

E1400.6
Up1
20:3



UPDATE

Volume XX Number 3

OCT 3 1989 ✓

July 1989

U. S. House Moves Quickly On Carl D. Perkins Act Reauthorization

Editors Note: The following article is an edited version of an article contained in the AVA Update of June 1989.

The House of Representatives on May 9 overwhelmingly approved H.R. 7, which reauthorizes vocational education activities for another five years, increases the authorized level of appropriations, and makes major changes in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. One of those changes was to rename the Act the Carl D. Perkins Applied Technology Education Act.

After completing its public hearings on the reauthorization of the Perkins Act, the House Education and Labor Committee held an intensive series of meetings with its staff to draft a bill during a two-week period culminating in the Vocational Education Subcommittee mark-up session on April 12. At that session, Chairman Augustus Hawkins (D-CA) and ranking minority member William Goodling (R-PA) presented a package of major changes to the Perkins Act.

With only minor changes, those amendments to the basic vocational education legislation were adopted unanimously by the Subcommittee. Two

weeks later, the full Education and Labor Committee also unanimously adopted the Hawkins-Goodling bill. The bipartisan measure was then passed by a vote of 402 to 3 by the full House of Representatives.

New Image /New Name

The legislation provides that funds will be used only for "Applied Technology Education (ATE)." ATE is defined as an education program "offering a sequence of courses which are directly related to the preparation of individuals in paid or unpaid employment in current or emerging occupations," not requiring a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

Federal funding can be used to support only "local programs which integrate academic and occupational disciplines and which lead to both academic and occupational competence."

Coordination

State Councils on Vocational Education are replaced by a State Human Investment Council which is authorized to review the provision of services and the use of funds and resources under:

- The Applied Technology Education Act;

- The Adult Education Act;
- The Job Training Partnership Act;
- The Rehabilitation Act;
- The Wagner-Peyser Act (which created the Employment Service).

The bill establishes an Interdepartmental Task Force on Applied Technology Education and Related Programs consisting of the secretaries of Education, Labor, and HHS to consider data needed; examine common objectives; and consider integration of research and development.

No 57/43 split

The legislation authorizes \$1 billion for the basic state grant program for fiscal year 1990. Funds would be distributed to the states based on population figures exactly like the current Act. Once funds are allocated to the states, however, the bill would dramatically alter current arrangements.

Of the basic state grant, 20 percent is to be transferred to the state government; 5 percent will be reserved for state administration of the state plan; 10 percent for state administered programs for displaced

-----continued on page 2

Proposed State Human Investment Council's Membership Outlined

H.R. 7 proposes to eliminate the separate state advisory councils on voc ed, adult ed, and JTPA and form one state level advisory group, the State Human Investment Council (HIC), to coordinate activities of five federally funded Acts.

The HIC shall consist of members appointed by the Governor:

- 30% from business and industry;
- 30% from organized labor and com-

munity-based organizations;

20% from chief administrators of each state agency responsible for programs and other members appointed by the other state agencies having direct interest in the programs administered; and

20% from local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions and individuals with a special knowledge of special education and career development. ####

INSIDE

- Master Plan Update Schedule
- SBOE Activities
- Coordinating Board Activities
- LEB Questions SBOE
- SBOE Responds to T/COVE Report

House Proposal Contains Sweeping Changes

continued from page 1

homemakers and the sex equity programs; and the remaining 5 percent for: business-education partnerships under Title III, the development of state standards of performance and measures of performance, at least one program for incarcerated youth, and preservice and inservice training for teachers, guidance counselors, and others.

The remaining 80 percent of the basic state grant is to be distributed to local education agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary education institutions for the improvement of vocational education. The proportion of the state grant going to LEAs or postsecondary education is at the discretion of the state, but allocation to individual LEAs and postsecondary institutions is governed by a formula.

Secondary Voc Ed

Of the funds the state chooses to distribute to LEAs, 70 percent of the funds shall be distributed based on the amount of Chapter 1 (Education of the Disadvantaged) funds received; 20 percent based on the number of handicapped students; and 10 percent based on enrollment.

Consortia of secondary schools are eligible to receive grants and any school district which sends students to an area vocational school must join in a consortium with other schools supporting that area vocational school in order to provide funds to that school through the consortium — but those funds must be transferred to the area school in proportion to the percentage of its students who are disadvantaged, have handicaps and have limited English proficiency. Any LEA receiving a grant less than \$5,000 must join a consortium unless this arrangement would not be productive because of the distance which must be traveled.

Postsecondary

Of the funds the state chooses to distribute to adult and postsecondary education programs, 70 percent of the funds shall be distributed based on the number of Pell grants received by the institution; 20 percent based on the number of handicapped students helped under the Rehabilitation Act; and 10 percent based on enrollment.

The state can make arrangements with profit or non-profit private technical institutes, private postsecondary education institutions, and employers to provide for educational training.

Conditions

Each LEA and postsecondary institution must first serve schools that have the *highest percentages of economically disadvantaged and low English proficiency students and are offering programs in greatest need of improvement.*

The state board shall assess local programs on the basis of their ability to provide: 1) strong experience in and understanding of all aspects of the industry the student is preparing to enter; and 2) strong development and use of problem-solving skills and basic and advanced academic skills (math, reading, writing, science, and social studies) in the technological setting.

No funds will be provided to a project in a school unless the state and local effort per student in that school equals or exceeds the per student effort for the preceding year.

For each project receiving federal funds, the state must determine whether:

- academic education and ATE are being properly coordinated;
- schools are offering coherent sequences of courses leading to occupational skills;
- both academic and occupational competencies are acquired by students completing such courses;
- access is provided to programs of good quality for students who are economically disadvantaged, students with handicaps, and students of limited English proficiency;
- equipment, facilities, supplies, curriculum development and teacher education are modern.

A local system of standards for performance and measures of performance for applied technology education programs must be *developed and implemented.*

Sex Equity

Each state agency will appoint one person to administer the sex equity program and the program for single parents, homemakers, and displaced homemakers.

This administrator will develop the plan; manage and monitor distribution of funds; assure access of handicapped, disadvantaged and LEP individuals; gather data; review programs for sex stereotyping and bias; review actions of the state board to assure "needs of women are addressed; develop programs of information and out-

reach; provide technical assistance to LEAs; and assist administrators in increasing access for women.

ATE programs for single parents, homemakers and displaced homemakers must provide preparatory services, basic literacy training, dependent care, and transportation.

Performance

Each state must develop and implement a system of "standards for performance and measures of performance for applied technology education at the state level."

Each system must contain:

- 1) Measures of learning gains and competency gains.
- 2) One or more of the following performance measures:
 - Competency attainment;
 - Job or work skill attainment or enhancement;
 - Retention in school or completion of secondary school;
 - Articulation into additional training, additional education, or military service.
- 3) Incentives or adjustments designed to encourage service to targeted groups or special populations.
- 4) Procedures for the utilization of existing resources developed in other programs receiving federal assistance.

Special Programs

In addition to the basic state grant, the following special programs were authorized:

- \$15 million for community-based organizations;
- \$40 million for consumer and home-making education;
- \$30 million for career guidance and counseling;
- \$20 million for business-education partnerships.

Tech-Prep

A separate line item of \$200 million was authorized to fund Tech Prep (2+2) articulation.

Equipment/facilities

An authorization of \$100 million is provided for a *new program* of Improvement of Facilities and Acquisition of Equipment. This would authorize the secretary of education to make grants di-

-----continued on page 6

Schedule of Activities for the Annual Update of the Master Plan for Vocational Education

June 10, 1989 Action on proposed responses to recommendations from the Texas Council on Vocational Education that impact the Master Plan.

September 8, 1989 Proposed draft of the annual update of the Master Plan submitted to the State Board of Education for discussion.

October 12, 1989 Proposed annual update to the Master Plan submitted to the Joint Liaison Committee for review and recommendations.

October 13, 1989 Public Hearing before the State Board of Education and invited members of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on the proposed annual update of the Master Plan.

October 26-27, 1989 Review of public testimony and recommendations of the Texas Council on Vocational Education regarding the proposed annual update of the postsecondary and adult sections of the Master Plan by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

October 26-27, 1989 Action on proposed annual update of the postsecondary and adult sections of the Master Plan by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

November 11, 1989 Review of public testimony and recommendations of the Texas Council on Vocational Education regarding the proposed annual update of the Master Plan by the State Board of Education.

November 11, 1989 Action on proposed annual update of Master Plan by the State Board of Education. Approved changes to the Master Plan would be effective with the 1990-91 school year.

July SBOE Activities

The State Board of Education (SBOE), during its July 8th meeting, considered several items impacting vocational education.

The Board adopted, on an emergency basis, the reinstatement of funding eligibility for junior high CVAE. Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff was instructed to develop an application process to make every effort to assure that five criteria be met by school districts in order to be eligible for 89-90 funding. Those five criteria are: (1) limited to districts where CVAE is identified in a district's plan for alternatives to social promotion; (2) students will be placed in CVAE programs based upon their individually assessed needs, interests, and abilities; (3) an educational plan is developed for each participating student; (4) a process is developed to ensure close coordination between the general and vocational components of the program; and (5) a process is developed and implemented for monitoring a student's academic and vocational progress and exit provisions. The Board instructed staff to begin the processes; however, they were instructed to delay approval until after the Legislative Education Board met.

The Board adopted on First Reading and Filing Authorization proposed amendments to 19 TAC 141.453, Specific Requirements for Provisional Vocational Certificates Based on Experience and Preparation in Skill Areas. These amendments condense office education certification into one certificate and delete the option for non-degreed individuals to qualify for office education.

Proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 141, Subchapter L, Certification for Special Service Positions and 19 TAC 141.297, Special Assignment Permits: Specific Requirements were adopted on Second Reading by the Board. The changes amend the teaching experience requirement for vocational counselor and vocational supervisor certification to accept classroom teaching experience in any approved vocational program identified in 19 TAC Chapter 75. The amendment to 141.297 (g) (3) (B) reads as follows: (g)(3)(B) . . . three years of successful [public-school] teaching experience in an approved vocational education program identified in Chapter 75 of this title (relating to Curriculum) or three years of public school experience as certified vocational counselor, or a combination of both. [preparing students for gainful employment. Supervisors of homemaking education programs are not required to have the three years of teaching experience in a vocational education program preparing students for gainful employment.]

The Board continued to review the Mission Statement, Goals, and Objectives for the Long-Range Plan for Public Education. Previous discussions by the Committee on Long-Range Planning have yielded the inclusion of vocational education in the Mission Statement. The following sentence has been added to the Mission Statement: *Students will be provided the opportunity to develop vocational skills and to apply knowledge to life situations. ###*

Coordinating Board Approves New Degrees

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on July 14, 1989 approved the following Associate of Applied Science degrees in technical and vocational education programs: Cooke County College, A.A.S. in *Electronic Engineering Technology* and A.A.S. in *Electronics Technology*; Houston Community College, A.A.S. in *Safety and Environmental Technology*; Kilgore College, A.A.S. in *Legal Assisting*; Midland College, A.A.S. in *Veterinary Technology*; North Harris County College, A.A.S. in *Airframe and Power Plant Technician*; Northeast Texas Community College,

A.A.S. in *Nursing*; San Jacinto College - North, A.A.S. in *Legal Assisting*; and Tyler Junior College, A.A.S. in *Emergency Technology*.

The Board also approved on final consideration an amendment to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Subchapter D, Chapter 9, and Subchapter B, Chapter 11 regarding qualification and professional growth of faculty.

----- continued on page 6

LEB Blasts SBOE on July CVAE Decision

SBOE strongly urged to reconsider position

The Legislative Education Board (LEB), a ten-member legislative oversight body chaired by Speaker Gib Lewis with Lieutenant Governor Bill Hobby serving as vice chair, strongly urged the State Board of Education (SBOE) to reconsider its actions regarding the restoration of vocational allotment funding for the 7-8th grade Coordinated Vocational Academic Education program during a meeting of the LEB held on July 13.

The meeting, termed by observers as a "trip to the woodshed", was initiated by the SBOE's decision to restore funding for the junior high school CVAE program for the 89-90 school year. The previous appointed SBOE had rendered decisions which would have eliminated vocational funding for the program, conceptually designed to serve academically disadvantaged and at-risk students, effective September 1, 1989.

The LEB, citing their perception that CVAE was merely a "dumping ground" for low-achieving students, in most urgent and threatening language called for the SBOE to reconsider their position in light of the demonstrated opposition by the LEB.

Hobby openly questioned Chairman Monte Hasie's commitment to quality education and whether the chairman was fulfilling his oath of office. After the meeting, Hobby called for Hasie's resignation and those of other SBOE members who support the CVAE proposal. Hobby said the actions of the elected board raised questions about the future of the 1984 reforms.

"When the voters turned down the continuation of an appointed board, that was a step backwards," said Hobby, who actively campaigned for the continuation of an appointed State Board of Education.

The CVAE funding issue had been brought up in the regular legislative session, passing the House with one dissenting vote, before stalling in the Senate, where Hobby presides, without a hearing.

Chairman Hasie, when informed of Hobby's call for his resignation, said, "To say that I'm against quality education - I'm real sorry he (Hobby) said that."

In justification of the Board's action Hasie said, "I'm hopeful that we can have a program in the junior high level that will be for kids that are in danger of dropping out because of the fact we have 87,000 kids dropping out and over half of them are at the junior high level."

Hasie indicated that he would bring the issue back before the SBOE for further discussion. #####

T/COVE's Justification For CVAE Recommendation

Editors Note: The following is excerpted from the Council's report to the State Board of Education in justification of its recommendation on 7-8th grade CVAE.

A February 1989 Council survey of school districts offering these courses at this level found CVAE (Coordinated Vocational Academic Education) very much at risk of being eliminated, if not this year, certainly after the 1989-90 school year. CVAE cannot survive at the same funding rate as general and/or compensatory education courses, which will be the only state dollar revenue sources available after September 1. Other courses at grades 7-8 can survive.

CVAE, as with any vocational program, is not a panacea for motivating or keeping students in school, but it is a viable option exercised by 14 percent of the state's school districts that offer vocational, for use with or independent of other initiatives, to serve educationally disadvantaged and at-risk students.

The Master Plan calls for CVAE at grades 7-8 to be phased into "alternatives to social promotion." Neither the Plan, nor Board rules, call for CVAE to be eliminated from the public schools or to necessarily lose its identifiable name; therefore, the Council interprets "phase in" to mean CVAE will be made an optional component to alternatives to social promotion strategies to serve

at-risk students. The issue becomes one of whether CVAE can survive without the benefit of the higher state vocational funding rate.

CVAE has been characterized as ineffective, a dumping ground for minorities and the poor, and a tracking system that keeps educationally disadvantaged students out of the education mainstream. None of these allegations have been substantiated. An independent study of high school CVAE completed last summer, the results of which can parallel the junior high level, diffuses the allegations, recommends the program's continuance, and outlines improvements that can be made.

Local school officials feel very strongly that CVAE at grades 7-8 contributes to reducing school dropouts. The independent study of high school level CVAE indicates that programs of this nature are keeping students in school.

Reaching out to special needs students is a complex proposition, requiring a myriad of programs and strategies. CVAE is just one strategy, but it is a concept that can be improved and built upon, rather than abandoned. Other approaches must be developed with diligence, commitment, and expediency. #####

SBOE Responds To T/COVE Report

T/COVE presented to the State Board of Education (SBOE) in May its annual evaluation report on issues assigned by the SBOE. The evaluation topics for the 1989 report were the same topics assigned for 1988:

1. Assess the extent to which the reforms articulated in the Master Plan for Vocational Education are accomplishing their intended purpose; and
2. Assess the impact of vocational education restructuring on local education agencies.

The Council submitted an initial assessment of the Master Plan's impact on local schools to the SBOE in June 1988. The initial assessment was conducted during the second half of the 87-88 school year, a time when the SBOE had not yet finalized its rules (e.g., curriculum, priority occupations, funding) to implement the Master Plan.

The Council chose to focus its 88-89 efforts on four issues which, due to the adoption of implementation rules, became areas of concern. The four issues were: 1. the eligibility of courses for voc ed funding; 2. the prioritization of courses for funding; 3. identifying priority occupations; and 4. regionalization of vocational education. The following are T/COVE's recommendations and the related SBOE responses to those recommendations.

Issue #1: Eligibility of courses for voc ed funding

a. Amend the eligibility rule for the state vocational education allotment to include CVAE at grades 7-8. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted with conditions. TEA staff was directed to develop proposed rule changes which would limit the funding of 7-8 Grade CVAE programs to those programs that are identified in a district's plan for alternatives to social promotion. The plan shall provide that: (1) students will be placed in CVAE programs based on their individual assessed needs, interests, and abilities; (2) an educational plan is developed for each participating student; (3) a process is developed and implemented to ensure close coordination between the general and vocational education components of the program; and (4) a process is developed and implemented for monitoring a student's academic and vocational progress and exit provisions.*

b. Clarify the eligibility of CVAE at grades 7-8 for federal vocational education funds. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted*

c. Target curriculum development funds linking CVAE with general education and other strategies to serve at-risk students, using a portion of the \$200,000 in federal funds authorized by the Board in March 1989 to develop alternatives to social promotion programs at grades 7-8. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Rejected*

Issue #2: Priorities of courses for funding.

a. Delete the section of Board rule that groups vocational courses into four priority funding categories. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted for funding purposes but rejected for purposes of providing direction to school districts for program devel-*

opment.

b. Develop a Board rule that identifies the regional planning process as the umbrella for identifying, validating, and justifying local requests for courses that address Master Plan initiatives, list of priority occupations, and other regional/local needs; delay implementation of rule until regional planning comes on line. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Rejected*

c. Delete the section of Board rule that would eliminate state vocational allotment funds for certain courses should local requests exceed available revenues, as this rule runs counter to current law regarding the foundation school program. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted*

d. Utilize proration of funds to school districts should changes occur in legislative appropriations process that would make the vocational line item funding level a "sum certain" and requests for courses exceed available state dollars. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Rejected*

Issue #3: Identifying priority occupations

a. List of priority occupations should include not only occupations identified through labor market data, but also new and emerging occupations, utilizing the best subjective judgement of the Board, with notations of occupations identified through means other than statistical validation. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted*

b. Utilize regional planning process, when it comes on line, as starting point in developing list of priority occupations. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Rejected*

c. Explore with Joint Committee the utilization of a list of priority occupations to impact postsecondary level. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted*

Issue #4: Regionalization of vocational education

a. Utilize the 24 planning regions designated by the Governor as the boundaries for the integrated regional planning system envisioned in the Master Plan. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted as a matter of law.*

b. Limit initial state mandates to be imposed on regional planning committees; however, in order to facilitate state level comparisons, validations, and program approval it is imperative that the regions follow uniform guidelines regarding committee composition, data gathering, needs analysis, program planning, and reporting. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted*

c. Utilize the Joint Committee to keep board level members of the three agencies apprised of and involved in guiding staff work in developing regional planning. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted*

d. Target September 1, 1990, as the date for full implementation of a regional planning system. **SBOE RESPONSE:** *Accepted with the understanding that all regions may not be able to have full implementation at that time and may need an additional year. ###*

**7th - 8th
Grade CVAE
Given
Conditional
Funding
Approval**

Senate Initiates Its Efforts On Perkins

Subcommittee plans to draft its own version of the bill

The Senate Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee opened its hearings on S.1109, a bill which will serve as the Senate's vehicle for the reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, on June 22.

The June 22 hearing included, in its' first panel, testimony from Education Secretary Lauro Cavazos; John Wirt, director of ED's National Assessment of Vocational Education; William Gainer, director of the General Accounting Office's employment and education issues division; and, Joyce Winterton, Executive Director of the National Council on Vocational Education. The second panel included Don Bright, president of AVA; Moody Oswald, Vocational Education Director-South Carolina; Martha Lawrence, Chairperson of Iowa's State Council on Vocational Education; and, Franklin Walter, Ohio's Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Though the Senate may share some of the concerns expressed by the House, the Senate plans to develop its own bill for reauthorization. Subcommittee staff direc-

tor David Evans said the Senate hearings will not be a forum of debate on H.R. 7.

The Senate plans to call for at least seven hearings on S.1109 — three in Washington, D.C., and field hearings in Kansas, Rhode Island, Vermont and Illinois — before the subcommittee marks up the bill in September, after the Congressional summer recess. Hearings in Washington, D.C., will resume on July 20. #####

Coordinating Board

continued from page 3

The Board postponed until the October meeting final consideration of an amendment to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Subchapter D, Chapter 9, regarding admission to a public community/junior college due to pending legal review. #####

House Proposal

continued from page 2

rectly to LEAs in *economically depressed areas* to improve facilities and acquire or lease equipment. Fifty percent of the grants are to be made in rural areas and 50 percent in urban areas.

Data

The bill creates an Applied Technology Education Data System and provides that the National Assessment of Educational Progress shall provide data on vocational education and the National Diffusion Network will carry vocational education information. The National Assessment of Vocational Education is permanently authorized. #####

*Will Reece, Executive Director
Kerry L. Horn, Program Officer
Val Blaschke, Admin. Technician
Selena Calley, Secretary*

T/COVE - (512) 463-5490

Texas Council on Vocational Education *
P. O. Box 1886
Austin, Texas 78767

William E. Zinsmeyer
Chairman, 1988-89

San Antonio
Hank S. Brown
Vice Chairman
San Antonio

Gary O. Boren
Chairman, 1986-87
Lubbock

Shirlene S. Cook
Beaumont

John C. Cox
Houston

Jim N. Hutchins
Estelline

Helen Soto Knaggs
Austin

Filomena Leo
La Joya

Ted Martinez, Jr.
Dallas

George F. Matott
Chairman, 1987-88
Austin

Joe Pentony
Houston

Donna Price
Houston

Talmadge D. Steinke
Waco

POSTMASTER: Address correction requested.

* Known under state law as The Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education in Texas