

National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity

PERKINS IV IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY-2008 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Thirty-seven states responded to this survey.
- Eight states have a full-time “equity coordinator” responsible for special populations or nontraditional provisions in the Perkins Act. These states are AR, CO, DC, GA, MS, NE, NJ, and PA. Five other states (IA, LA, ND, UT, WI) have a half-time coordinator.
- Twenty-three states have at least one person at the secondary or postsecondary level working on these issues. Employee time committed to equity ranges from 5 percent to 100 percent with less than half of the employees giving over 50 percent.
- Four states (HI, KY, NY, TN) are using Perkins administration funds alone and 11 states (CO, IA, IL, MI, MN, MS, ND, NE, NH, NJ, RI) are using administration funds with Perkins leadership, setaside, or state funds to support these positions.
- One state (GA) uses the Perkins leadership nontraditional setaside as the sole source of funding for these positions.
- Eight states reserve the maximum allowed for the nontraditional reserve (DC, IL, KY, MI, MO, NY, TX, VA).
- States are using the nontraditional reserve for a variety of activities. Primarily, these funds are being distributed by competitive grants to support local activities for assisting students in nontraditional career and technical education programs.
- Seventeen of the states are using other state leadership funds, besides the nontraditional reserve, to fund services to special populations.
- Twenty-five of the states indicated they are using local performance on the fourth core indicator to drive local uses of funds for nontraditional CTE programs.
- Thirty states encourage or require locals to spend any of their local allocated funds to provide services to special populations.
- Ten states (DE, ID, LA, MIps, MT, NH, OR, PA, RI, WI) restrict the type of service for special population students that were allowable under Perkins III. These restrictions relate to funding for support services.
- Twenty-four states are reserving 10 percent of the local allocation under Section 112 of the Perkins Act and are specifying a variety of reserve requirements.

Note: The use of small letters next to a state’s abbreviation are ps=postsecondary and s=secondary.

FINDINGS

Survey Process

The survey was developed by the NAPE Executive Committee and distributed to the NAPE contact in all 53 states and territories. The surveys were distributed by both e-mail and regular mail on January 19, 2009. The survey had a return date of February 28, 2009. Surveys were collected until June 18, 2009, in an attempt to increase the return rate.

Response Rate

Forty-one surveys were returned from 37 states. In some states Perkins funds are administered by a single state agency while in others the responsibility is shared between the secondary and postsecondary systems. Fifteen states with split responsibility had only the secondary or postsecondary agency respond while one state had both the secondary and postsecondary agency complete separate surveys. However, there are three duplicates in the forty-one surveys. The elimination of these duplicates results in 38 surveys. The responses are distributed as follows:

- 1- separate secondary and postsecondary (MI)
- 7- secondary only (AR, DE, IL, MN, TN, VA, WV)
- 8- postsecondary only (GA, KS, LA, MT, NC, NY, TX, WI)
- 21- combined secondary and postsecondary (AL, AZ, CO, CT, DC, HI, IA, ID, KY, MO, MS, ND, NE, NH, NJ, OK, OR, PA, RI, UT, WY)
- 2 – two surveys (duplicates) indicating “both” secondary and postsecondary (KY, NJ)
- 1 – one survey (duplicate) indicating secondary only (WV)

Status of the “Equity Coordinator” Position

Fourteen respondents (AL, AZ, CT, ID, KS, MO, MT, NC, OK, OR, TX, VA, WV, WY) indicated that no one was responsible for special population or nontraditional students at the state level. Sixteen (AR, DC, DE, GA, HI, IA, KY, LA, MIPs, MN, ND, NE, NH, NY, PA, UT) responded that there was one person while four respondents (CO, MIs, MS, NJ) indicated two people, and four respondents (IL, RI, TN, WI) indicated three people or more with these responsibilities.

Of the 16 respondents indicating one person had this responsibility, five (AR, DC, GA, NE, PA) of them are working 100 percent on these issues with the remaining 11 working from 5 percent to 50 percent time.

Of the respondents that indicated two people with this responsibility, three (CO, MS, NJ) have two of these individuals working 100 percent on these issues, with the remainder ranging from 25 percent to 30 percent time.

The four respondents indicating three or more people with this responsibility are working on these issues from 5 percent to 100 percent of their time.

Sources of Funding for State Staff

The respondents are using a variety of sources to fund their “equity coordinator” positions. The positions are funded as follows:

- Perkins administration – 4 (HI, KY, NY, TN)
- Perkins administration and State- 2 (MS, CO)
- Perkins administration and leadership- 2 (NE, IA)
- Perkins leadership NTO setaside- 1 (GA)
- Perkins leadership and state – 1 (DE)
- State only – 1 (AR)
- State and NTO setaside- 2 (DC, UT)
- State, Perkins administration and leadership- 2 (MIs, MN)
- State, Perkins administration and NTO setaside- 3 (IL, NJ, ND)
- State, Perkins administration, leadership and NTO setaside- 2 (MIs, RI)
- Perkins administration, leadership and NTO setaside- 1 (NH)
- State, Perkins leadership and NTO setaside- 1 (WI)
- NTO setaside only – 2 (LA, PA)

Setaside for Nontraditional Training and Employment

Thirty-six states indicated how much of the \$60,000-\$150,000 they were setting aside for services to students pursuing nontraditional training and employment with the amounts broken down as follows:

- 8 - \$150,000 (DC, IL, KY, MI, MO, NY, TX, VA)
- 1 - \$126,000 (NJ)
- 1 - \$110,000 (PA)
- 2 - \$100,000 (IA, LA)
- 1 - \$75,000 (KS)
- 1 - \$70,000 (WV)
- 21 - \$60,000 (AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, GA, HI, ID, MN, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, OK, OR, RI, TN, UT, WI, WY)
- 1 - \$30,000 (NC)

From the information collected from these states, the use of these funds can be categorized as follows:

- Competitive grants to school districts/colleges – 9 (AL, HI, MN, MS, MT, RI, TX, WIps, WY)
- Contracted services to conduct professional development activities– 4 (CT, MO, NY, VA)
- Nontraditional Career Workshops, Camps, Resources, etc. – 7 (AR, AZ, KY, NC, NJ, TN, WV)
- Incentive grants to Community and/or Technical Colleges.– 2 (IA, ID)
- Leadership, Special Projects, Mini and/or other Grants – 5 (CO, IL, ND, OR, WIs)
- Professional development activities and initiatives – 3 (DC, LA, UT)
- Mentoring for underrepresented students – 1 (OK)
- Support for Equity Consultant Position – 3 (GA, NH, PA)
- Breaking traditions awards– 1 (MIs)
- Data collection, analysis and reporting – 1 (DE)
- Research on how to impact nontraditional enrollments – 1 (NE)

Use of State Leadership Funds for Special Populations

Seventeen respondents **use** other state leadership funds **for serving** special population students.

From the information collected from these respondents, the use of state leadership funds for serving special population students can be categorized as follows:

- Specific training for special needs teachers – 5 (AR, GA, KS, KY, NE)
- Program development and implementation of program evaluations – 1 (IA)
- All special populations – 2 (IL, UT)
- In-service activities and Gender Equality Grants – 1 (MIPs)
- Assistance to special populations – 1 (TX)
- Career Equity Coordinators – 1 (MO)
- Alternative Cooperative Education programs – 1 (CO)
- Technical assistance programs – 2 (DE, RI)
- Training for disabled students – 1 (MN)
- Competitive grants – 1 (MT)
- Awards programs – 1 (TN)

Local Uses of Funds

Twenty-six states are using local performance of the fourth core indicator to drive local uses of funds for nontraditional CTE programs. These include:

- Improvement plans required when locals are not performing – 14 (AZ, CO, CT, DE, KS, MO, MT, NJ, NY, TN, TX, UT, VA, WV)
- Local plan or grant application requires “how funds will be used” language – 12 (AR, DC, HI, IA, IL, MI, MS, NC, NE, OK, PA, WI)

Thirty states are encouraging or requiring locals to spend their local allocated funds to provide services to special populations.

From the responses collected, the types of services/programs for special populations that states are encouraging locals to provide include the following:

- Support services – 14 (AZ, DC, GA, IL, MI, MO, MS, ND, NJ, NY, OK, TN, TX, WI)
- Not specified but required in the local plan – 11 (AR, KS, KY, MI, MN, MT, NE, OR, PA, RI, UT)
- Improvement of professional development – 3 (AZ, ND, VA)
- Tutoring – 4 (AZ, LA, NC, WI)
- Nontraditional career fairs and programs – 3 (MO, ND, WY)
- Mentoring – 4 (LA, MS, VA, WI)
- Same performance of special populations as all students – 2 (DE, KY)
- Collaboration with parents, business and industry – 2 (IA, NJ)
- Career counseling – 4 (IA, NC, NJ, WI)
- Transition services – 2 (IA, WI)
- Interpreters, tools, adaptive equipment – 2 (GA, NC)

- Training that provides a livable wage – 1 (DE)
- Childcare – 2 (NC, WI)
- Internships – 3 (IA, LA, MS)
- Job shadowing – 2 (IA, MS)
- Advanced technology access – 1 (LA)
- STEM for all populations – 2 (DC, NJ)

From the responses collected, 18 states indicated the types of services/programs for special populations that states are requiring locals to provide. These include the following:

- Information repeats the law, i.e., equal access and nondiscrimination – 2 (AZ, VA)
- Local control – 2 (MT, PA)
- Required additional program indicators for special populations – 1 (IL)
- Special Populations Coordinator – 1 (GA)
- Accommodations/modifications – 1 (MN)
- Guidance and counseling services – 1 (NC)
- Programs designed to enable special populations to meet local adjusted levels of performance - 3 (DC, DE, IA)
- Placement in program that leads to high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupation – 4 (IA, LA, MIs, RI)
- List in local plan – 7 (IL, MIs, MS, ND, NJ, TN, WI)

Ten states are restricting the types of services allowable for special population students that were allowable under Perkins III. Those restrictions relate to funding of:

- Remedial or developmental programs – 5 (LA, MIs, MT, PA , WI)
- Single Parents and Displaced Homemakers must be enrolled in approved CTE programs – 1 (OR)
- Tutoring at postsecondary level – 1 (NH)
- Tuition, books/supplies, and tools for approved programs – 1 (ID)
- Dedicated programs of study and individual learning plans – 1 (RI)
- Meaningful training – 1 (DE)

Twenty-four states are holding back the 10 percent reserve of the local allocation. Reserve requirements are being applied as follows:

- Rural – 3 (AL, GA, NH)
- Rural/high percent – 1 (IA)
- High percent/high numbers – 5 (CT, MIs, RI, TX, WI)
- Rural/high percent/high numbers – 10 (AZ, CO, ID, KS, MT, NE, NJ, OK, TN, UT)
- Rural/high numbers—2 (LA, MN)
- High numbers – 2 (MD, MO)
- High percent – 1 (AR)

Of these 24 states, 16 are setting programmatic priorities for the use of these funds at the local level. The priorities are described as follows:

- Develop innovative programs, address new and emerging occupations—1 (AZ)
- Strengthen academic skills – 1 (IA)
- Equity in NTO core indicator levels – 2 (MIps, MN)
- Supplemental grants targeting specific objectives – 1 (OK)
- Development of CTE Pathways and regional articulation agreements – 1 (UT)
- Professional Development and Technical Skill Assessment – 1 (OR)
- Professional Development and high-wage, high-skill program development – 1 (NH)
- Supporting Secondary to Postsecondary transitions and linkages, improving academic integration, developing local and statewide articulation agreements – 2 (TN, ID)
- Development of Programs of Study – 1 (WIs)
- Development of Programs of Study, identify measures for technical skills attainment – 1 (WIPs)
- Integration of all activities to meet workforce and economic development needs – 1 (DE)
- Support critical industries which are high-skill, high-wage and high-demand – 1 (KS)
- Based on certain innovation models – 1 (AL)
- Must first address any area where the local consortium falls short of negotiated accountability targets – 1 (MN)
- Based on individual institution – 1 (MT)

Note: The use of small letters next to a state's abbreviation are ps=post secondary and s=secondary.