace education and training programs.

As the growing literature on intellectual capital has demonstrated, companies that possess the tools and systems for understanding the "value-added" of worker's knowledge and skills have recognized the importance of "managing their knowledge assets". Informed by an understanding of how the skills and knowledge of their workers create value, companies that employ these approaches have vital information upon which to base their decisions, including decisions regarding the amount of their investment in training and education and in technology. The ASTD report, *Harnessing the Power of Intellectual Capital* (1997) indicates, "Knowledge

management and the intellectual capital it creates are the primary sources of competitive advantage in a growing number of industries. Success increasingly depends on how well companies create, capture, and leverage the skills and knowledge of their employees."

ASTD's report, *Profiting from Learning: Do Firms Investments in Training and Education Payoff?* (2000) offers convincing evidence that companies that invest more heavily in training are more successful and profitable. Based on analyses of unique data on training investments in over 575 publicly-traded firms, the study revealed that firms investing in training experienced better subsequent earnings, return on equity (ROE), and stock performance. The report concludes "that there is evidence that training creates value for organizations."

## EXISTING EVIDENCE OF JOINT PROGRAM IMPACTS

While these publications demonstrate the powerful benefits that employers can reap from workplace education and training, they do not provide specific evidence on the impacts of joint labor-management education programs. As a result, they are silent on the benefits experienced by other stakeholders in these programs, such as employees and unions. The review of the literature conducted for this study uncovered few solid research studies that examine the impacts of joint programs. While the exceptions provide valuable evidence, the sheer lack of a significant body of relevant literature points to the need for further research.

One of the more recent exceptions, a recent Conference Board research report, *Turning Skills into Profit: Economic Benefits of Workplace Education Programs*, (1999) reviewed a number of U.S. workplace education programs, many of which were joint labor-management efforts. The report found that 98 percent of surveyed employers reported increases in both employee skills and economic benefits from workplace education programs. Another important outcome cited in the report was improved labor-management relations and higher employee morale as a result of unions and management working together on common workforce development goals. Among the other improvements observed were an improved quality of work, better team performance, improved capacity to deal with workplace change, improved capacity to use new technology, increased productivity, reduced time per task, error rates, and waste, better health and safety, and improved retention of both employees and customers.

Broad surveys of joint education programs are very rare. More frequently published are evaluations or case studies of the impacts of specific programs. One example is a 1994 research study of participants in a joint labor-management educational program in the telecommunications industry, Training Partnerships Inc. – CWA/US West – Pathways, *Skills for the Workforce of the Future: The Impact of Education and Training on Adult Workers*. The author of the study, Mary Margaret Avertt, concluded that, "well-designed and administered training and education programs for adult workers can help meet the difficult problems that workplace changes have foisted upon employees and employers alike." Avertt also observed that, "particularly important was the perception that the PATHWAYS program's wide range of educational choices as well as the individualized design and structure of the programs played an important part in favorable outcomes."

A study by Beverly Takahashi and Edwin Melendez, from the Community Development Research Center in New York, reviewed three workforce development initiatives involving unions. The report, *Union-Sponsored Workforce Development Initiatives*, concluded that "successful union-led workforce development initiatives structured win-win outcomes that benefited both employers and union members." Among the employee outcomes found by their research were increased job security and improved career ladders. Employers benefited from

improved labor relations, increased efficiency and productivity, and a better equipped workforce. Finally, the programs increased the level of trust between management and workers, reducing grievances and improving teamwork.

Another, more specific example of the benefits of joint education programs comes from the U.S. Department of Labor report, *Working Together for Public Service* (1996). The report describes the case of a joint training program developed by the City of Madison, Wisconsin and AFSCME Local 60 for electricians. The training improved relations between city inspectors and private electrical contractors and reduced by 25 percent the number of inspections needed. While the training cost no more than \$4,000, the reduced need for inspections saved about \$30,000 annually.

Our literature review also uncovered a number of evaluations conducted by the programs themselves. For example, one union evaluated the literacy training it was providing for at risk health care workers in five separate programs. Among the outcomes observed were improved performance by participants in their current jobs, increased self-confidence, improved literacy skills, and a greater desire for more training. The study found that the team teaching model, where multiple instructors share the classroom, was the most promising method they examined.

The programs which participated in the Conference Board of Canada's portion of the current project have conducted numerous internal evaluations of their programs, many of which were carried out by external evaluators to insure their integrity. The Alliance for Employee Growth and Development, for example, has documented the benefits of its program over the years through various studies. One of its studies, conducted in 1999 of computer training for customer care employees, found the following benefits:

- Participants felt their skills improved the level of customer service they provided
- Participants reported significant time savings, estimated at 10,000 hours per year
- Participants reported fewer requests for help from in-house computer experts, saving another 600 hours per year
- Participants reported higher levels of job satisfaction
- Participants had an increased desire for more training

Another study by the Alliance consisted of a survey of representative sample of employees from one of the largest employers in the program. The study illustrated that the benefits of the training depended upon the motivations of the employees taking the training. Three-quarters of those who took the training to keep up with the requirements for their current job said that they had received skills that could be applied to their job. A similar percentage of those employees reported greater confidence in adapting to changes in their work environment. Of the employees who took training because of beginning a new job, 72 percent felt better prepared to start. And, across all employees, the program found a greater interest in longer-term education.

A third study by the Alliance in 2000 examined training received by customer service employees in the use of new web-enabled e-commerce and knowledge management systems. The study was unique in that it evaluated the training from the standpoints of both the employee and the employee's "coach." A substantial share of the participants in the e-commerce training reported enhanced employment security (48%) and increased job satisfaction (46%). Participants and their coaches tended to agree that the employees were more responsive to customer inquiries and could provide more current information.

Meanwhile, both types of training improved productivity significantly. The knowledge management training resulted in time savings of over 7,500 hours in its first year and the e-commerce training yielded an estimated time savings of over 9,300 hour. These time savings resulted in tremendous financial benefits to the employer. For each hour of time invested in the training, 7 hours of job-related efficiencies were generated. The total resulting dollar savings came to more than \$500,000.

These are just a sample of the kinds of impacts that joint programs of all types are having. There are likely many more which we were unable to uncover. Indeed, 65 percent of the programs participating in the ASTD survey in the next section of this report have conducted internal evaluations of their training activities. The portion of this project under the direction of the Conference Board of Canada will elaborate further upon the impacts of the specific programs participating in this research.

## **Survey of Joint Programs**

### **METHOD**

In the fall of 2001, ASTD conducted a mail survey of a sample of joint labor management education programs in the United States. The questionnaire was constructed jointly by ASTD and the Association. It contained 46 questions on the history, nature, extent, and impact of joint programs. Wherever possible, the questions were comparable to those fielded in the ASTD Measurement Kit, the questionnaire used in ASTD's annual survey of employer-provided training. For these questions, we are able to provide a point of comparison to the data that ASTD collects from hundreds of employers each year.

The questionnaire consisted of seven major sections:

- A. Background information on the program
- B. Program education and training expenditures
- C. Nature and extent of employee participation
- D. Services offered by the program
- E. Use of learning technology
- F. Use of outside training services and evaluation methods
- G. Impact of training

With the assistance of the AJLMEP, a sample was drawn from the Association's member programs. Approximately 30 programs were invited to participate in the survey. The survey was sent via email to a key contact at each program who was identified by the Association. Each program was sent at least two follow-up reminders by email, and the Association called each program that had not responded. By the close of the survey period at the end of January 2002, 21 programs submitted complete and valid data to ASTD for inclusion in the study.

All data were reviewed by ASTD for errors, invalid responses, and out-of-range responses. ASTD discussed each instance with the relevant program and made the necessary corrections. The data were entered into a database and analyzed with the SPSS statistical package.

### **RESULTS**

The full set of results from the survey can be found in the accompanying "AJLMEP/ASTD Survey Statistical Report." In this report, we review the main findings of the survey.

### **The Mission of Joint Programs**

We begin with an overview of the purposes that joint programs are intended to serve as stated in their mission statements. Of the programs surveyed, 16 submitted copies of their formal mission statements. They varied greatly in length, from as few as 15 words to as many as 215.

Not surprisingly, all but three of the mission statements explicitly mentioned their primary objective as providing training, education, or learning. In some cases, the programs also indicated that their charge included retraining (3) or development (4). About half of the programs also provided other career-related services, such as career counseling and curriculum design services.

A closer look at the mission statements revealed a stronger bias toward meeting the objectives of workers over those of unions or employers. Only two programs explicitly mentioned union outcomes, and seven programs cited outcomes they sought for employers. Most mission statements, however, noted employee outcomes of their programs (beyond training and education). The most common employee outcomes were personal growth, career growth, and advancement/promotion opportunities. A few programs also specifically sought to provide employees with employability or job security.

### **Breadth and Depth of Programs**

The survey revealed, for the first time, the true comprehensiveness, reach, and depth of joint programs. The median joint program serves about 4 employers. However, some serve several hundred or more employers. The employers, themselves can be quite large; the typical joint program serves employees in over 60 work sites, but some serve several hundred to over one thousand work sites.

On average, these programs serve employers in just one or two industries. About one third of the employers are in telecommunication services, and about one-quarter in health care. Other industries included aerospace, trade, services (hotels), governmental administration, IT services, and durable manufacturing (steel).

Collectively, these employers have a workforce of 857,134 employees. The vast majority of these employees (783,737) works under collective bargaining agreements and is eligible for training provided by the joint programs. On average, each program serves 39,187 eligible employees. A sizeable majority of the employees work on the first shift (56%) and another 3 out of 10 work the second shift.

The reach of joint programs, however, sometimes goes far beyond the employees under a union's collective bargaining agreement. Over a third of programs also provide training to other employees who fall outside the agreements. One in three programs provides training to families of eligible employees, and one in five programs even makes some of its services available to the general public. The costs for these training activities are covered by the employer or public funding sources, rather than through joint program funds.

## **Education and Training Expenditures**

Another way of sizing up joint education programs is to look at their financials. Funded by a variety of sources, collectively these programs had revenues totaling more than \$172 million in 2000, with about \$156 million of that coming from employer contributions. The typical program had income of \$9.1 million. The largest share of the revenue came from employer contributions (84%), followed by federal, state, and local government grants.

The programs reporting total training expenditures spent an average of over \$4.8 million for the 2000 fiscal year, for a combined total across all programs of \$82 million.<sup>1</sup> On an individual employee basis, the programs spent about \$128 per eligible employee on training. When averaged across the actual number of training participants, the cost per trainee served comes to \$704. This figure is even more impressive when added to the \$700 spent per employee by the typical employer in ASTD's Benchmarking Service™.<sup>2</sup> Taken together, each participant in joint program training may have received more than \$1,400 of training.

The manner in which joint programs allocated their funds, however, differs from the way employers spend their money. A little over 26 percent of training expenditures were spent on wages/salaries of training staff, which is about half of what employers devote to staff wages and salaries (51%). This finding may be a reflection of the fact that 50 percent of the programs relied on the training staff of their employers to provide training. On the other hand, joint programs spent 44 percent of their dollars on tuition reimbursements, while employers spent only 11 percent on these payments.

Joint program training also differs from employer-provided training in the subject matter of the training they fund. The content area most heavily funded by the joint programs surveyed was training in professional skills (26% of total training expenditures).<sup>3</sup> In 2000, the typical employer spent a mere fraction (8%) on professional skills training. Basic skills training received the second largest share of dollars (15%). This is an encouraging sign given the skill shortage faced by employers and the fact that employers only spent about 2% of their money on providing basic skills training to their employees. Instead, employers devote a much larger share of training dollars to training in IT skills and technical skills (26 percent combined), and to new employee orientation training (8%).

## **Participation in Joint Program Training**

A third measure of the size of joint programs is the amount of training they provide. As a whole the programs reported delivering in excess of 5.5 million hours of training in 2000. Due to the fact that less than 3 out of every 10 employees eligible for the training took advantage of it, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The marked difference between the levels of revenues and expenditures is the result of several factors. First, several programs reported total revenues, but were unable to provide spending totals. Second, a number of programs excluded certain administrative and curriculum development costs from the expenditure figures they reported. Finally, in a few cases, programs operated with a surplus which they carried over into the following year. If these factors are taken into account, the levels of revenues and expenditures correspond exactly to one another.

<sup>2</sup> The ASTD Benchmarking Service™ is a free service offered to any organization in the world interested in benchmarking its training expenditures, practices, and outcomes against those of other organizations. Each year anywhere from 600 to 1,200 organizations participate in this annual survey.

<sup>3</sup> Professional skills training refers to training and educational activities in a specialized body of knowledge or expertise such as accounting, engineering, manufacturing systems, optics, electronics, mechanics, materials science, chemistry, physics, legal, medical, financial services, banking, and consulting. It is discipline and/or industry specific.



typical participant received 69 hours of training in 2000 from joint programs. This represents a impressive amount of training, given that the typical employer reported giving each employee about 24 hours of training that same year.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, when combined across the programs we surveyed, eligible employees received about 5.5 million hours of training in 2000, an average of 456,000 hours per program per year. However, since about half of the programs were unable to estimate the total number of training hours provided by their programs, the true volume of training may have been twice this amount.

The training usually took place at one of three places. Approximately 35 percent of training occurred at the workplace, and an equivalent amount took place at an educational institution. Another quarter of the training was delivered in the joint program's training center.

### **Participation in Joint Program Operations and Management**

One of the hallmarks of joint labor-management committees is their mandated 50/50 committee structure. The survey revealed that joint labor/management committees were highly involved in various aspects of the programs. In nearly all programs, joint committees help implement the training activities (94%). In the majority of programs, joint committees also participate in designing the training (81%), evaluating the training (75%), and evaluating the instructors (69%). Even the selection of instructors is a role played by joint committees in over half of the programs (56%).

Another reflection of the "jointness" of these programs is the sharing of decision-making. Our survey queried the programs on the participation of employees, union representatives, and employer representatives in 11 types of decisions. We found nearly identical levels of involvement by union and employer representatives in these decisions (7.3 and 7.4 on an 11-point scale, respectively). There only discernable difference was a higher level of union involvement in decisions concerning the marketing and promotion of the program.

By comparison, employees had relatively lower levels of participation in decision making (3.9 on the same scale). This comes as no surprise considering the high level of union involvement which presumably brought the rank and file employees' voice to these decisions. When involved, employees were more likely to participate in decisions about what training was needed and about marketing the training. It was especially rare for employees to be involved in decisions regarding the program's budget.

### **Joint Program Services**

Our survey of joint programs revealed that most programs offer a wide assortment of services beyond training. Some of these services act to support employees training and education needs. The most common training support services included: tuition assistance (84%), computers for onsite training (80%), access to continuing education after training (78%), training resource centers (68%), and special learning needs resources, such as large print books (61%). When offered, the use of these services is relatively light by eligible employees: on average, no more than 45 percent of employees used any given service.

---

<sup>4</sup> Hours measured were measured in terms of instructional time. Hours for degree or credit courses at higher education institutions were calculated at 10 instructional hours for each credit hour.

These programs also offer a broad array of career and job placement related services. The most frequently offered career-related services included: career planning and counseling (80%), information about training providers (70%), information about skills necessary for promotion (65%), and access to information on career opportunities and job promotions (65%). Job placement services for workers seeking new or redesigned jobs was the least common service (35%). Use of these services by employees, when available, was somewhat heavier than training-related services. Half or more employees used programs to get information about skill requirements for promotions and about other training providers.

It came as no surprise during this period of socio-economic upheaval that joint programs have had to adapt and evolve as the environment around them changed. The results of our study suggest that most programs are trying to be responsive to these changes. A large majority of programs reported revising the content of their training activities in the last five years. The top drivers of changes in content included: changing skill requirements, changes in work processes, and the introduction of new technologies. To a somewhat lesser, but still large, extent, joint programs have also had to adjust the range of training and education activities they conduct, especially as a result of more computer-mediated training.

### **Delivery of Joint Program Training**

As the times have changed, so too have the technologies available to joint programs to support and deliver training and education. The survey found that, while the majority of their training activities were delivered with traditional classroom methods (84%), 7 percent of training was delivered via e-learning and other distance-learning technologies. Another 7 percent of training employed other methods, such on-the-job training and experiential learning, to deliver training. These delivery numbers are relatively similar to the ASTD benchmarks for employer-provided training. About 80 percent of this training occurred in the classroom, while 9 percent was delivered via some form of technology.

Joint programs employ a variety of technologies to deliver their training, from CD-ROMs to email to cable TV. On average, none of these delivery methods is used for more than 6 percent of training activities. CD-ROMs, local area networks, and the Internet were the most commonly used methods for distributing e-learning. The most common method of presenting the e-learning was in the form of computer-based text (CBT), used for about 14 percent of courses.

As we reported earlier, joint education programs spent substantially larger percentages on training and education provided by external organizations and individuals in 2000. In addition to 44 percent which went toward tuition assistance, about 27 percent of spending went to pay outside training vendors. Joint programs use a variety of outside vendors to deliver training. Independent training consultants/contractors, community colleges, and technical/vocational institutions were used by 85 to 90 percent of the programs. Somewhat unexpectedly, we found that only 70 percent of programs reported using internal joint program staff to deliver training.

When compared to ASTD employer-provided training benchmarks, joint programs used almost all types of outside training providers more than employers. The only exceptions were private training and consulting firms and product suppliers, both of which were used by employers much more frequently.

Selecting high quality, dependable outside providers is often a difficult task. It can be a challenge to get behind the marketing material used by providers to promote themselves. In our survey, joint programs shared with us that they use several venter selection criteria much more

frequently than others. Far and away, the most important criterion was the quality of the provider's content (53%). Next in importance were the qualifications of the firm and its staff (35%) and the match between the provider's skill sets and the specific project requirements (29%). Surprisingly, none of the programs listed the ability to address security concerns as a key criterion.

ASTD benchmarks on vendor selection criteria suggest that employers share two of the top three criteria used by joint programs: the qualifications of the firm and its staff (#3) and the match between the provider's skill sets and the specific project requirements (#1).

## **Evaluating the Impact of Joint Programs**

As mentioned earlier, a key challenge faced by joint programs is demonstrating the value they provide to various stakeholders, including employees, the union, and employers. The survey not only examined the methods of impact assessment and evaluation used by the joint programs, but also gathered some subjective data on the actual impact the programs have had in a number of areas.

As with employer-provided training, the most common form of assessment conducted by joint programs was measuring trainee satisfaction with their courses. However, the average program collected this information on only 63 percent of its courses in 2000, compared with 78 percent of employer-provided courses. More encouraging was the finding that the impact of the training on trainee skills and knowledge was gathered in 49 percent of joint program courses on average, while employers gathered this information on only 32 percent of courses. Joint programs were also more likely than employers to use less formal methods of evaluation, such as focus groups, observation, and assessing whether expectations were met.

We also found that many programs (65%) were concerned enough about their impact that they had hired third party organizations to conduct studies of their training and other services. A smaller number (33%) had also established a formal process for evaluating educational providers.

We believe that joint programs were relatively pleased by what they have found from their evaluations. The joint programs surveyed universally reported that their activities had positive impacts. All programs reported positive impacts of the training on work quality, and four out of five programs indicated their impact on labor-management relations and employee advancement had been positive.

The actual amount of the impact however varied according to the outcome being assessed. On average, the greatest positive impacts occurred in the quality of work and in labor-management relations. The programs' impacts on wage growth and absenteeism, while still positive, were somewhat weaker.

## **Conclusions**

Through joint labor-management programs, unions and their partner employers can be a powerful source of training and education for employees of all types. Indeed, ASTD's 2002 State of the Industry Report suggests that as many as 30 percent of employers nationwide use unions, trade associations, or professional associations to provide training to their employees.

The results of ASTD's survey reveal the tremendous potential of joint programs to reach millions of employees in hundreds of thousands of employers each year.

However, this potential will only be fully realized to the extent that joint labor-management education programs can successfully meet the needs of employees, unions, and employers. The evidence from research prior to this study hinted at the amount of success joint programs have achieved, but was not definitive. This study, particularly the ASTD survey, is the first systematic attempt to gather all the necessary information on the full range of joint education programs to make conclusive statements about their ability to realize their potential.

We found that most programs are multi-faceted and complex, yet well designed. The design elements of the programs and the nature of the training and other services they provided compare well with those provided solely by employers. In fact, employees in workplaces where their employers and joint labor-management programs invest heavily in their training and education are likely to find a wealth of skill development and learning opportunities.

Of greater significance to the survival and growth of joint education programs were the overwhelmingly positive impacts the programs have had thus far. We found that the majority of joint programs have resulted in improvements in work quality, labor-management relations, advancement opportunities, and employee retention. The picture our study draws is one of "wins" all around: for unions, workers, and employers.

With the information gathered by this survey and the research of the Conference Board of Canada, under the direction of the AJLMEP, employers and unions have further evidence to demonstrate the returns to the workplace education and training provided by joint programs. Moreover, in illustrating the full breadth and depth of these programs statistically, other programs can now benchmark themselves and better position themselves for success.

Many questions however, remain unanswered. Chief among them is the question of what makes for a successful joint training program. The data in this study reveal that certain programs stand out from the rest. What is it about them that sets them apart? Are there particular elements that any well-designed program should have? Answers to these questions will help employers and unions identify the success factors or levers they need to begin or improve their own programs. Alas, these types of questions can only be answered by gathering additional data on larger numbers of joint training programs. In the future, the AJLMEP and ASTD hope to extend this research beyond the participants in the present survey and provide even more definitive and practical information to guide the growth and management of joint labor-management educational programs.

	Joint Labor/Management Education Programs N = 21		ASTD Benchmark Firms N = 367
<b>A. PROGRAM BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b>			
<b>EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES SERVED</b>			
What employers and employees does your joint program serve?			
• Number of employers	54	Median 4	Average
• Number of employees	57,142	55,000	3,859
• Number of employees eligible under Collective Bargaining Agreement	39,187	39,368	
<b>EMPLOYEES SERVED BY SHIFT</b>			
What percentage of employees who typically work first, second, or third shifts?			
• First shift	56		
• Second shift	29		
• Third shift	15		
		(Average)	
<b>NUMBER OF PHYSICAL LOCATIONS SERVED</b>			
Total number of worksites	271	Median 61.00	

**A. PROGRAM BACKGROUND INFORMATION CONTINUED**

<b>BREADTH OF SERVICE DELIVERY</b>				
<b>Does your joint program provide services to:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employees of contributing employers who are NOT represented by a bargaining unit</li> <li>• The general public</li> <li>• Family members of eligible employees</li> </ul>	(Percentages) Yes			
		38		
		19		
		29		
<b>INCORPORATION</b>				
<b>Is your joint program incorporated as a non-profit organization?</b>				
	(Percentages) Yes			
<b>If "Yes", has your joint educational program created a for-profit entity?</b>	(Percentages) Yes			
		57		
<b>Does your joint educational program publish an annual report?</b>	(Percentages) Yes			
		17		
<b>In what year was your joint educational program established?</b>	(Average)			
		48		
		1990		
<b>GOVERNING BOARD</b>				
<b>What is the current structure of your governing board?</b>	(Percentages)			
• Board of Trustees		38		
• Board of Directors		24		
• Joint Committee		33		
• Other		5		

## B. EDUCATION AND TRAINING EXPENDITURES

<b>INCOME</b>				
<b>What percentage of the total income for your joint program during the last year came from the following sources?</b>	(Percentage)			
• Employer contributions		83.6		
• Public grants (local, state, and federal)		18.2		
• Private foundation and corporate grants		0.4		
• Other sources		3.4		
<b>Total income (per program)</b>	(Average)		\$9.1 million	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>What percentage of the total expenditures by your joint program during the last year was spent on the following types of training costs?</b>	(Percentages)			
• Wages and salaries of training personnel		26.3	50.8	
• Payments to outside trainers or outside training companies		27.1	22.2	
• Tuition for courses employees took at educational institutions		43.9	11.0	
• Expenditures on electronic hardware and software used to deliver information and facilitate the development of skills and knowledge.		0.4	3.7	
• Other training expenditures		9.0	12.3	
<b>Total training expenditures (per program)</b>	(Average)		\$4.8 million	
<b>Total training expenditures per eligible employee</b>	(Average)		\$128	\$704
<b>Total training expenditures per actual training participant</b>				\$704

**B. EDUCATION AND TRAINING EXPENDITURES CONTINUED**  
**EXPENDITURES BY TRAINING CONTENT**

What percentage of your expenditures on the design, delivery, and analysis of training activities went toward the following types of training/educational courses?

(Percentages)

• Professional skills	26		8
• Basic skills	15		2
• Other	12		N/A
• Interpersonal communications	11		6
• Career and educational counseling and advising services	10		N/A
• Joint labor-management committee training	5		N/A
• Managerial/supervisory skills	3		10
• Occupational safety/compliance	3		9
• Information technology skills	3		13
• Technical processes and procedures	2		13
• Customer relations	2		7
• Executive or leadership development	2		3
• New employee orientation	1		8
• Quality, competition, and business practices	1		5
• Sales and dealer training	0		4
• Product knowledge	0		9



**C. NATURE AND EXTENT OF EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION**

<b>PARTICIPATION IN TRAINING</b>				
What percentage of eligible employees took part in training during the last year?	(Percentage)	29	78	
<b>HOURS OF TRAINING RECEIVED</b>				
What was the total number of hours of formal training and education received by all eligible employees last year?	(Average)	455,896		
Number of hours of training per participant	(Average)	69		
Number of hours of training per eligible employee	(Average)	25	24	
<b>VENUE OF TRAINING</b>				
What percentage of all training took place at the following locations?	(Percentages)			
• At the participant's workplace		35		
• College or university		35		
• Joint program training center		25		
• At the participant's home		2		
• At the union hall		2		
• Other		0		

**C. NATURE AND EXTENT OF EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION CONTINUED**

<b>JOINT COMMITTEE'S ROLE</b>					
Was a joint labor/management committee involved in the following activities?		(Percentages)			
	Yes				
•	Implementation of the training activities	94			
•	Design of the training activities	81			
•	Evaluation of the training activities	75			
•	Evaluation of the instructor(s)	69			
•	Selection of the instructor(s)	56			
•	Other activities	23			
<b>DECISION MAKING</b>					
How much shared decision making occurs concerning the management and implementation of your training activities?		(Percentages)			
	Yes				
•	What training is needed?	76	Rank and file employees participate?	95	Union representatives participate?
•	How is training to be done?	56		79	84
•	Who is to receive training?	44		89	89
•	Where will training sessions be held?	56		72	72
•	Selection of course materials	25		61	67
•	Overseeing or management of the joint program's training budget	7		89	89
•	Selection of the instructor(s) for the training activities	19		56	56
•	Evaluation of the training activities	50		72	67
•	Evaluation of the instructor(s) of the training activities	56		61	61
•	Marketing and promoting your program's educational and training activities	69		94	83
•	Selection of outside training consultants and training companies	19		67	72
<b>Number of activities participated (Participation Index)</b>		3.9		7.3	7.4
				(Average)	

**C. NATURE AND EXTENT OF EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION CONTINUED**  
**NEEDS ANALYSIS PROCESS**

Do you have a formal process for assessing the need for developing new program activities?

(Percentages)  
Yes

78

**D. JOINT PROGRAM SERVICES**

**GENERAL PRACTICES AND SERVICES**

Are any of the following general services and practices available to your eligible participants and please estimate the percentage of participants that use them?

- Tuition assistance
- Computers or other technologies for employees to use on-site in the program
- Access to continuing education activities upon completion of a training activity
- Training resource centers
- Resource library
- Participation in joint labor/management committees
- Special learning needs (e.g., large-print textbooks for the vision impaired)
- One-on-one tutoring services
- Small group tutoring services
- Mentoring activities/services (e.g., being paired with more experienced employee)
- Other technologies for workers to use at home
- Pre-employment training activities
- Computers for workers to use at home

	Percent of programs with service	Percent of participants using service
	84	27
	80	45
	78	35
	68	39
	67	22
	65	17
	61	1
	56	10
	50	10
	37	5
	37	8
	22	43
	11	0

**D. JOINT PROGRAM SERVICES CONTINUED**

**CAREER OR JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES**

Does your joint program provide any of the following career or job placement services to employees who took part in your training activities? What percentage of all your participants made use of these services?

- Career planning or counseling
- Information about education and training providers
- Access to up-to-date information, about career opportunities and job openings
- Information about skills and training needed for promotion
- Assistance with finding a new job
- Articulated career ladder process
- Job placement services for displaced employees
- Job Placement services for incumbent workers upgrading to new or redesignated positions

Percent of programs with service

- 80
- 70
- 65
- 65
- 55
- 50
- 44
- 35

Percent of participants using service

- 38
- 60
- 46
- 50
- 27
- 32
- 14
- 20

**VOLUNTARY V. MANDATORY SERVICES**

Are the educational or training services offered by your joint educational program voluntary or mandatory for employees?

- Voluntary
- Mandatory
- Some programs voluntary, others mandatory

(Percentages)

- 80
- 0
- 20

**D. JOINT PROGRAM SERVICES CONTINUED**  
**CHANGES IN SERVICES**

	(Percentages) Yes
<b>How has your joint program changed over the past five years?</b>	
• Has the content of your education/training activities changed in response to changing job/skills requirements?	95
• Has the content of your education/training activities changed in response to changes in work process?	84
• Has the content of your education and training activities changed in response to the introduction of new technologies in the workplace?	79
• Has the content of your education and training activities changed in response to the introduction of new products and services?	74
• Has the range of educational and training activities offered by your program placed an increasing emphasis on computer related training?	74
• Has the range of educational and training activities offered by your program placed an increasing emphasis on job-related skills training?	72
• Has your joint program offered activities that place a greater emphasis on educational and career counseling?	68
• Has the range of educational and training activities offered by your program placed an increasing emphasis on communication skills (soft-skills training)?	61
• Has your joint program developed educational/training programs for displaced workers?	47

## E. USE OF LEARNING TECHNOLOGY

<b>PRIMARY DELIVERY METHODS</b>				
<b>What percentage of all training time was delivered to participants by the following methods?</b> (Percentages)				
• <b>Classroom</b> (instructor-led or advanced technology)		83.8		79.4
• <b>Distance Learning</b> (electronic learning technologies to deliver information and facilitate the development of skills and knowledge)		6.9		8.8
• <b>Other self-paced instruction</b>		2.3		7.2
• <b>Other delivery methods</b>		6.9		4.3
<b>PRESENTATION METHODS</b>				
<b>What percentage of formal training activities used each of the following presentation methods?</b> (Percentages)				
• Computer-based text (CBT, text only)		14.3		7.9
• Multimedia		4.9		17.0
• Interactive TV		1.5		0.9
• Electronic performance support system		0.8		0.1
• Teleconferencing		0.5		3.9
• Groupware		0.4		3.6
• Virtual reality		0.0		0.1

**E. USE OF LEARNING TECHNOLOGY CONTINUED**  
**DISTRIBUTION METHODS**

What percentage of formal training activities used each of the following distribution methods?

	(Percentages)			
• CD-ROM	5.9			5.4
• Local area network (LAN)	5.7			6.8
• Internet	3.5			3.4
• Extranet	2.0			1.9
• Voicemail	2.0			1.7
• Electronic mail	1.7			7.1
• Intranet	1.7			8.3
• Simulator	1.4			1.8
• Wide area network (WAN)	1.3			1.3
• Cable TV	0.6			0.6
• Satellite TV	0.0			0.6



## F. OUTSIDE TRAINING SERVICES AND EVALUATION METHODS

<b>OUTSIDE TRAINING PROVIDERS</b>	(Percentage of Programs Indicating "Yes")			
<b>Which of the following sources provided training to your employees during the previous year?</b>				
• Independent training consultants or contractors	90			77
• Community and junior colleges	85			59
• Technical and vocational institutions	85			45
• 4-year colleges and universities	75			71
• Other firms, including private training and consulting companies	70			82
• Your joint program internal staff	70			N/A
• Employer's internal training staff	50			N/A
• Product suppliers	45			71
• Trade or professional associations	40			30
• Federal, state, or local government organizations	30			26
• Other source	8			N/A

**F. OUTSIDE TRAINING SERVICES AND EVALUATION METHODS CONTINUED**  
**IMPORTANCE OF VENDOR SELECTION CRITERIA**

Which of the following are the three most important criteria for selecting a vendor?

- Quality of content
- Qualifications of the firm and their staff
- Match of vendor skill sets with project criteria
- Fit of vendor characteristics with organization culture
- Understanding of the work requirements
- Quality of the project design
- Fees
- Past experience with company
- Increase the impact of training/learning
- Resources not available internally
- Customer Service
- Gain access to world class capabilities
- Increase operational efficiency of the training/learning function
- Reduce operating costs
- Security
- Ability of products to interface seamlessly with current requirements

Percentage Ranking Criteria in Top Three	ASTD Rank Order (1 = Highest)
53	N/A
35	3
29	1
24	8
24	5
24	2
18	6
12	11
12	4
12	10
12	N/A
6	12
0	7
0	9
0	N/A
0	N/A

**G. EVALUATION OF IMPACT**

<b>TYPES OF EVALUATION</b>			
What percentage of training activities received each of the following types of evaluation?	(Percentages)		
• Reaction: trainees' satisfaction with course	63		78
• Learning: trainees' skill level and acquisition	49		32
• Behavior: trainees' behavior and change in performance	6		9
• Results: impact on business results	4		7
• Observation	46		22
• Focus groups	17		6
• Return on expectation	18		7
<b>EVALUATION PROCESSES</b>			
Has your organization had any evaluations, reports, or studies of your program conducted by an external third-party organization?	(Percentages) Yes	65	
Does your organization have a formally defined policy or process for evaluating the performance of educational providers?		33	
<b>AMOUNT OF IMPACT</b>			
What impact has your education/training program as a whole had? (0 = None, 1 = A Little, 2 = A Modest Amount, 3 = A Great Deal)	(Average)		
• Work quality		1.9	
• Labor management relations		1.6	
• Promotion of employees within the organization		1.4	
• Employee Retention		1.4	
• Wage growth		1.1	
• Absenteeism		0.8	