

National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity

PERKINS III IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY-2002 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- No state has a full-time equity coordinator as defined in Perkins II, where the individual is responsible for equity in career and technical education. However, nine states have full-time “equity coordinators” who are responsible for special population or nontraditional provision in Perkins III and other equity responsibilities within their agencies. Most of these individuals are also responsible for the Office of Civil Rights compliance for their state. The states are FL*, HI, ID*, KY*, MN, NE, OK, SC*, WI (*new for this survey as compared to the 2000 survey). The others are the same as in 2000 other than NV no longer has a full-time coordinator and NJ did not respond to the survey.
- Of the thirty-nine states that responded, twenty-eight have at least one person at the secondary or postsecondary level working on these issues. Their time committed to equity ranges from 1% to 100% with less than half over 50%.
- Eight of the states are using Perkins administration funds alone and nine are using administration funds with Perkins leadership, setaside, or state funds to support these positions.
- Five states are using the Perkins leadership nontraditional setaside as the sole source of funding for these positions.
- Fifteen states are reserving the maximum allowed for the nontraditional reserve. (AR, AZ, CA, CT, FL, KS, LA, MA, MN, MO, NE, NY, TX, WA, VA)
- States are using the nontraditional reserve for a variety of activities. Primarily these funds are being distributed by competitive grant to support local activities for assisting students in nontraditional career and technical education programs..
- Twelve of the states are using other state leadership funds to fund services to special populations. These amounts range from \$10,000-\$100,000.
- Seventeen of the states indicated they are using local performance on the fourth core indicator to drive local uses of funds for nontraditional CTE programs. But only seven states actually require local educational agencies to spend funds on special populations through local plan requirements or accountability improvement plan requirements.
- Twenty eight of the states encourage or require locals to spend any of their local allocated funds to provide services to special populations.
- One state restricts the type of service allowable for special population students that were allowable under Perkins II. These restrictions relate to funding for support services.
- Fourteen states are reserving 10% of the local allocation under Section 112 of the Perkins Act—applying a variety of reserve requirements. Six of this group is also setting programmatic priorities for the use of these funds at the local level. With two of them being for activities that would have been eligible for funding under the Perkins II gender equity setasides (ME, SD)

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 September 5, 2002. The survey had a return date of October 15, 2002. Surveys were collected until December 10, 2002 in an attempt to increase the return rate.

Response Rate

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

- 3- separate secondary and postsecondary (CA, VA, WI)
- 4- secondary only (MI, SC, TN, TX)
- 4- postsecondary only (MN, MT, OH, WA)
- 28- combined secondary and postsecondary (AL, AR, AZ, CT, FL, HI, IA, ID, KS, KY, LA, MA, ME, MO, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, RI, SD, UT, VT, WV, WY)

Status of the “Equity Coordinator” Position

Fourteen respondents indicated that no one was responsible for special population or nontraditional students at the state level. Nineteen responded that there was one person while nine respondents indicated two people, one respondent indicated three people, and one respondent indicated four 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 10% to 95%.

Of the respondents that indicated two people with this responsibility, two have one of these individuals working 100% on these issues, with the remainder ranging from 1% to 75%.

One respondent indicated that three people have this responsibility. Of these, one individual is working 100% on these issues, one at 20%, and one at an unspecified percentage.

One respondent indicated that four people have this responsibility. Of these, one individual is working 100% on these issues, two at 50%, and one at 10%.

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- 13
- Perkins administration and State- 5
- Perkins administration and leadership- 3
- Perkins leadership – 5
- Perkins leadership NTO setaside- 5
- Perkins leadership and leadership NTO setaside – 3
- Perkins leadership and state – 2
- State – 4
- State and other – 1
- Can’t determine – 2

Setaside for Nontraditional Training and Employment

Thirty seven 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:

- 14- \$150,000 (AR, AZ, CA, CT, FL, KS, LA, MA, MN, MO, NE, NY, TX, VA, WA)
- 1- \$125,000 (OH)
- 5- \$100,000 (AL, IA, KY, NM, WY)
- 1- \$85,000 (HI)
- 1- \$80,000 (MT)
- 2- \$75,000 (ME, UT)
- 1- \$72,000 (WV)
- 1- \$70,000 (OK)
- 10- \$60,000 (ID, ND, NV, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, VT, WI)

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

- Competitive grants to locals – 18 (AL, AR, IA, MA, MN, MT, ND, NE, NV, OH, OK, OR, SC, SD, UT, VAs, WA, WI, WY)
- Contracted services to conduct professional development activities – 11 (AZ, CA, CT, IA, KY, MO, NY, RI, TX, UT, KS)
- Statewide nontraditional advisory committee – 1 (CA)
- Producing recruitment and curriculum materials i.e. publications, videos, etc. – 9 (AR, CA, MN, NH, NV, OR, SD, TN, VAsec, WI)
- State staff to conduct technical assistance and professional development – 9 (FL, LA, ME, MI, ND, NH, NV, OK, VT)
- Men in Health Careers initiatives – 2 (HI, OR)
- Single Parent/Displaced homemaker programs – 1 (ID)
- Nontraditional awards program – 1 (MI)

- Professional development conferences – 13 (LA, MI, MN, ND, NH, NV, OR, SC, SD, TN, VAps, VT, WI)
- Technical assistance – 3 (MN, ND, WI)
- Direct services for GRADS program – 1 (NM)
- Summer nontraditional camps – 1 (NV)
- Nontraditional career fairs – 2 (OR, VT)

Use of State Leadership Funds for Special Populations

Fourteen respondents are using other state leadership funds for the purpose of serving special population students. The amount of funds was available from ten respondents and these amounts ranged from \$10,000 to \$105,000, with \$47,000 being the mean. Of these ten respondents six are also reserving the maximum allowed from the nontraditional reserve, \$150,000.

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

- Affiliation fees – 1 (AZ)
- Training and instruction – 2 (ND, OR)
- State staffing – 2 (ND, VT)
- Counseling –1 (NE)
- Assisting student organizations – 2 (MN, SD)
- Staff development – 4 (CAsec, ND, VAsec, WA)
- Competitive grants- 4 (CAps, IA, MA, VAps)
- Technical assistance – 1 (FL)
- Resource centers – 1 (TX)
- Financial incentives for postsecondary placement – 1 (FL)

Local Uses of Funds

Fifteen 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 – 15 (CAsec, FL, IA, ID, MA, MN, MO, OR, SD, TN, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV)
- Local plan requires “how funds will be used” language – 4 (CAsec, KS, MO, VAsec)
- Local plans must describe how services are being provided- 5 (NV, OK, OR, RI, VAps)
- State requires 10% of local funds to be spent on nontraditional activities – 1 (NY)
- State requires 10% of local funds to be spent on nontraditional activities if the local is not meeting the performance measure – 1 (NH)
- Workshops, conferences, professional development – 1 (AR)
- Summer camps- 1 (AR)
- State equity staff review all plans- 1 (MN)

Thirty-one 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-one respondents, the types of services/programs for special populations that states are encouraging locals to provide can be categorized as follows:

- Support services – 8 (LA, MO, MT, ND, NE, NY, VAps, VT)
- Not specified but required in the local plan- 4 (RI, VAsec, VT, WA)
- Allowable uses of funds are listed in the local application – 4 (ID, KS, TX, UT)
- Improve professional development – 4 (MA, NH, OR, SC)
- Equity coordinator at the local level – 3 (NH, SD, VT)
- Tutoring – 3 (SD, NY, WI)
- Not specified as it is a local decision – 2 (CT, FL)
- Focus on limited English proficient and students with disabilities – 2 (MA, MI)
- Nontraditional career fairs and camps – 2 (NE, SC)
- Materials and publications development – 2 (NE, NH)
- Mentoring – 2 (SC, SD)
- Support groups – 2 (NY, SC)
- State identified recommendations and objectives, comprehensive support services – 1 (CA)
- Same performance of special populations as all students – 1 (KY)
- Speakers – 1 (NH)
- Collaboration with parents, business and industry – 1 (SC)
- Career counseling – 1 (TN)

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

- Identify barriers and strategies in local plan – 4 (NV, SD, UT, VT)
- Information repeats the law i.e. equal access and nondiscrimination – 3 (NE, SD, UT)
- Local control – 3 (KS, KY, TN)
- Special populations representative on planning team – 2 (CAps, NE)
- Funds must be used for programs and services for special populations – 2 (CAps, CT)
- Required additional program indicators for special populations – 2 (MN, VA)
- Performance measures used to analyze program improvement – 1 (CAps)
- Under federal court order for special education – 1 (HI)
- Assistance to educationally disadvantaged deficient in English, Biology and Algebra 1 – 1 (TN)
- Additional weighted funding to provide services to special populations – 1 (TX)
- Special needs staff/coordinator – 1 (VT)

Only one state is restricting the types of services allowable for special population students that were allowable under Perkins II. Those restrictions relate to funding of support services: childcare (ID), reasonable amount of support services (KY), tuition (WI).

Fourteen states are holding back the 10% reserve of the local allocation. Reserve requirements are being applied as follows:

- High numbers - 1 (WI)
- Urban – 1 (FL)
- Urban/high numbers of voc. ed. students – 1 (RI)
- Rural/high percent of voc. ed. students – 3 (AL, OK, WA)
- High percent/high numbers – 2 (MO, TX)
- Rural/high percent/high numbers – 4 (AZ, ME, NV, SD)
- Rural/urban/high percent/high numbers – 2 (NE, UT)

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

- Improving performance in areas related to the Perkins core indicators and state standards – 3 (FL, HI, MN)
- Improving distance learning, program flexibility, and the use of technology – 2 (FL, SD)
- Demonstrating new models and/or practices for CTE programs and teachers via innovative grants – 1 (NE)
- Demonstrating the linkage of secondary to postsecondary education – 1 (SD)
- Providing experiences for students in industry (work-based learning) and pretechnical services and workshops- 1 (WI)
- Seeking national certification of programs – 1 (SD)
- Providing funds for staffing, student transportation, books and supplies, child care, and other needs to ensure single parents/displaced homemakers remain in school – 2 (ME, SD)
- High skill/high wage – 1 (FL)
- Formula allocation – 1 (RI)
- Integration of academic and vocational education – 1 (SD)