

National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity

PERKINS III IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY-2004 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, eight 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 DC*, FL, HI, MS*, NJ, OK, SC*, WI (*new for this survey as compared to the 2002 survey). The others are the same as in 2002 other than ID, KY, NE no longer has a full-time coordinator.
- Of the forty-five states that responded, twenty-nine 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%.
- Eleven of the states are using Perkins administration funds alone and twenty 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.
- Fourteen states are reserving the maximum allowed for the nontraditional reserve. (AZ, CA, FL, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, NJ, NY, TX, WA, WI, 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.
- Twenty-four of the states are using other state leadership funds to fund services to special populations. These amounts range from \$12,000 to 10% of the basic state grant.
- Thirty-one 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 fifteen states actually require local educational agencies to spend funds on special populations through local plan requirements or accountability improvement plan requirements.
- Thirty-four 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.
- Sixteen states are reserving 10% of the local allocation under Section 112 of the Perkins Act—applying a variety of reserve requirements. Seven of this group is also setting programmatic priorities for the use of these funds at the local level. With one of them being for activities that would have been eligible for funding under the Perkins II gender equity setasides (WI postsec)

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 June 5, 2004. The survey had a return date of August 15, 2004. Surveys were collected until December 10, 2004 in an attempt to increase the return rate.

Response Rate

Forty-nine surveys were returned from forty-five 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. Nine 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 (MN, NC, VA, WI)
- 7- secondary only (CA, IL, IN, MS, SC, VT, WV)
- 2- postsecondary only (MT, GA)
- 32- combined secondary and postsecondary (AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, FL, HI, IA, ID, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, MO, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY)

Status of the “Equity Coordinator” Position

Nineteen respondents indicated that no one was responsible for special population or nontraditional students at the state level. Eighteen responded that there was one person while eleven respondents indicated two people, and three respondent indicated three people with these responsibilities.

Of the respondents that indicated one person with this responsibility, four of them are working 100% on these issues with the remainder ranging from 5% to 75%.

Of the respondents that indicated two people with this responsibility, three have two of these individuals working 100% on these issues, with the remainder ranging from 5% to 60%.

Three respondents indicated that three people have this responsibility:

- Three full time individuals (WI)
- One at 100%, one at 20% and one unspecified (MN)
- One at 100%, one at 33% and one at 20% (MS)

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 - 11
- Perkins administration and State- 4
- Perkins administration and leadership- 3
- Perkins administration and NTO setaside- 3
- Perkins leadership - 6
- Perkins leadership NTO setaside- 5
- Perkins leadership and leadership NTO setaside - 1
- Perkins leadership and state - 1
- State only - 5
- State and other - 1
- State and NTO setaside- 1
- State, Perkins administration and leadership- 4
- State, Perkins leadership and other- 1
- State, Perkins administration, leadership and NTO setaside- 8
- Can't determine - 6

Setaside for Nontraditional Training and Employment

Forty-six 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:

- 15- \$150,000 (AR, AZ, CA, FL, KS, MN, MI, MO, NE, NJ, NY, TX, VA, WA, WI)
- 1- \$120,000 (DC)
- 7- \$100,000 (AL, CT, IA, KY, MA, NM, WY)
- 1- \$90,000 (NC)
- 1- \$85,000 (RI)
- 3- \$80,000 (HI, MT, PA)
- 3- \$75,000 (IL, LA, UT)
- 2- \$70,000 (OK, WV)
- 13- \$60,000 (CO, GA, ID, IN, MD, MS, ND, NH, OR, SC, SD, VT, WI)

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

- Invited awards—1 (OR)
- Competitive grants to locals— 20 (AL, AZ, HI, IA, IL, LA, MA, MN, MT, ND, NE, OK, RI, SC, SD, UT, VAs, WI, WV, WY)
- Contracted services to conduct professional development activities— 12 (AZ, CA, CT, IA, IN, IL, KY, MO, NC, NY, KS, VT)
- Statewide nontraditional advisory committee— 2 (CA, IL)
- Purchasing or producing recruitment and curriculum materials i.e. publications, videos, etc.— 7 (AR, GA, HI, MN, NC, NH, SD)
- State staff to conduct technical assistance and professional development— 11 (DC, FL, GA, MI, NC, ND, NJ, PA, VT, WI, WV)
- Men in Health Careers initiatives— 1 (WI)
- Single Parent/Displaced homemaker programs— 1 (ID)
- Nontraditional awards program— 2 (MI, NY)

- Professional development conferences— 6 (HI, LA, MN, NE, RI, UT)
- Technical assistance— 3 (CT, MN, ND)
- Direct services for GRADS program— 1 (NM)
- Summer nontraditional camps— 1 (UT)
- Student Aid (HI, SD)
- Services with Other State Agencies—1 (AR)
- Career Information Website—2 (VAsec, WI)
- Best Practices Replication—1 (WA)
- Sector Partner Initiative—1 (MD)
- State NTO Career Resource Center—5 (IL, KY, MO, NJ, NY)
- Direct Services—2 (NH, OK)
- Research—1 (MA)
- Local NTO Coordinators—1 (SD)
- Regional NTO Centers—2 (KS, TX)

Use of State Leadership Funds for Special Populations

Twenty-five respondents are using other state leadership funds for the purpose of serving special population students. The amount of funds was available from 16 respondents and these amounts ranged from \$15,000 to \$412,000, with \$117,000 being the mean. Of these 16 respondents 9 are also reserving the maximum allowed from the nontraditional reserve, \$150,000.

From the information collected from the 25 respondents, the use of state leadership funds for serving special population students can be categorized as follows:

- Advisory Committee—1 (CA)
- Affiliation fees – 1 (AR)
- State staffing – 2 (MA, WV)
- Research—1 (CA)
- Assisting student organizations – 1 (SD)
- Staff development – 8 (AZ, CO, GA, IL, MI, CA, WI, VAsec)
- Competitive grants—5 (CO, IA, IL, MT, VAs)
- English as Second Language/Adult Basic Ed Services—2 (MN, WI)
- Resource centers – 1 (TX)
- Training for disabled and incarcerated students—3 (AL, NJ, SD)
- Single Parent/Displaced Homemakers Centers—2 (ID, WI)
- Awards Programs—1 (MI)
- Jobs for Americas Graduates—1 (NM)

Local Uses of Funds

Thirty-one 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 – 9 (AL, AZ, FL, IL, MA, MO, SD, WA, WY)
- Local plan requires “how funds will be used” language – 1 (KS)
- Local plans must describe how services are being provided—3 (IL, MD, VAsec)

- State requires 2% of local funds to be spent on nontraditional activities— 1 (WA)
- State requires 10% of local funds to be spent on nontraditional activities if the local is not meeting the performance measure – 1 (NH)
- Target funds to NTO activities if local not meeting performance goal—11 (CO, KS, MA, MI, MS, NC, NJ, SC, WA, WV, WI)
- Technical assistance—1 (UT)
- Use state 10% reserve for NTO and other performance improvement—1 (WIPs)

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

From the responses collected from the 34 respondents, the types of services/programs for special populations that states are encouraging locals to provide can be categorized as follows:

- Support services – 6 (CO, MA, MI, SC, WI, VT)
- State staff—1 (AZ)
- Not specified but required in the local plan—4 (IN, MD, MN, NJ)
- Allowable uses of funds are listed in the local application – 4 (FL, KS, OR, VA)
- Improve professional development – 11 (AZ, CA, CO, IA, IL, MA, NC, NH, OR, SC, WV)
- Single Parent coordinator at the local level – 6 (CO, GA, MA, NC, SD, VT)
- Tutoring – 7 (AL, CO, MA, NC, NY, SD, WI)
- Focus on limited English proficient and students with disabilities – 1 (WI)
- Nontraditional career fairs and camps – 1 (NY)
- Mentoring – 2 (SD, WI)
- Same performance of special populations as all students – 1 (KY)
- Collaboration with parents, business and industry – 1 (SC)
- Career counseling – 8 (CO, GA, MA, NY, OK, SC, SD, WI)
- Transition services—2 (SC, WI)
- Displaced Homemaker Programs—1 (OK)
- Interpreters, tools, adaptive equipment—5 (CO, GA, MA, OK, WI)

From the responses collected from the 34, 21 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, i.e., equal access and nondiscrimination – 4 (AZ, CO, RI, SD)
- Local control – 3 (KS, KY, WV)
- Required additional program indicators for special populations – 1 (VA)
- Performance measures used to develop program improvement plans and funds – 2 (MA, MI)
- Special needs staff/coordinator – 1 (MS)
- Accommodations/modifications—2 (AL, MN)
- Career counseling—2 (NC, OK)
- Outreach—1 (AL)
- Support services—4 (MN, NC, ND, WY)
- In local plan with list of suggested activities—1 (MS)
- Student assessment-technical and academic—1 (NC)
- Local equity committee—1 (NH)
- Individual vocational plan—1 (AZ)

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: reasonable amount of support services (KY).

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

- Rural/adversely affected—2 (FL, NH)
- Rural/high percent of voc. ed. students – 2 (CO, WI)
- High percent/high numbers – 1 (AZ)
- Rural/high percent/high numbers – 4 (MT, NJ, SD, TX)
- Rural/urban/high percent/high numbers – 2 (AL, NE)
- Rural/high numbers—2 (CT, WA)
- Rural/urban/high percent—1 (OK)
- N/A-1

Of these 15 states, 5 are setting programmatic priorities for the use of these funds at the local level. The priorities are described as follows:

- USDOE Administrations priorities (Sec-tech)—1 (FL)
- Professional development, articulation, technological fluency—1 (AL)
- Innovative programs, new start-up—1 (CT)
- Expand use of tech, inservice training, improving academic and CTE integration, sec-postsec linkages, new program implementation, national certification of programs—1 (SD)
- Industry recognized skill certification—1 (WIsec)
- NTO training, work-based learning, pretechnical education (WIPs)