

Action #17.2 Funding and Expansion of Construction Career Technical Education (CTE)

1.1	Key Element of CASA Compact	#17. Stabilize construction labor supply
1.2	Brief Description <i>1-3 sentence summary of action or policy</i>	MTC-ABAG commission a report & action plan for public & private construction training programs to tap foundation & public funds that would enable program expansions. Estimate resources necessary (a) to train approximately 50,000 additional northern California building trades workers & (b) to reduce knowledge barriers that prevent construction workers from becoming construction contractors. Assess training programs' appropriateness for pre-apprenticeship & would-be contractor education.
1.3	Supports these CASA goals:	<input type="checkbox"/> Protection <input type="checkbox"/> Preservation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Production
1.4	Desired Effect <i>What problem would this solve? Who would benefit? If applicable, identify any specific populations who will especially benefit.</i>	<p>The Bay Area has about 135,000 trades people employed in the construction industry and 5,000 annual job openings (BLS; Centers of Excellence 2016); CASA aims to increase new housing production 1.7 – 2X, which would increase both jobs & annual openings 20-45%.</p> <p>Annually, 900 Bay Area community college “exiters” who had enrolled in Construction Career Tech Ed (CTE) courses are employed within one year of exit (not necessarily in construction). Construction CTE has low enrollments & awards as a % of all Bay Area community college CTE enrollments/award (0.6% & 1.1%, respectively).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify & propose ongoing, steadily budgeted funding streams for existing programs, based on a transparent funding formula, for CTE spending on secondary & post-secondary construction crafts. • Identify & propose separate funding streams for startup, expansion, & updating of construction CTE programs. • Identify & propose separate funding streams for addressing issues with historically underrepresented &/or under-trained populations. <p>Ultimately, bolster the supply of residential building with adequately skilled labor & contractors. Potential workers include: women, people of color (including & in addition to Latinos); vets; formerly incarcerated; people with related craft skills from declining industries.</p>
1.5	Key Questions and Points of Concern <i>What key questions or issues need to be resolved?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of info gaps/deterrents/obstacles for people of color & all women to entering & remaining in the pipeline for building trades. • California community colleges already have undertaken an intensive strategic CTE planning process. Can the system be channeled in the direction of prioritizing residential building CTE? • CCC's CTE cost data by course or program weren't available in 2015

1.6	Resources Needed <i>What costs will be incurred and by whom? Note any funding sources that are readily available, if known.</i>	MTC-ABAG staff time &/or budget for consultant study. Calif spent a total of \$5.6 billion on workforce education and training during FY14-15 (\$3.1 billion from state funds and \$2.5 billion from federal funds). At least \$2 billion of state CTE funds was spent by the community college system. Amount spent on <i>construction</i> CTE in either the CCC or K-12 systems is unknown.
1.7	Scale of Impact <i>(as measured by Plan Bay Area goal alignment)</i>	Produce: To 820,000 net new units of housing by 2040, the need is to double the new residential construction workforce (impossible without expansion of residential builder & specialty contractor labor supply)
1.8	Potential Vehicles for Implementation <i>Check all that apply</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Legislation (medium term: authorize sector-targeted spending) ✓ Regional Funding ✓ Statewide Funding ✓ <i>Private FOUNDATION funding:</i> start-up, expansion, updating costs; underrepresented populations programs ✓ Education and Advocacy (targets: Appropriators & Administrators) <p>Pilots & Spreading Best Practices (list of existing programs to be provided in Pt 2)</p>
1.9	Time Frame <i>Time needed for action to be approved and implemented.</i>	<p><i>Select one (Short-term approval; continuous implementation)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Short-Term (0-2 years) ✓ Med-Term (3-5 years) Long-Term (6-10 years)
1.10	Feasibility <i>Select one and describe your rationale for why this level of feasibility is anticipated.</i>	<p><i>Select one</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Difficult: Trying to reprioritize the programming & expenditures of K- 12 schools & Community College Districts will require engagement with institutions that have independent policy & implementation processes. Working with community-based organizations takes less time, but involves a considerably smaller baseline of capacity.