

National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity

PERKINS III IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Nine states continue to have full time sex equity administrators.
- Of the thirty-six states that responded, thirty-five have at least one person at the secondary or postsecondary level working on these issues. Their time committed to equity ranges from 5% to 100% with a majority under 50%.
- States are using a combination of state administration and/or state leadership funds to support these positions.
- Sixteen states are using the state leadership nontraditional setaside to fund these positions.
- Only 13 states are reserving the maximum allowed for the nontraditional reserve. These thirteen states represent larger states that receive large amounts of Perkins funds. Generally, as the state allocation decreases so does the size of the reserve.
- States are using the nontraditional reserve for a variety of activities. Primarily these funds are being used to support technical assistance and professional development.
- States generally are continuing to allow locals to support activities previously funded by the setasides under Perkins III. However, it appears that this is not generally occurring at the local level.
- Sixteen states are using additional state leadership funds beyond the nontraditional reserve to fund services to special populations.
- Generally, the state sex equity administrator was not involved in the development of the state's performance measure for core indicator IV.
- States are being held accountable by the U.S. Department of Education for minimum improvement (one half of one percent) for increasing participation and completion of students in nontraditional training and employment programs.

FINDINGS

Survey Process

The survey was developed by the NAPE Executive Committee and distributed to the NAPE contact in all 52 states and territories. The surveys were distributed by both e-mail and regular mail on August 1, 2000. The survey had a return date of September 10, 2000. Surveys were collected until December 1, 2000 in an attempt to increase the return rate.

Response Rate

Forty surveys were returned from thirty-six 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. Ten states with split responsibility had only the secondary or postsecondary agency respond while four states had both the secondary and postsecondary agency complete separate surveys. The responses were distributed as follows:

4 separate secondary and postsecondary (CA, MI, NC, TX).

7 secondary only (AZ, NJ, OK, RI, SC, TN, WI)

3 postsecondary only (AL, MN, NH)

22 combined secondary and postsecondary (AK, CO, FL, HI, IA, ID, IL, KS, KY, MA, MO, MS, ND, NE, NV, NY, OR, SD, UT, VT, WV, WY)

Use of State Administration Funds for State Staff

Twenty-five respondents are using state administration funds to support an “equity administrator” or state staff responsible for special population or nontraditional students.

The amount of state administration funds being used to support these positions ranged from \$87,500 to \$6,000 with the median at \$60,000. For those respondents that did not report a dollar amount three were funded at 100% with the others at 75%, 40% and 5%. Five respondents did not know the amount of state administration funds that were being used to support an “equity administrator”.

Seventeen of the twenty-five respondents using state administration funds for this position have at least one person fulfilling this role while three respondents had two people and five respondents had three people.

Five respondents have one person with 100% of their time dedicated to this responsibility with the remainder ranging from 75% to 5%. Of the three respondents that have two people working on these issues only one respondent has one of these two people working 100% on these issues. Of the five respondents who reported having three people working on these issues none of them were dedicating 100% of their time. Time commitments ranged from 52% to 5%.

Two respondents indicated they were funding this position with state funds. One of the positions was 100% equity while the other dedicated only 5% of their time on these responsibilities.

Use of State Leadership Funds for State Staff

Twenty-one states are using state leadership funds to support an “equity administrator” or state staff responsible for special population or nontraditional students. 16 of these states are using funds from the state leadership nontraditional reserve for this purpose.

The amount of state leadership funds being used to support these positions ranged from \$150,000 to \$8,000 with the median at \$60,000. Four respondents did not know the amount of state leadership funds being used to support an “equity administrator”.

Fifteen respondents have at least one person fulfilling this role while three respondents have two people and two respondents have three people.

Of the fifteen respondents with one person fulfilling this role, only one is working 100% on this responsibility. The remainder range from 60% to 10%. Five respondents named more than one person with the responsibility with one of these having three full time people working on these responsibilities and another with one working full time in this capacity.

Status of the State Sex Equity Administrator Position Regardless of Funding Source

Two respondents indicated that no one was responsible for special population or nontraditional students at the state level. Twenty-five responded that there was at least one person while six respondents indicated two people and seven respondents indicated three people with these responsibilities.

Of the respondents that indicated one person with this responsibility five of them are working 100% on these issues with the remainder ranging from 90% to 5%.

Of the respondents that indicated two people with this responsibility two respondents have one of these individuals working 100% on these issues with the remainder ranging from 50% to 5%

Of the respondents that indicated three people with this responsibility one has three people working 100%, one has two people working 100% and the remainder range from 80% to 5%.

State Leadership Setaside for Nontraditional Training and Employment

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

- 13- \$150,000 (AZ, CA, IL, KS, MA, MI, MO, MN, NE, NJ, NY, TX, UT)
- 1- \$125,000 (TN)
- 4- \$100,000 (AK, KY, NC, WY)
- 1- \$110,000 (MS)
- 1- \$75,000 (HI)
- 1- \$72,000 (WV)
- 1- \$70,000 (OK)
- 12- \$60,000 (CO, IA, ID, ND, NH, NV, OR, RI, SC, SD, VT, WI)

From the information collected from the thirty-four respondents the use of these funds can be categorized as follows:

- Competitive grants to locals – 13
- Contracted services to conduct professional development activities – 12
- Statewide nontraditional advisory committee – 1
- Producing recruitment materials i.e. publications, videos, etc. – 3
- State staff to conduct technical assistance and professional development – 16
- Website development and support – 1
- Producing curriculum materials – 1
- Direct services to students – 2
- Statewide technical assistance centers – 9 (AZ, IL, KS, KY, MO, NJ, NY, TX, UT)
- Unplanned at the time of the survey - 2

Use of State Leadership Funds for Special Populations

Sixteen respondents are using other state leadership funds, beyond the nontraditional reserve, for the purpose of serving special population students. The amount of funds was available from thirteen respondents and these amounts ranged from \$654,777 to \$1,000 with \$20,000 being the median. Of these thirteen respondents six are also reserving the maximum allowed from the nontraditional reserve, \$150,000.

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

- Professional development – 8
- Curriculum development – 4
- Technical assistance – 6
- Statewide technical assistance centers – 2
- Resource libraries – 1
- State staff – 2
- Marketing materials – 1
- Evaluation and assessment – 2
- Direct support services to single parent/displaced homemakers – 1
- Competitive grants- 2

Local Uses of Funds

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

From the responses collected from the thirty respondents, the types of services/programs for special populations that states are encouraging locals to provide can be categorized as follows:

- Information repeats the law – 9
- Providing supplementary services: i.e. tutoring, equipment modification, counseling and guidance, assessment, job placement, mentoring, support groups, job shadowing, internships, entrepreneurial experiences, job fairs, child care – 9
- Special populations coordinator – 1
- Support services undefined – 2
- Set aside 5% of the local funds for services to students pursuing nontraditional training and employment – 1
- Locals required to write in plan how they are serving special populations – 8

From the responses collected from the thirty respondents, fifteen indicated the types of services/programs for special populations that states are requiring locals to provide. These can be categorized as follows:

- Information repeats the law - 1
- Local required to meet Core Indicator IV – 1
- Conduct assessment of the needs of special populations – 2
- Educational development plans required for all special population students – 1
- Describe awareness, recruitment, assessment, counseling and support services in their local plan – 1
- Meet additional core indicators – 1
- Provide supplementary services based on assessment – 2
- Special populations identified and description of services in local plan – 4
- Make modifications to curricula, instruction, facilities, assessment and equipment – 1
- Professional development for teachers to better serve special populations – 1

Four respondents are restricting the types of services allowable for special population students that were allowable under Perkins II.

Eleven respondents are holding back the 10% reserve of the local allocation. Six respondents are setting programmatic priorities for the uses of the 10% reserve at the local level. Three of these respondents indicated the priority as improvement in one or more of the Core Indicators. One respondents priority was for direct services to special populations for 99-00 only. One respondents priority at the postsecondary level was for nontraditional training and employment activities.

Accountability

At the time of the survey states had not completed their negotiation process with the USDOE for their performance measures. It was clear from the survey responses that this question was the most difficult as typically the person completing the survey had not been involved in determining the performance measure and was not informed of the status. It required significant research by the individuals completing the survey to determine the answers to the accountability section of the survey.

After all state negotiations were completed no state was asked to set their measure more than one half of one percent above their benchmark by the USDOE. States indicated they were directed by the USDOE to lower their performance measure if it was greater than one half of one percent. For those States that responded to the survey, their benchmark and final negotiated performance measure is included in the appendix.

When asked to describe the process used by the State to set its benchmark and performance measures seven respondents did not know. Six indicated they did what the U.S. Department of Education instructed them to do and two indicated the benchmarks and measures were set by an individual. Nineteen respondents described a process using occupational data crosswalked with CIP codes to determine which programs were designated as nontraditional then determined participation and completion baselines using current enrollment data. Twenty-five respondents indicated that benchmarks were set using historical enrollment data.

Eighteen respondents indicated they used national occupational data to determine which programs were to be designated as nontraditional while five used state occupational data, one used local occupational data and three used enrollment data.

Four respondents chose to focus their efforts on high skill high wage occupations. However others indicated a desire to do this but were not allowed by the USDOE to do so. The USDOE is requiring that all states collect data on all nontraditional programs regardless of the focus of their efforts. Of the four who indicated a targeting effort, each identified a threshold for wages using state wage data.