

370
255d

PN-ABI-479
ISN 72352

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHEMES

A paper prepared for the Seminar on Non-Formal Education
conducted by the SouthEast Asia Development Assistance Group

May 13-14, 1971

National Training Schemes.

370 Harbison, Frederick H.
H255d National Training Schemes. Frederick H.
Harbison and George Seltzer. Apr. 1971.
21 p.
Prepared for the SEADAG Education and Human
Resources Development Panel Seminar, Washing-
ton, D.C., May 13-15, 1971.

1. Industrial training. 2. Apprentices - Training. 3.
Vocational education. I. Title. II. Southeast Asian
Development Advisory Group (SEADAG).

Frederick H. Harbison
George Seltzer

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

NOTE

Dr. Frederick H. Harbison is Professor of Economics
and Roger Williams Strauss Professor of Human
Relations, Princeton University

Dr. George Seltzer is Professor of Economics and
Industrial Relations, University of Minnesota

This paper was prepared by them as Consultants to the Office of
Education and Human Resources, Technical Assistance Bureau,
Agency for International Development

April 1971

- 1

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHEMES

by

Frederick Harbison and George Seltzer

I. INTRODUCTION

A central issue in educational human resource planning is the extent to which responsibility for development of specific skills can be placed upon employing institutions. The planner is faced with questions such as these: What kinds of skills are best developed off-the-job or at the work-place? Who should bear the costs of such skill training? How will the required funds be raised? And, what kind of organizational machinery is required to deliver the appropriate training services?

Many countries in Asia are deeply concerned about these questions. Some already have established through legislation various kinds of training programs. Others are investigating possibilities for the future. Indeed, the role of employing institutions in training and skill building is a high priority item on the agenda of national planning in almost all of the newly developing countries.

This paper sketches briefly three approaches. The first is the Latin-American type program which is now well established in Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela and is being extended to most other countries in the area. The paper describes the program in Colombia (SENA) which has been in operation for fourteen years. The second is the approach of the Industrial Training Act of 1964 in the United Kingdom. The third is a modification of the UK program which is being initiated in Kenya.

In all three cases training is financed through levies on employing institutions. All three aim through taxation and incentives of various kinds to place the main burden of specified training costs on the shoulders of

employing institutions. All three, in effect, establish a "system of training quite separate from and beyond the system of formal education. Each is described very briefly, and the critical problem areas in their operation are identified. A short concluding summary highlights some of the more important comparisons and contrasts.

II THE NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP SERVICE IN COLOMBIA SENA

The National Apprenticeship Service (SENA) is the largest, the most extensive and the best financed training organization in Colombia, and probably also in any Latin American country. It organizes and operates a vast array of training programs for workers in industry, commerce, agriculture, animal husbandry, mining, hotel and catering, as well as in medical services (nurses) and even vocational training in the military. *

Financial Base

SENA draws its financial support from a tax of 2 percent on salaries and wages paid by both public and private enterprises with capital exceeding 50,000 pesos or employing at least ten workers, and from a tax of 0.5 percent on salaries and wages paid by the Central Government and the territorial departments and municipalities.

Scale of Operations

By any measure, SENNA is a "big operation" in Colombia. Its total projected expenditures for 1971 are close to 500 million pesos. This is a sum equivalent to about one-eighth of total public expenditures on all education, about a third of expenditures for secondary education, and a little less than half of expenditures for higher education. SENNA, moreover, has an assured growth of income

* The organization, legal basis, governing structure and stated objectives of SENNA are set forth in some detail in a more lengthy paper.

based upon payroll taxes.

As a semi-autonomous organization within the Ministry of Labor, SENA budgets and controls its own resources, establishes its compensation scales, plans and operates its own programs, and is relatively free from control or interference by other government bodies. The government ministries, and particularly the Ministry of Education, look with envy on the autonomous status and assured financial resources of SENA.

Importance

The Sena experience is important for these reasons:

- (1) It has been in operation for some 14 years and thus has accumulated great experience in training.
- (2) It is a strong and powerful organization with a far-flung constituency of employers, unions, government officials and politicians. Its permanent role in Colombia is assured.
- (3) Other newly developing countries in Africa and Asia are now planning to establish "SENA-type" organizations, and thus they can benefit from greater knowledge of, and contact with, SENA.
- (4) SENA commands vast financial resources and dominates middle-level training in the modern sector. The effectiveness of the use of these resources is a critical factor in national development of Colombia.

Range of Activities

SENA provides a wide range of training services in industry, commerce and agriculture. These include classes in its own training centers (there are over 100 of these), training within enterprises, mobile training units in both rural and urban areas, and consulting assistance to enterprises. These activities are described in some detail in the SENA Five Year Plan (1970-74).

According to the 1971 Plan, SENA will have a total of 337,000 persons in all training programs. The grand total of trainee-hours is estimated at 68,391,500. Thus the average class time in training per student is about 200 hours. A break-down by major categories is as follows:

	<u>No. of Students</u>	<u>Trainee Hours</u>
<u>Formal Apprenticeship Training (3 year program)</u>		
Agriculture, etc.	8,324	8,579,712
Commerce	9,539	9,903,784
Industry	<u>11,398</u>	<u>10,215,920</u>
Total	29,261	28,699,416
<hr/>		
<u>Training of Adults</u>		
Agriculture, etc.	20,848	3,725,028
Commerce	74,501	9,859,745
Industry'	59,044	9,464,947
P.P.P. Rural	87,795	8,896,082
P.P.P. Urban	<u>65,818</u>	<u>7,746,282</u>
Total	308,001	39,692,084
<hr/>		
Grand Total	337,262	68,391,500

Formal apprenticeship training thus involves about 9 percent of the trainees but nearly 42% of training hours, whereas the P.P.P. (rural and urban basic training, largely for the unemployed and underemployed) accounts for nearly 45 percent of trainees but only about 22 percent of total training hours.

One must remember that within these broad categories there is a very wide range of training programs, from foreman and supervisory training to short courses for semi-skilled industrial, agricultural, and commercial workers. In 1971 SENA will operate more than 1000 classes. Consulting and technical assistance will be given to about 1,200 enterprises. This is a rapidly expanding activity. In 1969 it involved only 250 enterprises; by 1974 it is expected to reach 2,200.

Excluding the P.P.P. programs for the unemployed which have been initiated only during the last year, most of the SENA trainees are employed in public or private enterprises, but most of the actual training, probably more than 80 percent, takes place off-the-job in the SENA training centers.

SENA develops its programs in response to requests by enterprises and government agencies. It also is guided by regional manpower surveys which it undertakes itself. Its training programs are thus constantly changing. Some of the more significant new programs are vocational training in the military and the mobile units which provide basic training in simple skills for those seeking employment in the modern sector. In general, the entire SENA operation is geared to the needs of the modern sector. In effect, SENA is the servant of its constituency, the enterprises both public and private whose payrolls are taxed to support its activities.

Some Problem Areas

Some of the more important problem areas in the SENA operation are these:

(1) Relevancy of Training to Employment

One criticism of SENA is that it has trained some persons for whom there were no jobs, and that it has failed to provide training where shortages exist. There is evidence that some SENA-trained workers are unable to

find employment. And some employers complain that the quality of training is poor in some areas. For the most part, however, employers, unions and workers are reasonably well satisfied with the relevance as well as the quality of the training. SENA maintains very close contacts with industry; it is under obligation to provide training to meet the specific needs of employers; it employs competent teachers and pays them well; and its human resources division makes continuous assessments of manpower requirements. But SENA does need a better system for evaluating the effectiveness of its various training programs. The experience of persons completing courses is seldom traced, and the pay-offs of training in terms of increased wages and salaries are not measured. The human resources division, however, has made some "opinion surveys" of course completers but these provide little "hard data". Perhaps the most crucial area for follow-up evaluation is the impact of the newly initiated rural and urban basic skill development programs for the unemployed.

(2) High Costs

SENA has been criticized widely for the very high cost of many of many of its training programs. For example, the unit costs for apprenticeship training probably exceed those for many categories of university students. Even the shorter courses for semi-skilled workers have higher per student costs (in terms of instruction hours) than in many kinds of secondary education.

The high costs of SENA training may be the result of several factors: rapid expansion of the whole program; the necessity to provide a very large number of specialized courses to meet specific training requirements; the quality of training provided; the relatively high salaries paid to instructors; the high

cost of plant and equipment in very modern and elaborate training centers; and rather high costs for instructional materials and administration. Another basic reason for high costs is probably the easy availability of financial resources provided by the tax on payrolls.

SENA is aware of the need to reduce the cost of training as well as to increase greatly the numbers of workers being trained. It has been making detailed studies of unit costs. It is attempting to reduce costs and expand services by increasing class sizes, shortening training periods, introducing new teaching technologies, and improving administration and control. It is quite possible that, with expansion during the seventies, unit costs may be reduced substantially. This is an area of high-priority concern.

(3) Coordination with the Educational System

In reality SENA is a massive, far-reaching organized system of training which is separate from the formal system of education. In some respects the two systems are complementary, but there is also much duplication and overlapping of their activities. For example, the vocational schools, the new multi-purpose secondary schools (INEM schools) and the projected junior colleges or polytechnic institutions (all under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education) are involved in the development of the same kind of skills as SENA. Presumably, SENA concentrates on training employed manpower, whereas the formal education system is primarily concerned with pre-employment education and training, but the lines of demarkation are not at all clear.

Many of the established ministries, particularly Education, would like to tap SENA's financial resources to help finance some of the activities of

the junior colleges and the multi-lateral secondary schools. Some have suggested that SENA funds should be used for training outside of the modern sector. Up to now, however, SENA has resisted all attempts to share its payroll tax income with other organizations. It has maintained its exclusive prerogative to manage and spend all of its own resources.

The great danger is that the new secondary and polytechnics will duplicate the facilities, machinery and even teaching personnel of SENA. There is much talk about joint use of facilities and teaching personnel as well as coordination of activities, but concrete programs for effective integration at the local level are at best only in the initial stage of development. Here is an area where objective investigation and hard-headed negotiations are urgently needed.

It is generally agreed that SENA needs to develop a better system of measuring the effectiveness of its programs, particularly by following or "tracing" the work and earnings experience of those who have completed the various programs. In a broader perspective, there is need for rationalization and much better integration between SENA and the formal education system which at the moment itself is undergoing great change. There is great concern in Colombia about this problem, and the time is ripe for more objective investigation in depth.

A final observation may be in order. During the last decade SENA has received technical assistance from several international agencies and a great many advanced countries. It has had virtually no assistance from, or contact with, the United States. Yet, in terms of effectiveness of training programs for its constituency, SENA probably has a better record of operation than that of U.S. programs, such as MDTA, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps,

and other manpower development projects. The SENA experience is certainly more relevant to the problems of other developing countries than is the experience of the United States. It would be appropriate, therefore, to explore some areas of collaboration and partnership between SENA and other countries in Asia and Africa which are in the process of establishing employer-financed training systems.

III THE UNITED KINGDOM: INDUSTRIAL TRAINING ACT, 1964*

Purposes

The Industrial Training Act of 1964 sets out the most comprehensive public policy for skill acquisition in the United Kingdom. Its objectives are:

- (1) to ensure an adequate supply of qualified employees;
- (2) to improve the quality of training; and,
- (3) to distribute more equitably the costs of training among employers.

* A note of caution: This is not intended as a complete account of training policy and programs in the United Kingdom. It focuses on the 1964 Act to provide comparison and contrast with the Columbia SENA prototype re government and industry relationships for training. For a concise account of the span of training activities carried on or fostered by the Department of Employment - e.g., Vocational Training at Government Training Centers, Instructor Training Service, TWI for Supervisors, Training Development Service, etc. - see Employment Productivity Gazette, April and October, 1970.

Basic View

The Act is predicated upon the view that employers acting within industrial groupings are the key to the formulation of training needs and the provision of training programs. It does not impose a direct obligation to train; rather, it provides the basis for financial penalties and incentives to encourage employers to undertake, expand, or improve training programs.

Industry by Industry Approach

The Act takes an industry-by-industry approach. Its implementation is centered in the Industrial Training Boards established by the Secretary of State for Manpower. The respective Boards are vested with the obligation to impose periodic levies (taxes) and the task of making training grants (rebates). The levies, when approved by the Secretary of State, have the force of a "statutory instrument" and provide the preponderant bulk of funds deployed by the Act; The grants, also subject to the approval of the Secretary, provide the mechanism for industry-wide training standards. The basic thrust of the Act is to center the impetus and locus for training decisions within industry groups rather than leaving these to the individual firm.

Central Training Council

The Act provides for a Central Training Council to serve in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of State for Manpower. The Council's membership is broadly based and is made up of employers, trade unionists, representatives from nationalized industries, chairmen of Industrial Training Boards, educationists, and others with a special interest in industrial training. The Council's role is clearly advisory. It provides an overview and educational function through its examination of training issues. Its memoranda have drawn attention to training guidelines, the training of trainers, release time as a necessary component, commercial and clerical training, programmed instruction, management development, computer staff, training standards for common occupations, etc.

The Industrial Training Boards

By the end of March, 1970, the Secretary of State had designated 28 Industrial Training Boards. These were estimated to cover some 15 million employees or between 85/90 percent of those to whom the Act is potentially applicable. The Act is not confined to manufacturing; but, also includes agriculture, wholesale-retail trade, and other services.

The Boards vary widely in the homogeneity of their constituency (i.e., in terms of product market, occupational mix, mechanization, etc.) and the number of firms and employees within their scope. Thus, for example, in 1970 the Carpet Board included 281 establishments with 45,000 employees, whereas the Engineering Board covered 27,800 establishments with more than 3,500,000 employees. Indeed, the Engineering Board accounted for more than 20 percent of employment covered by all 28 Boards.

The majority of each Board is made up by equal numbers of employer and trade union representatives. A number of members drawn from education constitute the remainder of the membership. The Act does not stipulate the precise membership size or the industrial scope of a Board. These are determined by the Secretary of State. General Board policies are voted upon by its entire membership. However, only employer and union representatives vote on issues pertaining to levy.

Board Initiative and Industrial Self-Government

Once established, the Boards - as intended - have the initiative. The terms and conditions of levies and grants, however, are subject to approval of the Secretary of State. Moreover, should a Board fail to act or submit satisfactory proposals within a reasonable period, the Secretary has the authority to dissolve and create a new one. This power is not intended to be utilized in a coercive manner but is in reserve as an ultimate sanction. Collaboration, negotiation, and consensus between government and industry sum up the spirit of the Act. A large measure of differentiated, industrial self-regulation is the chosen instrument in the United Kingdom for determining training needs, formulating programs, and providing the financing.

Board Levies

Accordingly, considerable variation in levy base and rate, on the one hand, and grant basis and amount, on the other, is manifest from Board to Board. The initial 5 years have been characterized by cautious steps and experimentation in these matters.

Boards typically (22 of 26 making leview at the end of 1969) use a percent of total payroll as the base for levy. Some use a per capita assessment; a few,

Construction and Civil Air Transport, for example, have switched from one base to the other. In the fiscal year ending March, 1969, the percent of levy ranged from .035 in Electricity Supply to 2.5 in Engineering; the Iron and Steel Board imposed the highest per capita assessment at £ 23 10s.

Increasingly, Boards have provided exclusion from levy for very small employers and have evolved in the direction of multi-rate structures to take account of inter-firm variations in size, degree of skilled labor utilization, extent of process integration, end-product, etc. Moreover, the levy rates within industries reflect upward and downward variation from one assessment period to the next and indicate a tendency to "fine tuning" in terms of total funds to be raised as well as among firms. The Boards have been careful not to build large reserves.

For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969, the Boards collected about £130 million in levies. This approximated the outlays for training grants to employers. About another £10 million was disbursed by the Boards - almost £4 million for administrative costs and more than £6 million for advisory and direct training services. While the system operated in a deficit position during that period, many individual Boards recorded surpluses. The excess of expenditures over receipts was financed by charges against funds raised in previous years, by charges on future receipts, and by government grants or loans.

Government Grants to Boards

The Act allows the Secretary of State to make grants or loans to Boards up to a limit of £50 million. From 1964 to March 31, 1970, the Department of Employment expended a total of £12.3 million under this provision. The levies by the Boards, however, are expected to - and, do - cover the greater proportion of their expenses; the government grants are designed to facilitate initial organization and to encourage selected Board activities. The following types of

grants are indicative: 100 percent reimbursement of administrative expenses incurred during a Board's initial 12 months; 50 percent reimbursement of the training of training officers and instructors during the first 18 months of a Board's establishment and 25 percent of such outlays thereafter during the first three years of the Board's existence; partial support (i.e., subject to negotiation) for industrial training in selected sandwich courses; 25 percent running expenses (exclusive of trainee wages) for additional off-the-job training places during a Board's first five years; in development areas and with regard to craftsmen and technicians, capital grants for additional off-the-job training places and annual per capita grants (£ 100) for each new on-the-job trainee; etc. The government grant schemes are not static; in the future, they may give less attention to Board start-up time and direct more to selected issues affecting the numbers, quality, occupational mix, and geographic location of training.

Board Grants and Services

Diversity and evolution likewise denote the grant schemes and training recommendations of the respective Industrial Training Boards. The redistribution of training costs between firms is central in the process of grant setting. Along with this consideration, Boards have reflected their concern with numbers trained and the quality of training. Boards have given particular support to apprenticeship training - especially, the need for off-the-job training, release for further education, and reduction in the years required. Increasing emphasis has been assigned to management development and training. The training needs of the full range of the occupational spectrum have been encompassed. And, by March, 1970, almost all of the Boards (24) were making grants for the training of union shop stewards.

In addition to grant support, the Boards provide various central services to their member firms. These include: training advisors to assist individual

firms in the (more than 800 were employed by the Boards in 1970); non-resident for off-the-job training (e.g., Engineering, Shipbuilding, Engineering), residential training centers (e.g., Construction, Road Training Supply); standardized training materials and procedural guides.

Evaluative

Various concerns have surfaced regarding the workings of the Act.

The following are indicative of the criticisms:

- (1) Faulty in concept in that its frame is an "industry" whereas industry, occupation, and geography provide more appropriate terms of reference and these tend to be ignored or subordinated.
- (2) Provides little or no additional funds for industrial training but allocates training outlays within industry. The "poaching" of workers by non-training firms lacks empirical justification.
- (3) Holds a short-run time horizon. This is evidenced by the "fines" levies and grants on a year-to-year basis.
- (4) Places undue reliance upon the industrial sector for initiative in programming. This is not to say that effective training can be carried out without collaboration of employers, but the leadership role is centered on Industrial Training Boards and these are more likely to respond to cutbacks and cost reallocation than anticipate impending needs.
- (5) Institutionalizes and bureaucratizes what has to be a dynamic activity. Gives emphasis to training per se as an approach to dealing with needs and subordinates consideration of alternatives - e.g., job production scheduling, etc. It may encourage training for the training.

On the positive side, it is noted:

- (1) The Act has broadly heightened awareness of the economics of training and has forced explicit consideration of training by top management. In the short-run, this has vastly increased knowledge re training needs, approaches, and costs; in the long-run, it may evolve into more effective manpower planning generally.
- (2) The Act has jarred the simple "sitting by Nelly" emphasis of the past with explicit attention to off-the-job training.
- (3) The Act has stimulated group training among smaller companies (some 500 programs).
- (4) The Act has provided impetus for pervasive reconsideration of length of training period, content of training, training methodology, adequacy of trainers/facilities, etc.
- (5) The Act has added awareness of the linkage between industrial training and further education (growth of "day-release", "block-release", and "sandwich" programs).

The ultimate consequences of the Act are difficult to perceive at this point in view of the brevity of the period since its inception and its continuing evolution. It could, as its critics indicate, result in a highly bureaucratized set of arrangements which simply level off and redistribute costs. Or, it may evolve into a system which brings into working balance the role of the industrial sector and government policy.

IV KENYA

The Kenyan Industrial Training Act of 1970 is the first in Africa which establishes a comprehensive framework (i.e., beyond apprenticeship) for systematically linking the private sector with public policy for manpower training.

Initial Stage

The Kenyan Act was passed by Parliament in December and received final Presidential authorization in late January, 1971. It, therefore, is in the start-up phase of its implementation. Extended comment regarding its operations must necessarily be deferred.

Purposes

The Act, in the form of a series of amendments to a more limited vocational training statute, stipulates the following:

- (1) "it shall ensure an adequate supply of properly trained manpower at all levels of industry";
- (2) "it shall secure the greatest possible improvement in the quality and efficiency of Vocational Training"; and,
- (3) "it shall share the cost of training as evenly as possible between firms".

Employer Support

The Act was forged with the active support of the Kenyan Federation of Employers. The membership of the latter operates in a context denoted by:

- (1) pervasive skill shortages;
- (2) reported high turnover and "piracy" of experienced employees; and,
- (3) a policy for "Kenyanization" of employment.

Patterned on UK Model

In broad outline, the Kenyan approach to industrial training is closely modeled after that of the United Kingdom. Its basic frame-of-reference, too, is an industry-by-industry basis. Like the United Kingdom program, the Kenyan uses economic penalties/rewards and gives an employer the option of maintaining training activities or contributing to the costs of employers within his industry who meet training standards. And, as in the case of the United Kingdom, the text of the Kenyan Act does not set out specific levy/grant terms but provides organizational machinery to work these out.

Machinery

The Kenyan Act provides for the establishment of a National Industrial Training Council. The Act stipulates that the Council shall be comprised by a chairman and "not less" than 12 representatives drawn equally from employers, employees, and "other interests". The Minister of Labour appoints the Council's membership and holds ultimate authority for the imposition of industry levies, and the making of training grants. The Council, in turn, is authorized to establish tripartite industry Training Committees and direct these to submit levy proposals. Council approval of a Training Committee's levy proposal is a requisite condition for its transmittal to the Minister of Labour. Thus, unlike the advisory role of the UK Central Training Committee, the Kenyan National Council is assigned a direct role in the levy/grant decision process with the industry Training Committees explicitly subordinate to it.

Further differences between the UK and Kenyan policies will undoubtedly emerge in practice. This is already indicated with respect to the development of training levies. The Kenyan policy is being implemented with explicit concern for any negative impact on the level of employment. As a result, the respective industry levies are being tailored - at least in the initial phases -

upon such bases as value added, percent of prime contracts, or percent of physical production. Taxes on payroll -- or employment -- per se are to be avoided.

Concluding Comments

Kenyan manpower planners anticipate a close working relationship between specific industry training programs and various educational facilities of both a formal and nonformal nature. Thus, heightened usage is expected of the National Industrial Training Centre, the Management Training and Advisory Centre, the Kenya Polytechnic, the Mombassa Technical Institute, etc.

Whether or not, the Kenyan Act will make a significant contribution to trained manpower -- or, will get mired in the redistribution of costs between employers -- remains to be seen. Lack of adequate information re training needs, limited training resources, and sparse training facilities pose major problems.

V. COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS

The outstanding features of the three approaches may now be summarized.

Scope of Training Activity

SENA is the most comprehensive program. It services agriculture, commerce and the military as well as industry. It provides a wide variety of courses for unskilled and semi-skilled workers as well as intensive apprenticeship programs for master craftsmen. It also provides short courses for unemployed youth and others seeking entry jobs in the economy. The UK and Kenya programs offer services to workers already employed in industry. Relatively more of the training is provided within the work-place than in off-site training centers as such. SENAs are administered as a nation-wide enterprise. The UK and Kenya plans are directly linked to individual industries.

Financial Support

SENA is supported mainly by a 2 percent statutory tax on payrolls of all

enterprises both public and private employing 10 or more persons. No rebates or grants are given to employers who have their own training programs. The UK and Kenya plans are based upon levies which are differentiated among industries and which may vary from year to year. They also give grants to employers operating their own programs.

The main thrust of SENA's across-the-board payroll tax is to generate extensive financial resources for broad training purposes. The emphasis of the levies in the UK and Kenya programs is more on redistribution of training costs between employers.

Relationships to Formal Education

All three programs are managed autonomously from the formal educational system. In some instances, the training provided duplicates that offered in the formal vocational schools. In all cases, the impetus for policy and program -- and, perhaps, effective control for all practical purposes -- is centered in employer and union groups rather than with ministries of education or labour.

Costs

As yet there have been no really definitive studies of unit training costs in any of the programs. There are indications that SENA's costs are excessively high, but efforts are being made to lower them through more efficient management and use of resources.

In the case of the UK sizeable and continuing administrative and service costs are being engendered by the Industry Training Boards. It is too early to say what the costs are likely to be in Kenya.

Relation of Training to Employment

In all three cases, major emphasis is given to training workers who are already employed. The instruction provided is therefore closely related to

specific jobs. As originally constituted, none of the three programs aimed to train the unemployed or those seeking employment for the first time. But, because of mounting unemployment and consequent political pressures in Colombia, SENA has recently instituted programs for out-of-work youth in both rural and urban areas. The effectiveness of these programs in reducing unemployment is doubtful. Other nations introducing national training programs might well examine this experience.

Exchange of Information re National Training Programs

Because of the rapid introduction of national training schemes in the newly developing countries, information on legislation and operating experience should be made available.

The ILO is probably the most appropriate organization to undertake the task. SENA and similar organizations in other Latin American countries are able and willing to provide information and receive study missions from other countries. National training schemes should indeed be given serious study by countries which are pressing forward rural and industrial development programs.