DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 608 JC 030 662

TITLE	Developing a Rationale for Wyoming's Carl Perkins Funding Split.
INSTITUTION	Wyoming Community Coll. Commission, Cheyenne.
PUB DATE	2003-03-13
NOTE	9p.; Contains small print.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; *Financial Support; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; School Support; *Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Wyoming

ABSTRACT

This report discusses how in Wyoming, the State Board of Vocational Education is in charge of dividing Perkins funds between secondary and postsecondary institutions. The purpose of this report is to discuss a requirement in the Perkins Act—developing a rationale for allocating money between secondary and postsecondary education. When Perkins funding is offered across the country, it is given in two categories: counting enrollment (vocational or non vocational) or some kind of needs assessment. Currently Wyoming allocates 65% to secondary schools and 35% to postsecondary schools and the Wyoming State Board of Vocational Education (WSBVE) must decided if it will leave the split as is (65/35) or modify it. Overall, career-technical education is more expensive to deliver than traditional academic coursework. Therefore, both secondary and postsecondary institutions struggle with decisions as what they can and cannot afford to offer in the vocational arena. Information is provided on other states' rational for funding, purposes of Perkins Funding, and Wyoming data on vocational full time equivalency. The report concludes with a discussion on the history and purposes of federal vocational funding programs and four major reasons why some favor a greater split for postsecondary education. (Contains 11 references.) (MZ)

Developing a Rationale for Wyoming's Carl Perkins Funding Split

March 13, 2003

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

As stated in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Amendments of 1998, the purpose of Perkins funds is "to develop more fully the academic, vocational, and technical skills of secondary students and postsecondary students who elect to enroll in vocational and technical education programs...." To that end, federal funding is provided to state-level organizations tasked with determining how best to split the bulk of Perkins funding between secondary and postsecondary educational institutions. In Wyoming, the State Board of Vocational Education, having the same membership as the State Board of Education, is charged with dividing Perkins funds between secondary and postsecondary institutions. The purpose of the research presented in this report is tied directly to a requirement in the Perkins Act—developing a rationale for allocating money between secondary and postsecondary[1].

The current split in Wyoming allocates 65% to secondary schools and 35% to postsecondary institutions. The research presented here will hopefully become the foundation upon which the Wyoming State Board of Vocational Education (WSBVE) will build a sound rationale for the existing split or justification for altering that split. Of considerable importance to secondary and postsecondary institutions in Wyoming, the amount of the Wyoming Perkins funding is approximately $4.5 million annually.

The origins of this research project appropriately stem from the WSBVE, who asked that a study be conducted in 2001, but attention to time-consuming, competing projects thwarted the start of the study. At the April 11, 2002 meeting of the WSBVE, 5 individuals—2 from postsecondary, 2 from secondary, and the Perkins director from the Wyoming Department of Education—asked that the board leave the funding split as is for 2002-2003 and begin a collaborative, data-driven analysis to reevaluate the distribution of Perkins funds in the spring of 2003. The board agreed unanimously and asked that the 5 individuals (a task force) begin organizing the study. After a meeting and several emails, the task force agreed that a primary researcher was needed, and so the WCCC contracted with a University of Wyoming graduate student, Andrew Karavitis, to conduct the bulk of the research and provide a report. The graduate student's report is the basis of some of the information shared here, for which we are very grateful.

Research customarily begins with a review of existing practices when such data are available and ideally, a review of "best practices" when identified in previous research. The available information contained no "best practices" literature relevant to the topic of developing a sound rationale for the division of Perkins funds, and somewhat spotty information on existing funding split rationales (even though required by the Perkins Act). Obligingly, the Wyoming Perkins director offered to instigate a survey of her counterparts in other states, and so original data was gathered for the study. Another weakness in the literature review is that some of the

rationales offered would not qualify as prime examples of distributive justice, let alone objective, data-driven justifications—nine states cite historical precedence for their splits. True distributive justice would offer objectively derived rules for distribution that seem fair and reasonable to a consensus, or at least a majority of informed stakeholders. State's rationales that result from simple agreement among decision-makers does not promise judgments based on quality in education and fairness in the distribution of valued resources. Several states relied on counting things—all students, vocational students, disabled students—with the summative results cited as the basis for the Perkins split. Are such methodologies adequate to the task of determining the split of prized federal assistance? Providing information to shed light on that question and others is the purpose of this research.

OTHER STATES' RATIONALES

This section explores national adherence to the federal requirement of establishing a rationale for dividing Perkins funds between secondary and postsecondary. Territories and districts (D.C.) are referred to as "states" for simplicity. All entities listed receive Perkins funding, distribute it to secondary and postsecondary education, and complete annual reports.

States' rationales were not always easy to locate, or in some cases, understand. Initial searching online revealed that few documented rationales were available. As mentioned above, many states have no publicly available rationales, so assistance was requested from Teri Wigert, Wyoming's State Coordinator of Career and Technical Education. She in turn asked the federal contact person for all state coordinators to request data from each state director of vocational education, whatever their individual titles might be. The National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education Consortium (NASDVTEC) solicited these responses in October of 2002. All quotations in this section are from this email survey.

A state-by-state description is necessary to describe the findings because states have unique ways of making the split decision decision. There are a few trends, however. The first group to be discussed are states that cite historical precedent, report that a governing body made the decision, report that no rationale exists, or don't report at all. None in these categories actually present a rationale; instead they offer a description of how rather than why the current split was reached. Unfortunately, this is the largest group of respondents. Throughout this report the Perkins split information is reported in the format secondary/postsecondary. The data on state funding splits comes from the federal Office of Vocational and Adult Education and references Perkins funds distributed in fiscal year 2002.

Nine states cite purely historical precedent as the sole basis for their decisions. These are Alabama (67/33), Alaska (86.5/13.5), Delaware (85/15), D.C. (84/16), Colorado (42/58), Georgia (50/50), Louisiana (56/64), Montana (65/35), and Oklahoma (84/16). Alaska reports that the reason they have produced no real rationale is absence of data supporting development of a rationale. Georgia explains, "...a political decision that was established in 1985 and has remained in place since that time." Three of the nine states, Colorado, Georgia, and Louisiana, have something called a rationale, though the explanations offer no real reason that could be used to answer the question, "why is the money split this way." Instead of answering the question "why," these states tend to explain "when" the decision was made or "who" made the decision.

North Carolina (66/34) and Wyoming (65/35) report that no rationale is available. North Carolina, like Wyoming, undoubtedly has some board, group, or person making the funding split decision and that decision may have involved various stakeholders from both secondary and postsecondary arenas. Nevada (69/31) reports: "The split was negotiated between secondary and post secondary and approved by the State Board of Education." Indiana (64/36) apparently received a legislative decision: "mandated by state legislature." New Mexico reports a "State Board decision." Rhode Island (85/15) says: "State agreements and SEC.132/SEC.133 (a)(2)."

Eleven states failed to report at all to the survey, yet four of these non-responders have rationales posted at websites online. In summary, two states report no rationale exists, four simply state who made the decision, and seven have no explanation available whatsoever. Add to these the nine states that cite historical precedent (lacking substantive information to qualify as an actual rationale), almost half have not addressed or have inadequately addressed the Perkins III requirement to develop a rationale supporting division of Perkins funds.

Of the states that have rationales that could be located and understood, nine base their rationale on a comparison of enrollment in secondary/postsecondary education in the state. Connecticut (86/14), Florida (53/47), Guam (25/75), Michigan (60/40), Missouri (73/27), North Dakota (65/35), Oregon (50/50), Texas (58/42), and Washington (44/56); each uses language that suggests total enrollment figures are the basis for their rationales. It is problematic to determine at times whether states are referring to vocational students or all students. For example, Michigan says the rationale is "enrollment, number of programs." This leaves some question as to what enrollment in what programs? Texas specifies that they "...will begin using the formula based on technical students when the calculations are complete," which suggests that the current calculation is based on total enrollment (http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/ctc/perkins/perkins2002/rfq/default.htm).

Eleven states use of a measure like vocational full-time equivalency (VFTE) as the basis for their rationales. Arkansas (75/25), California (44/56), Idaho (65/35), Illinois (60/40), Kentucky (49/51), Massachusetts (70/30), Minnesota (35/65), New Jersey (55/45), New York (52/48), South Carolina (77.5/22.5), and West Virginia

(78/22) are the members of this category.

Several states went further and conducted analyses such as need assessments to determine the split. These are Hawaii (50/50), Iowa (52/48), Kentucky (49/51), Minnesota (35/65), New York (52/48), and South Dakota (45/55). Maryland (65/35) also conducted data-driven research to form a rationale. Arizona's (85/15) rationale considered poverty information from the Arizona Department of Economic Security and Pell Grant recipient headcounts rather than education or employment data.

The above results indicate that few states produce motives for dividing Perkins funds between secondary and postsecondary that one could legitimately consider a sound rationale—approximately $900 million in Perkins funds are distributed annually. Data gathering can be expensive and work intensive for practitioners whose primary responsibility it is distribute funds in a manner that aids intended recipients, and so the lack of thorough research is not wholly surprising. If time and money were available to a state, what should be the focus of research that would result in a reasonable and fair distribution of funding? To answer this question, we must turn to the "purposes" of Perkins funding.

PURPOSES OF PERKINS

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (Perkins Act) contains a definition of vocational and technical education.

> The term `vocational and technical education' means organized educational activities that--
> ``(A) offer a sequence of courses that provides individuals with the academic and technical knowledge and skills the individuals need to prepare for further education and for careers (other than careers requiring a baccalaureate, master's, or doctoral degree) in current or emerging employment sectors; and
> ``(B) include competency-based applied learning that contributes to the academic knowledge, higher-order reasoning and problem-solving skills, work attitudes, general employability skills, technical skills, and occupation-specific skills, of an individual.

More guidance regarding the purpose of Perkins is offered in the following two paragraphs from the U.S. Department of Education.

> The U.S. Department of Education has established 16 broad Career Clusters that reflect a new direction for education. Each cluster consists of all entry-level though professional-level occupations in a broad industry area. Each cluster includes both the academic and technical skills and knowledge needed for further education and careers. Clusters provide an ideal organizing tool to assist educators, counselors and parents in their work with students to identify their interests and goals for the future (Clusters Homepage. U.S. Department of Education - Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), May 20, 2002)

> The purpose of the Career Clusters Initiative, formerly known as the Building Linkages Initiative, is to enable States to establish linkages among State educational agencies, secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, employers, industry groups, other stake holders and Federal agencies (Career Clusters--Cooperative Agreements; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 2001; Notice. The Federal Register Online via GPO Access, Volume 65, Number 235, Page 76523-76543, December 6, 2000).

A short history of the federal government's support of vocational education, accompanying changes in the U.S. workforce, and the corresponding roles of secondary and postsecondary over time will help provide a context from which to better understand current Perkins legislation. The history is from a paper prepared under contract for the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education in March 2002 by James Jacobs, W. Norton Grubb, and David Gardner.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was the first federal legislation that specifically funded vocational education. At this time the federal government had not supported K-12 education at all. A broad coalition of business representatives, education, social reformers, and labor unions overcame objections to the feds involvement in states' responsibility—education. In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education was established and supported legislation resulting in increased funding of vocational education—the George-Ellzey Act in 1934 and the George-Deen Act in 1936. Then in 1936, President Roosevelt convened the first Advisory Committee on Vocational Education. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 again increased vocational funding and permitted states flexibility in the development of programs. Amendments were added in 1968 and 1972, and in 1984 it was renamed after Carl Perkins. Perkins was reauthorized in 1990 and again in 1997.

Jacob, et al state at the outset of their paper:

> ... [W]e continue the process of examining the rationale for federal involvement in occupation education. Past discussions of this issue have come to a broad set of conclusions: that the federal government should fund what states cannot fund on their own, including efforts to improve the quality of occupational education, to enhance equity, and to conduct the kind of research and

demonstration projects that are more efficiently carried out at the federal level....

At the turn of the last century, around 1900, there was widespread fear that the previous methods of preparing a labor force—apprenticeship-based methods... had become inadequate. Improvement in technology—the development of electrically-driven equipment, the expanded use of complex machinery, new production processes in many different sectors—and shifts in business organization, especially the expansion of corporations with their great needs for accountants, clerks, and various management positions—were changing the nature of occupations and skills required and, it was widely feared, leading to shortages in certain critical occupations. ...Educators bemoaned the high dropout rate from high schools.... Agreeing with the necessity of keeping youth in school longer, they searched for forms of schools that would be more motivational and more likely to lead to permanent employment....

But high schools, as they emerged from the nineteenth century, were still predominantly academic institutions, with a curriculum resembling the current college prep curriculum.... Federal support was necessary if the multiple goals of the movement for vocational education were to be met, in order to make the transformation in high schools that states and localities were unable to undertake on their own. And so industrial education for production-related occupations, trade education for the emerging wholesale and retail sectors, and home economics to support the application of "science" in the home... were included in legislation for federal funding.

... [L]egislation therefore provided federal support to introduce into high schools that might otherwise persist in being wholly academic institutions, all in the name of preparing the labor force to generate individual benefits, high rates of economic growth, a stronger role in international competition and solution to various social problem. ...If we fast-forward from 1900 to 2000, we can see that many of the conditions of a century ago are remarkably similar to those prevailing now. ...It goes something like this: the Knowledge Revolution (or the Information Society) is changing the nature of work, increasing the skills required for the 21st century in virtually all areas of employment. In response, it is necessary for prospective employees to have both higher levels of education—in most cases education beyond high school (the notion of College for All, which has replaced the earlier deal of High School for All)—as well as different forms of education, with a new focus on such higher-order competencies as problem-solving abilities, communication, and critical thinking skills.

At this point the authors depart from the strictly historical narrative and begin to make their case for changes in federal vocational funding policy. For continuity's sake, we will let the narrative continue, and will discuss other perspectives at its conclusion.

... [A] number of implications follow for federal (as well as state and local) policy. In terms of levels of education, policy should first promote high school graduation, since the economic penalty for dropping out of high schools has gotten larger and larger; and since access to college of some sort is increasingly important, high school completion is a near-requirement. In addition, policy should enable students to access postsecondary education, though not necessarily at the baccalaureate level. ... In terms of the kinds of education that should be supported, it follows... that broader and higher-order competencies are necessary for skilled work in flexible production, to facilitate retraining as technologies change and required competencies shift, and to enable individuals to move among job if necessary. The kinds of narrow job-specific skills associated with traditional high school vocational education are now inappropriate.

As we have moved from the ideal of universal high school articulated around 1900, to an emerging consensus about (some) College for All, the role of the high school has changed and new institutions—particularly community colleges—have become more important. Vocational course-taking in the high schools has remained steady and has not grown; almost all high school students still take at least one vocational course. Yet the percentage of "concentrators" (students taking three or more courses in a single occupational area) has declined dramatically (Levesque et al., 2000). This is partly due to the pressure from increasing graduation requirements stressing academic coursework, partly because high schools have found it increasingly difficult to maintain coherent programs and maintain up-to-date equipment; partly because parents (and students) want access to college and see vocational education as a "dumping ground" with potentially discriminatory efforts for women, minorities, and lower-income students and partly because the evidence suggests that the vocational track in most high schools does not generally lead to higher earnings or improved employment.

... [This] implies that high schools should be places where students master a set of basic (or general, or foundation) competencies necessary for all of adult life, rather than specializing in specific preparation for employment; this idea has been embedded in state high school exit examinations that focus on basic academic subjects, and now in the exams required in the No Child Left Behind legislation.

Conversely, occupational education programs in community colleges and related institutions are

where preparation for the workplace is now taking place. These programs have expanded since the 1960s and have become increasingly differentiated as the variety of occupations in the economy has expanded, and as, increasingly, occupational preparation becomes formalized in colleges rather than being developed on the job. In 1996, about one-half of sub-baccalaureate students majored in a vocational program area (Levesque et al., 2000). ... The dominant fields of study have shifted away from the traditional occupations that have dominated high school vocational education to newer occupations that are part of the modern economy: 29 percent of enrollments are in business, 22 percent in health occupations, 12 percent in engineering and science technologies, 5 percent in computers and data processing. The "old" vocational areas—agriculture, home economics, marketing, trade, and industry—together comprise only 12 percent of all enrollments (Levesque et al,. 2000).

Because of the Institutional Transformation in occupational education, any federal policy should emphasize different goals at the secondary and at the postsecondary levels. At the secondary level, the emphasis should be on completing high school, not simply with standard academic skills (something that the No Child Left Behind legislation tries to accomplish through periodic exams), but also with the higher order competencies that are prerequisites both for further education and for employment in the jobs in the modern economy. The emphasis of occupational education in high school should not be on obtaining the job-specific, entry-level skills of traditional vocational education.

The authors leave no doubt of their position on where vocational funding should be concentrated. It is but one perspective, but one that is important to the purpose of this research. The perspective takes the discussion of federal funding beyond the mostly superficial rationales offered (when offered) in the previous section. Federal money, they believe, should be distributed in a manner that produces the best "fit" with the collective state of affairs linking recent secondary and postsecondary educational trends to changing workforce and industry needs. But public education exists in communities having preferences and long histories of locally elected board members representing civic wants and needs. Communities understandably prefer "comprehensive" institutions offering their children the full array of educational opportunities.

Wyoming is a rural state where construction trades, mining, oil and gas extraction, ranching, and other blue collar trades (excluding, for the most part, large manufacturing) comprise a good deal of non-baccalaureate and beyond workforce opportunities. The skills required for mining and construction jobs are often similar (Outlook 2000, Wyoming Department of Employment Research and Planning Section). Employment opportunities in these fields can be enhanced by skills attained through secondary vocational education, but increasingly postsecondary credentials and sometimes licensing through industry defined exams are required. And as Jacob et al state above, occupational preparation is becoming more formalized in colleges rather than being developed on the job because of the nature of the modern economy. Although Wyoming is a state experiencing this trend at a lesser magnitude than most others, modernization's effect on the workplace is expanding with technological advancement.

Should workforce trends wholly determine whether secondary students gain familiarity (hands-on experience) with trade/professional training provided in career-technical education? Decisions are always more valid when based on information specific to the probable outcomes. Experiencing the physical and mental realities of welding or sitting at a computer terminal diagnosing network problems will no doubt contribute to youths making better informed career path decisions. Some will discover proclivities and talents, some will confront dissatisfaction, and others will enjoy and learn from the exposure, but realize that their genuine interests lie elsewhere. There is value in the exposure because whether positive or negative, the experience adds tactile authenticity to youthful aspiration. Despite the overall trend toward postsecondary credentials in vocational fields, some will get jobs because of the secondary training, particularly those who are able to complete a series of courses within a single field. But it is unlikely that students with secondary vocational training will compete as effectively in the job market as those students with postsecondary credentials.

Another benefit of secondary vocational coursework is preparation for postsecondary education in the same field. Students with completed coursework (and interest) in a given field gain a body of knowledge that can assist them in their postsecondary training. Additionally, vocational coursework offered at the secondary level in conjunction with postsecondary institutions gives students the opportunity to attain postsecondary credit hours before leaving high school. Such cooperative efforts can be taught by high school faculty (using a syllabus identical to cooperating colleges' specifications for the same college course) or college faculty traveling to a high school, or can be offered at a college outreach center in the same town where the high school resides, or on colleges' main campuses (when distances are not prohibitive).

The WCCC conducted an email survey on a national list serve of professionals in career and technical education to better understand partnering between secondary and postsecondary institutions in the delivery of vocational education. The survey asked respondents to comment to the perceived nationwide trend towards more extensive partnering between secondary and postsecondary institutions in the delivery of vocational education. Members of the list serve were asked to respond to issues that might be resulting in greater cooperation: a) technologically up-to-date career-technical education is expensive to deliver; b) secondary institutions overall cannot afford to offer the very latest in some fields; c) community colleges are more likely to have modern equipment/methodologies; hence d) secondary students are receiving a larger portion of career-technical

education through partnerships with community colleges.

All responses that were received in the order received:

1. New Hampshire: I have no "scientifically based research" on this but in our state partnerships are on the rise, but not because the two year public postsecondary institutions have more funding. We have developed pathways, under Tech Prep and better articulation programs, dual enrollment programs etc. so student realized in High School that they are capable of college level work.
2. Minnesota: This is certainly the case for us at Hennepin Technical college and our collaboration partners at Intermediate District 287.
3. Georgia: Jones County HS in Gray, GA participates in Tech Prep with CTE programs such as construction, automotive, and computer that are articulated with Central GA Tech College programs. Teachers from CGTC come to JCHS and teach one or more advanced classes and the students receive dual credits.
4. Illinois: Illinois has made a large commitment to developing various secondary—postsecondary partnership models over the last few years. Chief among those is a redesigned dual enrollment system that actually encourages both sides to craft innovative agreements that ultimately benefits all students (traditional academic and CTE).
5. California: I would agree that secondary/postsecondary partnerships are on the rise nationally. This is in part a result of the Tech Prep funding that was intended to build and foster this type of relationship. I would, however, challenge the idea that secondary institutions do not have the facilities, technology or instructional methodologies to deliver high-quality, technologically up-to-date instruction to their students. ...In California, we have a very strong, viable delivery system of CTE called Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs) whose primary purpose is to provide CTE instruction to secondary students. The ROCPs also provide CTE instruction for adults. ROCPs, high schools and community colleges have built strong partnerships in many areas throughout our state to provide high-quality instruction in state of the art facilities that serve our divers student population. As budget issues arise throughout the nation and new acts are implemented effecting public education, I feel it is critical to include CTE at the secondary level so that, truly, no child is left behind. ...CTE provides an educational experience for ALL secondary students that is a vital component of their educational development and growth. To propose that CTE be better taught at the post secondary level is not a solution for the success of ALL secondary students.
6. Ohio: Some of these partnerships are being forced or mandated by the federal government, i.e., Department of Labor and their "workforce investment act" which placed partnerships at a high priority. Also, some of the Carl Perkins legislation has urged partnerships. I believe these are good, but I know in some instances, private community-based non-profits like ours who have delivered services under contracts prior to the changes, have lost funding to education.
7. California (2nd respondent): I'm in California and taught at a comprehensive high school for years. We shut down our metal shop, woodworking shop, autotechnology dept. and electronics classes, as well as, sewing and many cooking classes. Our students can take a class through ROP in autotechnology if they are willing to be bussed some distance. Woodworking is offered through adult education on another campus. Many of our students take autotechnology classes at Citrus Community College. They also can enroll in their electronic and drafting classes. The school allows our student to attend tuition free which is a help.
8. Ohio (2nd respondent) I am the CEO of a predominantly secondary school district that serves 9 Ohio school districts in southwest Ohio. We are referred to as joint vocational schools. Our labs, curriculum, and equipment are significantly better than many of our community college counterparts. We value them as partners and don't make this observation as a negative comment against them. We are just better positioned financially to provide high end equipment. Also, we serve over 4,000 adults in high quality labs as well and thus are a valuable partner with our community college colleagues who strive to serve high end career and workforce education. I'm sure the equipment varies from state to state, but a general statement like you made really doesn't fit with many situations. Also, we are a critical "farm league" for our colleagues at the community college level. Remember, career technical is often the difference between students completing high school or dropping out. Finally, to assume that we can somehow separate the academic and career-technical instruction between the two levels misses the incredible synergy of project-based, applied learning tha enhances academics all the way from middle school to the university.
9. Ohio (3rd respondent): I'm sure this is not true in all states or even in all parts of all states, but Dayton, Ohio, has a tremendous Community College, Sinclair. Sinclair Community College has partnered with vocational school and comprehensive secondary schools to give students the opportunity to learn a skill that could be used directly out of high school or enhanced by attending Sinclair and even to continue to a 4-year university.
10. Kentucky: Secondary Area Technology Centers in Kentucky are well equipped as are some of the postsecondary institutions. The statement that more secondary students are getting their technical education at postsecondary institutions than secondary is not a true statement.
11. Kentucky (2nd respondent): Kentucky is working hard to engage more students into seamless transfer opportunities via statewide articulation and dual credit agreements. Kentucky has many quality secondary programs that provide CTE instruction at secondary students and continue to engage many students in school. Secondary programs provide opportunity to focus on career interests, develop skills relative to applications of their entire educational experience within an occupational context. However, students need more education beyond high school to be fully successful in the workplace. ...There has also been

much discussion of the "wasted senior year" of high school. One tool to help alleviate this challenge is dual credit and dual enrollment as additional course offerings are made available to students. I think to the contrary, that the growth of articulation, dual credit and dual enrollment opportunities in not to replace challenges for postsecondary programs, but to provide greater opportunity for secondary students to access postsecondary experiences and higher level skills attainment. This is a tool (dual credit opportunities) that will hopefully screen students into higher education as opposed to screening out.

12. Illinois (a vendor of educational equipment): I think the answer may vary depending on the technology being taught. For example, in manufacturing, industrial grade CNC machines cost $50,000 to $100,000+ each and can only be used by 1 0r 2 students at a time. We have sold at very preferential prices about 120 of our Charmilles EDM machine tools to educational institutions in the last 10 years. The ratio of postsecondary to secondary buyers is about 30:1. If I am missing the secondary market, I look forward to hearing from its representatives and helping them with their programs.

The comments are primarily positive with regard to dual enrollment and partnering opportunities. Some expressly warn against reducing secondary vocational education available at the high school level (a couple say that the career-technical equipment available at the high school level surpasses what is available at the college level); some speak of formal, systematic partnering, and some recognize that postsecondary career-technical education improves employment opportunities.

Every Wyoming community college has dual enrollment agreements with area high schools. The agreements are reached individually between each college and constituent high schools and differences exist in eligibility requirements, funding, and delivery methods (see WPEOP Study at http://commission.wcc.edu). Statute exists in Wyoming that provides guidelines for offering concurrent enrollment programs and all colleges are operating within those guidelines, but systematic review could result in discovering methods that could result in all students receiving the same dual enrollment opportunities statewide.

WYOMING DATA ON VOCATIONAL FTE

Discussion in the previous section reveals a variety of issues germane to developing a sound rationale for distribution of Perkins funds, but information on vocational full-time equivalency (VFTE) in secondary and postsecondary was compiled by MPR Associates (secondary) and the WCCC (postsecondary) so that, at the very least, a method used by some other states could be explored in Wyoming.

MPR Associates compiled data on secondary VFTE and the WCCC, after conferring with the primary researcher for MPR, devised a similar approach to measurement. Postsecondary VFTE analysis uses Wyoming's community colleges' enrollment data from the spring semester, 2002. Computer programming was created to gather from the administrative computing system, a complete list of all courses taught in that semester as well as the number of students in each class and the number of credit hours. This data was used to calculate a full-time equivalency number for each course. The WCCC compared each course with the National Center for Education Statistics Classification of Instructional Program Code (CIP Code) that identifies the program with which the course is affiliated. All college must code their credit coursework to coincide with a specific CIP Code entry. Only courses associated with terminal degrees/certificates (not requiring a baccalaureate degree or graduate degree) in workforce related areas were used in the VFTE. No general education requirement courses needed for a degree or certificate across disciplines were included. After the CIP Code review, the lists of courses identified as vocational were sent back to each college for review. College personnel were asked to either agree or disagree with the choices based on that review. The final tally was 4,563 VFTE in postsecondary in the spring semester, 2002. MPR's study came up with a 3,855 VFTE in grades 9-12.

SUMMARY

Overall, career-technical education is more expensive to deliver than traditional academic coursework. Both secondary and postsecondary struggle with decisions as to what they can afford to offer in the vocational arena. Qualified faculty are often hard to find and expensive to attract in some fields. But there is no doubt that from the perspective of parents and students, an extensive array of vocational programs offerings is preferable to more limited selection.

Actual rationales for Perkins funding split decisions across the country, when they are offered at all, fall into two basic categories—counting enrollment (vocational or non-vocational plus vocational) or some kind of needs assessment. Not considered actual rationales, are the majority of states that report historical precedent or simply name who made the funding split decision.

Information on vocational full-time equivalency in secondary and postsecondary is presented in this study, secondary 3,855 VFTE and postsecondary 4,563. If the Wyoming State Board of Vocational Education were to base the spilt on this alone, it would be 46% to secondary and 54% to postsecondary. Discussion on the history and purposes of federal vocational funding was offered by Jacob et al and their conclusions favored a greater split for postsecondary for 4 primary reasons:

1. The nature of jobs in the modern economy requires greater career-technical education than can be offered at the secondary level alone.

2. More jobs are requiring postsecondary credentials (certificates and associate degrees), net of experience and training, therefore the greatest benefit to the workforce is through postsecondary.
3. Vocational course-taking in the high schools has remained steady and has not grown. Yet the percentage of students taking three or more courses in a single occupational area has declined dramatically.
4. High schools should be places where students master a set of basic competencies necessary for all of adult life, rather than specializing in specific preparation for employment; this idea has been embedded in state high school exit examinations that focus on the basic academic subjects, and now in the exams required in the No Child Left Behind legislation.

Regardless of the above arguments, parents and student prefer comprehensive high schools that offer education in a wide variety of areas where students gain familiarity with trade/professional training. And students, no doubt, benefit from this training through more informed career choices. Those students taking vocational coursework through dual enrollment at the secondary level enter college more prepared for further vocational training and with credit hours toward a degree. Partnering between secondary and postsecondary in the delivery of vocational education is also an effective cost saving measure that can be more systematically explored in Wyoming. Partnering is on the rise nationally.

We hope this study has provided information that will assist the WSBVE in developing a sound rationale for either leaving the Perkins split as is (65/35) or modifying it in some way.

> *1The State plan shall include information that describes how funds received by the eligible agency through the allotment made under section 111 will be allocated among secondary school vocational and technical education, or postsecondary and adult vocational and technical education, or both, including the rationale for such allocation.... (Perkins Amendments of 1998, p. 112 STAT. 3103-3104 (c)(4)(A))*

References:

Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act

Jacobs, J. Grubb, W. & Gardner, D. "Implementing the 'Education Consensus': The Federal Role in Supporting Vocational – Technical Education. March 2002.

USDOE in State Education Indicators with a Focus on Title I
[http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/esed/2000_indicators/wyoming.html]

Wyoming State Board of Vocational Education Minutes - September 15-16, 1993. Page 8.

Wyoming State Board of Vocational Education Minutes - April 11, 2002.

Wyoming Education Code of 1969

WyCTA state reports for 2001.

National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education Consortium survey of state directors.

WCCC Annual Enrollment Report

WDE reporting forms 330 - 333

Federal E.D. Homepage, OVAE, Career and Technical Education reports.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").