



Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming: *A Study of State Policies and Funding*

National Research Center for
Career and Technical Education
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

**Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming:
A Study of State Policies and Funding**

Catherine A. Oleksiw
Chloe C. Kremidas
Mark Johnson-Lewis
Natasha Lekes
Academy for Educational Development

October 2007

Funding Information

Project Title: National Research Center for Career and Technical Education

Grant Number: V051A990006

Act under Which Funds Administered: Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology of 1998
P.L. 105-332

Source of Grant: Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202

Grantees: National Research Center for Career and Technical Education
University of Minnesota
1954 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108-6197

Director: James R. Stone, III

Percentage of Total Grant Financed by Federal Money: 100%

Dollar Amount of Federal Funds for Grant: \$2,400,000

Disclaimer: The work reported herein was supported under the National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education, PR/Award (VO51A990004) and/or under the National Research Center for Career and Technical Education, PR/Award (VO51A990006) as administered by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education or the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Discrimination: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 states: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” Therefore, the National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education and the National Research Center for Career and Technical Education, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Appendices	v
Executive Summary	vii
Introduction	1
Research Questions	12
Methods	12
Participants	12
Materials	12
Procedure	13
Categorizing and Defining Noncredit Occupational Programming	16
Categories of Noncredit Courses	16
Occupational Programming as Quick Response to Business and Industry Needs	18
Duration and Depth of Noncredit Occupational Programming	18
Noncredit Course Definition and Categorization in State Code	18
Summary	19
Development and Delivery of Courses	19
Range of State Policies	19
Broad Systems to Describe Policies on Noncredit Occupational Programming	20
Entity Responsible for Programming	21
Content Standards	22
Instructor Qualifications	23
Transfer of Courses from Noncredit to Credit	24
Summary	25
Data on Noncredit Occupational Programming	25
State-Level Data Systems	26
College-Level Data Systems	27
Sample of State Data Reported	28
Summary	32
Funding for Noncredit Occupational Programming	32
States with Policies on Funding	32
States with No Policies on Funding	33
Funding Mechanisms for Noncredit Occupational Programming	34
Funding Formula	35
Tuition and Fees	35
Other Nonstate Funding Sources	38
Summary	40
Contract Training	40
Contract Training in Specialized Industries	41
Policies on Contract Training	41
Funding for Business and Industry	41
Partnerships Between Community Colleges and Business and Industry	41
Summary	44
Key Findings	44
Conclusion	46
Recommendations for Future Research	47
References	49

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Inventory of State Policies and Funding for Community College Noncredit Programming.....53

Appendix B. Community College Noncredit Study Interview Protocol55

Appendix C. Sample State Web Sites and Documents Reviewed61

Appendix D. Noncredit Programming Definitions63

Appendix E. State Policies for Community College Noncredit Occupational Course Development and Delivery71

Appendix F. State Funding Policies and Entities Responsible for Noncredit Occupational Programming.....77

Appendix G. State Funding Mechanisms for Noncredit Occupational Programming at Community Colleges85

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study inventoried state policies and regulations on and financial support for noncredit occupational programming offered by community colleges. Information collected from state- and community college-level administrators and Web-based searches is organized by a range of issues related to noncredit occupational programming and funding, such as definitions for *noncredit*; categories of noncredit courses; development and delivery of programming, including content standards, instructor qualifications, and noncredit-to-credit course transfer; state-level collection of noncredit programming data; state funding mechanisms for noncredit courses; and contract training. The study also lays the groundwork for further research on the impact of community college noncredit programming policies and funding on course availability and accessibility, business and industry partnerships, and reporting mechanisms and data systems for noncredit programming.

Research Questions

1. How is noncredit programming defined in the state? How is noncredit programming categorized and how does it differ from credit programming?
2. What are the state policies and regulations related to noncredit occupational programming at community colleges?
3. What entity or entities (e.g., state agency for economic development, community college board, or individual college) is/are responsible for the planning and development of noncredit programming?
4. What entity or entities (e.g., state agency for economic development, community college board) fund(s) community college noncredit occupational programming?
5. Through what mechanisms (e.g., FTE student equivalent reimbursement, lump sum grant) are noncredit occupational programs funded at community colleges?

Design and Methodology

State-level and community college representatives responsible for noncredit occupational programming and funding participated in this study. A matrix was developed to inventory each state's practices related to the development and funding of noncredit occupational courses. Primary areas covered in the matrix were: a) state policies and regulations for community college noncredit occupational programming; b) state policies and mechanisms for funding community college noncredit occupational programming; c) contract or customized training; and d) other nonstate support. Interviews were conducted using an interview protocol. Due to the difficulty of scheduling interviews with state-level contacts, gaps in the information provided by the state-level interviewees, and lack of state-level interviewees in states without policies or regulations on noncredit occupational programming, community college representatives were also interviewed. At the state level, 55 individuals from 48 states were interviewed. At the community college level, 44 individuals at 37 community or technical colleges in 35 states and the District of Columbia were interviewed.

Categorizing and Defining Noncredit Occupational Programming

States defined and categorized their noncredit programming differently. Many states identified two main categories of noncredit programming: leisure/personal enrichment and occupational/workforce development. In these states, the occupational courses tend to be offered either as contract training or as open enrollment courses. Some states described three main categories of noncredit programming: personal enrichment, workforce development, and contract training. In a number of states, customized or contract training is the only type of noncredit occupational programming offered at community colleges. Duration of programming and duration of approval were often reported as the criteria for noncredit occupational courses. Since the approval process for credit courses is longer and more involved than that of noncredit courses, occupational courses may be first offered as noncredit and then later for credit after they have gone through a curriculum review process.

Development and Delivery of Courses

By and large, noncredit occupational programming is created in response to needs identified either by college personnel in collaboration with business and industry, or solely by business and industry. Most states and colleges are using some kind of formal structure to discern industry needs, ranging from college-instituted advisory boards to collaboration with local economic and workforce development entities. For the most part, content requirements and instructor qualifications are driven by industry standards, although those standards could be determined at the national, state, or local level. In some cases, state or college policies set general requirements for instructors, but the content expertise of the instructors is set either by, or in collaboration with, industry.

Data on Noncredit Occupational Programming

There is little consistency across state data systems with respect to terminology, definitions, and reporting standards regarding noncredit occupational programming. Few states collect the same kind and quality of data even though all community colleges interviewed were engaged in some kind of noncredit occupational programming in which contract or customized training makes up a significant proportion. The range of complexity between systems also compromises the value of any cross-state comparisons. The states that do collect data all collect it differently, within different policy contexts and with different program development and delivery systems.

Funding and Funding Mechanisms

The majority of states provide funding for noncredit occupational programming at community colleges through one or more funding mechanisms. The two most common mechanisms reported are funding formula and state grants for business and industry. The most common non-state source of funding that states use or have access to is Workforce Investment Act funds. All states reported charging students tuition and/or fees and contracting with business and industry on a fee-for-service basis.

Contract Training

In all of the states interviewed, at least part of community college noncredit occupational programming takes the form of contracting with business and industry to provide training to existing or future employees. In some states, the majority of noncredit occupational programming is contract training, with most states contracting with the health, manufacturing, and information technology/computer industries. Community colleges are often designated as the main venue for and preferred provider of customized training and technical assistance.

Some states have policies and regulations on contract training that encourage quality economic development by providing incentives for the location of new industries or the expansion of existing firms to improve employment opportunities in the state. Other states support and promote skill training, retraining, and upgrade training through their state policies or, more specifically, aim to lead to regional economic growth.

All states contract with business and industry on a fee-for-service basis, with some states offering incentive grants through federal or state sources to help businesses cover the cost of training and to foster economic development. Grant programs may subsidize the training or retraining of a state's existing or emerging workforce, helping adults gain employability skills or training employers in new technologies. Funding to encourage and support contract training often includes one-to-one matches or matches with private funding sources.

Conclusion

Our most telling findings concerned the range of operational definitions for noncredit programming and for noncredit occupational programming; the existence or absence of policies for development, delivery, and funding; the extent to which different funding mechanisms were used; and the paucity of data easily accessible (if even available) by the states. An apparent constant was the use of contract training in some capacity in every state. In all of this, the community college played a primary role, although many states maintained some degree of oversight, mainly for content standards and course approval. Another key player was the business and industry partner, often but not always through formal agreements due to either by programming or funding policies.

Key Findings

Our findings are organized into three major categories: programming, funding, and data systems.

Programming

- Noncredit courses can often be divided into two broad categories: occupational or workforce development courses, and personal enrichment or recreational or avocational courses.

- In most states, almost all community colleges offer noncredit occupational programming. The amount and type of offerings vary by the resources available to fund these courses as well as the geographic location of the college relative to business and industry sites.
- Colleges and business and industry often partner to plan and develop noncredit courses. In some states, the majority of occupational noncredit programming is customized training.
- The specific needs of a particular state drive the development of noncredit courses and the focus of those courses.
- Field experience and industry accreditation are important instructor qualifications. Instructors often have to meet national standards through accrediting bodies.
- Some states institute new occupational courses first as noncredit and then later as credit. Since the noncredit courses do not have a lengthy approval process, they can initially be offered to meet industry demand and then eventually be put through the course approval process to be offered for credit.
- In some states, noncredit courses are not transferable to credit programs. States may offer students the opportunity to test out of a credit program requirement based on their participation in noncredit courses or to earn credit for noncredit courses by taking an assessment. States sometimes award credit for prior learning and experience.
- Noncredit courses and programming not receiving state funding do not have to undergo a formal approval process. Instead, industry content standards and the needs of industry are often used as a basis for developing these courses.
- Some states are in the process of reforming their noncredit system due to increased attention to noncredit occupational programming.

Funding

- If state funding is available, it is only for occupational, remedial, and adult basic education courses, not for recreational courses.
- In states where only credit courses receive state funding, it is advantageous for colleges to offer occupational, workforce development courses for credit.
- In some states, noncredit occupational courses are self-sustaining. These courses are market-driven and funded by sources other than the state (tuition and fees, industry, college general fund, etc.).
- A few states offer noncredit occupational courses at no charge or regulate tuition and fees so that these remain low. In states with no state funding for noncredit occupational courses, tuition and fees vary widely.

Data Systems

- Many states do not have a centralized system for gathering and reporting data on noncredit programming.

- Some states have not designed their data gathering systems to differentiate between credit and noncredit courses.
- States that fund noncredit occupational programming tend to collect more data on noncredit courses than states that do not provide funding for these courses.

Several factors affect both the development and funding of noncredit occupational programming: a) historically, every community college competes with the four-year postsecondary institutions for state resources; b) community colleges provide noncredit occupational programming based on local and regional workforce development needs that may not match state priorities or initiatives for workforce development; and c) although community colleges work in partnership with business and industry to provide work-related training, the need for training in specific skills and in more general skills may not be equally met.

In addition, it was strikingly apparent that there is no comprehensive and common reporting system for noncredit occupational programming. Having no information limits sound evidence-based decisions on scope of training, funding for training, and balancing the community college academic and noncredit programs to meet the needs of the local workforce. The National Governors Association (2007) recommends that specific metrics be developed so that states can better understand how well postsecondary education is meeting the skill needs of business and industry. Examples include measures of retention of program graduates in their field or discipline, alumni satisfaction concerning their preparation and readiness for work, and satisfaction of employers with workers having the necessary job skills. “Community colleges need to do a better job both of documenting the impact of their programs on local labor forces and economies, and of publicizing their impact to policymakers and the general public” (Jenkins & Boswell, 2002, p. 9). Looking to next steps, any national data reporting on noncredit programming will require significant federal and state investments to create the systems necessary for data management and analysis.

Key Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the extensive amount of information gathered for this study as well as in-depth discussions with state and community college representatives, different avenues for future research might be considered. Listed below are the key recommendations.

1. Assess the overall impact of noncredit workforce development programming on business and industry (in economic terms: more skilled workers, higher salaries, new business, work performance, etc.).
2. Research the administrative structures in the development and delivery of content. Create a taxonomy to appropriately analyze the current structures and determine if there are any lessons to be learned from the different structures might inform the field. Are some structures more effective at delivering content? Is there a relationship between state policies and administrative structures that could inform future policy?

3. Investigate workplace outcomes of noncredit occupational programming. Do states or colleges collect any wage data to measure value added by the training? Are students advancing in their current jobs or careers in ways that could inform policy initiatives?
4. Conduct case studies of states with fully-developed data systems for noncredit occupational programming.
5. Research the recruitment of and the selection criteria for students in state-funded contract training programs to provide additional information on the scope and aim of such grant programs.
6. Identify funding formula components, their relationship to state appropriations, and their relationship to credit course funding in each state to further understand what role noncredit occupational programming plays in each state.
7. Conduct case studies of states to determine best practices: states with state funding, states without state funding, states where the majority of noncredit is customized training, etc. Include interviews with community colleges, business and industry, and employees/students.
8. Monitor and evaluate the progress of a state in the process of revamping noncredit occupational programming.

INTRODUCTION

This study inventoried state policies and regulations on and financial support for noncredit occupational programming offered by community colleges. Information collected from state- and community college-level administrators and Web-based searches is organized by a range of issues related to noncredit occupational programming and funding, such as definitions for *noncredit*; categories of noncredit courses; development and delivery of programming, including content standards, instructor qualifications, and noncredit-to-credit course transfer; state-level collection of noncredit programming data; state funding mechanisms for noncredit courses; and contract training. The study also lays the groundwork for further research on the impact of community college noncredit programming policies and funding on course availability and accessibility, business and industry partnerships, and reporting mechanisms and data systems for noncredit programming.

Highlighting the ongoing need to increase each state's ability to compete in the global economy, the National Governors Association (NGA) released a report (NGA, 2007) calling for state governments, postsecondary education, and the private sector to collaborate in the alignment of postsecondary goals and outcomes with the economic needs of each state. The underlying premise of the proposed collaboration is that postsecondary education policies, programs, curricula, and resources must begin to better address current, emerging, and future economic realities. Graduates must have the skills critical to a competitive workforce. The report addressed the postsecondary sector in general; however, the community college was specifically mentioned as being more responsive to local and regional workforce demand than other types of postsecondary institutions. Community colleges—which offer a range of academic, vocational training, and certification programs—are “nimble, high-quality institutions and, in many ways, provide a model from which postsecondary systems can draw” (NGA, 2007, p. 4).

The mission of the community college. In setting the context for this study from an institutional perspective, consider the overall mission of the community college: “to provide access to postsecondary educational programs and services that lead to stronger, more vital communities” (Vaughan, 2006, p. 3) by offering both academic and vocational and technical training, and credit and noncredit courses that lead to certificates, degrees, and diplomas. The “multiple missions” of the community college, as described by Bailey and Morest (2004), include academic programs that permit students to transfer to four-year institutions as well as a range of additional programs including remedial or developmental education, community service, continuing education, and career and technical education (CTE). Since the early years of community colleges (originally known as junior colleges), there has been some tension in the field regarding what the primary mission of the community college is or should be. While advocates welcome the comprehensive reach of the community college, “critics suggest that the [community] colleges have abandoned missions that should form the foundation of a democratic society and have squandered effort and resources in an attempt to ‘be all things to all people’” (Bailey & Averianova, 1999, p. 1). Tension may exist within the community college between the student-centered academic college which operates according to established institutional practices, and the other more employer- and market-oriented college which operates according to more entrepreneurial prin-

principles (Grubb, Badway, Bell, Bragg, & Russman, 1997).

Career and technical education at the community college. CTE related to workforce development and occupational training has historically been offered at community colleges since the 1920s. Since the 1960s, community colleges have gradually absorbed occupational programming formerly under the purview of other segments of education such as postsecondary occupational programs formerly operated by the secondary schools, adult education programs, technical institutes, and vocational centers (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Jenkins and Boswell (2002) reported that in at least 19 states, the community college system was designated as the lead agency for the provision of workforce training, while in most other states the community colleges played a prominent role. “Business and industry by itself spends massively on worker training, providing almost half of all work-related courses” (Voorhees & Milam, 2005, p. 10). However, the degree to which these courses are developed in partnership with higher education is not clear. The increase in the number of private for-profit providers and the rise of access to Web-based instruction suggest that the noncredit programming market is becoming ever more competitive.

Federal support for the CTE mission of the community colleges is reflected in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and its 1968 and 1972 amendments as well as the Comprehensive Training and Employment Administration (1973), the Job Training Partnership Act (1982), and the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984 and its subsequent reauthorizations. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 redefined the vocational education funding criteria for schools and saw an increase of appropriated funds from \$43M in 1968 to \$981M in 1974 with additional funds for vocational programs for students with disabilities and disadvantaged students (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

More recently, in the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, specific language was added to support partnerships among a range of entities, including postsecondary institutions, local workforce investment boards, and business and industry. Through stronger ties and coordination with business and industry, states and community colleges can develop programming that closes skill gaps and insures continual employability for the local workforce. This focus on state and local cooperation relates to priorities identified by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE): to increase flexibility and reduce bureaucracy at the state level in providing access to training for high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupations in current or emerging professions.

Recent research funded by the Lumina Foundation for Education (Pusser et al., 2007) suggests that the contemporary adult learner needs to secure jobs quickly to match the changing needs of the labor market and so cannot afford the long-term enrollment degree programs require. However, these same adult learners may need to return to college periodically for more training. Although CTE programs do prepare students for employment and serve business and industry by supplying trained workers, no clear pathway is provided for students to earn a credential which may make them more marketable in the future. On the other end of the spectrum, there are students who return to college to learn new job skills or improve existing ones, often after completing a master’s or other advanced degree (Vaughan, 2006).

Noncredit occupational programming. Since there are no reporting requirements for noncredit enrollments, the extent to which higher education is involved in noncredit work-related courses is not known; however, it is estimated that five million Americans participate in noncredit courses and programs at community colleges across the country each year (ECS, 2000). A primary vehicle for providing workforce development training, noncredit classes account for nearly 10% of total classes across all of American higher education with only one in four post-secondary institutions not offering noncredit courses (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). The autonomy of noncredit programming from the traditional academic term, from the inherent institutional bureaucracy of course design and program approval, and from state oversight insures its flexibility and responsiveness. Harmon and MacAllum (2003) suggest that noncredit programming is one of higher education's most effective vehicles for responding quickly to the needs of business and industry. In the Lumina Foundation study on adult learners in college (Pusser et al., 2007), the most prominent fields of study for noncredit courses were computer and information technologies; management, business, and marketing; and arts, humanities, and social sciences.

Described as the hidden or shadow college, noncredit programming is often viewed as less important or credible than credit-bearing academic programs at the community college. Noncredit education, with inadequate funding, a preponderance of adjunct faculty, and general low respect, "represents yet another form of the stratification within postsecondary education" (Grubb, Badway, & Bell, 2002, p. 3). This is partly due to the paucity of data available on noncredit programming. For noncredit occupational courses, the focus of this study, community colleges have historically been the local delivery system, although the market is becoming increasingly more competitive with other entities such as business and industry or for-profit entities offering such courses.

Findings of studies from OVAE's Community College Labor Market Responsiveness Initiative (MacAllum, Yoder, & Poliakoff, 2004) suggest that noncredit occupational courses offered by community colleges can play a critical role in supporting regional economic and workforce development. Since economic growth can be uneven, unpredictable, and rapid, while jobs are constantly evolving, colleges responding to the education and training needs of employers must be able to develop new courses or modify existing courses and deliver them very quickly to meet shifts in local labor markets. Community colleges thus bridge the gap between existing workplace skills and employer-required skills (Drury, 2001). This responsiveness is often most apparent in the degree to which community colleges offer contract or customized training to public and private employers, frequently being the primary provider of workforce training for a geographical region. Dougherty and Bakia (2000) suggest that a healthy tension exists between the needs of business and industry for a trained workforce and the community college's institutional mission of credential attainment.

A report to the U.S. Senate Committee Chairman on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions on credit and noncredit programs for workforce development (Bellis, 2004) noted that at the more than 1,100 public community colleges and technical schools across the country, nearly 6 million students were enrolled in for-credit courses in 2000 and "millions more participated in noncredit courses" (p. 1). The report divided noncredit programming into work-related and

leisure courses. The work-related courses fell into four broad categories: a) occupational, professional, or technical training leading to a certificate, license, or diploma; b) remedial courses such as mathematics, English, and reading; c) basic skills training including English as a Second Language (ESL) and General Educational Development (GED) preparation; and d) contract training provided to businesses, governmental entities, or other employers. Table 1 reports the percentage of the 758 public community colleges and technical schools responding to the GAO survey that offered noncredit programs in the fall of 2002. The top two noncredit program areas reported were remedial education (89%) and contract training (79%).

Table 1.

Types of noncredit programming at community colleges and technical schools in fall 2002

<i>Noncredit programs</i>	<i>% of community colleges and technical schools offering noncredit programs</i>
Below college-level (remedial) courses	89
Contract training	79
Basic skills training/courses	73
Occupational, professional, or technical training	61

Source: GAO, 2004.

Contract training may be held at the workplace or on campus, and use existing faculty or hire instructors. Schools reported serving a total of over 1 million trainees through contract training during the 2002-03 academic year, with a median of 982 trainees per school. More than half of the contracts were with private companies and 20% were with municipalities or other government agencies (Bellis, 2004).

The IPEDS glossary (IPEDS, 2007) defines noncredit programming as “a course or activity having no credit applicable toward a degree, diploma, certificate, or other formal award.” As reported by states and institutions in a survey funded by the Lumina Foundation and conducted by HigherEd.org (Voorhees & Milam, 2005), the range of definitions of noncredit programming include 1) having no credit applicable to degree, diploma, or certificate; 2) not part of academic program; 3) offered through continuing education; 4) not supported by state funded formula; 5) not on degree transcript; and 6) in a business and industry contract. Noncredit not being applicable toward a degree is most accepted by public institutions and the State Higher Education Executive Offices, and less so by private institutions. Although most institutions and states may agree that non-credit courses are not applicable toward a degree, “other definitional statements vary in acceptance between public and private institutions” (Milam, 2005, p. 18).

The adult education component of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) National Household Education Survey (NHES) reports on formal adult educational activities that are not part of a college or a vocational/technical degree, diploma, or certificate program or an apprenticeship program, including work-related courses or training (Kim, Collins Hagedorn, Williamson, & Chapman, 2004). Enrollment in these work-related courses did not necessarily infer

current employment. As reflected in Table 2, the percentage of participants in work-related courses citing certain reasons for participation in these courses remained fairly constant from 2000-01 to 2004-05. Nearly all of the participants (95%) reported wanting to maintain or improve current skills or knowledge, while over 80% reported wanting to learn new skills. Over 60% of the survey respondents reported being required to take the work-related course(s).

Table 2.

Percentage of participants in work-related courses who cited various reasons for participation

<i>Reasons for participation in work-related courses</i>	<i>% in 2000-01</i>	<i>% in 2004-05</i>
To maintain or improve skills or knowledge	95	95
To learn new skills or methods	84	83
Required to take course(s)	62	63
To get or keep a state, industry, or company certificate or license	38	42
To get a raise or promotion	22	19
To get a new job with a different employer	10	10

Source: NCES NHES.

As reported in Table 3, over 50% of the NCES NHES survey respondents reported taking work-related courses that were provided by business, private companies, or private hospitals, with considerably fewer reporting taking courses offered by postsecondary schools, professional or trade associations, or government agencies (O'Donnell, 2005; O'Donnell, 2006). Between 2002-03 and 2004-05, there was little change in the type of provider reported by the NHES participants.

Table 3.

Percentage of adults who took work-related courses, by type of provider

<i>Type of provider</i>	<i>% in 2002-03</i>	<i>% in 2004-05</i>
Business/private company/private hospital	51	52
Postsecondary school (college/university, community/junior college, vocational/technical/occupational school)	21	19
Professional/trade association/organization or union	19	17
Government agency (federal, state, or local)	19	16

Source: NCES NHES.

Although unrelated to job-related technical skills, ESL and basic skills are sometimes required or desired by employers to support their employees' overall job performance. As reported in the 2004-05 NCES NHES, 55% of the adults reported that they participated in basic skills or GED preparation classes to get a new job, while 45% reported participating to get a raise or promotion. For this same respondent set, 56% reported taking ESL classes to get a new job with a different employer and 60% reported taking ESL classes to get a raise or promotion.

Employer support for work-related courses varies and may include provision of instruc-

tion during work hours or reimbursement for tuition, books, and materials. The NCES NHES data on employer support for work-related courses as presented in Table 4 shows that the percentage of adults reporting some type of employer support for work-related courses increased over 10% from 2000-01 (82%) to 2004-05 (91%). For both years, the majority of respondents reported receiving employer support through reimbursement or payment for tuition, books, and materials and/or courses being offered during work hours as part of regular pay or salary. One noticeable change from 2001-01 to 2004-05, however, was an increase of over 60% in adults reporting that the employer provided the instruction. As reported in the 2004 GAO study, benefits to students enrolled in noncredit programs often include “low or no tuition and fees, simpler enrollment procedures, less formal classroom settings, and more flexible class schedules” (Bellis, 2004, p. 12).

Table 4.

Percentage of adults receiving employer support, by selected characteristics

<i>Employer support/incentive</i>	<i>% in 2000-01</i>	<i>% in 2004-05</i>
Received any type of employer support	82	91
Employer provided instruction	46	75
Took educational activities at workplace (offered)	49	56
Took educational activities during work hours while being paid (salary)	70	77
Received reimbursement or payment for tuition, books, and materials	74	83

Source: NCES NHES.

The financial burden borne by the student taking noncredit courses varies. The 2002-03 NCES NHES adult education survey reported median expenses of \$0 for both tuition and fees and for books and materials. The range for tuition/fees was \$0-\$30,000, with more than three-quarters of the respondents (76.8%) reporting spending \$0. The range for books and materials was \$0-\$2,288 with nearly 9 out of 10 respondents (89.7%) reporting \$0.

Even with the millions of adults enrolled in noncredit courses at community colleges, there is little detailed information available on the profile of these adult learners. In a collaborative effort, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and ACT developed the *Faces of the Future* survey to gather information on both credit and noncredit community college students and their overall diversity. Administered annually since 1999, the survey has been used by more than 300 community colleges in order to obtain feedback from their students and to compare their performance against national data. Key *Faces of the Future* findings from the 2006 National Comparison Data Report (2006), which includes information collected from August 2003 through December 2005, describe some noncredit student characteristics such as: 25% of noncredit students had already attained a bachelor’s degree or higher; 59% of credit students and 47% of noncredit students recently had had a change in jobs or had lost their job; and of the noncredit students, 37% were taking courses for self-improvement, 35% to prepare for work, and 20% for their current job. Of the noncredit students, more than one-third reported taking non-

credit courses for work preparation, almost one out of four for improving skills in their current job, and 12% to attain a license or certificate.

Other *Faces of the Future* survey findings further illuminate the kind of student that enrolls in noncredit courses. For instance, of students enrolled in noncredit courses, a higher percentage of students aged 30 years and beyond reported being enrolled in more noncredit courses than credit courses compared to younger students. Although less than 10% of both credit and noncredit students, a greater percentage of noncredit students than credit students had household incomes at or above \$40,000. Another related factor was current employment, with over 40% of all noncredit students compared to 25% of all credit students reporting being employed full-time. In addition, more noncredit students (over 10%) than credit students (7%) reported having been at their current job for 5-10 years, while almost 15% of noncredit students vs. less than 5% of credit students reported having been at their current job for more than 10 years. These data support the general observation that noncredit students tend to be more seasoned workers with full-time employment.

Credentialing. Credentialing is a major concern for those seeking to build a workforce with the skills and training necessary to compete in the global economy. Although the employer may focus more on skills and less on credentials, the evidence of skills that a credential carries in employee selection may become more important in certain circumstances, especially in a recession, when employee selection may become more competitive. As suggested by K. R. Bartlett (2002; 2004), industry-sponsored credentials are often one aspect of the noncredit occupational programming offered at community colleges, indicating the signaling power of industry-sponsored credentials to employers. In a report on credentialing at community colleges sponsored by the National Council for Continuing Education and Training (NCCET), an affiliated council of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), Flynn (2001) presents a range of policy and programmatic recommendations for colleges, including developing a local point of contact with the corporate community, designing outcomes-based curricula, and offering credentialing and certificates in both credit and noncredit formats to provide students with the flexibility of choosing degree or immediate employment options and to promote portability. “The need for a portable, market-driven credentialing system in community colleges has become increasingly acute” (Flynn, 2001, p. 3).

Accountability is intrinsic to noncredit programming. Since noncredit programming survives only as a function of repeat business, “quality is demanded or students fulfill their educational needs elsewhere” (Warford, 2002, p. 23). Furthermore, noncredit programming developed in partnership with business and industry infers another layer of accountability. To be meaningful and relevant to the community college, the learner, and the employer, “different measures of success other than completion of credentials are necessary, but precisely what should replace (or add to) these conventional definitions is not yet clear” (Grubb et al., 1997, p. 59).

Responsiveness and flexibility of noncredit course offerings. Noncredit programs are more responsive to business and industry needs and workforce requirements than credit programs at community colleges are since they typically do not need faculty, administrative, or state approv-

al. “The principal importance of flexibility is that noncredit programs can put new programs into place when a specific community need arises, or when a particular kind of occupational course becomes hot” (Grubb et al., 2002, p. 10). In his study on the future of postsecondary occupational education, Jacobs (2001) suggests that “there should be concerted effort within postsecondary occupational education to develop niche market programs rather than comprehensive programs” (p. 16). This requires a more responsive dynamic for course development as well. Noncredit programs are not usually subject to the same restrictions as credit offerings (which are required to undergo a lengthy curriculum approval process) and thus can be launched more quickly. In addition, for several of the colleges studied in the Labor Market Responsiveness Initiative, noncredit programming served as a foundation for developing for-credit curricula, and thus was an important source of innovation. By engaging in the same strategic development as any business, a community college may offer a course below cost to test the market, or by working with a specific employer. This risk-taking can be funded from the “profits” or surpluses of the workforce development programs, allowing the college to theoretically start new ventures, whereas the FTE funding of the regular college prevents or seriously impedes this kind of market-responsive start-up (Grubb et al., 1997). “Offering such training on a noncredit basis allows schools to use shorter training periods and more quickly add or delete courses to meet local training needs” (Bellis, 2004, p. 4).

Sometimes, however, tensions arise in the marketplace. The community college may be caught between the needs of small and medium-size employers and those most concerned with relatively narrowly-defined, job-specific skills; and larger national and international corporations who are more interested in general skills and higher-order skills (e.g., problem-solving, learning independently, communication with variety of clients and co-workers) (Grubb et al., 1997). A second source of potential tension is the development, implementation, and funding of local initiatives vs. state initiatives in economic and workforce development.

Content standards and instructor qualifications. Content standards and instructor qualifications are two factors that affect the quality of curriculum and content delivery. The Perkins Act stipulates that content standards, with academic and technical standards be presented as a unified program of study for helping students to prepare for high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupations. In a study on the integration of skills standards into community college curricula (Aragon, Woo, & Marvel, 2004), a representative sample of community colleges were surveyed regarding their implementation of industry-based skills standards, and their assessment and credentialing practices. Of the reporting institutions, more than 75% used skills standards in the postsecondary CTE curriculum. “Colleges are implementing both national industry-based and similar state-level standards; however, more institutions implement national standards” (Aragon et al., 2004, p. 23). In specifically addressing noncredit quality standards, Smotroff (2002) recommends that community colleges begin to develop their own standards. In his quality standards model, he delineates specific criteria for program development, design, delivery, and assessment; critical elements of needs analysis and market research; documentation of preferred characteristics of noncredit instructors; and documentation of desirable output characteristics of noncredit learners. From another perspective, just as the Carnegie Unit provides a benchmark for credit instruction, the continuing education unit (CEU) was created by the International Association for Continuing

Education and Training as a standard measurement of continuing education participation. The CEU system provides a common metric across multiple providers and employers in the same way that credit hours do for credit programming. “Absent national or regional accreditation standards for noncredit providers, the CEU serves as a quality control” (Voorhees & Milam, 2005, p. 7).

Instructors of noncredit courses. The Perkins Act encourages local education and business partnerships to develop adjunct faculty arrangements for recruiting qualified industry professionals, and conversely, to provide industry experience for faculty [§135(c)(3)]. In his report on preparing and certifying postsecondary career and technical educators, J. E. Bartlett (2002) presents a major challenge for CTE at large—if there are no instructors, there will be no programs. However, as suggested by Grubb et al. (2002), since low funding and high proportions of adjunct faculty are the norm, “the conditions that would be necessary to improve teaching are simply absent in noncredit programs” (p. 14). Faculty are selected on the basis of content expertise, availability, and cost, with no monitoring system for pedagogical expertise. The postsecondary instructor’s technical skills can be developed through many means—including traditional courses, distance education courses, work experience, and professional development activities (J. E. Bartlett, 2002)—however, the assessment of minimum entrance skills for successful postsecondary CTE educators is still needed in order to determine the relationship of these skills to student achievement.

Transferability of noncredit to credit. Transferability of noncredit course time to credit hours is an economic reality for the workforce, although business and industry, one of the principal drivers of workforce development training, has no vested interest in this issue per se. AACC’s 2004 survey of “hot” programs in community colleges described the salary disparity between for-credit program graduates and noncredit program graduates. “Starting salaries tended to be higher for graduates of for-credit programs than for those of noncredit programs” (McPhee, 2004, p. 5). Still, some of the community colleges in MacAllum et al.’s (2004) labor market responsiveness study had created degree ladders that linked noncredit and credit programming. Pusser et al. (2007) recommend “degree mapping,” whereby a sequence of courses specific to a program of study should “be linked to clear and reliable estimates of time required to earn a degree” (p. 12). From an administrative perspective, schools sometimes use noncredit courses as a transition to adding or deleting courses from the curriculum, converting the course to credit if interest and enrollment increase (Bellis, 2004). Voorhees and Milam (2005) report that both the American Council on Education (through its College Credit Recommendation Service) and the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (through its Prior Learning Assessment) provide institutions and learners with vehicles to bridge the credibility gulf between credit and noncredit learning.

Funding for noncredit programming. Historically, public community colleges have relied on a mixed funding base, with states providing the greatest share of funding and federal funding accounting for a much smaller share (Bellis, 2004). In a survey on state funding for community colleges conducted by the Education Commission of States (ECS) (2000), 26 states reported depending on local tax funds for their community college systems, while 24 states received the bulk of their funds from annual or biennial state legislative appropriations. There is

little information about how and under what circumstances states support noncredit occupational courses. Of the 758 community colleges surveyed in the 2004 GAO study, nearly two-thirds reported receiving state funds for noncredit occupational programming, while less than one-fifth reported not being permitted to use state funds to support such programming. Furthermore, one-third reported receiving about the same level of state funding for credit and noncredit occupation training programs, although most states fund noncredit courses to a lesser degree or not at all. With respect to contract training, of the schools who reported receiving state funds (nearly two-thirds), 54% received state funding for a portion of costs and 11% had most or all costs covered by the state. Twenty-one percent (21%) of the schools reported receiving no state funds for contract training. Some states reported that funding was provided by multiple agencies, such as the community college board and the agency responsible for economic development in the state.

In 2000, the National Center for Continuing Education and Training (NCCET) surveyed all 50 states regarding the funding of noncredit programming (Warford, 2002) and found that 24 states provided resources for noncredit programming. Programs most often funded were workforce training or adult literacy, with no state reporting funding for noncredit avocational or recreational classes. Of the states that provided funding for noncredit programming, 17 states funded noncredit courses on a FTE basis, the conventional funding mechanism used for K-12 and postsecondary education in most states. All but 3 of the 17 states reported being funded at 50-75% the rate of credit courses: only Maryland, Oregon, and Texas funded noncredit FTE at the same rate as credit FTE. In addition, Arizona, Illinois, and New York only provided noncredit FTE reimbursement for remedial programs. “In workforce development programs, where all learners are by definition part-time, FTE funding becomes extremely difficult to apply” (Grubb et al., 1997, p. 57). Twenty-four states also funded noncredit programming directly through targeted grants, most often applied to the workforce area.

The benefit of predictable state funding for noncredit programming lies in institutions being able to plan and budget for courses, although “when state reimbursement is limited to certain noncredit classes or programs, it can dictate the content as well as delivery of those experiences” (Voorhees & Milam, 2005, p. 16). On the other hand, limited or no funding for noncredit programming affects both the institution and the learner. At the institutional level, noncredit programs, unlike credit programs, must cover some or all of their operating costs. The community college is challenged with providing training programs in high demand among local employers that have higher operating costs in terms of teacher salaries and equipment. “When state reimbursement formulas do not take into consideration the higher instructional costs for such programs, the colleges are actually financially penalized for offering access to these high-demand programs rather than lower-cost general education courses” (Jenkins & Boswell, 2002, p. 8).

Since noncredit programs do not qualify for federal student financial aid and typically are not subsidized by state governments, adult learners must bear the burden for tuition and fees unless their training is subsidized. According to Voorhees and Milam (2005), these fees can vary from “a minimal charge for supplies and materials to several hundred dollars” (p. 16). Relative to funding for credit programs, many noncredit programs must support themselves financially, begging the

question of whether or not noncredit adult learners can afford these courses (Warford, 2002). Pusser et al. (2007) recommend that “to maintain individual quality of life and the economy of the state, state policymakers need to establish financial aid programs for working adult learners” (p. 16).

In another study conducted by ECS (2000), 45 of the 50 states were surveyed regarding revenue sources used to fund workforce development activities in their state. Aside from the community college legislative appropriation, the main public funding sources were other state agencies or departments, including state departments of labor, vocational education, economic development, commerce, and human resources. Non-state funding included federal sources such as Perkins funds and Workforce Investment Act, Title II, and Adult Basic Education. To a lesser degree, local municipality and county public sources were mentioned, as were private sources such as foundations.

States reported two primary methods for allocating funds to community colleges: a funding formula developed through a legislative process or by a state higher education board, or appropriations determined through legislative hearings and/or deliberations while considering state higher education board recommendations. Twenty-nine states reported using a formula to appropriate funds for all community colleges, for each college, or both. In these states, the individual institution generally determined how the funds would be spent. The primary factors in the state formulas included enrollment, space utilization, and comparison with peer institutions. (Twenty states identified actual enrollment and four other states used projected enrollment.) Fifteen states reporting having no funding formula. Twenty-four states reported a single consolidated appropriation for all community colleges, with 12 states reporting appropriations allocated to individual institutions and 8 states reporting their community college budgets being included in a consolidated postsecondary appropriation.

The type of funding for community colleges varied across the states, with 21 states reporting special funding for community colleges to train workers for high-demand jobs and 20 states funding noncredit occupational training (not including customized training for employers) at community colleges. In addition, of the 40 states responding to a question on challenges they faced in the provision of workforce training, 30 states cited lack of funding as a primary concern. Several states highlighted the dissonance between the unwillingness of policymakers to support workforce development programs and their calls for a skilled workforce. Exacerbating these resource shortages for community colleges is the fact that “unlike universities that generally have far greater resources, 80% to 85% of the average community college budget is typically tied up in fixed personnel costs” (ECS, 2000, p. 8).

Focus of this study

This study asks questions about policy, including: What state policies support the delivery of noncredit occupational programming? Who is responsible for noncredit program development and delivery? What is the program approval process? How are content standards and instructor qualifications determined? Questions also address state funding for noncredit occupational programming: What state policies support the funding of noncredit occupational programming and

what are the funding mechanisms? Finally, this study provides information on contract training and, as a topic related to noncredit occupational programming in general, information on data and data systems.

Research Questions

The research questions are:

1. How is noncredit programming defined in the state? How is noncredit programming categorized and how does it differ from credit programming?
2. What are the state policies and regulations related to noncredit occupational programming at community colleges?
3. What entity or entities (e.g., state agency for economic development, community college board, or individual college) is/are responsible for the planning and development of noncredit programming?
4. What entity or entities (e.g., state agency for economic development, community college board) fund(s) community college noncredit occupational programming?
5. Through what mechanisms (e.g., FTE student equivalent reimbursement, lump sum grant) are noncredit occupational programs funded at community colleges?

METHODS

Participants

State-level and community college representatives responsible for noncredit occupational programming and funding were the primary sources for this study. At the state level, 55 individuals were interviewed in 48 of the 50 states (Indiana and Vermont did not respond). Interviewees typically included state directors of workforce training for community colleges or vice chancellors within the state community college system. At the community college level, 44 individuals at 37 community or technical colleges were interviewed in 35 states and the District of Columbia, with interviewees typically including deans of continuing education or directors of business and industry. *Note: For the purposes of this report, the 49 states for which data are reported represent 48 of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia.*

Materials

Matrix

A matrix was developed to inventory each state's practices related to the development and funding of noncredit occupational courses (see Appendix A). (The completed matrices for all states are available upon request from the senior author.) The matrix was subdivided into four sections: a) State policies and regulations for community college noncredit occupational pro-

gramming; b) State entities and mechanisms for funding community college noncredit occupational programming; c) Contract or customized training; and d) Other nonstate support. Section A includes items on state policies governing noncredit occupational course development and delivery, the definitions and categorization of noncredit courses, the course approval process, content standards, instructor qualifications, and the transferability of noncredit courses. Section B focuses on state policies for funding noncredit occupational courses and funding mechanisms. Section C isolates contract or customized training from other types of noncredit occupational programming and includes items on the policies for such courses and the types of industries which contract with community colleges to offer customized courses. Finally, Section D addresses other sources of nonstate support for noncredit occupational courses. Each section also includes, where appropriate, items on data, such as enrollment numbers, funding amounts, and percentages of courses in different program areas.

Interview Protocol

An interview protocol was developed based on the matrix (see Appendix B). For each matrix item, a set of prompts were created to ensure a detailed, comprehensive response.

Procedure

Web-based Research

An initial search of state-based Web sites for the community college system, higher education agency, economic development agency, and legislature for all 50 states and the District of Columbia was conducted to collect as much information as possible before contacting the states directly. The Web sites typically contained only general background information or, more often, very little or no information specific to noncredit programming.

LexisNexis, a searchable database of legal documents, was also used to locate state laws, regulations, and policies regarding noncredit programming. LexisNexis terms and connectors were combined with the following keywords: community/junior/college occupational/noncredit/not-for-credit/policy/vocational/program/programming/trade/industrial/credits/credit/hours/course/colleges/state/policies/policy/funding/code/law/technical. Search strings ranged from 2-15 words. Most keywords were truncated to increase results. This process generated a range of documents and reports. The LexisNexis technical support team was contacted periodically to rerun several searches and to verify the accuracy of the search results. Although relevant information was found for a few states using this method, searching through the LexisNexis materials was generally time-consuming, since LexisNexis often identified lengthy documents that were too broad to be useful to this study. Since these searches rarely provided information specific to noncredit occupational programming, LexisNexis was determined to be an ineffective means of collecting information on noncredit occupational courses.

In addition to LexisNexis, other Web sites—including the American Association of Com-

munity Colleges, the Center for Community College Policy, the Council of Chief State School Officers, FindLaw, the National Council for Continuing Education and Training, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, and the Education Commission of the States—were searched to identify both general and state-specific reports, technical papers, and related documentation. These searches provided general information, but not a meaningful range of state-specific information on noncredit occupational programming.

Identifying and Contacting State-Level Representatives

The following contact lists were used to identify an interviewee in each state:

- Primary contact lists: State CTE director contact list provided by NRCCTE, and state-level contacts responsible for noncredit programming provided by NRCCTE.
- Secondary contact list: Postsecondary participants in the 2006 Data Quality Institutes. These events, convened by AED and sponsored by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, gathered experts on the development of a performance accountability system for vocational and technical education.

In an introductory e-mail, the National Research Center for Career and Technical Education (NRCCTE) and the National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education contacted state CTE directors, the state-level representatives responsible for noncredit occupational programming. Although the state CTE director generally is not the ideal source of information on community college noncredit occupational programming since they usually focus only on secondary education, this e-mail from NRCCTE was the first point of contact for state-level postsecondary representatives.

Following the introductory state contact, the study team e-mailed prospective interviewees describing the purpose of the study and referencing the introductory communiqué. At the same time, the researchers called these same individuals to reinforce the e-mail and to provide them with contact information for the researchers. In addition, where identified, the assistants of potential interviewees were contacted to schedule an interview. The researchers then sent the contacts the matrix of interview questions, explaining specific items and providing examples, so that the contacts could determine whether they were the best person to interview and, if not, forward the e-mail to the appropriate individual(s) in their state. Although several means were used to identify and contact potential interviewees, scheduling the interviews was time-consuming. Typically, the study team made a minimum of 10 contacts via e-mail and phone to schedule one interview in any given state.

In cases where the individual contacted did not feel knowledgeable enough to respond to any or all of the questions, they were asked to recommend another individual. In a handful of cases, there was no state response, and the study team collaborated with researchers at the Community College Research Center (CCRC) at Teachers College, Columbia University who were concurrently conducting a study on noncredit programming and interviewing the same state contacts in many cases. If this method did not produce results, the study team made cold calls

based on a Web-based search to locate a state-level interviewee, such as the executive director of a community college association. On average, the cold call method was successful 50% of the time. It is worth noting that two major studies on the same topic being conducted concurrently did create some confusion in the field and, in some instances, compromised the willingness of many of the state contacts to participate.

Interviewing State-Level Representatives

Interviews were conducted using the interview protocol, which took 30-60 minutes to complete. In some cases, a group of individuals were interviewed together. In a few instances, separate interviewees responded to the policy and funding sections of the matrix—for example, the deputy secretary of academic affairs for a higher education institution would answer the policy questions while the finance director would answer the questions on funding mechanisms. Based on issues that arose during the initial interviews, the original matrix was revised. For instance, it became clear that states categorized and defined noncredit occupational programming differently. Consequently, questions specifically addressing the categorization and definition of noncredit occupational programming were added to the interview protocol.

Identifying and Interviewing Community College Representatives

Due to difficulties scheduling interviews with state-level contacts, gaps in the information provided by the state-level interviewees, and/or no state-level staff in states without policies or regulations on noncredit occupational programming, the study team conducted a second set of interviews with community college representatives. To identify a suitable community college interviewee, state-level contacts were asked to recommend a community college with a large proportion of its student population enrolled in noncredit occupational courses and provide the name of an appropriate individual at that college. If the community college contact did not respond or if a contact was not provided, cold calls were made to community colleges to identify an interviewee. Generally, community college contacts were responsive to requests to be interviewed. In addition to filling in information gaps, the interviews with community college representatives validated the information collected in the state-level interviews.

Completing the Inventory

Information gathered during the interviews and through review of documents was summarized and then entered into the matrix described above. The matrix was first filled out based on the interview with the state-level contact. It was then sent to the interviewee for verification and subsequently revised. Several attempts were made to receive comments and revisions from each interviewee, but the matrix was not verified by all of the interviewees. Of the 48 states for which state-level data were collected, 20 verified the state information. In some cases, the matrix was verified by several individuals who had participated in the interview. Of the 37 community colleges, including the University of the District of Columbia, for which information was collected, 14 verified the information.

The matrix was updated based on the revisions received. In a few instances, where requested by the state contact, the matrix was first filled out by the state or community college contacts and then the researchers followed up with a phone call to clarify the responses. Finally, information from documents collected in the Web-based research or provided by interviewees supplemented the data collected in the interviews. Examples of such documentation included a position paper from a workforce investment board, a Web site for a career consortium, a Governor's Council annual report on workforce policy, and the fact book report for a community college system. Appendix C presents sample documents and Web sites that were reviewed.

Analysis of Responses Across States

The matrices were compared across the states to identify the range of responses. Information was synthesized by research question and topic as outlined in the matrix. For example, for state policies on funding for noncredit occupational programming, commonalities and differences in the development, delivery, and funding of noncredit occupational programming were recorded. Similar responses were tallied. Note that throughout this report, whenever a state is listed or described, no distinction is made between the state or community college information source.

CATEGORIZING AND DEFINING NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMMING

In initial interviews with state-level representatives, it immediately became apparent that states define and categorize noncredit programming differently. Since noncredit programming encompasses a range of courses, it was important to first identify the various types of noncredit courses before focusing specifically on noncredit occupational programming. State-level and community college interviewees were asked to define noncredit courses and describe how they categorized such courses. They were also probed regarding how credit and noncredit programming differ. In a few cases, noncredit definitions were outlined in the state code. A state-by-state summary matrix of noncredit course definitions and categorization is presented in Appendix D.

Categories of Noncredit Courses

Although not necessarily reflected in state policy, state and community college contacts often described different categorization schemes for noncredit programming in their state. This is evident in the varied examples of noncredit programming for any one state. Since all states could not provide a list of all of the categories of noncredit programming in use in their state, examples of the ways in which states categorize noncredit courses are presented in Table 5.

In practice, many states distinguish between two main categories of noncredit programming: leisure/personal enrichment and occupational/workforce development (CO, CT, DE, HI, KY, SC, TX, WV). In these states, the occupational courses tend to be offered either as contract training or as open enrollment courses. For instance, in Kentucky, noncredit workforce development courses include customized training as well as skills upgrade and professional licensure courses. Some states described three main categories of noncredit programming: personal enrich-

Table 5.

Examples of state categorization of noncredit programming

<i>Categorization of noncredit programming</i>	<i>States</i>
Two main categories: Leisure/personal enrichment and occupational/workforce development	CO, CT, DE, HI, KY, SC, TX, WV
Three main categories: Leisure/personal enrichment, occupational/workforce development, and contract/customized training	AL, AZ, AR, NM

ment, workforce development, and contract training (AL, AZ, AR, NM). In these states, contract training is distinguished from other workforce development courses. The leisure/personal enrichment category includes community interest and recreational courses such as knitting and ballroom dancing. In contrast, the occupational/workforce development category encompasses courses designed to improve technical workplace skills, such as plumbing skills or information technology. Finally, in a few states, such as Colorado and North Dakota, all of the occupational noncredit courses are customized training.

As shown in Table 6, states described a range of programming that falls under the category of noncredit occupational. Many states referred to skills upgrading when describing noncredit occupational courses (AK, CO, FL, KY, MS, MT, NE, OK, OR). For instance, in Colorado, courses are offered to upgrade the skills of workers who have been displaced, and in Montana and Oklahoma, courses are available to upgrade the skills of professionals. Some states define noncredit occupational courses as those that do not lead to a degree (FL, MD, OR). For example, in Maryland, noncredit courses are those that do not partially fulfill the requirements for the award of a degree or certificate, but which may be prerequisites for participation in credit courses leading to a degree or certificate.

Table 6.

Examples of noncredit occupational programming

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational and workforce development courses that are shorter in length and not as in-depth as those offered for credit • Customized or contract training • Upgrading the skills of displaced workers • Upgrading the skills of professionals • ESL language skills necessary to enter and advance in the workplace • Basic skills, including remediation and GED courses
--

In many states, basic skills courses, including remediation and GED courses, are a category of noncredit programming (AZ, CA, CT, MD, NJ, NM, NC). In some cases, basic skills are specifically included in the category of occupational or workforce development programming (CA, CT). For example, in Connecticut, a basic skills course is categorized as workforce development if it is requested by business and industry. In some states, ESL courses are considered occupational because language skills are necessary to enter and advance in the workplace (CA,

NV). In California, there is a category of noncredit programming specifically for immigrants that includes ESL and workforce preparation classes—courses which allow such students to gain the employability and language skills needed to participate in job-related technical training.

In a few states, customized or contract training is the only type of noncredit occupational programming offered at community colleges (CO, ND). In other states, noncredit occupational courses are offered either as open enrollment classes which any interested person can take, or as customized training in which a business contracts with a college to offer courses for its employees.

Occupational Programming as Quick Response to Business and Industry Needs

Several states indicated that since the approval process for credit courses is longer and more involved than that for noncredit courses, occupational courses are first offered as noncredit and later for credit, once they have gone through a curriculum review process (AZ, CO, LA, MD). For example, in Louisiana, a course might first be offered as noncredit in order to respond quickly to the needs of business and industry and then, prior to being offered for credit, be submitted to the Board of Regents for approval. Likewise, at some Colorado colleges, an occupational program will begin as a noncredit customized training class to quickly fulfill a workplace need and later be offered as a for-credit program. In these states, offering courses initially as noncredit allows them to be piloted before being introduced as credit programs.

Duration and Depth of Noncredit Occupational Programming

In several states, noncredit courses differ from credit courses based on the duration of programming (CA, GA, HI, IL, MT, NM). For example, at Montana technical colleges, noncredit professional and continuing education courses provide working students and professionals with condensed coursework to upgrade their skills. In New Mexico, noncredit and credit occupational courses differ in depth of content and timeframe. While credit courses are offered during a 16-week period, noncredit courses are offered in a condensed format over one to several weeks. Similarly, in Georgia, noncredit occupational programming is offered in a 4-6 hour block whereas credit occupational programming is offered in a 70-80 hour block. In the Texas state code, course duration distinguishes credit and noncredit workforce education, with workforce continuing education programs that exceed 780 contact hours being eligible for credit.

Noncredit Course Definition and Categorization in State Code

Florida and California and Florida state codes contain a specific definition and detailed categorization of noncredit occupational programming. Florida has several categories of noncredit programming, including postsecondary adult vocational education, continuing workforce education, lifelong learning, and community instruction services. California clearly delineates nine areas of noncredit programming eligible for state funding, although not all of these are necessarily related to workforce development. For example, short-term vocational training with high employment potential is an occupational category while parenting training is not. The level of

detail in the classification for Florida and California seems to be linked to state policies governing the use of state funds for some but not all noncredit programming. In Florida, for instance, postsecondary adult vocational courses are eligible for state funds but continuing workforce education courses are not. Likewise, in California, not-for-credit courses, which can be occupational in nature, are not eligible for state funding whereas noncredit occupational courses do receive state support. Specifically, if a business agrees to open enrollment for its contract training class, then the class is a state-supported noncredit course; otherwise, this same contract training course is classified as a nonstate-supported not-for-credit course. In other states, local colleges determine the definition and categorization of noncredit programs (KS, ME, NY, OH, OR, WA, WY).

Summary

States define and categorize their noncredit programming differently. Many states identified two main categories of noncredit programming: leisure/personal enrichment and occupational/workforce development. In these states, the occupational courses tend to be offered either as contract training or as open enrollment courses. Some states described three main categories of noncredit programming: personal enrichment, workforce development, and contract training. Skills upgrading was one specific purpose of noncredit programming mentioned by some states. In a number of states, customized or contract training is the only type of noncredit occupational programming offered at community colleges.

Duration of programming or length of approval process were often reported as criteria for noncredit programming when describing noncredit occupational courses. Since the approval process for credit courses is longer and more involved than that for noncredit courses, occupational courses may be first offered as noncredit and then later for credit, once approved via the curriculum review process. Unlike the other states reporting, California and Florida have detailed classification systems related to state policies governing the use of state funds for some noncredit courses but not others. There is a specific definition and detailed categorization of noncredit occupational programming outlined in their state codes, whereas in other states, the definition and categorization of noncredit programs are determined at the local college level.

DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF COURSES

Range of State Policies

In 38 of the 49 states (77.6%) interviewed, noncredit programming is under the purview of individual colleges. (See Appendix E for a state-by-state matrix of state policies on development and delivery of noncredit occupational programming.) However, this does not necessarily imply that a state has no policy on noncredit occupational programming. In fact, there are only two states with a policy of no policy on noncredit occupational programming (IL, WY) which would appear to be a conscious effort on the part of these states to encourage the development of noncredit programming without bureaucratic interference. Of the states with that do have a policy on noncredit programming, many of them expressed concern that creating state-level

structures or regulations would in fact hamper such development. As described below in the section on funding, in most states interviewed, state policy on noncredit occupational programming is driven by funding to a certain extent. However, in reviewing the information collected, it is apparent that whether or not a state funds noncredit programming may have little to do with how involved it actually is in the development and delivery of courses.

Some state policies highlight the importance of delivering noncredit occupational courses to meet community needs (CO, CT, GA). For example, the Colorado Customized Training Act encourages economic development through the development of new industries and the expansion of existing businesses. In some states, policy for the development and delivery of workforce courses is codified but may not differentiate between credit and noncredit courses. For example, the mission of the North Carolina Community College System, as outlined in the state education code, emphasizes the importance of workforce education and support for business and industry partnerships that foster economic development, but does not specifically name noncredit programming as a means for workforce development.

Broad Systems to Describe Policies on Noncredit Occupational Programming

Noncredit programming has developed in different ways in different states. The 49 states interviewed described a range of noncredit course delivery systems with varying layers of complexity, thus confounding the simple identification or summary of common programming elements. Therefore, only general relationships among the different dimensions inherent in the planning, development, and delivery of noncredit occupational programming at community colleges are obvious. Two general approaches are apparent: a) a mix of state and college involvement in development and delivery, and b) development and delivery as the sole responsibility of the college. However, beyond this general distinction, similarities across states are less apparent. For example, North Carolina is characterized as having a mixed system while Colorado and Connecticut have an explicit policy of community colleges having autonomy in the development and delivery of noncredit programming. This brings an added layer of complexity to the analysis, as illustrated in Table 7, where six distinct state profiles are presented.

Table 7.

Sample profiles on state policy on and involvement in development and delivery (D&D) for noncredit occupational programming

	<i>State involvement in D&D</i>	<i>No state involvement in D&D</i>
State has policy	X	X
State has no policy	X	X
State policy is no policy	X	X

Within each of these profiles, variability across states remains due to the degree of state involvement and the nature of noncredit occupational programming itself. In Wisconsin, for example, noncredit occupational programming is used as a testing ground for future for-credit courses. In other states, the intent is that institutions be flexible and responsive to the needs of

the community or industry, which requires a quicker review process than that used for approval of credit courses. Efforts at the community college may take the form of college personnel actively marketing programming to businesses and other entities. This often involves a relatively intensive needs analysis of the region. In other states, successful institutions need only open their doors and businesses approach them with their training needs. Some of this training may be customized or contract training. In other instances, the development of an open enrollment course may meet an identified need for business and industry. To better illustrate the six state profiles, Table 8 populates the cells of Table 7 with state information.

Table 8.

State profiles on noncredit occupational programming policy and development and delivery (D&D)

	<i>State involvement in D&D</i>	<i>No state involvement in D&D</i>
State has policy	AR, CA, DC, FL, ID, MS, NC, NE, NJ, OK, TX	CO, CT, GA, IA, LA, ME, MD, MT, PA, SC
State has no policy		AL, AK, AZ, DE, HI, KS, KY, MA, MI, MN, MO, NC, ND, NH, NM, NV, NY, OH, OR, RI, SD, TN, UT, VA, WA, WI
State policy is no policy		IL, WY

As Table 8 illustrates, no state with no policy or a policy of no policy reported being involved in the development and delivery of noncredit occupational programming. Approximately 78% (38 of 49) of states have no involvement in the development and delivery of noncredit content. Of these states, 26 have no policy at all. Two states, Wyoming and Illinois, have a state policy to have no policy on noncredit occupational programming. Eleven states (22%) have a policy and are involved in some level of development and delivery at some level, and 10 other states (20%) have a policy that assigns responsibility for course development and delivery to the individual colleges.

Entity Responsible for Programming

Of the 49 states, none reported that noncredit programming is solely a state-level process wherein the state oversees the entire process of course planning, development, and delivery, similar to the credit course approval process in most states. However, as reported in Table 8, eleven states (AR, CA, DC, FL, ID, MS, NC, NE, NJ, OK, TX) do play some role in the noncredit course approval process, from requiring a report on course information to instituting a course approval process.

Among those states involved in development and delivery, the role varies. For example, in California, noncredit courses must be approved by a state curriculum committee, while in Idaho, short-term training classes must be approved by the State Board for Professional-Technical Education. States have some oversight of the development and approval of noncredit occupational courses, while most of the responsibility rests with the community colleges (CA, DC, FL, NJ, TX). For instance, in New Jersey, responsibility for course development and accountability is lo-

cal, but the Council of County Colleges plays a quasi-governmental role in the review of courses eligible for state aid. In Oklahoma, on the other hand, the Governor’s Council for Workforce and Economic Development adopted the national career cluster framework and identified state industries that a) can be categorized as at-risk, new, and emerging; b) must be sustained statewide; and c) must be grown to benefit rural and urban Oklahoma. These industry sector clusters are identified as key industries in Oklahoma with high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand opportunities. In addition, the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education works with its 29 local technical centers to plan and develop noncredit programming for customized training.

In the 38 states interviewed with no state involvement in noncredit occupational programming, the development and approval at some colleges resides within one department and, in some cases, with one individual (IL, NH, ND, TN). At other institutions, approval of a program or course requires the dean’s signature, and the vice president and, in some cases, the president of the institution is informed of new approvals (AL, MA, NV). Some of this variance may be due to the size of the institution, although this study did not verify this. In addition, where noncredit occupational programming is situated in the organizational structure may determine the approval process. At some institutions, for example, noncredit programming resides within the office or department of Continuing Education or Workforce Development (MD), which is usually headed by a dean. In Delaware and Illinois, the majority of noncredit occupational programming is administered by a somewhat separate entity, typically called “Center for Business and Industry” or “Corporate and Community Programs,” and led by a director with most of its programming being contract or customized training. In at least two states, Montana and Wisconsin, noncredit programming is overseen by a vice president responsible for instruction.

Content Standards

The majority of colleges interviewed have content standards for their occupational courses, but these standards vary in degree and complexity. The standards are usually aligned with industry requirements. A program leading to a certificate or credential, such as a massage therapy course, may have content requirements. Content standards may be set by either the state or national certifying body with oversight. In other industries (e.g., building trades) there is often a local advisory board with representation from both employers and organized labor that ensures that the coursework is aligned with industry standards. This is particularly true for heavily unionized industries like the building trades. Table 9 reports the most common state processes for setting content standards for noncredit occupational programming.

Table 9.

Examples of content standards processes for noncredit occupational programming across the states

<i>Formal advisory boards</i>	<i>Informal process with business representatives</i>	<i>Utilize national industry standards</i>
AL, CA, CT, MA, MD, MI, OK, TX	AZ, CO, DE, FL, LA, ID, ME, NC, NH, NV, OH, TN, VA, WA	AZ, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, LA, MS, NM, NY, OK, SD

For the most part, determining content standards is a local, college-managed process. Community colleges in some states (AK) have developed working relationships with their local workforce development entities, while other states, like California and Connecticut, partner with industry-specific associations and also have their own advisory boards. Several other states (AL, MA, MD, MI, OK, TX) also have developed their own advisory boards. There are detailed requirements about who sits on the board, who nominates the representatives, and what kinds of qualifications those individuals should have. In eight other states (ID, ME, NC, NH, NV, OH, TN, VA), institutions have more informal relationships with industry representatives, including both employers and employees. In addition, for those occupational areas for which standards are not dictated by some external body, the college is responsible for ensuring course quality. This can take the form of an advisory board that informs the college or a more informal arrangement in which the individual at the college in charge of development and delivery relies on his/her best judgment in reviewing the curriculum and the content covered.

Twelve states reported utilizing industry standards (AZ, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, LA, NM, NY, OK, SD), and two other states (MI, OK) reported using the National Skills Standards. Other states are more significantly involved in standards setting. Sometimes this takes the form of a state-supported industry advisory board, such as in Alabama and California, or an occupational training standards manual written with the input of industry representatives, as in Texas and Washington.

Instructor Qualifications

For the most part, minimum qualifications for noncredit occupational course instructors are set at the college level. They may be articulated in a formal college policy as in Arkansas, but more often are based on the discretion of the individual responsible for administering noncredit programming. However, virtually all the states interviewed indicated that industry standards or certification requirements typically drive instructor qualifications. For example, an instructor in CISCO Certification would have to be CISCO certified. Most of these requirements are determined either by state licensure or certification requirements (e.g., real estate or massage therapy), or industry requirements (e.g., HVAC teacher needs EPA certification, a Microsoft instructor needs Microsoft certification).

Some states (AR, CA, CO, ID, TX, WI) have standard qualifications for all instructors. In California, for example, short-term programs require instructors have either a) a B.A. and two years of experience; b) an A.A. and six years of experience; or c) a credential authorizing them to teach in the subject area. In North Carolina, a B.A. is required along with competency in the area that the instructor will be teaching. Texas requires that instructors have a minimum of three years experience in the field, and for certificate programs, instructors need a degree higher than that of the students they are training.

Aside from external industry or certification requirements, criteria for qualifications are at the discretion of the person responsible for programming. Most of these individuals have their

own criteria, often related to field experience. In some cases, the college may first seek out prospective instructors with industry experience exclusive of ability to teach or experience teaching and then train them in pedagogy (NH, NY, WA). In Rhode Island and Wisconsin, where there are no minimum degree requirements, the administrator of noncredit programming determines instructor worthiness. In all five of these states, the administrator determines instructor requirements based on course content and instructor experience in the field.

Transfer of Courses from Noncredit to Credit

One important aspect of noncredit programming is the transfer of noncredit hours to credit. Table 10 shows that with a few exceptions (AR, GA, HI, KY, NE, NH), states do make provisions for the transfer of noncredit coursework to credit. Usually, a student earns credit either by taking a placement test after taking a noncredit course (AZ, CO, DE, FL, LA, VA, WA) or by petitioning the appropriate academic dean or faculty body for credit (IA, ID, RI, TN), either through a formal process or on a case-by-case basis.

Table 10.
Transfer processes¹ used from noncredit to credit

<i>Transfer not allowed</i>	<i>State- or college-level process</i>		
	<i>Placement test</i>	<i>College process²</i>	<i>Credit tied to certification³</i>
AR, GA, HI, KY, NE, NH	AZ, CO, DE, LA, WA	CT, IA, RI, TN, TX, VA, WA	DE, FL, MA

¹These categories are not meant to be exclusive or exhaustive, but representative.

²Could include petitions to dean or college, and/or a curriculum review committee at the college level.

³e.g., CISCO certification

Some states appear to have relatively detailed procedures and criteria for transfer. In Connecticut, for example, the college first determines: a) whether the course is “college level”; b) the number of equivalent credit hours; and c) whether there is a legitimate assessment of student performance, then a curriculum committee comprised of Office of Continuing Education staff and academic faculty decides if the course is creditable. In Texas, the state’s Higher Education Coordinating Board recommends that institutions not award academic credit for work taken on a noncredit basis without appropriate documentation that the noncredit coursework is equivalent to a designated credit experience. In such cases, the institution documents that the credit awarded for noncredit coursework represents collegiate coursework relevant to the degree, with the course content and level of instruction resulting in student competencies equivalent to those of students in the institution’s degree programs and coursework taught by faculty members qualified to teach the appropriate degree level.

In Delaware and Massachusetts, passing a certification exam such as CISCO after taking a noncredit course allows a student to receive credit for the course. Florida, for instance, has certification programs defined as Postsecondary Adult Vocational (PSAV) whereby through a statewide articulation agreement, PSAV courses transfer as for-credit either internally or from other institu-

tions. In these cases, students may have initially enrolled in noncredit courses and then enrolled as a matriculated student in a degree program. Related to this credit-gaining policy is that of granting credit for experiential learning or for work experience (CT, MN, NM, NV, WA, WV). In other states (MA, MT, NJ, WA), state-level discussions are currently underway to formalize this process.

A few states do not provide for credit transfer (AR, GA, HI, KY, NE, NH). For example, in Arkansas, transfer is currently not permitted, but the state is developing a portfolio process based on experience and coursework as a likely mechanism to create a bridge between noncredit and credit. In Georgia, students sign a waiver stating that they will not receive credit for a non-credit course.

Summary

As reported by 49 states, almost all community colleges engage in noncredit occupational programming. In many instances, a significant proportion of that programming is contract or customized training. Due to the unique approach that each state takes to this programming area, generalizing across states is difficult. However, by and large, states develop noncredit programming in response to needs identified either by college personnel in collaboration with business and industry, or needs identified solely by business and industry. Most states have some kind of formal structure in place to discern what the needs of industries are, ranging from college-instituted advisory boards to collaboration with local economic and workforce development entities. For the most part, content requirements and instructor qualifications are driven by industry standards, although those standards could be national, state, or locally determined. In some cases, state or college policies set general requirements for instructors but the necessary content expertise of the instructors is set either by, or in collaboration with, industry.

DATA ON NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMMING

As part of this study, the states were asked several data questions related to programming, including:

1. How many students are enrolled in community college noncredit courses?
 - a. How are the data collected? Is it duplicated or unduplicated?
 - b. Are the data reported by type of noncredit offerings, such as CTE vs. non-CTE?
2. How is noncredit programming distributed across community college program areas such as health care, manufacturing, and information technology?
3. How is noncredit programming for contract training distributed across community college program areas such as health care, manufacturing, and information technology?
4. What is the percentage of noncredit occupational programming in your state that is contract training?
5. How many students (in your state) are enrolled in contract training?

Only a few states were able to respond to any or all of these data questions, making evident that data systems were an issue for many states, with states falling into one of these categories related to policy and data:

- State has a state policy on noncredit occupational programming and does collect data on noncredit occupational programming;
- State has a state policy on noncredit occupational programming but does not collect data on noncredit occupational programming;
- State has no state policy on noncredit occupational programming but does collect data on noncredit occupational programming; and
- State has no state policy on noncredit occupational programming and does not collect data on noncredit occupational programming.

Although state reporting requirements for noncredit occupational programming and the existence and related capabilities of state and community college data systems to report on this programming were not initial points of inquiry, these three factors were inherent in determining the comprehensiveness and accessibility of noncredit programming data in each state. Only 10 states (AR, FL, IL, IA, MD, MN, NC, ND, OH, WI) have a robust system in place for tracking and reporting noncredit occupational programming. Even among these states, some respondents reported that accessing the data required additional time and resources. In the remaining states, some colleges do collect this information but the level and complexity of the system in place varies widely. This, in addition to the wide range of definitions of noncredit across states and institutions as previously presented, makes any cross-state analysis not useful or meaningful in general.

The Perkins Act of 2006 specifically provided optional administrative activity funds for the support and development of state data systems. Given that some states and colleges are using Perkins dollars to support noncredit occupational programming, the availability, comprehensiveness, and accuracy of these data may improve in the future. Also worth noting is that the Commission on No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is recommending that all states be required to design and implement a high-quality longitudinal data system to enable states to calculate growth in student achievement from year to year. Theoretically, such data systems could support the development of systems to measure and report CTE student outcomes as well as student outcomes identified under NCLB.

State-Level Data Systems

Beyond the 10 states with more robust systems, 8 other states (AK, GA, ID, MO, NY, SC, TX, VA) report total noncredit enrollments but not noncredit occupational enrollments. At least one state, New Hampshire, collects data on contract training, but not all occupational training. Iowa and Oregon can access enrollments by Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code, but again, the response received was that more time and resources would be needed to access and report on these data. Of the states that can produce data on noncredit occupational programming,

only a few can partition the data further to identify whether the training is contract or customized training (IA, MN, WY). For two states just beginning their collection and analysis (OH, VA), available data are limited.

In 17 states (35%), there is no policy nor data on noncredit occupational programming (AK, AZ, DE, KS, KY, MA, MI, MO, NH, NM, NV, NY, OR, RI, SD, UT, WA). Exceptions to this are Minnesota and North Carolina, which have no policy related to noncredit occupational programming but do have a fairly sophisticated database to track enrollments. Minnesota, a state that supports occupational and contract training, tracks those dollars in its data system. Data systems in the remaining 15 states with a data system in place vary in data collected and reported. Iowa, for instance, is able to track enrollment data, but these are tied to state funding streams for contract training. State policy is often driven by what the state funds, and in the states where there is no state funding, there is no state-level data system.

As noted earlier, there is also the issue of definitions of noncredit, which has a direct impact on what data reside in the data systems. Many college data systems originally were developed to capture for-credit data. Enrollment data are of primary importance to the colleges since enrollment is the basis for funding in most states. The definition of a credit hour then often becomes a function of how the system defines a full-time student. Most of these data systems report enrollments as Full-Time Equivalent (FTE). In addition, most states have developed data systems to report on Perkins-related programming—primarily, for-credit instruction. In the world of noncredit occupational programming, and in contract training in particular, credit hours have no meaning. In those instances, the currency is contact hours—how many actual hours the student is being taught. However, in one state where colleges have separate credit and noncredit data systems (NV), non-credit programming is required to have its own registration and student data systems.

College-Level Data Systems

In some states, the colleges interviewed did have data systems in place which were aligned with a state data system. The data, however, were not specific enough or organized in a fashion to be able to provide the explicit information requested for this study. For example, one area of inquiry was what program areas and industries were served by noncredit occupational programming. A number of colleges could provide data on the name of the employer (in the case of contract training) or the type of training (e.g., computer, management training, fire fighting), but could not provide information on the type of industry. For example, if a college provided a software course for a county government, but only reported the data as “I.T.,” the industry type was not recorded. Alternatively, a college that only reports the employer (in this example, the county government) would have no way of reporting that the class was an I.T. class. In the case of New York, training courses such as communication or anger management are provided for preparation for entry-level positions, but no specific industry is reported. In some cases, the individual interviewed was able to provide rough estimates of the kind of industry but no actual data (AL, AR, HI, MD, MT, NH, TN, UT). In North Dakota, this kind of information is reported to the legislature but only within the state-mandated categories.

All colleges receiving federal funding are required to collect information by CIP code for federal reporting purposes. A few states indicated that they could provide this level of detail because of their access to enrollments by CIP code. However, based on the interviews conducted, only a few states collect CIP code information for noncredit programs. By and large, those states that did have data systems were not able to readily respond to the five data questions in the study protocol, although they indicated that given more time, they would be able to provide the data (DC, HI, KY, ME, NV, PA, VA). In addition, while this study did not directly ask the question, the ability of a college to produce this kind of information may be related to the size of the noncredit program and the size of its administration. A small workforce development program with three staff probably would not have its own data analyst, while a larger program led by a vice president may have access to the institution's centralized research capacity (e.g., an office of institutional research).

Sample of State Data Reported

Number of Community Colleges in State Providing Noncredit Occupational Programming

Because of the sheer diversity in data systems, it is difficult to reach any summative conclusions about noncredit occupational programming in the U.S. In those states where fewer than 100% of the community colleges offer noncredit work-related programming, there was a higher probability that no data system was in place. For example, in Alaska, 85% of colleges offer such programming; in Arkansas 95%; and in California 59%. There are also some states that did not provide data because they do not collect this information at the state level (DE, MO, NM).

Students Enrolled in Noncredit Occupational Programs

Only a few states provided detailed data, as listed.

Alabama:

- In 2005-06, 62,664 students took noncredit courses.
- At the college interviewed, 190 students (unduplicated) took noncredit courses in maritime (a primary focus of the college).

California:

- The unduplicated total for 2003-04 was 792,881 noncredit students.
- Of the noncredit students, 297,674 were in short-term occupational programs.
- At the college interviewed, noncredit unduplicated enrollment was 64,519, and approximately 19,000 were noncredit occupational students.

Georgia:

- The unduplicated count of noncredit students was 35,772 noncredit attendees for FY06.

Iowa:

- The unduplicated noncredit student enrollment for 2005 was 294,668.
- The duplicated noncredit student enrollment for 2005 was 557,944.
- For 2005, 9,232 noncredit students were enrolled in Iowa Jobs Training Programs.
- For 2005, 5,292 noncredit students were enrolled Iowa Industrial New Jobs Training Programs.
- For 2005, 27 noncredit students were enrolled in Accelerated Career Education.

New Hampshire:

- For 2005-06, 12,000-15,000 noncredit seats were sold.
- Of those, 75% are open enrollment and 25% contract training.

Oklahoma:

- For FY06, there were 290,754 enrollments in Industry-Specific Training.
- For FY06, there were 23,457 enrollments in Training for Industry (start-up training).
- For FY06, there were 75,391 enrollments in Adult and Career Development.

A few states provided more detail, including information on contract training courses, instruction hours, expansion of companies, development of jobs, and retention of jobs. Illinois shared their Workforce Development Grant report for the 2005 fiscal year which contains data on activities funded by the eponymous state grant. While this grant does not cover all noncredit programming in Illinois, it does include a large percentage. For example:

- Illinois community colleges provided 9,159 contract training courses to 3,032 companies. Through these courses, 88,232 employees were trained for a total of 255,363 contact hours of instruction or 31,920 days of training. This contributed to the start-up of 67 companies, the expansion of 81 companies, the retention of 552 companies, the development of 2,053 jobs, and the retention of another 9,491 jobs.
- Illinois community colleges provided 2,380 noncredit public training courses and 1,396 noncredit workshops and seminars to 24,814 individuals, serving 1,870 organizations.
- Thirteen Illinois community colleges reported offering 480 noncredit workshops and seminars to 5,285 unemployed or underemployed individuals. Another 67 noncredit and credit courses were provided to 527 participants. As a result, 1,213 individuals received counseling or job placement. Community colleges also reported an additional 413 activities such as job fairs, job networks, assessments, and advisement services that served another 15,239 individuals.

Wyoming provides an example of a state with no policy related to noncredit programming but with a state data collection system. See Table 11 for a list of the noncredit courses that were included in their Workforce Development Activities report for the 2004-05 academic year.

Table 11.

Noncredit offerings organized through the Workforce Development Offices (2004-05)

<i>Course Category</i>	<i>Count of sections</i>	<i>Duplicated headcount</i>	<i>Contact hours offered</i>
Agriculture, Food, & Natural Resources	34	230	299
Architecture & Construction	21	164	160
Arts, A/V Technology, & Communications	31	388	323
Business, Management, & Administration	298	2,666	1,146
Education & Training	27	126	420
Finance	14	32	97
Health Science	68	514	601
Hospitality & Tourism	1	4	10
Human Services	6	57	111
Information Technology	59	847	437
Law, Public Safety, & Security	36	357	515
Manufacturing	81	579	657
Marketing, Sales, & Service	14	103	80
Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics	14	207	249
Transportation, Distribution, & Logistics	60	103	699
TOTAL	764	6,377	5,804

Source: Table adapted from Workforce Development Activities: 2004-2005 Academic Year. Wyoming Community Colleges, 2005.

Percentage of Noncredit Occupational Programming that is Contract/Customized Training

Only a few states were able to provide the percentage of noncredit occupational programming offered as contract or customized training (e.g., 10% in IL and 59% in MN). State estimates of the percentage ranged from 98% in Alabama to 10-15% in Hawaii. Other states simply did not have data. Two notable exceptions to this were Kentucky and North Dakota, where 100% of noncredit occupational programming is contract training.

While Wyoming did not have access to data on the percentage of noncredit occupational enrollments for contract training, it was able to provide a data table on industries served through customized training with the associated total enrollment as reported in Table 12.

Table 12.

Sample data table from Wyoming

<i>Industries served through customized training, by 2-digit NAICS code^a: 2004-05 academic year</i>	<i>Total Enrollment^b</i>
Mining/Extraction	1,607
Health Care & Social Assistance	1,342
Information	702
Manufacturing	464
Public Administration	442
Finance & Insurance	420
Utilities	300
Management of Companies & Enterprises	286
Arts, Entertainment, & Recreation	249
Education Services	127
Other Services (except Public Admin.)	87
Retail Trade	78
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, & Hunting	42
Transportation & Warehousing	21
Construction	14
Accommodation & Food Services	5
Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services	2
Real Estate, Rental, & Leasing	1
TOTAL	6189

^aNorth America Industry Classification System

^bRepresents head count enrollment in workforce development classes customized for specific industries. Source: Workforce Development Activities, 2004-2005 Academic Year. Wyoming Community Colleges, 2006.

Table 13 shows data from Montana’s FY2006 Outreach on customized trainings, including number of offering descriptions, noncredit courses offered, credit courses offered, and enrollments.

Table 13.

Sample of Montana’s AY 2006 Outreach data

	<i>Offered</i>	<i>Businesses</i>	<i>Hours</i>	<i>Students</i>
Customized Trainings-AY 2006	61	18	866.5	486
<i>Offering description</i>	<i>Summer</i>	<i>Fall</i>	<i>Spring</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Non Credit Courses Offered-AY 2006	99	94	132	325
Credit Courses Offered-AY 2006	5	9	9	23
Special Events-AY 2006	7	0	1	8
Enrollments-AY 2006	767	626	1801	3194

Summary

There is little consistency across states in terminology, definitions, and reporting standards for data on noncredit occupational programming. Not many states collect the same kind and quality of data, even though all community colleges interviewed were engaged in some kind of noncredit occupational programming in which contract or customized training comprises a significant proportion (see the section on contract training below). In addition, similar to what was described in the section on policy, the range of complexity within systems compromises the value of any cross-state comparisons. The states that do collect it all collect data differently, with different policy contexts and with different program development and delivery systems. Based on the information gathered, within these differing policy contexts, a statewide data system could be developed to effectively report on a variety of noncredit programming data. Looking to next steps, any national data reporting on noncredit programming will require significant federal and state investment to create the systems necessary for data management and analysis.

FUNDING FOR NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMMING

The level of state engagement in noncredit occupational programming varies as a function of both state policies and regulations and the state funding policy on noncredit occupational programming. As reported in the summary table on funding policies (Appendix F), states provided a range of responses to the question of whether there were state policies on funding, with states falling into one of the following categories:

- State has policy on funding noncredit occupational programming and does fund noncredit occupational programming;
- State has policy on funding noncredit occupational programming but does not fund noncredit occupational programming;
- State has no policy on funding noncredit occupational programming but does fund noncredit occupational programming; and
- State has no policy on funding noncredit programming and does not fund noncredit occupational programming.

Table 14 presents states with policies related to funding and states with no funding policy on noncredit programming. Those states with no funding policies but that nevertheless do provide funds for noncredit programming are also reported.

States with Policies on Funding

Fourteen states (29%) reported that they have funding policies and provided information on those policies (AR, CA, FL, GA, ID, MD, MS, NJ, NY, PA, SC, TX, VA, WV). Although having a state funding policy in place is not necessarily indicative of funding actually being appropriated for noncredit occupational programming, all 14 states did report providing state funds

Table 14.

State funding policies on noncredit occupational programming

<i>Policy on funding</i>	<i>States</i>
States with funding policy on noncredit occupational programming	AR, CA, FL, GA, ID, MD, MS, NJ, NY, PA, SC, TX, VA, WV (14 states)
States with no funding policy	AK, CO, CT, DE, HI, IL, IA, KS, KY, LA, MA, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, ND, NH, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, RI, SD, TN, UT, WA, WI, WY (30 states)
States with no funding policy but still provide funds for noncredit occupational programming	AK, CO, IL, IA, MA, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, SD, UT, WA, WI (17 states)

through one or more funding mechanisms. Of the 14 states, 4 provided information on their state code regulations (CA, MD, PA, TX). Some of these states also have funding policies specific to business and industry contract training (see more detail in the section on contract training below).

Comparable to the range of state policies on the definition, development, and approval of noncredit occupational programming, state policies on funding also vary. Five states reported policies stipulating the type of programs or courses eligible to receive funding (CA, FL, ID, MD, NJ). In Idaho, the state funding policy is based on duration of course—only short-term courses are eligible for state-based grants, with \$650K being made available to support such training. The New Jersey funding policy sets parameters on course cost: for a course to be eligible for state funding for fiscal year 2006, tuition, including any general fee, could not exceed \$9.50 per contact hour. Two states, Florida and Maryland, have funding requirements related to course approval. In Florida, the policy stipulates that, in order to receive FTE funding, noncredit occupational courses must be coded in the Community College Management Information System as Postsecondary Adult Vocational (PSAV). PSAV courses are state-approved. Maryland state code mandates that only continuing education courses approved by the Higher Education Commission can be funded by the state.

Other states have policies related to the nature or type of noncredit courses that are eligible for state funding (CA, MS, PA, TX, WV). In Texas, for example, continuing education courses designed to prepare adult students for employment are eligible for state appropriations. Similarly, the West Virginia state policy provides funds for workforce development programming but not for noncredit recreational courses. California state code lists the types of courses that are eligible for funding, and Mississippi has a state-level action plan and project policies on targeted priorities and financial requirements for noncredit courses.

States with No Policies on Funding

Thirty states (73%) reported that they do not have policies on funding for noncredit occupational programming (AK, CO, CT, DE, HI, IL, IA, KS, KY, LA, MA, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC,

ND, NH, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, RI, SD, TN, UT, WA, WI, WY). However, of these 30 states with no funding policy, 17 (33%) did provide state funds for noncredit occupational programming (AK, CO, IL, IA, MA, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, SD, UT, WA, WI).

Arizona stipulates in its state code that the local community college districts have the financial responsibility for noncredit occupational programming. In Iowa, on the other hand, noncredit occupational courses are mentioned in the state code as being part of the mission of community colleges, and the majority of the financial responsibility for noncredit occupational programming lies at the local level with the individual community colleges (even though in theory there is some FTE reimbursement for funding).

FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMMING

Community colleges have three primary funding sources for noncredit occupational programming: state support, tuition and fees, and business and industry. The states provide funds through a funding formula, appropriations for grants, or direct allocations to the college. Table 15 reports on the principal funding mechanisms used by states. All the states interviewed charge tuition and fees for some or all noncredit occupational programming. In addition, business and industry often covers 100% of the cost of a course to train their employees on a fee-for-service basis.

Table 15.

Major state funding mechanisms for noncredit occupational training

<i>Funding mechanism</i>	<i>States</i>
State support: Formula	CA, FL, ID, IL, IA, KS, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NE, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, TX, UT, VA, WV, WI (27 states)
State support: Matching grants	AL, AR, CO, DE, ID, IA, KY, NH, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, SD, WA, WV (16 states)
Tuition and fees	100% of states interviewed (49 states)
Non-state support: Business & Industry	100% of states interviewed (49 states)

In five states, credit and noncredit courses are funded in the same way (KS, MI, OR, PA, WI). In Wisconsin, where there is no separate allocation for noncredit occupational programming, the Wisconsin Technical College System receives a state appropriation for general aid that is allocated to the technical college districts on the basis of their net operating costs. Included in the net costs is the cost of offering noncredit occupational programming. In the other four states where credit and noncredit are funded similarly (KS, MI, OR, PA), the funding formula is exactly the same for credit and noncredit. In Kansas, for example, where the funding formula clock hours for credit and noncredit courses are grouped together, noncredit courses are funded if the clock hours relate directly to an existing program that has been approved.

In states where no state funds are provided for noncredit occupational programming, the community colleges fund their work-related programs through student tuition and fees, business

and industry, and other sources, including WIA funds, Perkins funds, and grants from local and national foundations. A few states (DE, MD, ND) reported that funds from foundations and federal sources are not available on a sustainable basis, and that the resources available to pursue funds from such sources varies from college to college.

Funding Formula

Appendix G provides a state-by-state summary of funding mechanisms used for noncredit occupational programming. A funding formula is indicated for any state that reported receiving reimbursement for noncredit programming through FTE even if the amount is relatively small (e.g., 2.5% in MT). Allocation of funds varies across the states: some states distribute funds to each college by using a rule for allocation (e.g., equally among colleges in OH) and others allocate funding to community colleges directly through a formula (e.g., MI, OK). Twenty-six states (53%) reported using a formula to distribute state appropriations (CA, FL, ID, IL, IA, KS, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, TX, UT, VA, WV, WI).

For most states, the funding formula included an FTE calculation. In some states, funds are allocated based on clock hours (KS, FL, OR) or contact hours (MS, TX, VA). Other considerations in the funding formulas included instructor salaries, equipment and supply costs (e.g., MS), student enrollment (KS, NJ, OK, PA), hours of training (e.g., SC), or number of courses (e.g., OK). The Maryland formula stipulates that the FTE rate for community colleges will be 30% of the FTE rate for state universities. In Illinois, the Workforce Development Grant provides a base allocation to the colleges (\$35K), and the remaining amount is allocated on the basis of credit hours through a funding formula. In Ohio, state funds (\$5.5M) are distributed equally among community colleges and additional funds (\$3.8M) are made available in the form of incentives. In Utah, the formula provides a base amount plus membership hours, and in Washington there is a base amount (\$40K) plus an FTE calculation. Similarly, in Pennsylvania, as of 2005-06, each community college receives base operating funds plus a growth supplement for increased enrollment. In addition, Economic Development Stipend funding is available for noncredit workforce development courses that provide opportunities for students and incumbent workers to develop and/or upgrade skills necessary in high priority occupations.

Tuition and Fees

All states reported that community colleges charge tuition and/or fees for noncredit occupational programming. Where the information was provided, a distinction was made between tuition and fees. In some community colleges, noncredit occupational programming is self-sustaining, funded almost exclusively by a combination of tuition and fees and business and industry contracts (DE, GA, MO, NH, SD, RI, WY). Although the states were not specifically asked whether students are reimbursed through employer-based tuition assistance, a few states did mention using this funding mechanism.

In some cases, community colleges receive some state funding, although it does not

cover the cost of programming. For example, the Maryland community college interviewed receives less than total FTE reimbursement for noncredit occupational programming, with 75-80% of noncredit FTEs being fundable. Similarly, in Iowa, noncredit hours are included in the FTE calculation but assigned only a small weight in the formula; therefore, although in theory the funding formula provides reimbursement for training in the form of noncredit programming, in practice, the credit programming exhausts the budgeted state reimbursement. In Idaho, community colleges also have access to a funding stream that subsidizes the cost of noncredit workforce training, with funds apportioned by formula to the community colleges. However, the colleges charge tuition on a cost-recovery basis to cover the total cost of classes, with no ceiling on total cost to the student. In North Dakota, funds are appropriated and divided among the four community colleges, covering 26% of the total cost of a class (mainly operational costs). The remaining amount comes from business and industry for direct training. Similarly, the Ohio community college interviewed reported that of training costs, 25% is covered by state-appropriated dollars, 50% by fees, and the remaining by foundation grants.

A few states do not charge tuition and/or fees to students for certain types of courses or programs (CA, NV, MS, AL). In California, noncredit occupational programming is free with no tuition, although fees are charged not exceeding \$125. Similarly, in Nevada, ESL classes are provided free and subsidized through federal funding. In Alabama, where most occupational programming is provided through contract training, students are not charged for the classes and, depending on the program fees, are covered through federal grants. For Alabama's On-the-Job Training program described above, students use their Individual Training Accounts, earn a wage, and receive a transportation stipend while in training. Also in Alabama, the state has earmarked \$750K for a maritime training program offered free to students at the community college interviewed. In Mississippi, another state where most occupational programming is provided through contract training, students rarely pay tuition and fees.

Considerations in Charging Tuition and Fees

States reported a few factors that influence the amount of tuition and fees charged to students for noncredit occupational programming. In a few states, policies determine how much tuition can be charged (GA, MN, TX, UT, WI). In Texas, tuition and fees for state-funded workforce continuing education are assessed according to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board policies. For courses not eligible for state appropriations, the governing board of the individual community college determines the tuition. In Minnesota, the policy on tuition allows colleges to charge market-driven tuition for customized training, continuing education, distance learning, noncredit instruction, and contract postsecondary enrollment options programs. Although Georgia has no state funding for noncredit occupational programming, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education does regulate the pricing structure, specifically requiring that tuition be calculated using a cost-recovery model. Idaho and West Virginia also work on a cost-recovery basis. In Utah, technical colleges have a per-hour tuition stipulated by the Utah Board of Regents (currently, \$2 an hour). In Wisconsin, state code states that colleges can charge tuition up to 14% of the total program cost, and fees are set at 12.1% of the total program

cost. A Virginia policy requires that the school charge students 130% of the total cost of the class, with the extra 30% going to the college for indirect costs associated with the course offering.

For states without policies on tuition and fee structures, the cost of noncredit programming is most often market-driven. This seems to be as likely in states where noncredit occupational programming is self-sustaining (NH, TN) as in states where state funding is available (NY, FL, OH). For example, in New Hampshire, the cost for classes, 100% of which is paid by students, is driven by the cost that the private sector charges for similar courses. In Tennessee, community college courses are self-sustaining, with tuition and fees charged at least 25% above the overall instructional costs. In other states, such as New York, where the state provides some funding, tuition and fees for open enrollment classes are mainly market-driven; for example, tuition and fees for continuing workforce education courses range from \$25-\$1,800. In Ohio, the state provides a base allocation and distributes other funds for noncredit occupational programming in the form of incentive funds; however, tuition is set by the colleges and is industry driven.

Student Share of Cost

Some states limit what students pay for noncredit occupational programming. Eleven states reported that community colleges decide how much to charge students in tuition and fees (AZ, IA, KY, MA, MN, NV, NH, NY, OH, SC, TX). Of these, three states also reported that the decision is market driven (MN, NV, NH). In some states, there is no cost to the students, since grants cover tuition, or businesses are responsible for paying tuition (AL, AR, ND). In California and Mississippi, tuition is free with minimal fees; however, in other states (CO, CT, DE, GA, HI, NH, WY), students cover 100% of the cost of non-contract training classes. Some states reported that there is no policy regarding the amount that students are charged (MT, VA, WV). In Maryland, a policy requires that students be charged “reasonable” tuition and fees.

Michigan and Wisconsin have policies that limit student cost for a course. In Michigan, students cover one-third of the cost of a class; in Wisconsin, student cost can not exceed 14%. Florida, Kansas, and Oklahoma all reported policies limiting the percentage of a course covered by students. Oklahoma students cover 16% of the cost of a class, Kansas students cover 15%, and Florida students cover 50%.

Range for Tuition and Fees

Tuition and fees for noncredit occupational programming vary by state. To provide a base for comparison, as reported in the NCES NHES 2003 on work-related courses, the range for tuition and fees was \$0-\$30,000, with more than three-quarters of students reporting \$0; the range for books and materials was \$0-\$2,288, with nearly 9 out of 10 students reporting \$0. Most of the states interviewed reported that an average cost for tuition and fees is difficult to estimate since cost depends on the type of course. In Hawaii, for example, tuition is determined by the cost of instruction and the duration of the class. Similarly, in New Mexico, noncredit tuition and fees range from \$20-\$100, with higher tuition for more specialized courses for which instructor sala-

ries are also higher. In Rhode Island, a culinary arts program could cost about \$3,900 (the highest cost reported among all states) whereas a one-time workshop could cost around \$45. In Nevada, the community college reported that tuition ranges from \$99 for an 8-hour class to \$500 for a 40-hour class. New Hampshire reported the lowest tuition and fees at \$15. In North Carolina, the state sets the range of noncredit occupational tuition (currently, \$50-\$65) which ensures affordability for all students.

For states where most or all of the noncredit occupational programming is contract training (AR, AL, KY, ND, OH), students are not charged tuition, but companies that contract with the community college are charged by instructional hours. Again, the cost per hour for instruction varies. In Arkansas, businesses are charged \$25-\$150. In Kentucky, the range for fees charged to the business is \$60-\$250. In Alabama, where some community college courses are subsidized by state-appropriated funds for special projects (e.g., maritime and ship-fitting), training is free. In North Dakota, operational costs are covered by the state and the direct cost of training is covered by the contracting business, although businesses can apply for Workforce 20/20 Funds for assistance in covering the cost of training. Priority is given to companies bringing new money to the state or to companies using training to increase employee salaries. Members of the state review committee are from Job Service North Dakota, the Department of Economic Development and Finance, the Department of Career and Technical Education, the Greater North Dakota Chamber of Commerce, organized labor, local development associations, and private business.

Other Nonstate Funding Sources

Although states were asked to provide information on other funding sources available for occupational programming apart from tuition and fees, business and industry, and state funds, most state-level interviewees did not have access to this information. However, the community colleges interviewed were able to provide some estimates.

Federal Funding Sources

Community colleges identified the federal government as a source of funding for noncredit programming (NJ, VA). In Virginia, for example, the community college interviewed had received a federal grant to provide training in health care, and to provide a course offered by Command Spanish[®], a leading provider of occupational Spanish language training materials and programs for the workforce development, for their 911 operators and airport personnel. Of the total \$700,000, \$40,000 covered the Command Spanish[®] course and \$660,000 was spent on the health care training. In Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, and Oklahoma, colleges reported that students use Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services for occupational training. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education's Carl D. Perkins Act was also identified as a source of funding for noncredit occupational programming, although how Perkins funds were specifically applied was not described.

Twenty-nine percent of the states (14 of 49) reported that Workforce Investment Act

(WIA) funds are used for noncredit programming through Individual Training Accounts (ITAs) or vouchers (AL, AZ, FL, HI, KY, MT, NH, NM, NV, RI, SC, WA, WV, WY). In Kentucky, for example, WIA funds are available for dislocated workers to train in high-growth areas as defined by the Department of Labor. Community colleges also identified Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) as sources of funding for noncredit occupational programming (CT, FL, IL, KY, MA). In Massachusetts, a community college can obtain a training contract from a WIB as a preferred provider of training. A number of states mentioned that although WIA funds are available, the application process and reporting requirements are major deterrents. In New Hampshire, the Workforce Opportunity Council, which oversees WIA funds, provides some money for training, but in order to be named as authorized training providers, colleges must go through a lengthy, labor-intensive process. When more than six students with ITAs participate in any given course, the community college becomes responsible for tracking their employment data, an additional disincentive.

Five states (AK, AR, FL, LA, VA) identified the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) as a source of grants for workforce training. In Arkansas, the DOL provides four colleges with funds to develop automotive manufacturing and for high-growth occupational training, as well as partnerships between secondary and postsecondary education and businesses. In Louisiana, the DOL provided \$5M for post-hurricane workforce reconstruction.

Local Funding Sources and Foundations

Funding is also available from local sources and foundations. Community colleges interviewed in three states (MD, OK, WI) mentioned that funds are available from local municipal sources. In Wisconsin, for example, the majority of nonstate funding comes from local property taxes. Another source of funding for community colleges is local and national foundations (CO, KY, VA, WI). Kentucky community colleges have used grants from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to provide training. In Ohio, a grant to help nonprofits take advantage of training at the college was obtained by a Cleveland-based foundation (COSMOS). In Alabama, a foundation grant was used for training fire cadets. Similarly, in North Carolina, a grant from Duke Energy provided funds for manufacturing and incumbent worker training. Community colleges in other states (DC, ND, WV) reported that they can access funds for occupational programming from their own foundations. In North Dakota, employers can access funds for contract training from the Bismarck State College Fund. The University of the District of Columbia also has a foundation that provides scholarships to students, which they can use for occupational training. The community college interviewed in West Virginia reported that the college has a foundation and runs major gift campaigns to sustain its programs. Connecticut community colleges also use local college foundations to fund noncredit occupational programming.

Funds for Special Populations

Occupational training funds are also available for specific populations. In Rhode Island, the community college reported that through the Trade Adjustment Assistance program funded by the DOL, employees who lose their jobs due to industry relocation overseas can receive two

years of training funds. This is particularly helpful to a state like Rhode Island, where there is a lot of manufacturing. Similarly, in Oklahoma, funds designated for specific employers (e.g., General Motors) are available for workers dislocated by global competition. In Alabama, the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independent Living Act of 1999 provides scholarships to youth transitioning out of foster care for any two- or four-year college for both credit and noncredit programming.

Summary

Although the majority of states reported not having a policy on funding noncredit occupational programming, many actually do provide funding for these courses. The three primary funding sources for noncredit occupational programming are state support, tuition and fees, and business and industry fee-for-service. State support is provided through a funding formula, grant appropriations, or direct allocations to colleges. The two most common noncredit occupational programming funding mechanisms reported are funding formulas (used by more than half of the states) and state grants for business and industry. In states with no state funding for noncredit programming, these courses are funded through tuition and fees, business and industry, and nonstate sources. Most states interviewed reported that they have access to some form of nonstate support, such as Perkins money, WIA funds, U.S. Department of Labor grants, or local or national foundations. In a few states, tuition and fees and contracts for training solely fund noncredit occupational programming. Almost one-third of the states reported using or having access to WIA funds, the most common nonstate source of funding.

A number of states had exemplary funding policies. Oklahoma provides grants to business and industry that cover 100% of the cost of training new employees. California funds most noncredit courses (and includes ESL in that category) and does not charge tuition to students although fees are charged. North Carolina sets noncredit occupational tuition at \$50-65 to keep noncredit occupational courses affordable and accessible to all students.

CONTRACT TRAINING

All of the states interviewed provide at least part of their occupational programming by contracting with business and industry for training existing or future employees. Community colleges are often designated as the main venue and preferred provider for customized training and technical assistance to business and industry (NC, NJ, WI, WV), with the partnership between the community colleges and business and industry often serving as one of the driving forces behind regional economic development. Through these partnerships—that generally are not regulated by the state—community colleges enter agreements with business and industry to provide contract training with few restrictions, apart from basic state regulations that would apply to any contract. Some states reported that the majority (75-100%) of noncredit occupational programming offered in the state is contract training (AL, AR, AK, CO, KY, LA, ND, MS, OH).

Contract Training in Specialized Industries

Since the states usually delegate authority to contract with business and industry to the community college, information is not typically collected on the distribution of noncredit programming by program area. A few states did provide detailed information on what percentage of their contract training is in specific industries (WY, ND, SC). All states, however, were able to report the types of industries for which contract training is provided, with health, manufacturing, and information technology/computer industries being the top three industries mentioned. Table 16 shows the main industries that states reported contracting with for training.

Table 16.

Industries that contract with community colleges for training

<i>Health</i>	<i>Manufacturing</i>	<i>IT/Computers</i>	<i>Business/Management/ Financial</i>
AZ, CO, FL, IA, ID, IL (30%), KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MT (65%), ND (14%), NH, NV, NY, OH, OK, RI, SC (30%), SD, WA, WI, WV	AL, AZ, FL, GA, IA, IL (30%), KY, LA, MI, MN, NC, ND (6%), NE, NH, NJ, NV, OH, OK, RI, TN, VA, WI, WV, WY (19%)	<i>IT:</i> AZ, IA, KS, LA, MD, MT, NH, NJ, OK, SC, VA, WA, WY (13%) <i>Computers:</i> HI (36%), MI, IL, SD	<i>Business:</i> CT, HI (36%), NE, SC (30%), SD, WI, WY (28%) <i>Management:</i> MI, OK <i>Financial:</i> MT, ND (5%), NY, RI, TN

Other industries that contract with community colleges are state and government agencies (CT, ID, KY, MD, ND, NE, NV, WI); auto (AR, AL, KY, MD, MI, MS); gas, oil, and mining (AK, CO, KY, ND, MN); service (IA, OH, NE, NJ, WI); transportation (IL, IA, SD); agriculture (IA, SD); arts and culture (HI, WY); construction (MN, SD); distribution (IL, NV); shipbuilding (AL, MS); tourism (LA, WV); aerospace (KS); hospitality (MS); logistics (WA); maritime (AL); the military (FL); and utilities (TN).

Policies on Contract Training

Some states have policies and regulations on contract training, although the policies cover a range of areas. In Colorado, for example, the state policy encourages quality economic development by providing incentives for the location of new industries or the expansion of existing firms in the state to improve employment opportunities. In addition, Colorado has made \$2.7M available for business and industry grants. Similarly, in North Dakota, state policy supports and promotes skill training, retraining, and upgrade training for North Dakota workers through a workforce training program called Workforce 20/20.

Other contracting policies focus more specifically on regional economic growth. In the District of Columbia, the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) is charged with offering noncredit occupational programming. UDC can contract only with businesses that make \$500,000 or more a year on DC-based projects and have a workforce that is comprised of at least 51% DC residents. In Wisconsin, the state authorizes two-year college system boards to enter into contracts

with businesses to provide job training and other services but sets a monetary limit on how much training an individual can receive (\$3,500) and on the total cost of such contracts in any fiscal year.

Community colleges contract with different types of industries depending on the industrial needs of their region. For example, the community college interviewed in North Dakota contracts mainly with the government since it is located in the state capital. Similarly, South Carolina community colleges in the center of the state provide services to corporate offices and the state government; whereas in the western part of the state, contracts tend to be with automotive, plastic molding, and chemical industries; and on the east coast, with tourism, aeronautics, and automotive companies. In New York, the community college interviewed is located in New York City's lower Manhattan, near Wall Street; therefore, their main contracting partnership is with the financial service industry. In order to avoid competition among community colleges, some states have policies that do not allow a community college to contract with businesses outside their service area or the county in which the community college is located (e.g., IL, NC, WA).

Funding for Business and Industry

As mentioned above, all states contract with business and industry on a fee-for-service basis. In these cases, a business requests training for its employees and pays for the total cost of the course. Seventeen states (35%) encourage business and industry to contract with colleges by offering incentive grant programs (AL, AR, CO, HI, ID, IA, KY, LA, ND, NH, NJ, NY, NC, OH, OK, WA, WV). These grants are funded through federal or state sources to help businesses cover the cost of training and to foster economic development by training or retraining a state's existing or emerging workforce (KY, NJ, OK); encouraging new businesses to come to the state (ND, OK); helping adults gain employability skills (AL); or training employers in new technologies (FL).

Assistance to business and industry through state or federal grants varies, typically through a 50-50 match with 50% of the cost provided through a Request for Proposal process and the other 50% provided directly by the business (OH, WA). In Ohio, the Targeted Industry Grant goes to the community college, which then solicits businesses to cover the remaining 50% of training costs. In Kentucky, a workforce training incentive program administered by the Kentucky Community and Technical College System provides technical skills training to existing and new businesses that are creating high-paying jobs in the state. The general state fund provides \$6M for up to 65% of the costs of training to a business, with the business contributing the remaining cost.

In Alabama, another state like Kentucky where the majority of noncredit occupational programming is contract training, On-the-Job Training (OJT) is available through federal WIA funds. Companies contracting with the community college enter a "moral agreement" to hire local graduates of the training. This program reimburses employers up to 50% of their training costs. Unlike Ohio's Targeted Industry Grant, businesses that contract through OJT in Alabama do not necessarily have to use the community colleges as their training service provider; however, their incentive to do so is maximum reimbursement from the state of 50% of the training cost. With a different service provider, the business receives less than 50% of the cost of training from

the state. Arkansas' Existing Workforce Training Program (funded every two years with the last state appropriation at \$1.4M) uses the same differential reimbursement approach. The primary purpose of the program is to provide financial assistance through grants or an income tax credit to Arkansas business and industry for the delivery of customized, industry-specific training to upgrade the skills of the existing workforce.

In New Hampshire, every four or five years, the state provides grants using unemployment insurance funds that businesses pay over a number of years. Approximately \$1M has been made available to business and industry through this grant program, which provides for a 50% match from business. In Oklahoma, the state appropriates funds directly to local technical centers and covers 100% of the cost of training new employees. Oklahoma's Training for Industry Program (TIP) is described as a no-cost or low-cost vehicle for companies creating new skilled jobs in Oklahoma through contract training. Another program in Oklahoma, the Existing Industry (EI) Program, provides funding for upgrading incumbent workers' skills.

Besides matching grants, states can use other funding methods to encourage and support contract training. In West Virginia, through the Workforce Development Initiative, the state provides a one-to-one match with the contracting business for credit or noncredit occupational programs. Funding is allocated to the West Virginia Development Office for workforce development initiatives implemented at two-year colleges. The funding awarded to the colleges must be matched by private funding sources, thus creating public/private partnerships and providing more funds for education and training. In Massachusetts, there have been a few initiatives at the state legislature to provide funding to community colleges for specific programs. The Workforce Training Incentive Fund reimburses \$.20 for every dollar a college brings in for workforce training. In 2006, Massachusetts made \$2.3M available, but the amount available for reimbursement varies from year to year.

Other states offer incentives to business and industry on a case-by-case basis. In Delaware, when a business works with the Economic Development Office to bring jobs or business into Delaware, the state may cover some of the cost for a community college course developed in partnership with the business. In Oklahoma, the state occasionally provides one-time grants to meet a specific need (e.g., to buy training equipment). In North Dakota, where most noncredit occupational programming takes the form of contract training, funds provided by the state cover community college operational costs, but are not enough to cover direct training costs. However, North Dakota does provide additional funds directly to businesses that bring new money to the state or companies that use training to increase employee salaries. These funds are awarded through an application process and can be used for direct training costs.

Partnerships Between Community Colleges and Business and Industry

In some instances, individual community colleges (CO, ID, NC) or the community college system (the Community College Consortium in NJ, the Kentucky Community and Technical College System) will work with a business partner to apply for a state or federal grant to bring

the training to the colleges. For example, the Commodity Growers Cooperative and the Kentucky Community and Technical College System partnered to obtain a grant from the Agricultural Development Board to provide computer literacy training for farmers in the most tobacco-dependent parts of the state. The community college received part of this grant and currently provides training to tobacco farmers.

Summary

All of the states interviewed provide at least part of their occupational programming by contracting with business and industry to train existing or future employees. In some states, the majority (75-100%) of noncredit occupational programming is contract training. Most states contract with the health, manufacturing, and information technology/computer industries. Many states have policies and regulations specific to contract training, although a range of policies exist. A policy might encourage economic development by providing incentives for the location of new industries or the expansion of existing firms to improve employment opportunities in the state. States may support and promote general skill training, retraining, and upgrade training through their state policies, while other states focus specifically on regional economic growth in their contracting policies.

Community colleges are often designated as the main venue for and preferred provider of customized training and technical assistance with the community college-business partnership often being crucial to regional economic development. With few restrictions apart from state regulations that would apply to any type of contract, community colleges enter into agreements with business and industry to provide contract training. All states contract with business and industry on a fee-for-service basis. In these cases, a business requests a class for its employees and pays for the total amount of the training. Some states offer incentive grants funded through federal or state sources to help businesses cover the cost of training and to foster economic development. Incentive grant programs may subsidize the training or retraining of a state's existing or emerging workforce.

KEY FINDINGS

The principal objective of this study was to develop a comprehensive national profile of state-based systemic mechanisms in place for community college noncredit occupational, professional, and technical training courses. The study reports on state policies and regulations on noncredit occupational programming and direct and indirect financial support for these courses. In addition, this study specifically addresses contract training for business and industry offered in the community college setting, describes data system capacity at the state and local level, and provides samples of data related to noncredit occupational programming. The findings of this study are organized under three major themes: programming, funding, and data systems.

Programming

- Noncredit courses can often be divided into two broad categories: occupational or workforce development courses, and personal enrichment or recreational or avocational courses.

- In most states, almost all community colleges offer noncredit occupational programming. The amount and type of offerings vary by the resources available to fund these courses as well as the geographic location of the college relative to business and industry sites.
- Colleges and business and industry often partner to plan and develop noncredit courses. In some states, the majority of occupational noncredit programming is customized training.
- The specific needs of a particular state drive the development of noncredit courses and the focus of those courses.
- Field experience and industry accreditation are important instructor qualifications. Instructors often have to meet national standards through accrediting bodies.
- Some states institute new occupational courses first as noncredit and then later as credit. Since the noncredit courses do not have a lengthy approval process, they can initially be offered to meet industry demand and then eventually be put through the course approval process to be offered for credit.
- In some states, noncredit courses are not transferable to credit programs. States may offer students the opportunity to test out of a credit program requirement based on their participation in noncredit courses or to earn credit for noncredit courses by taking an assessment. States sometimes award credit for prior learning and experience.
- Noncredit courses and programming not receiving state funding do not have to undergo a formal approval process. Instead, industry content standards and the needs of industry are often used as a basis for developing these courses.
- Some states are in the process of reforming their noncredit system due to increased attention to noncredit occupational programming.

Funding

- If state funding is available, it is only for occupational, remedial, and adult basic education courses, not for recreational courses.
- In states where only credit courses receive state funding, it is advantageous for colleges to offer occupational, workforce development courses for credit.
- In some states, noncredit occupational courses are self-sustaining. These courses are market-driven and funded by sources other than the state (tuition and fees, industry, college general fund, etc.).
- A few states offer noncredit occupational courses at no charge or regulate tuition and fees so that these remain low. In states with no state funding for noncredit occupational courses, tuition and fees vary widely.

Data Systems

- Many states do not have a centralized system for gathering and reporting data on noncredit programming.

- Some states have not designed their data gathering systems to differentiate between credit and noncredit courses.
- States that fund noncredit occupational programming tend to collect more data on noncredit courses than states that do not provide funding for these courses.

CONCLUSION

The most telling observations from analyzing the data collected on noncredit occupational programming were the range of operational definitions for *noncredit programming* and *noncredit occupational programming*, the existence or absence of policies for development and delivery and funding, the extent to which different funding mechanisms are used, and the paucity of data easily accessible (even if reported) by the states. An apparent constant was the use of contract training in some capacity in every state. In all of this, the community college played a primary role, although many states maintained some degree of oversight, mainly regarding content standards and course approval. Another key player was the business and industry partner, often but not always through formal agreements precipitated either by programming or funding policies.

Several factors affect both the development and funding of noncredit occupational programming: a) historically, every community college competes with the four-year postsecondary institutions for state resources; b) community colleges provide noncredit occupational programming based on local and regional workforce development needs that may not match state priorities or initiatives for workforce development; and c) although community colleges work in partnership with business and industry in providing work-related training, the need for training in specific skills and in more general skills may not be equally met.

In addition, it was strikingly apparent that there is no comprehensive and common reporting system for noncredit occupational programming. Having no information limits sound evidence-based decisions on scope of training, funding for training, and balancing the community college academic and noncredit programs to meet the needs of the local workforce. As reported by the GAO (Bellis, 2004), only about a sixth of community colleges and technical schools track data for noncredit occupational, professional, or technical training programs, with the most common tracking mechanism being student self-report follow-up surveys. The National Governors Association (2007) recommends that specific metrics be developed so that states can better understand how well postsecondary education is meeting the skill needs of business and industry, including measures of retention of program graduates in their field or discipline, alumni satisfaction concerning their preparation and readiness for work, and satisfaction of employers with workers having the necessary job skills. “Community colleges need to do a better job both of documenting the impact of their programs on local labor forces and economies, and of publicizing their impact to policymakers and the general public” (Jenkins & Boswell, 2002, p. 9).

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the extensive amount of information gathered for this study as well as in-depth discussions with state and community college representatives, several avenues to further extend this line of inquiry on noncredit occupational programming are delineated below.

1. Assess the overall impact of noncredit workforce development programming on business and industry (in economic terms: more skilled workers, higher salaries, new business, work performance, etc.).
2. Research the administrative structures in the development and delivery of content. Create a taxonomy to appropriately analyze the current structures and determine if there are any lessons to be learned from the different structures might inform the field. Are some structures more effective at delivering content? Is there a relationship between state policies and administrative structures that could inform future policy?
3. Investigate workplace outcomes of noncredit occupational programming. Do states or colleges collect any wage data to measure value added by the training? Are students advancing in their current jobs or careers in ways that could inform policy initiatives?
4. Conduct case studies of states with fully-developed data systems for noncredit occupational programming.
5. Research the recruitment of and the selection criteria for students in state-funded contract training programs to provide additional information on the scope and aim of such grant programs.
6. Identify funding formula components, their relationship to state appropriations, and their relationship to credit course funding in each state to further understand what role noncredit occupational programming plays in each state.
7. Conduct case studies of states to determine best practices: states with state funding, states without state funding, states where the majority of noncredit is customized training, etc. Include interviews with community colleges, business and industry, and employees/students.
8. Monitor and evaluate the progress of a state in the process of revamping noncredit occupational programming.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges & ACT, Inc. (2006). *Faces of the future – Findings from the 2006 national comparison data report*. Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Projects_Partnerships/Current/FacesoftheFuture/Faces_of_the_Future_Homepage.htm
- Aragon, S. R., Woo, H. J., & Marvel, M. R. (2004). *Analysis of the integration of skill standards into community college curriculum*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, National Research Center for Career and Technical Education. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://www.nccte.org/publications/infosynthesis/r%26dreport/Integ_of_Skill_Stand_Aragon.pdf
- Bailey, T. R., & Averianova, I. (1999). *Multiple missions of community colleges: Conflicting or complementary?* (CCRC Brief No. 1). New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?uid=101>
- Bailey, T. R., & Morest, V. S. (2004). *The organizational efficiency of multiple missions for community colleges*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?uid=7>
- Bartlett, J. E., II. (2002). *Preparing, licensing, and certifying postsecondary career and technical educators*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education.
- Bartlett, K. (2004). *The signaling power of occupational certification in the automobile service and information technology industries*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, National Research Center for Career and Technical Education. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://www.nccte.org/publications/infosynthesis/r%26dreport/Signaling_Power_Bartlett.pdf
- Bartlett, K. R. (2002). *The perceived influence of industry-sponsored credentials in the information technology industry*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, National Research Center for Career and Technical Education. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://www.nccte.org/publications/infosynthesis/r%26dreport/PerceivedInfl_Bartlett.pdf
- Bellis, D. (2004). *Public community colleges and technical schools: Most schools use both credit and noncredit programs for workforce development*. Report to the Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, U.S. Senate. (GAO-05-04). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Dougherty, K., & Bakia, M. (2000). Community colleges and contract training: Content, origins and impact. *TC Record*, 102, 5–10.
- Drury, R. L. (2001). The entrepreneurial community college: Bringing workforce, economic and community development to Virginia communities. *Inquiry*, 6(1), 26–33.
- Education Commission of the States. (2000). *State funding for community colleges: A 50-state survey*. Denver, CO: Author, Center for Community College Policy.
- Flynn, W. (2001). *More than a matter of degree: Credentialing, certification and community colleges*. Carlsbad, CA: National Center for Continuing Education and Training.
- Grubb, W. N., Badway, N., Bell, D., Bragg, D. & Russman, M. (1997). *Workforce, economic, and community development: The changing landscape of the entrepreneurial community college*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?uid=30>
- Grubb, W., Badway, N., & Bell, D. (2002). *Community colleges and the equity agenda: The potential of noncredit education*. Prepared for the Metropolitan Life Foundation Community College Excellence Awards Initiative. ED 466 245.
- Harmon, R. & MacAllum, K. (2003). *Documented characteristics of labor market-responsive community colleges and a review of supporting literature*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.
- IPEDS. (2007). *IPEDS glossary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/pdf/IPEDSglossary.pdf>
- Jacobs, J. (2001). What is the future for postsecondary occupational education? *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 26, 1–23.
- Jenkins, D., & Boswell, K. (2002). *State policies on community college workforce development: Findings from a national survey*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, Center for Community College Policy.
- Kim, K., Collins Hagedorn, M., Williamson, J., & Chapman, C. (2004). *Participation in adult education and lifelong learning: 2000-01* (NCES 2004-050). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_6/6_4/6_1.asp
- MacAllum, K., Yoder, K., & Poliakoff, A. R. (2004). *The 21st-century community college: A strategic guide to maximizing labor market responsiveness. Vol. 2 – Promising practices*

and lessons from the field. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

- Milam, J. (2005). The role of noncredit courses in serving nontraditional learners. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 129, 55–68.
- National Governors Association. (2007). *Innovation America: A compact for postsecondary education*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/0707INNOVATIONPOSTSEC.PDF>
- O'Donnell, K. (2006). *Adult education participation in 2004-05* (NCES 2006-077). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006077.pdf>
- O'Donnell, K. (2005). *Tabular summary of adult education for work-related reasons: 2002-03* (NCES 2005-044). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005044.pdf>
- Pusser, B., Breneman, D., Gansneder, B., Kohl, K., Levin, J., Milam, J., et al. (2007). *Returning to learning: Adults' success in college is key to America's future*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education.
- Smotroff, L. (2002). *Noncredit quality standards: A practical guide for a competitive advantage*. Carlsbad, CA: National Council for Continuing Education and Training.
- The Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the promise to our nation's children*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2004). *Public community colleges and technical schools: Most schools use both credit and noncredit programs for workforce development* (GAO-05-04). Washington, DC: Author.
- Vaughan, G. (2006). *The community college story* (3rd ed). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Voorhees, R. & Milam, J. (2005). *The hidden college: Noncredit education in the United States*. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from [http://curry.edschool.virginia.edu/files/pathways/hidden\)college_draft_053105.pdf](http://curry.edschool.virginia.edu/files/pathways/hidden)college_draft_053105.pdf)
- Warford, L. (2002). Funding lifelong learning – A national priority. *Community College Journal*, 72(3), 15–23.

**APPENDIX A
INVENTORY OF STATE POLICIES AND FUNDING FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGE NONCREDIT PROGRAMMING**

State: _____

Interviewee: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Recommended Community College (and Contact if available): _____

Other sources of information: _____

A. State Policies and Regulations for Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming

1. Definition and categorization of <i>noncredit</i>	
2. Policy for community college noncredit occupational course development and delivery	
3. Entity or entities (state or local) responsible for noncredit occupational course planning and development	
4. Approval process for noncredit occupational courses	
5. Content standards for noncredit occupational courses	
6. Minimum qualifications for instructors of noncredit occupational courses	
7. Transferability of noncredit courses	
8. Percentage of community colleges offering noncredit occupational courses (%)	
9. Number of students enrolled in community college noncredit courses and the number of students (<i>n</i>) enrolled in community college noncredit occupational programming (<i>n</i>)	
10. Distribution of noncredit programming by community college program areas	

B. State Entities and Mechanisms for Funding Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming

11. State policy on funding	
-----------------------------	--

continued

12. Funding mechanisms	a. ____ State support – one-time appropriation b. ____ State support – funding formula c. ____ Tuition and fees d. ____ Nonstate support through business and industry contract training e. ____ Other nonstate support
13. State agency/entity	
14. Amount of state allocation to community colleges for noncredit occupational programming	
15. Funding formula	
16. Student share of cost (% or \$)	
17. Cost of tuition and fees (\$) (range)	

C. Contract or Customized Training

18. State policy for community colleges contracting with public or private entities to provide customized training	
19. Main industries that contract with community colleges and brokering services, if applicable	
20. Distribution of noncredit programming for contract training by community college program area	
21. Percentage of noncredit occupational programming that is contract or customized training (%)	
22. Contract training funding	
23. Student enrollment for contract training	

D. Other Nonstate Support

24. Other sources for nonstate support (federal, foundations, business, etc.)	
25. Other nonstate support (% or \$) for noncredit programming	
26. Percentage of noncredit occupational programming costs covered by nonstate support (%)	
27. Industries for which noncredit occupational programming is supported by nonstate sources	

APPENDIX B
COMMUNITY COLLEGE NONCREDIT STUDY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

State: _____

State Contact Interviewee: _____

Position/Title: _____

Organization: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Interviewer: _____

Date of First Call: _____

Date of Second Call: _____

PART A: Introductory Phone Call

Hello. My name is _____ and I'm calling from the Academy for Educational Development. This phone call is a follow-up to an introductory letter sent to all State Directors of Career and Technical Education on March 17, 2006, from James R. Stone III, Director of the National Research Center for Career and Technical Education (NRCCTE), and Kimberly Green, Executive Director of the National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education (NASDCTE) notifying you of several research studies recently funded by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE). In addition, you may have responded to an e-mail from Katie Ruffing of NASDCTE requesting contact information on individuals responsible for specific areas being addressed in these studies.

The Academy for Educational Development is conducting the study on community college noncredit programming. For that study, we are developing an inventory of state policies and regulations on noncredit occupational programming offered by community colleges.

[Over the last few months, you also may have been contacted by the Community College Research Center at Columbia University, which is currently engaged in a separate study on noncredit programming. The focus of their study differs from ours. The Columbia University study is focusing on how noncredit programs are linked to credit programs and how noncredit information is recorded on transcripts.]

AED's study is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education. We are collecting detailed information on whether there are state policies specifically related to noncredit occupational programming, how noncredit courses are developed, and the entities that fund noncredit occupational courses at community colleges.

We would like your assistance in collecting the information necessary to accurately portray community college noncredit programming in your state. In that regard, we would like to send you a matrix that outlines the information in which we are interested. Could I please have your

e-mail address so that I might send this to you?

We also would like to schedule a call with you to discuss your state's policies and regulations for community college noncredit occupational programming. This interview should take approximately 30 minutes. Finally, we would appreciate your recommendations on other state contacts we might speak with in gathering information for this study.

PART B: Interview

Hello. This is _____ calling from the Academy for Educational Development. Thank you so much for taking the time to talk with us today. To begin, I'd like to get some very general information from you.

1. Are there any reports that you would recommend to us that relate to any of the topics covered in the matrix we e-mailed to you earlier? How might we obtain these reports?
2. Are there any other individuals you would recommend we contact about noncredit programming in your state? Could you share their area of responsibility and their contact information?
3. Following this call, we may be contacting a community college in your state. What is the community college with the largest student population in your state that engages in noncredit occupational programming? Is there a specific person there you would recommend we speak to on noncredit programming?

Now I'd like to ask you a series of questions on the **State Policies and Regulations for Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming**. For cases where you do not have the information, please let us know where we might find it—for example, by referring us to reports or other sources of information.

1. To begin, we would like to know how noncredit courses are defined and categorized in your state.
 - a. How are noncredit courses defined? How do these courses differ from credit-based courses?
 - b. What are the areas of noncredit courses? (For example, workforce development, work readiness, customized training, recreational, etc.)
2. Are there state policies that govern the development and delivery of community college noncredit occupational courses? Yes No
 - a. If there are state policies, could you please describe them? [*How might I get a copy of these policies?*]
 - b. How long have these policies been in effect? When were they most recently updated?
 - c. Are these policies different than those for credit-based courses? How?

3. What entity or entities (state or local) are responsible for noncredit occupational course planning and development?
 - a. Who plans and develops noncredit occupational programming?
 - b. For what specific industries is noncredit occupational programming currently provided?
 - c. Does the person responsible for planning and development differ depending on the industry?
4. What is the approval process for noncredit occupational courses?
 - a. Who is responsible for approving noncredit occupational courses?
 - b. What criteria are used to approve noncredit occupational courses?
5. Are there content standards for noncredit occupational courses?
 - a. What are they? *[Are they included in any available report? What is the year in which the data were collected?]*
 - b. How are they determined? And are they linked to specific industry standards?
 - c. Who is responsible for developing the standards?
 - d. Is there a mechanism in place to monitor their application?
6. What are the minimum qualifications for instructors of noncredit occupational courses?
 - a. Do these differ by course or program area?
 - b. Do these differ depending on whether the courses are driven by industry standards?
 - c. Who sets the minimum standards for instructors of noncredit occupational courses?
7. Are there opportunities for academic transfer of noncredit courses to credit-bearing certificate and degree programs?
 - a. Are there any initiatives to facilitate student transition from noncredit occupational programming into credit-based certification programs?
8. How many of _____'s (name of state) community colleges offer noncredit occupational courses?
 - a. Do some offer more than others?
 - b. What do you think drives these differences (e.g., state policy/incentives, school personnel, location within the state, etc.)?
9. How many students are enrolled in community college noncredit courses? *[Get report.]*
 - a. How are the data collected? (Is a duplicated or unduplicated count used?)
 - b. Are the data reported by type of noncredit offerings such as CTE vs. non-CTE (e.g., workplace readiness skills), *OR* customized training, continuing education (e.g., relicensure), and noncredit courses offered to test course offerings before offering them for credit, etc?

10. How is noncredit programming distributed across community college program areas such as health care, manufacturing, and information technology? (For example, % in health care, % in manufacturing, etc.)?

Now I'd like to ask you a series of questions on **State Entities and Mechanisms for Funding Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming**. Again, in cases where you do not have this information, please indicate where we might find it.

11. What is the state policy on funding? *[At minimum, this should directly relate to response to #1 above.]*
12. How is noncredit occupational programming funded in your state?
- _____ State support – one-time appropriation
 - _____ State support – funding formula
 - _____ Tuition and fees
 - _____ Nonstate support through business and industry contract training
 - _____ Other nonstate support
13. What are the state agencies or entities responsible for providing funds for noncredit occupational programming?
14. How much does the state allocate to community colleges for noncredit occupational programming? *[Is there a specific report with these statistics? On what year are the statistics based?]*
15. If funding is based on a state funding formula, what is that formula?
- What considerations are made in determining the formula?
 - Are any of the following addressed in the formula?
 - _____ Enrollment
 - _____ Space utilization
 - _____ Comparison with peer institutions
 - _____ Other: _____
16. If there is a state policy on community college funds generated by student tuition and fees for noncredit occupational programming, what is the total student share of cost for instruction (student share of cost: % or \$)?
17. If students share the cost for noncredit programming in community colleges, what is the average tuition and fees (annual or per course hour)? *[If you do not know the average tuition and fees, do you know the general range for tuition and fees?]*

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about **Contract Training**.

18. Is there a specific policy for community colleges contracting with public or private entities to provide specific customized training?
___ Yes. If Yes, could you please describe the policy? [*How might I get a copy of this policy?*]
___ No
19. What are the main industries that contract with community colleges for customized or contract training?
 - a. Also, in your state, do community colleges ever function as a brokering service to identify a consultant to provide the business with specific training they have requested for their employees?
20. How is noncredit programming for contract training distributed across community college program areas such as health care, manufacturing, and information technology? (For example, % in health care, % in manufacturing, etc.)?
21. What is the percentage of noncredit occupational programming in your state that is contract training?
22. How is contract training financed in your state? [For example, does business or industry cover all of the costs? Does the business reimburse the students for tuition? Does the state subsidize some of the costs?]
23. How many students (in your state) are enrolled in contract training?
24. Are there any other sources of nonstate support (besides from businesses contracting with community colleges) for noncredit occupational programming? (i.e., federal, foundations, etc.)
25. If there are other sources of nonstate support, how much funding (% or \$) do they provide?
26. What percentage of noncredit occupational programming costs is covered by nonstate support?
27. What are the industries for which noncredit occupational programming is financially supported by nonstate sources?

APPENDIX C
SAMPLE STATE WEB SITES AND DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- The Alaska Process Industry Careers Consortium (<http://www.apicc.org/>)
- Reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998: A Position Paper, Alaska Workforce Investment Board, Alaska Department of Labor & Workforce Development, September 9, 2003
- Arizona Governor's Council on Workforce Policy 2006 Annual Report
- Florida Community College System FTE 2005-06 Reporting Year (6A-10.033(2) FAC) (July 1, 2005)
- The Fact Book Report for the Florida Community College System, February 2005
- Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (<http://www.technicalcollegesystemofgeorgia.org/>)
- Mississippi State Board for Community Colleges (<http://www.sbcjc.cc.ms.us/>)
- Pennsylvania Title 22. Education Part XVI. Standards Chapter 335. Community College Courses: Subchapter C. Noncredit Courses
- Texas Chapter 9. Program Development in Public/Junior College Districts and Technical Colleges: Subchapter F. Workforce Continuing Education Courses

**APPENDIX D
NONCREDIT PROGRAMMING DEFINITIONS**

AL	Noncredit courses are categorized as continuing education (leisure and personal enrichment classes), workforce development, and contract training.
AK	Noncredit courses include workforce development and skills upgrade courses dictated by the needs of the state.
AZ	Noncredit continuing education courses include contract training, arts and crafts, and coursework leading to credentialing, such as health care courses. Skill centers attached to the colleges offer occupational, technical, and basic skills courses. At many community colleges, occupational courses begin as noncredit contract training and then transition to credit courses. The process of offering a contract training course is accelerated, allowing a course to be piloted for a year before creditability is determined through a curriculum review process. Apprenticeship programs, the majority of manufacturing programs, and other occupational programs such as EMT, police academies, and training for state agencies are all offered for credit.
AR	There are three types of noncredit courses: business- or occupational-related courses that are offered as open enrollment classes, noncredit customized training, and noncredit avocational community education courses (e.g. computer classes and courses specifically for leisure and personal enrichment).
CA	<p>Courses are divided into not-for-credit and noncredit. Not-for-credit courses can be occupational in nature but do not receive state funding. They are categorized as corporate welfare and businesses are responsible for paying the fees of those courses. Avocational courses also fall into the not-for-credit category and are defined as leisure and personal development.</p> <p>Noncredit courses are eligible for state apportionment [as set forth in Education Code §84757(a)] and include nine areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parenting, including parent cooperative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships. • Elementary and secondary basic skills, other courses, and classes such as remedial academic courses or classes in reading, mathematics, and language arts. • English as a second language (ESL).* • Classes and courses for immigrants eligible for educational services in citizenship, ESL, and workforce preparation classes in the basic skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, mathematics, decision making, and problem solving skills, and other classes required for preparation to participate in job-specific technical training.* • Education programs for persons with substantial disabilities. • Short-term vocational programs with high employment potential (includes apprenticeship).* • Education programs for older adults. • Education programs for home economics. • Health and safety education. <p>* ESL, courses for immigrants, and short-term vocational programs are considered occupational.</p>

CO	Noncredit courses include customized training, such as training new workers and upgrading the skills of displaced workers, and personal enrichment courses. At some colleges, a new occupational program starts as customized training to fulfill a workplace interest and need. A noncredit course can be quickly instituted, providing a means for assessing the course before putting a credit program in place.
CT	There are two major categories for noncredit programming: workforce development and personal fulfillment/enrichment. These two categories are in the BANNER information system that is used across all 12 CT community colleges. Workforce development courses are those courses that may help students in their current job or in getting a better job. Basic skill courses can be classified as workforce development courses only if requested by business. Personal fulfillment courses have no direct relationship to jobs and are not considered occupational courses.
DE	Noncredit courses are divided into occupational, professional development, and personal development courses. Occupational courses include workforce development and customized training.
DC	Noncredit courses that the Office of Apprenticeship, Technical and Industrial Trades oversees are: apprenticeship courses in personal care services (e.g., cosmetology), building trades, technical trades (e.g., EMT), and industrial trades (e.g., heating and plumbing), as well as workforce development for four DC wards, and continuing education (e.g., computer networking and training). Noncredit leisure classes fall mostly under the jurisdiction of the Department of Parks and Recreation.
FL	Noncredit programming at community colleges refers to the instructional classifications of supplemental, adult basic and secondary, citizenship, and recreational. Noncredit categories include life-long learning (noncredit instruction other than recreation and leisure); community instruction services (noncredit courses designed to meet community needs, or recreation activities); postsecondary adult (vocational); vocational education (non-college-credit courses for persons who have completed or left high school); and continuing workforce education (CWE) (improving the job skills of employed persons). Occupational noncredit courses may be tailored to a given employer and job (customized) or may have broader applicability. CWE instruction does not result in a technical certificate, diploma, associate of applied science degree, or associate of science degree. CWE is for: a) individuals who are required to have training for licensure or certification renewal by a regulatory agency or credentialing body; b) new or expanding businesses; c) business, industry, and government agencies whose products or services are changing so that employee retraining is necessary or whose employees need training in specific skills to increase efficiency and productivity; or d) individuals who are enhancing their occupational skills in order to maintain their current employment, to cross train, or to upgrade their employment. (F.S. 1004.02(13))
GA	Noncredit courses include avocational (recreational) courses, occupational licensing, and customized contract training. Noncredit programming is shorter in duration (4-6 hours) than credit programming (70/80 hours).

HI	There are two types of noncredit courses: workforce development and personal enrichment. The workforce development courses are generally short-term skills training. Courses are offered as open enrollment or as contract training.
ID	Noncredit courses are any classes for business and industry skill development. Students cannot earn or transfer credit for these classes. At the community college interviewed, workforce training programs usually take the form of short-term, noncredit classes that are affordable and conveniently scheduled to allow workers to update their skills in programs such as computer training, machining, electronic repair, real estate, and health-related fields such as dental assisting and certified nurse assistant.
IL	Noncredit courses include business directed (contract training), continuing education (individuals seeking employment, career advancement, job upgrading, new career, occupational and leisure-oriented continuing education, and/or basic education), and community education. Noncredit courses are for short-term (generally 1-4 hours) education.
IN	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
IA	Noncredit courses can be in any subject and are classified as eligible or noneligible for FTE purposes. Eligible courses are state-mandated, for state re-licensure, or are a customized industry supplemental.
KS	Each college defines <i>noncredit</i> independently.
KY	Noncredit courses are of two general types: 1. Workforce development: training and education designed to improve an individual’s professional or workplace skills. These courses may award individual CEUs or academic credit if they meet certain criteria as established by the Commission on Colleges. These courses include customized training, regulatory training, apprenticeship, professional development, skills upgrade, workplace essential skills, and professional licensure/certification. 2. Community education: personal and community development activities that take the form of educational programs organized to provide enrichment to individuals in subjects of social awareness or personal interest. These courses include leisure, personal growth, and age-specific programs.
LA	Noncredit occupational courses are customized training courses. They are offered in response to the needs of business and industry. Depending on the college, customized training courses are offered as noncredit or credit. Since noncredit courses do not go through a lengthy approval process, they offer a quick response to the needs of business and industry. If noncredit courses are later approved by the Board of Regents, they become credit courses. LA is currently working on a framework for noncredit courses.
ME	The definition of <i>noncredit</i> varies by college. There is no state oversight and the courses are market-driven and consequently not categorized. Examples of courses include safety training and welding. Individual colleges design, develop, and deliver noncredit occupational courses.

MD	<p>A noncredit course is a classroom or non-classroom experience which is not recognized as partially fulfilling the requirements for the award of a degree or certificate, but which may be a prerequisite for credit courses. At the community college interviewed, courses are categorized by discipline (35-40 standard disciplines) and by type of course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workforce development/job preparation (e.g., preparation for a particular job/occupation, including apprenticeship training); • workforce development/licensure or certification (e.g., preparation for certification or licensure or renewals of those); • workforce development/job skill enhancement (e.g., for enhancing, upgrading, or refreshing workforce skills; usually stand-alone courses); • basic skills (e.g., literacy, GED, remediation); and • general education (e.g., philosophy and principles of various academic areas). <p>Courses are offered either as contract training or open enrollment. Noncredit occupational courses are offered within the three workforce development categories.</p>
MA	<p>Noncredit courses include enrichment, certification programs, career programs, licensure, and recreational classes.</p>
MI	<p>There is no official definition of <i>noncredit courses</i>. At the community college interviewed, the majority of noncredit courses are contract training, in which the college develops a class to meet the need of a business.</p>
MN	<p>There is not a definition for <i>noncredit</i> at the system level; categorization is recorded via application of Classification of Instruction Programs (CIP) codes. Course offerings vary by institution coinciding in large part with regional differences.</p>
MS	<p>There are several types of noncredit courses: workforce education, adult basic education, literacy training, high school vocational, community interest/recreational, etc. Workforce education projects are defined as projects that provide pre-employment training, post-employment training, job-specific skills training, skills upgrade training, and retraining.</p>
MO	<p>Noncredit programming is not regulated at the state level. Noncredit courses are defined and developed at the college level.</p>
MT	<p><i>Noncredit</i> is defined by individual colleges' continuing education units. At the technical colleges, noncredit professional and continuing education courses are typically offered to provide condensed coursework to meet the needs of working students and professionals in need of skills upgrades. These noncredit courses fulfill some requirements of Professional Certifications (formerly referred to as Specialized Endorsements) and some needs of Professional Certifications (e.g., Office of Public Instruction (OPI) Renewal Units for MT K12 Teacher Certification). These courses are eligible for Continuing Education Units (CEUs) and OPI Renewal Units.</p>
NE	<p>Based on NE State Aid Enrollment Audit Guidelines, for a noncredit course to meet reimbursement eligibility requirements, it must run a minimum of three contact hours in an academic support or vocational discipline and must meet one of the following criteria: a) job entry; b) job update; c) job upgrade; d) consumer, personal, and miscellaneous classification of instructional programs; or e) vocational home economics.</p>

NV	Noncredit programming is defined at the local level since it is not governed by state policy. At the community college interviewed, noncredit categories include professional skills, personal interest, adult basic education, ESL, recreation/physical education, and career education.
NH	At NH Technical Institute (the largest community college in NH), noncredit courses are mostly occupational. A limited amount of noncredit falls into the personal development category. At the other campuses across NH, the majority of open-enrollment noncredit classes are personal development and any workforce development noncredit courses take the form of contract training.
NJ	Occupational, remediation, general education development, and adult basic education are the categories of noncredit courses that receive funding.
NM	Noncredit courses are categorized as workforce development, workplace readiness, customized training, and recreational/leisure courses. A wide range of occupational courses are offered as noncredit. Some academic courses, such as study skills and test-taking skills, are also offered as noncredit. Noncredit courses are offered within a shortened time frame with condensed content that is not as in-depth as credit courses. A credit course is offered during a 16-week period, while the timeframe for a noncredit course varies from one week to several weeks.
NY	Noncredit courses are offered in response to each individual college's needs assessment of the local area. There is no review of noncredit courses and no specific noncredit categories.
NC	Most noncredit courses fall into the category of continuing education as part of the Economic and Workforce Development Division. Categories of noncredit courses include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • basic skills; • occupational extension courses, comprised of Focused Industrial Training (catering to existing businesses in NC), New and Expanding Industry (state incentive program), and Customized Industrial Training (for companies that need training in high technology equipment); • the Small Business Network; and • human resource development (noncredit free training program for people in transition). There are also a few noncredit courses offered for community and personal development.
ND	Most noncredit courses are offered through the Department of Corporate and Continuing Education. In terms of workforce or occupational training, all noncredit courses are customized training courses with the contracting business as the primary customer.

OH	Individual campuses decide how to define <i>noncredit courses</i> . The Higher Education System collects information on noncredit training and decides, based on definitions, how to sort activities into the following categories: job-related and pre-employment training and development. At the community college interviewed, there are two categories in the noncredit occupational area: workforce training and incumbent worker training. Workforce training is for individuals starting a career or who were on public assistance and is designed to help them get entry-level basic training (e.g., call-center training, help-desk customer service, advanced manufacturing). Incumbent worker training is a skilled technical type of training similar to consulting. The college develops long-term partnerships (24-36 months) with businesses to consult on Information Technology or to evaluate and help answer business' questions (e.g., should the organization keep using its current operating system).
OK	Noncredit programming offered through the OK Department of Career and Technical Education is all outcomes-based, occupation-driven, and related to skill-specific training such as “upskilling” incumbent workers or training for new jobs.
OR	Whether a course is credit or noncredit is up to local boards. Generally, noncredit courses do not require a formal assessment—e.g., an end-of-course test. Categories of noncredit courses include: occupational supplementary (skills upgrading), up to 210 contact hours, for specific employee populations, and/or not part of a degree program; occupational preparatory (for job entry); and adult continuing education.
PA	Noncredit courses are planned educational activities designed to enable students to achieve stated learning goals. They differ from credit courses by offering less depth or breadth in subject matter; by being custom designed to meet the workforce training needs of local employers and other community organizations; by being designed to provide advanced training for professional or training or retraining for occupational workers; OR by not being postsecondary in nature. They also differ from credit courses by not being part of a program of study which leads to a formal college award. [22 Pa. Code §335.21] Noncredit reimbursable courses include public safety, adult basic education, occupational skills, and academic courses. Avocational and recreational courses are not reimbursable. Eligible Noncredit Workforce Development Courses receive additional Economic Development Stipend funding and must meet several criteria.
PR	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
RI	Noncredit occupational courses offered at the community college interviewed include professional development courses (e.g., management) and vocational courses (e.g., culinary arts, welding, teaching assistantship). Some recreational courses such as sewing and ballroom dancing are offered, but the college is moving away from offering these types of courses since other organizations offer them and the college wants its focus to be vocational and second career courses.
SC	Noncredit courses are continuing education courses and are divided into two categories: community interest and industrial development courses. Community interest courses are courses deemed to be good for the community and include such recreational courses as knitting and art. Industrial development courses are industry-based courses such as health care and manufacturing.

SD	Noncredit occupational courses are short-term classes customized for business and industry.
TN	Noncredit courses are those that do not require the same approval process as credit courses. The main categories are professional advancement and personal enrichment.
TX	Noncredit courses are either community interest courses or workforce continuing education (WCE) courses. The WCE courses are listed in a state manual. Students take the WCE courses to train for a job, to retrain, or to maintain a job. Any WCE program meeting or exceeding 780 contact hours (up to 800 hours for emergency medical/paramedic continuing education programs) must result in the award of semester or quarter credit hours and be applicable to a certificate and an applied associate degree program.
UT	There are very few policies or definitions related to noncredit programming at the state level. <i>Noncredit</i> is defined and categorized at the college level.
VT	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
VA	Noncredit courses can be divided into continuing education and community education. Workforce training falls under continuing education, whereas leisure classes tend to fall under community education.
WA	Noncredit courses are defined at the college level. These courses must be self-supporting whereas credit courses are eligible for state support. Noncredit classes include personal enrichment, community education, and professional or occupational training.
WV	Noncredit courses are divided into recreational and workforce development courses. Most noncredit courses are workforce development courses.
WI	Noncredit courses are: 1) courses to upgrade individuals in their present occupation; 2) courses which contribute to basic education, citizenship, and community safety for the general public; and 3) leisure-time enrichment courses like arts, crafts, hobbies, etc.
WY	Due to a statutory requirement that the state can only be involved in credit programming, there are not specific categories for noncredit courses. Noncredit courses have been categorized as business training and development (or workforce skills) and life enrichment (or personal growth).

**APPENDIX E.
STATE POLICIES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL COURSE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY**

AL	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The development of courses is based on individual demand and follows industry standards. The state does fund a substantial amount of contract training, but the courses are designed and developed at the local level.
AK	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The development of courses is based on individual demand and follows industry standards.
AZ	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. There is policy governing the community college skills centers where noncredit courses receive the same type of reimbursement as credit courses and are included in the funding formula as clock hours.
AR	The Department of Higher Education has regulations and forms that were developed several years ago by a panel of chancellors and college presidents in an effort to regulate quality standards by defining what could count as workforce training. Some of the criteria are the same as for credit classes (e.g., the course is instructor-led and there is instructional control), but they are not offered regularly and are customized to fit the need of a business.
CA	Guidelines are set forth in Title V. CA has a shared governance model. Faculty has priority in the development of courses. A statewide curriculum committee exists (Advancement Committee on Curriculum). The curriculum is designed at the local level and goes to the Title V-established committee for approval. Code mandates that there be a partnership and that the local academic senate be represented on the committee.
CO	It is the policy of the state to encourage quality economic development by providing incentives for the location of new industries or the expansion of existing firms, thereby improving employment opportunities (Policy 23-60-306: CO Customized Training Act). The college and businesses work together to plan courses and write grants to receive funding for them.
CT	CT has a broad policy that community colleges shall offer credit and noncredit courses to meet the needs of their specific communities. This is a “non-regulated arena with local digression.” Decisions on development of noncredit programming are made at the local level. However, the state sometimes does major program evaluation of specific areas that may be of interest across the community college system, such as programming for Certified Nurse’s Aide.
DE	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Noncredit courses are developed in partnership with the community.
DC	DC’s plan mandates that the University of DC partner with the DC Public Schools district office which manages workforce training funds.

FL	Continuing Workforce Education. Each community college may provide continuing education instruction tailored to individual needs and designed to improve job performance. Such instruction shall be classified in the Community College Management Information System as continuing workforce education, a noncredit classification. (6A-14.030(8) FAC)
GA	Noncredit instructional activities may include courses, seminars, and workshops provided to business and industry, organizations, governmental agencies, and the general public. Adult literacy, developmental studies, and Quick Start programs are not covered by this policy. Each technical college shall maintain an active noncredit instructional program throughout its respective service area. The pricing structure for the charge to the participant should be calculated on the basis of “cost recovery plus.” Each technical college shall develop a consistent basis for establishing its fee structure. Each technical college shall report enrollment or participation in noncredit instructional activities and community service activities in accordance with guidelines promulgated by the Department. (Policy IV. N. Noncredit Instruction, available at http://www.technicalcollegesystemofgeorgia.org/.)
HI	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The noncredit workforce development courses are self-supporting, market-driven classes. There is state oversight of credit-based workforce development courses but not of noncredit classes.
ID	State policies for short-term training are that classes must be approved by the State Board for Professional-Technical Education. The content and instructional hours enable participants to achieve the expected competencies. Approval to offer short-term classes that are not listed in the postsecondary short-term professional-technical training class catalog is requested by providing notice to the Division of Professional and Technical Education. A class outline with objectives must be submitted as part of the New Course Outline/Application for Approval form.
IL	The state policy is that noncredit programming is created and approved at the local level. The colleges are responsible for course development and delivery, and the courses must be self-sustaining.
IN	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
IA	At the state policy level, noncredit occupational courses are mentioned as part of the mission of community colleges. Programming development and delivery rests with the colleges.
KS	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. All programming responsibility resides at the local community college level.
KY	The KY Community and Technical Colleges System (KCTCS) does not have a formal policy in place to govern noncredit occupational training. KCTCS colleges have local autonomy in developing noncredit occupational training.
LA	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery.
ME	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Decisions are made at local community college level. The community college develops the course with business and industry.

MD	The development of courses is done at the local level and mostly initiated by the deans and program directors for Workforce Development at the college. State policy requires that a college may not identify a continuing education course or a series of continuing education courses as credit programs and that a college may not receive state funding for continuing education courses until the MD Higher Education Commission approves the courses. Generally, community colleges design the majority of their noncredit courses to meet the funding eligibility criteria (since noncredit courses must meet certain criteria to be eligible for funding).
MA	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Colleges are autonomous in their development and delivery of noncredit courses.
MI	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The State of MI has general supervision and leadership over community colleges, but by law, community colleges are autonomous.
MN	There is no policy at the system level for course development and delivery other than as a part of the system's tuition policy. Each institution's course list is market-based by choice, with some institutions offering courses in partnership with industry associations or boards.
MS	There are state-level policies on financial requirements, targeted priorities, and credentialing (state-endorsed certificates for noncredit) based on the state's Workforce Project Policies. The planning and development of workforce education courses is done at the local level by the community colleges in collaboration with their industry partners. There are some statewide efforts for specific programming such as welding and construction in which state-level partners provide their input. Community colleges electronically submit proposals for specific programming for approval to the State Board of Community and Junior Colleges.
MO	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Colleges are responsible for course development and delivery, but content is coordinated with the Department of Economic Development, Workforce Development Division to align with local and state Workforce Investment Boards.
MT	In Montana, the state policy requires colleges to make decisions concerning noncredit programming. Colleges have workforce development as part of their mission; they are responsible for development and delivery of workforce education courses in consultation with industry partners.
NE	Noncredit development and delivery is determined at the college level. The only state-level policy relates to state reimbursement for noncredit programming. It must be a minimum of three contact hours, and must related to at least one of the following criteria: job entry; job update; job upgrade; consumer, personal, and miscellaneous classification of instructional programs; or vocational home economics.
NV	The only existing policy addresses the delivery of distance education to discourage colleges from providing programming in another college's service area.
NH	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Course development and delivery is the responsibility of the colleges.

NJ	NJ has a decentralized system. There is no state board for higher education. Responsibility for courses and accountability resides at the local level. The Council of County Colleges plays a quasi-governmental role by reviewing courses eligible for state aid.
NM	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The planning and development of occupational noncredit courses are primarily the responsibility of individual institutions. The board and administration of community colleges are responsive to local needs and businesses.
NY	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Courses are developed in response to industry need, with input from business and industry.
NC	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The mission of the NC Community College System is to open the door to high quality, accessible educational opportunities that minimize barriers to postsecondary education, maximize student success, and improve the lives and well-being of individuals by providing: 1) education, training, and retraining for the workforce, including basic skills and literacy education, and occupational and pre-baccalaureate programs; 2) support for economic development through services to and in partnership with business and industry; and 3) services to communities and individuals which improve the quality of life (23NCAC02B .0104). There are general policies in each of the above areas regarding how to develop and deliver various classes. Courses are developed at the local level, but to be offered they must be registered in the Master Course List.
ND	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. In 1999, legislation was passed that identified the community colleges as accountable to deliver workforce training to the whole state and to utilize the existing eight state zones. The colleges are responsible for having an advisory board that reports to the legislature biannually. The community colleges are required to have a business plan and budget, both of which are approved by the board (comprised of business representatives from each of the four regions: SW, NW, SE, NE) and the Department of Higher Education. There are four training managers, one for each region. One training manager functions as the director and is responsible for collecting data from all regions to report to legislature through the ND University System Office. (This position rotates among the four directors every two years).
OH	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. The president and vice president of the college oversee the process of noncredit course planning and development and the executive director aids in the development of the programs. The faculty is mostly uninvolved in the course planning and development, with 98% of consultants and trainers coming from business and industry.
OK	The OK Department of Career and Technology Education (DCTE) regulates noncredit programming for customized training and establishes standards and approval guidelines. Over the past two years, there has been a concerted effort by DCTE and the State Regents for Higher Education to create a crosswalk for course development and approval addressing each of the 16 career clusters—for example, studies on supply and demand have been commissioned in the areas of health and manufacturing.

OR	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery, although noncredit and credit courses are reimbursed by the state in the same way. Course development and delivery is the responsibility of the individual colleges.
PA	The quality of course's content and its learning processes must be evaluated by each community college at least once every five years. The elements that must be included in a course outline include the title, description, learning goals, number of hours of instruction, planned sequence of topics designed to help students achieve learning outcomes, and resources to be used by student. (22 PA Code Chapter 335)
PR	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
RI	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Course planning and development is a joint effort of staff in the lifelong learning division.
SC	There is not a policy manual, but there is a system for noncredit programming run by the state board. There are policies and procedures for financing industrial development courses that are set by the system office. These policies generally do not refer to curriculum development, which is done at the local community college level where efforts are made to align courses with industry standards. The state system has been in place since 1961 and the funding policies have been in place for approximately 20 years.
SD	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Course development occurs at the college level with coordination of industry representatives. Each of the four technical institutes has a full-time position devoted to occupational program development.
TN	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Course development occurs at the college level with coordination of industry representatives.
TX	Policies on the development, delivery, and funding of community college noncredit occupational courses are available on the Web site for the TX Higher Education Coordinating Board (http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/Rules/tac3.cfm?Chapter_ID=9&Subchapter=F). Planning and development of the workforce continuing education courses are the responsibility of the community college administration. It is not regulated by the coordinating board.
UT	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery.
VT	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
VA	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. Each community college takes the lead in working with businesses to identify the needs of a company or even a region. There are three options for curriculum development: employ internal curriculum designers, locate the product online, or contract outside of the community college for the design.
WA	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery, but there is movement to encourage the transferability of noncredit courses to credit courses.
WV	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery.
WI	There is no state policy on noncredit occupational course development and delivery. However, technical colleges do receive state support for noncredit occupation-specific courses.

WY	By statutory requirement, the state can only be involved in for-credit programming. Noncredit programming development and delivery are the responsibility of the individual colleges.
----	---

APPENDIX F
STATE FUNDING POLICIES AND ENTITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR
NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMMING

AL	Funding policy information was not available from the state contact. At the community college included in the study, the Chancellor’s Office is the entity responsible for providing funds earmarked for maritime welding and ship-fitting courses/programming. In the past, the Governor’s Office has also been responsible for providing funds for noncredit occupational programming.
AK	There is not a state policy on funding, but the University of AK Statewide System receives a single budget line item from the legislature. The state funding for noncredit courses is distributed through a prioritization process internal to the University and some courses are self-sustaining. Senate Bill 137 outlines that statewide training providers receive state appropriations.
AZ	According to state code (A.R.S. §15-1410, 2006), noncredit courses are the financial responsibility of the community college district area. State funding policy only governs credit courses.
AR	The Department of Higher Education has regulations, developed by a panel of chancellors and college presidents, detailing the quality standards and definitions for workforce training. AR Code Annotated §6-50-701 et seq. provides funding for noncredit contract training through the Existing Workforce Training Program and the money is appropriated through the AR Department of Economic Development.
CA	Authorized categories for state-supported noncredit apportionment are identified in Education Code §84757(a). Pursuant to Education Code §84760.5, CA is working on developing criteria and standards for the identification of career development and college preparation noncredit courses and the eligibility of these courses for enhanced funding. The System Office of the CA Community Colleges is responsible for the allocation of state apportionment funds. At community colleges, noncredit course funding is calculated on the basis of headcount and actual student daily attendance contact hours. One FTE equals 525 student contact hours of attendance. Enrollment is recorded for each class and reported as part of the district’s regular enrollment reporting process to the state.
CO	Noncredit courses are not included in FTE funding, but there is some state funding through grants (i.e., CO First and Existing Industry training funds). The CO Department of Workforce and Employment is responsible for distributing these funds. All other noncredit occupational courses are self-funded.
CT	Noncredit courses are not funded by the state, but through tuition or a combination of tuition and support from business and industry. Business and industry funding for contract training varies widely. At some community colleges, overhead expenses such as space or even instructor salaries may be covered from the general college fund. The extent of this kind of support varies by college.
DE	There is no state system in DE, which has one community college with several campuses. Noncredit occupational courses at the community college are self-sustaining.

DC	The University of DC (UDC) is responsible for providing noncredit occupational programming. UDC receives an allocation through Perkins from the DC Public Schools. UDC also receives nonpersonnel funds to offset costs and offer free training for residents of certain DC wards (5, 6, and 7). The state agency involved in providing these funds is the City Council.
FL	The FL Department of Education is responsible for distributing funds for noncredit occupational programming. To receive state funding, noncredit occupational courses must follow the state curriculum frameworks and be classified in the state’s reporting system as Postsecondary Adult Vocational courses.
GA	There is no state funding for noncredit occupational courses; however, there is a policy governing the fee structure. Each technical college maintains an active noncredit instructional program throughout its respective service area. The fee structure is calculated on the basis of “cost recovery plus.” Each technical college develops a consistent basis for establishing its fee structure. Each technical college reports enrollment or participation in noncredit instructional activities and community service activities in accordance with state guidelines.
HI	Generally, businesses pay the cost of noncredit occupational programming. Some state funding exists from the Employment Training Fund through matching grants (whereby a business pays for 50% of the class and the state pays 50%). At the community included in the study, occupational noncredit courses are self-supporting. However, there are some state-supported positions at the community college through general state funding, and about one-third of those personnel work with noncredit occupational programming.
ID	There is no official policy on funding; however, any state funding for noncredit occupational programming must be applied to programs that are short-term. Based on the community college interviewed, available state funding takes the form of a matching grant for business and industry. The Division of Professional and Technical Education is responsible for providing these funds.
IL	There is no policy on funding noncredit occupational courses. However, the IL Department of Commerce and Economic Development provides business and industry with workforce development grants that cover infrastructure costs for noncredit occupational programming. This grant is allocated through a funding formula.
IN	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
IA	There is no state funding for noncredit occupational programming. As reported by the community college, there is FTE reimbursement for noncredit occupational programming in theory but not in practice. Contact hours are reported (one FTE is the equivalent of 600 contact hours of noncredit). Vocational and state-mandated courses (e.g., Transportation and Safety) are eligible for state funding.

KS	In order for noncredit occupational courses to receive state funding (through reimbursement), the clock hours reported must relate directly to an existing approved program. The KS Board of Regents is responsible for fund allocation, but it does not govern the community colleges (there is strong local governance). The number of clock hours and the number of students participating are considerations in determining funding formulas. Credit and noncredit funding cannot be distinguished from each other.
KY	There is no general state policy for noncredit occupational funding and state funds are not directly allocated to noncredit occupational programs. Local colleges are responsible for developing annual budgets based on their state allocation and funding. Community and Economic Development departments at the community colleges receive part of their funding from this general fund allocation. Additional revenue is generated through services delivered by these departments to business and industry and through various grants. State funding for business training comes from KY WINS (Workforce Investment Network System) and the general state fund. These funds are designated for business and industry training and the community colleges apply to receive the funds on a project-by-project basis.
LA	There is no state policy for noncredit course funding. The majority of noncredit occupational courses are funded through business and industry and from student tuition and fees. Some courses are funded by the LA Department of Social Services and through the LA Department of Labor.
ME	There is no state policy on noncredit course funding and state funds are generally not available for noncredit occupational courses at community colleges. Courses are funded through student tuition and fees, and business and industry.
MD	The community college reported that state funding is available through FTE reimbursement. The community college reports its full-time equivalent FTE students (FTE) to the higher education commission each year. At all MD community colleges, 100% of all credit FTE is fundable. At the community college included in this study, about 75-80% of noncredit FTE is fundable. MD has a state policy that requires community colleges to charge students reasonable tuition and fees for noncredit occupational programming.
MA	There is no specific policy on noncredit occupational programming, although there have been a few initiatives in which the state legislature provides funding to community colleges for specific programs. The Workforce Training Incentive Fund reimburses \$.20 for every dollar the college brings in for workforce training. The Workforce Training Incentive Fund is managed by the Board of Higher Education.
MI	The legislature appropriates funding directly to the community colleges (without an intermediary state entity). A funding formula for both credit and noncredit courses is used as a guide for funding and includes all activities of the community college (administration, instruction, student services, etc.).
MN	The legislature annually supports noncredit programming with \$11.44M and customized training with \$2.5M. The MN State Colleges and Universities System's Board of Trustees is responsible for providing funds from the appropriation provided by the state legislature.

MS	There are state-level policies on financial requirements, targeted priorities, and credentialing (state-endorsed certificates for noncredit). Programs are driven by local industry needs. The State Board of Community and Junior Colleges is responsible for distributing funds. The state funds the noncredit workforce education courses based on the number of hours, the instructor's salary, equipment and supply costs, travel expenses, and contractual services. The community college reported that there are state policies for submitting workforce projects to the state board. For example, there might be a limit on instructor pay. If an industry instructor charges more, the company has to cover the remaining cost.
MO	There are no specific funding policies originating at the MO Department of Higher Education.
MT	There are no state policies on funding for noncredit occupational programming. Courses are funded through tuition and fees, and business and industry contracts. There is also a small amount of FTE reimbursement for noncredit occupational courses (2.5% of noncredit FTE is reimbursed).
NE	The state funds noncredit with the credit courses on a FTE base through a formula (900 noncredit contact hours equal one FTE—the FTE produced by noncredit and credit courses are weighted the same when allocated by the state funding formula).
NV	There is no state policy on funding for noncredit occupational programming. These courses are self-sustaining at the community college level.
NH	There is not a comprehensive state community college system and there is no state funding for noncredit courses. Each NH community college offers noncredit occupational courses through its own center for business and training. These courses are self-sustaining, and ideally, revenue-generating. At the community college included in the study, the Vice President for Community and Corporate Affairs is responsible for managing the funding of noncredit programming.
NJ	To be eligible for state funding, the tuition for noncredit courses cannot exceed \$9.50 (including any general fee) per contact hour (for fiscal year 2006). The State Treasurer, in consultation with the Council of County Colleges, can adjust the tuition eligibility limit for noncredit courses annually. There is a single line item in the state budget for all 19 community colleges and a formula is used to distribute for-credit and state-funded noncredit enrollment. The State of NJ has designated community colleges as the preferred provider for its customized training program and provides grants each year to upgrade workers' skills. Through the NJ Community College Consortium, companies can access, develop, and receive workforce education and training for current and emerging employees. Customized training courses are funded through state- or DOL-funded grants, or through fee for service.
NM	Restricted courses, including noncredit occupational courses, do not receive state funding.
NY	There are funding policies for noncredit remedial programs (8 NYCRR §602.5 2006). Courses and programs that are not eligible for State funding have to be self-sustaining and revenues collectively received for these courses must cover direct costs for all courses and programs (e.g., faculty salaries, fringe benefits, supplies).

NC	There are three funding formulas, one each for curriculum (credit side), basic skills, and occupational continuing education. The funding formula is based on FTE and is different for each of the three program areas. The majority of training is state-supported. The actual dollar amount paid to each college by the state for each FTE earned is determined by the amount of money appropriated by the General Assembly for this purpose each year. It is also different for FTEs earned by students in curriculum (degree or certificate) programs and continuing education or extension programs. (If the legislature fails to increase funding as enrollments increase, the institutions do not receive funds for the full number of FTE credits earned.) The community college system distributes the funds to community colleges.
ND	There is not a comprehensive state community college system. The four community colleges rotate in having the responsibility of reporting to the state. The community college interviewee reported that funding for workforce training which is earmarked by the legislature for that purpose is routed through the Career and Technical Education Department once every two years. The noncredit courses that are not in the workforce training category are self-sustaining.
OH	Noncredit occupational programming is supported through state appropriations. Funding sources for workforce development also come through the Board of Regents from other agencies (e.g., Family Services, Department of Education, Department of Aging, Department of Development, and WIA) and are distributed to community colleges.
OK	Federal, state, and local funds support noncredit occupational programming. A state funding formula is based on enrollment and number of courses offered. Federal support includes Perkins and some WIA funds. Local funds are <i>ad valorem</i> with a percentage of the mill rate being appropriated for noncredit programming. For some programming, tuition and fees are applied. One-time appropriations to cover grants are also sometimes applied, such as reimbursement for specific equipment for a health-related program. Funding for contract training may be provided by business and industry or by state funds directed to a Local Training Center in one of the 29 technical center districts across the state.
OR	Credit and noncredit are not distinguished in the funding formula and so are funded in the same way. Local taxes, private organizations, FTE, and Perkins funds are all used to fund credit and noncredit alike. The Community College Support Fund distributes the money. The community colleges and the Workforce Development Office are responsible for funding.
PA	State funding is provided. Each community college receives Base Operating Funds based on the amount they received the previous year. A growth supplement is given to community colleges that have increased enrollment. Economic Development Stipend funding is given to the community colleges for enrollment in credit programs and noncredit workforce development courses aligned with PA's High Priority Occupations.
PR	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.

RI	There is not a comprehensive state community college system and there is only one community college in the state. There is not a state policy on noncredit occupational programming; courses at the community colleges are self-sustaining.
SC	There is a state system run by the State Board of Education. There are policies and procedures for financing the industrial development courses that are set by the system office. The Board reimburses colleges for every hour that they provide training and the Department of Commerce also provides some training funds. To generate an hourly rate, \$10M is divided by the total number of hours of training. At the community college, the number of contact hours for the continuing education classes are converted into FTEs and added to the funding formula for the college, although this amount is minimal.
SD	At the community college included in the study, there are some state funds available for companies contracting with the college and separate funds to cover the positions of the four coordinators at the state's four Technical Institutes. The State of SD provides for two line items on the budget for business and industry.
TN	At the community college interviewed, noncredit occupational programming is self-sustaining.
TX	The Coordinating Board and the Workforce Commission are responsible for distributing funds for noncredit occupational programming. According to state code (§9.115 on Funding): a) Contact hours reported for workforce education courses, which result in continuing education units (CEUs), shall be eligible for state appropriations. b) Workforce continuing education courses with fewer than seven contact hours of instruction will not receive state funding unless the specific type and length of instruction are required by local, state, or national licensing, certifying, regulatory, or accrediting agencies. c) Community interest courses shall not be eligible for state appropriations. d) Workforce Education Course Manual continuing education special topics courses that are not designed to prepare adult students for employment shall not be eligible for state appropriations. (Source Note: The provisions of this §9.115 adopted to be effective May 25, 2004, 29 TexReg 5069).
UT	The largest amount of state money for noncredit occupational programming goes to the technical colleges. The entity responsible for providing funds is with the UT Board of Regents. Distribution is based on a quasi-formula (base plus membership hours).
VT	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.
VA	In the appropriation Act of the VA Code, noncredit business and industry work-related and work programs at community colleges must be funded 30% from the general fund and 70% from non-general fund sources.
WA	There is no state support for students in noncredit occupational programming, but there are some incentive programs (e.g., a matching grant and tax credit program). The Job Skills Grant Program is a matching grant program by application, where the state pays 50% of business costs. The Customized Training revolving loan program provides loans for businesses. High Demand Funds are designated by the legislature to respond to state industry skill gap needs and to establish ongoing (permanent) funding for high-demand, high-cost programs that otherwise may not have been started or expanded.

WV	There is a state policy allowing state funds to be used for workforce development but not for recreational courses. The entity responsible is the WV Council for Community and Technical Colleges.
WI	There is no separate allocation for noncredit occupation programming. The WI Technical College System (WCTS) receives a state appropriation for general aid for the technical colleges that is allocated to the districts on the basis of net operating costs of the technical colleges. Included in these net costs are the cost of offering noncredit occupational programming (Voc-Adult Aid Code 47). The districts may charge tuition and program fees for these courses and, depending on how the courses are offered (e.g., seminars/workshops), may recover more than 100% of the cost in student fees. Because the allocation formula for state aid is based on net costs and an equalization factors, among other components, districts receive varying amounts of support for “noncredit occupational programming.” The State Board of WCTS is responsible for distributing funds.
WY	There is no state funding for noncredit occupational programming. Noncredit occupational programming is funded through student tuition and fees, and business and industry support.

APPENDIX G
STATE FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR
NONCREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMMING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
AL		x (matching grants for B&I)	x (student fees covered by various federal grants)	x	x (Perkins, WIA, foundations, Pell grants, nonprofits, other federal sources)
AK		x (single budget line from legislature)	x	x	x (DOL – Office of Mine Safety and Health Administration)
AZ			x	x	x (WIA)
AR		X (matching grants for B&I)	x	x	x (grants through WIB)
CA	x		x (only small fees charged to students)	x	x (Perkins)
CO		x (state grants for B&I to partner with CCs)	x	x	x (foundations)
CT			x	x	
DE		x (occasional state grants for specific projects, e.g., waste water management training)	x	x	x (students can use WIA money to pay for training)
DC			x	x	x (Perkins routed through DC Public Schools)

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
FL	x		x	x	x (TANF; WIA; grants through DOL, WIBs, and Homeland Security)
GA			x	x	
HI		x (Employment Training funds)	x	x	x (WIA)
ID	x	x (workforce development grants)	x	x	
IL	x (base payment and formula based on credit hours)		x	x	
IN	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.				
IA	x (a very small percentage of noncredit is included in the contact hours for the FTE calculation)	x (grants for B&I and Department of Economic Development grants)	x (training is funded mostly through tuition and fees)	x	
KS	x (clock hours have to relate to approved program to receive state aid for noncredit courses)		x	x	

Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming: A Study of State Policies and Funding

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
KY		x (matching grants for B&I)	x	x	x (local community resources, foundations, TANF-U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, WIB, and the Agricultural Development Board)
LA			x	x	x (DOL grants and grants for incumbent worker training)
ME			x	x	x (Perkins, foundation grants, and federal grants)
MD	x		x	x	x (local government)
MA	x		x	x	
MI	x (formula includes credit and noncredit courses – used as a guide for funding)	x (legislature appropriates funding directly to the community colleges)	x	x	x (property tax revenue)
MN	x		x	x	x

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
MS	x (money allocated is based on number of hours trained, instructor salaries, equipment/supply costs, travel expenses, and contractual services)		x (students rarely pay fees)	x	
MO			x	x	
MT	x		x	x	
NE	x		x	x	x (local property tax revenue, grants)
NV			x	x	x (Dept. of Education)
NH		x (matching grants for B&I)	x	x	x (WIA)
NJ	x	x (grants from state for B&I)	x	x	x (grants for B&I from DOL)
NM			x	x	x (WIA)
NY	x	x (state economic grants for training and retraining)	x	x	x
NC	x	x (state grants for new companies moving to the state; B&I competitive grants)	x	x	

Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming: A Study of State Policies and Funding

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
ND	x (funds come through CTE Dept. every two years divided among CCs by formula based on number of employees in the CC region)	x (B&I grants funded through Job Service Department)	x	x	x (federal money for some large costs, e.g., heavy equipment; B&I can apply to Bismarck State College Foundation for funds)
OH	x (line item in state budget – amount distributed evenly among CC campuses)	x (incentive funds; matching grants)	x	x	x (local foundations; National Science Foundation; DOL)
OK	x (based on FTE and number of courses offered)	x (one-time grant for specific need, such as reimbursement for equipment)	x	x	x (local property taxes, Perkins, WIA, TANF, TAA)
OR	x (funding formula same as for credit – base payment for each FTE and weighted enrollments from previous three years)		x	x	x (Perkins)

Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming: A Study of State Policies and Funding

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
PA	x (credit and noncredit are grouped together – colleges receive a Base Operating Fund and a growth supplement)		x	x	
PR	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.				
RI			x	x	x (WIA)
SC	x (reimbursed by hours trained)		x	x	x (Dept. of Commerce)
SD		x (some funds for business and industry grants)	x	x	
TN			x	x	
TX	x		x	x	
UT	x		x	x	
VT	Unknown – State was contacted but did not respond to repeated requests for interview.				
VA	x	x (Economic Development Office; Regional State Partnerships)	x	x	x (DOL, foundations, other federal money for specific projects)
WA		x (matching grants for B&I)	x	x	
WV	x (base budget for personnel)	x (matching grants for B&I; rapid response grant)	x	x	x (WIA)

Community College Noncredit Occupational Programming: A Study of State Policies and Funding

	a. State Support – Funding Formula	b. State Support – Non-formula	c. Tuition and Fees	d. Nonstate Support – Business and Industry (Contract Training – fee-for-service)	e. Other Nonstate Support (Examples of nonstate support)
WI	x (appropriation allocated based on net operating costs – formula same for credit/noncredit)		x	x	x (federal, local property taxes, foundations)
WY			x	x	x (WIA, DOL)