AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

H.R. 4496, THE VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE ACT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

June 15, 2004

Serial No. 108-62

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/house
or
Committee address: http://edworkforce.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

94-193 PDF WASHINGTON : 2004

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin, *Vice Chairman*
Cass Ballenger, North Carolina
Peter Hoekstra, Michigan
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, California
Michael N. Castle, Delaware
Sam Johnson, Texas
James C. Greenwood, Pennsylvania
Charlie Norwood, Georgia
Fred Upton, Michigan
Vernon J. Ehlers, Michigan
Jim DeMint, South Carolina
Johnny Isakson, Georgia
Judy Biggert, Illinois
Todd Russell Platts, Pennsylvania
Patrick J. Tiberi, Ohio
Ric Keller, Florida
Tom Osborne, Nebraska
Joe Wilson, South Carolina
Tom Cole, Oklahoma
Jon C. Porter, Nevada
John Kline, Minnesota
John R. Carter, Texas
Marilyn N. Musgrave, Colorado
Marsha Blackburn, Tennessee
Phil Gingrey, Georgia
Max Burns, Georgia

George Miller, California
Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
Major R. Owens, New York
Donald M. Payne, New Jersey
Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
Lynn C. Woolsey, California
Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Carolyn McCarthy, New York
John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Dennis J. Kucinich, Ohio
David Wu, Oregon
Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Susan A. Davis, California
Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Danny K. Davis, Illinois
Ed Case, Hawaii
Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Denise L. Majette, Georgia
Chris Van Hollen, Maryland
Tim Ryan, Ohio
Timothy H. Bishop, New York

Paula Nowakowski, *Staff Director*
John Lawrence, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM

MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware, *Chairman*

Tom Osborne, Nebraska, *Vice Chairman*
James C. Greenwood, Pennsylvania
Fred Upton, Michigan
Vernon J. Ehlers, Michigan
Jim DeMint, South Carolina
Judy Biggert, Illinois
Todd Russell Platts, Pennsylvania
Ric Keller, Florida
Joe Wilson, South Carolina
Marilyn N. Musgrave, Colorado
John A. Boehner, Ohio, *ex officio*

Lynn C. Woolsey, California
Susan A. Davis, California
Danny K. Davis, Illinois
Ed Case, Hawaii
Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Dennis J. Kucinich, Ohio
Chris Van Hollen, Maryland
Denise L. Majette, Georgia
George Miller, California, *ex officio*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on June 15, 2004	1
Statement of Members:	
Castle, Hon. Michael N., Chairman, Subcommittee on Education Reform, Committee on Education and the Workforce	1
Prepared statement of	3
Woolsey, Hon. Lynn, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Education Reform, Committee on Education and the Workforce	4
Statement of Witnesses:	
Lufkin, Mimi, Executive Director, National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, Cochranville, Pennsylvania	20
Prepared statement of	22
Oliver, Katharine, Assistant State Superintendent, Career, Technology and Adult Learning, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland	12
Prepared statement of	15
Sommers, Dr. Robert D., CEO, Butler Technology and Career Development Schools, Fairfield Township, Ohio	6
Prepared statement of	9
White, Robin, Senior Program and Policy Director, Academy for Educational Development, National Institute for Work and Learning, Washington, DC	26
Prepared statement of	28
Additional materials supplied:	
Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Statement submitted for the Record	46
United Tribes Technical College, Statement submitted for the Record	41

H.R. 4496, THE VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE ACT

Tuesday, June 15, 2004
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Education Reform
Committee on Education and the Workforce
Washington, DC

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:30 p.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael N. Castle [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Castle, Biggert, Woolsey, Davis, and Van Hollen.

Ex officio present: Representative Boehner.

Staff present: Kevin Frank, Professional Staff Member; Alexa Marrero, Press Secretary; Whitney Rhoades, Professional Staff Member; Deborah L. Samantar, Committee Clerk/Intern Coordinator; and Lynda Theil, Minority Legislative Associate, Education.

Chairman CASTLE. A quorum being present, the Subcommittee on Education Reform of the Committee on Education and the Workforce will come to order.

We are meeting today to hear testimony on H.R. 4496, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, and the Committee will recall, only statements are limited to the Chairman and the rights and minority member of the Subcommittee who is on her way here right now.

Therefore, if other members have statements, they may be included in the hearing record. With that, I ask you now to consent that the hearing record remain open fourteen days to allow member statements and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record.

Without objection, so ordered.

STATEMENT OF HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Good afternoon to everybody here. Thank you for joining us today to hear testimony on H.R. 4496, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, which I introduced 2 weeks ago. This is our third hearing on the vocational and technical education, and first on this bill to re-authorize the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.

We look forward today to getting feedback from the education and Perkins community on the major provisions in the legislation.

The Perkins Act aims to prepare youth and adults for the future by building their academic and technical skills in preparation for post-secondary education and/or employment.

The bill we are examining today enhances Perkins by ensuring both secondary and post-secondary students receiving assistance through the program are acquiring rigorous academic and technical skills, and will have the opportunity to transition into further education and/or successful employment.

H.R. 4496 strengthens accountability by requiring that locals establish adjusted levels of performance to complement the state-adjusted levels of performance already in current law.

The state agency will evaluate annually whether the local recipient is making substantial progress in achieving the local adjusted levels of performance. Our goal is not to penalize those local areas facing difficulty in achieving high-quality outcome for their students, but to create a structure that includes technical assistance, opportunities for program improvement, and sanctions only as a last resort.

H.R. 4496 also folds a separate tech prep program activities and funding into the larger state grant. Under the bill, states will be expected to spend the same amount of money on tech prep activities as they did under the former stand-alone program. Through this re-authorization, we want to ensure that all state programs incorporate important lessons learned from the former separate grant program, and strengthen the ties between secondary and post-secondary education. Consortia that would receive funding under the state grant for tech prep activities must be effective programs that ensure that transfer of credits from secondary to post-secondary education, and provide non-duplicative academic and vocational and technical education.

The bill also requires states to establish model sequences of courses to emphasize further student academic and vocational and technical achievement. Sequences of courses will incorporate a non-duplicative progression of both secondary and post-secondary elements, which would include both academic and vocational and technical content.

Local recipients at both the secondary and post-secondary level would adopt at least one model sequence of courses as developed by the state. I believe this also will help drive program improvements by ensuring that states clarify the progression of academic and vocational and technical courses needed for the post-secondary education and training or employment of a student's choice.

As a result of the changes in the bill, I believe that H.R. 4496 would help states, community colleges, and other post-secondary education institutions and local educational agencies better utilize funds for vocational and technical education programs, increase accountability, emphasize student achievement, and strengthen opportunities for coordination.

We welcome the testimony of our witnesses as we seek to ensure that the re-authorization of the Perkins Act achieves those goals.

Our panel today represents state and local educators and a researcher, who will share with us their experiences at operating and

evaluating vocational and technical education programs. And we do thank you for joining us today, and we do appreciate hearing their insights.

In just a moment, we will begin with the introductions, but first I will yield to the ranking member, Ms. Woolsey, for any statements she may wish to make.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Castle follows:]

Statement of the Hon. Michael N. Castle, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education Reform, Committee on Education and the Workforce

Good afternoon. Thank you for joining us today to hear testimony on H.R. 4496, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, which I introduced two weeks ago. This is our third hearing on vocational and technical education and first on this bill to reauthorize the Carl. D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act. We look forward today to getting feedback from the education and Perkins community on the major provisions in the legislation.

The Perkins Act aims to prepare youth and adults for the future by building their academic and technical skills in preparation for postsecondary education and/or employment. The bill we are examining today enhances Perkins by ensuring both secondary and postsecondary students receiving assistance through the program are acquiring rigorous academic and technical skills and will have the opportunity to transition into further education and/or successful employment.

H.R. 4496 strengthens accountability by requiring that locals establish adjusted levels of performance, to complement the state adjusted levels of performance already in current law. The state agency will evaluate annually whether the local recipient is making substantial progress in achieving the local adjusted levels of performance. Our goal is not to penalize those local areas facing difficulty in achieving high quality outcomes for their students, but to create a structure that includes technical assistance, opportunities for program improvement, and sanctions only as a last resort.

H.R. 4496 also folds the separate Tech–Prep program activities and funding into the larger state grant. Under the bill, states still will be expected to spend the same amount of money on tech-prep activities as they did under the former stand-alone program. Through this reauthorization, we want to ensure that all state programs incorporate important lessons learned from the former separate grant program and strengthen the ties between secondary and postsecondary education. Consortia that would receive funding under the state grant for tech-prep activities must be effective programs that ensure the transfer of credits from secondary to postsecondary education and provide non-duplicative, academic and vocational and technical education.

The bill also requires states to establish model sequences of courses to emphasize further student academic and vocational and technical achievement. Sequences of courses will incorporate a non-duplicative progression of both secondary and postsecondary elements, which would include both academic and vocational and technical content. Local recipients at both the secondary and postsecondary level would adopt at least one model sequence of courses as developed by the state. I believe this also will help drive program improvements by ensuring that states clarify the progression of academic and vocational and technical courses needed for the postsecondary education and training or employment of a student's choice.

As a result of the changes in the bill, I believe that H.R. 4496 would help states, community colleges and other postsecondary education institutions, and local educational agencies better utilize funds for vocational and technical education programs, increase accountability, emphasize student achievement, and strengthen opportunities for coordination.

We welcome the testimony of our witnesses as we seek to ensure that the reauthorization of the Perkins Act achieves these goals. Our panel today represents state and local educators and a researcher who will share with us their experiences in operating and evaluating vocational and technical education programs. We thank you for joining us today and appreciate your insights.

I will now yield to Congresswoman Woolsey for any opening statement she may have.

STATEMENT OF HON. LYNN WOOLSEY, RANKING MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being late. I appreciate that we are having this hearing, but I wish we had had a little more time to review the bill before it was introduced. I do believe, though, that we have heard from your staff and from you that there is still time to make some changes in it, and that, from the testimony we hear today, we may craft an even better bill.

Chairman CASTLE. Yes. Sorry.

[Laughter.]

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you.

Chairman CASTLE. That was my cue.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That was your cue. I am particularly pleased to have Mimi Lufkin as one of our witnesses. Mimi has been working tirelessly for years on one of the issues that is most important to me as we re-authorize the Perkins Act, and that's the Access for Special Populations Vocational and Technical Training, particularly for women in non-traditional careers. Mimi is the national leader on these issues and, not coincidentally, she is a product of Sonoma County, which is one of my counties, and a product of our great schools up there. And her parents still live there, and welcome, Mimi.

I'm very glad that H.R. 4496 uses current law as its foundation. I've been very concerned by proposals made by this administration to turn the Federal Vocational and Technical Education programs into post-secondary programs only. While I'm fully aware that many, many occupations these days require some post-secondary education—in fact, the great majority—we must not lose sight of the important role that Perkins funding has and will play in helping to prepare students for jobs following their graduation from high school.

Not every high school student is ready to go directly on to higher education following graduation. Many who want to simply don't have the money to do so, and career training can prepare them for jobs that earn good salaries in order to finance further learning down the road. So we don't want to cut them short by not giving them that extra help.

Some students are just not ready to spend additional time in a post-secondary school and, again, good career training ensures that we don't lose these students completely while they take a breath and get their bearings as an independent adult, and learn how important it is to get a higher education.

You can be fairly sure, Mr. Chairman, that young people who get started on a decent job, a job that leads to a career, will return to school at some point during their lives, usually because they want to, and/or because their career demands it.

So I want to make sure that any re-authorization of the Perkins Act clearly allows funding of good vocational and technical education programs, even if they do not necessarily provide a degree, and that Perkins funds can be used for counseling and educational materials for high school students for careers following high school.

I also have a number of concerns, as I said earlier. One, about increasing access and support for special populations, and also for training women for non-traditional occupations. I saw that the accountability measure, which requires states to report on the success in preparing students for non-traditional occupations, is not in this bill. But I understand that it will be put back in by the time we come up to mark-up. I think that's very important. It's important to me because it also is the very least of what we should be doing to improve career choices and earnings for women. More than half of the workforce are female. Many of them—many, many of them—supporting families. And it only makes good sense to ensure that they are being prepared to earn a wage and receive benefits that keep their families independent of Federal subsidies.

So I look forward to hearing from all of our witnesses, and to continuing to work with you, Mr. Chairman, so that we can report a re-authorization bill out of this wonderful Subcommittee that really meets the needs of all of our vocational and technical education students.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Ms. Woolsey, for your nice words. Hopefully we can still say nice words when we get all this said and done here in a few weeks or months or whatever it takes.

We do indeed have a very distinguished panel of witnesses, as we mentioned, and we do thank each of you for coming today. And, at this time, I will introduce and welcome the Chairman of the full Committee of Education and Workforce, the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman Boehner, to introduce our first witness.

Mr. BOEHNER. Thank you, Chairman Castle. It's my pleasure to welcome all of you on the witness panel, but, specifically, to introduce Dr. Bob Sommers. Dr. Sommers is the CEO of Butler Technology and Career Development Schools in Butler County, Ohio, and has been since 2001. And in this capacity, Dr. Sommers is directly responsible for leadership of a school with more than 6700 high school students and more than 7800 adult students annually.

Major accomplishments of the district under Dr. Sommers' leadership include improvements in student and organizational performance, program expansion in high-end career technical programs, including teacher education and biotechnology, as well as a growth of enrollment in both the high school and adult programs.

Prior to this position, Dr. Sommers was the associate director in the Office of Career Technical and Adult Education for the Ohio Department of Education. And, as I said before, Butler Tech is located in my home county, and I certainly appreciate the great work that Dr. Sommers is doing with vocational and technical education in southwest Ohio.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Chairman Boehner, and welcome, Dr. Sommers, pleased to have you here.

Our second witness will be Mrs. Katherine Oliver, and she, Mrs. Oliver, is the Assistant State Superintendent for Career, Technology and Adult Learning. She leads the division of the Maryland State Department of Education dedicated to excellence and innovation in career and technology education and adult education. Mrs. Oliver serves on a variety of local, state and national advisory boards relating to education, and workforce development and par-

ticipates in numerous professional organizations associated with career and technology education and adult learning.

Ms. Mimi Lufkin has already been mentioned by the ranking member. Actually, you were identified as a product of Sonoma County—I thought you were some kind of wine there for a minute. I wasn't sure what we were dealing with.

Ms. LUFKIN. Oh, gee.

Chairman CASTLE. But she is currently the Executive Director for the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, with the acronym NAPE. The organization is a consortium of state agencies providing national leadership and equity in education and workforce development. As the Executive Director for the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, Ms. Lufkin manages the organization's activities, publishes an electronic newsletter and website, plans an annual professional development institute, and presents at other national organization conferences.

And our clean-up hitter will be Ms. Robin White, who has worked on the design, implementation, and evaluation of education requirement improvement efforts for almost 20 years. As Senior Program and Policy Director for the Academy for Educational Development, the National Institute for Work and Learning, Ms. White specializes in program evaluation as well as technical assistance and capacity building relating to research evaluation and performance measurement. From 2000 to 2004, Ms. White served as co-director and lead author of the National Assessment of Vocational Educational Funding and Accountability Study. Prior to joining AED, Ms. White designed and directed school reform efforts in urban high schools and middle schools, and led state-wide school reform efforts through positions with the Connecticut Business for Education Coalition and the Commission on Educational Excellence for Connecticut.

And we welcome and thank all of you again for being here.

Before the witnesses begin to testify, I would like to remind the members that we will be asking questions after the entire panel has testified. In addition, Committee Rule 2 imposes a 5-minute limit on all questions. And I think you have had the rules explained to you as well. You have 5 minutes, you have little lights there, green for four, yellow for one, red—until it all stops somehow or another.

[Laughter.]

Chairman CASTLE. And we really do appreciate your being here. After that, we will go back and forth and take turns asking questions. And we look forward to your testimony.

And Dr. Sommers, we're going to start off with you, sir.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. SOMMERS, CEO, BUTLER TECHNOLOGY AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS, FAIRFIELD TOWNSHIP, OHIO

Dr. SOMMERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Woolsey, and Representative Boehner. I appreciate the introduction. And also, the other members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of House Rule, or House Resolution 4496.

I share my remarks on behalf of the Butler Tech Board of Education and the nearly 15,000 students who participate in our high school and adult education programs. H.R. 4496 is critical to America's continued global competitiveness. The Act builds on the academic foundation established by the No Child Left Behind Act, and provides our nation's youth and adults with the opportunity to acquire knowledge and skills essential to their economic productivity.

The Act recognizes the importance of rigorous academics and the importance of technical skills on our future generation's success. Butler Tech students receive a college prep plus curriculum, a combination of rigorous academics plus rigorous career technical education, thus preparing them to be lifelong learners and economically productive citizens.

H.R. 4496 is a catalyst for assuring students receive rigorous, challenging academic and technical instruction. The proposed changes embodied in H.R. 4496 are consistent with our business and education communities' request. The following are important, are improvements that we strongly endorse.

The first is the inclusion of "rigorous and challenging" in the purpose statement, two, including baccalaureate degree-based programs in the vocational definition, eliminating the separate tech prep provisions and blending these concepts into all programs, establishing consequences for institutions showing poor student performance, requiring the establishment of local accountability targets, and continued support of career information, so that we can assure youth and adults choose their careers based on good information, and not on the latest television series.

While the proposed re-authorization is a great start, there are some minor adjustments that would further improve it. I share these points in my written testimony.

I would also encourage you to consider several breakthrough provisions that could move career technical education forward more quickly. I outline several in my written testimony, but one is worth noting here.

Student performance is very important, but the next generation of performance measures will have to include measures of program efficiency. Cost per pupil is no longer a meaningful measure. Reporting the cost of performance more accurately measures the efficiency by linking expenditures to student performance. This concept is too new to incorporate into current reporting systems, but we would call for voluntary involvement in the creation of what Butler Tech refers to as the Kalmus Ratio. The Kalmus Ratio is the intersect between student performance and expenditures.

The quality and completeness of accountability issues is the most important issue facing Congress. If you get the accountability system right, everything else will occur naturally. Performance measures are the new leadership tool for Congress. If you provide clear performance expectations, local flexibility in program design, educators, parents, and business leaders will create outstanding educational experiences.

Overall, the proposed accountability system is on target, and an improvement over the Perkins Act version. Some areas needing additional attention include the following: most of the measures are

results-oriented, but the one asking us to report college credit earned by high school students is not. Research shows that college credit acquisition at the high school level is highly correlated to college attendance, and therefore that credit measure is redundant to the higher education attendance rate measure.

Keep your focus on the higher attendance rate, and we'll make sure that programs are designed to seek not only college credit, but many other activities that are highly correlated with higher education attendance.

The current Perkins legislation supports secondary schools serving high school students, adult workforce education, and also community colleges. The performance measures adequately address secondary and credit-based programming, but they fail to fully address customized training or short-term skill upgrade programs.

And, finally, the state and local negotiations regarding performance levels should be changed to an every-other-year process. As a local education leader, I strongly endorse the provisions requiring locals to establish performance improvement goals, but I think an every-other-year process would be better.

Finally, I'd ask, as you craft this legislation, you remember some key things. First, stay the course on the accountability system. Let the states build on what they've worked on in Perkins, and advance into the future. Be sure the accountability system maintains a strong career technical component. No Child Left Behind addresses academics, let this legislation add career technical competence to the public education agenda. After all, rigorous and challenging academics are necessary but no longer sufficient for citizens to be productive.

Demand more from American education by expecting rigorous and challenging academics for all students, and high-quality career technical education for those who choose to participate. Support strong state leadership, and, finally, provide help for creating a new generation of career technical education assessments that are valid, reliable, rigorous, and highly correlated with needs.

If you do all those things, we'll have a good piece of legislation that will advance not only career technical education, but the citizens of this country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Sommers follows:]

Statement of Dr. Robert D. Sommers, CEO, Butler Technology and Career Development Schools, Fairfield Township, Ohio

Introduction

On behalf of the Butler Technology and Career Development Schools Board of Education and the over 14,000 southwestern Ohio citizens that participate in Butler Tech high school and adult programs, thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 4496 Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act. This act is critical to America's continued global competitiveness. The act builds on the rigorous and challenging academic foundation established by the No Child Left Behind Act and supports the development of high quality essential technical skills. The act is important to our nation's economic success because rigorous academics are necessary, but no longer sufficient for individuals to be economically productive. Fewer and fewer jobs are available to individuals that are either academically ill-prepared or technically unskilled. Everywhere, the academic expectations are rising and so are the technical knowledge and skill requirements. The act clearly ends the notion that some students do not require strong academic instruction. Clearly, all students must have rigorous academic instruction. Butler Tech students receive what we refer to as a college prep plus curriculum... a combination of rigorous college academics PLUS the technical skills to make them economically productive. H.R. 4496 is the catalyst Congress can use to further advance the teaching of rigorous academics while providing for rigorous and relevant technical instruction.

The introduced draft of the reauthorization entitled "H.R. 4496, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act" is a solid start to the reauthorization process. The changes being proposed are consistent with the requests for improvement made by local business and education leaders who ultimately have to implement the legislation.

Changes worthy of support

I will begin with a brief overview of new provisions being proposed that clearly strengthen the career-technical legislation. These are significant changes which will result in improved services to America's youth and adults.

1. **Enhanced purpose statement** – The inclusion of "rigorous and challenging" to the purpose statement is a clear message of the importance of premier educational experiences. We should expect nothing less for our citizens.
2. **New definition** – Including careers requiring more than an Associate's Degree is a fundamental and important step forward for career-technical education. Many emerging high school and adult career-technical programs lead directly to careers requiring Bachelors degrees. Further, the definition finally ends the ill conceived notion that career-technical education is for students who were not college bound. My daughter, Lorraine Sommers, was a college preparatory honors student who took career-technical education courses while in high school. Her experiences in career-technical education gave her the edge as she attended The Ohio State University, graduated on time, and landed a high quality job with Agco Industries in Atlanta Georgia.
3. **Alignment with NCLB** – Aligning academic expectations for career-technical education with those in NCLB is a logical and reasonable step. Some caution must be expressed that NCLB academic standards are sometimes lower than business and industry expectations, but requiring at least NCLB levels of quality will not detract from local efforts to meet the more rigorous business expectations.
4. **Model sequences of courses** – The expectation for secondary and postsecondary collaboration on model sequences of courses is a solid provision in the proposed act. Curriculum that is aligned, seamless, and non-repetitive is critical to the efficiency and effectiveness of good career-technical programming. I would prefer to avoid the use of the word courses because it implies monitoring student progress by course taking rather than competence, but the concept is a good first step.
5. **Merger of Tech Prep into the mainstream** – Eliminating the separate Tech Prep provisions in the Perkins Act and blending the Tech Prep concepts into the new legislation is right on target with the more progressive career-technical programs in America. This change will assure elimination of unnecessary paperwork and duplicate bureaucracies while continuing the good qualities of Tech Prep programming in states that embraced the concept. It will further advance the importance of integrating academic and career-technical education and postsecondary linkages. One caution: the total funds available to support the infusion of Tech Prep into the mainstream MUST be equal to or greater than the current level of funding found in the basic grant PLUS the current Tech Prep funding. Every effort must be made to hold the total legislation at levels equal to or greater than the current levels. It would be inappropriate to expect states to expand the Tech Prep concepts while reducing overall support.
6. **Sanctions for poor performance** – The establishment of consequences for poor performance at the state and local level are critical to moving career-technical education quality forward. It is not a popular issue among educators, but it must occur if we are to disinvest in poor quality programming and support high quality programming. It further refines the legislation's already solid focus on student performance. Establishing annual performance targets at the local level are a positive and useful part of this provision. Local education providers must learn to set clear performance improvement targets annually. This provision in the bill will support this process and is consistent with major continuous improvement concepts.
7. **Continued support of career information** – Continued support of section 118 is central to our efforts to have students choose their careers based in good career information and not on the latest television series. Career information is vital to our fight to eliminate gender bias in the career selection process. Butler Tech invests significant resources in career development efforts and we rely heavily on the state services supported by section 118 in our work.
8. **Separation of secondary and postsecondary performance measures** – Separating the secondary and postsecondary performance measures makes clearer the Congressional intent of the legislation. Performance measures are the new leadership tool for Congress. Given the correct performance measures and local implementation flexibility, local educators, parents, and business leaders will create quality educational experiences.

Suggested improvements

While the proposed reauthorization is an outstanding start to legislative improvements, there are some minor adjustments that would further improve its chances of reforming career-technical education nationwide.

1. **Eliminate the word vocational** – The word vocational refers to specialized skill training related to a trade[1]. Although career-technical education does provide such training, it does much more. It provides instruction for the professions, such as teaching, and it is an outstanding methodology for delivering other knowledge and skills including academics. Leaving the word vocational in the legislation detracts from the positive and much needed advances embodied in career-technical programs and the act.
2. **Restore administration and leadership funding percentages** – Transferring more of the legislation's funds should sound appealing to a local education leader, but it is not. Great career-technical education has always required strong state leadership. In fact, many of the great reforms in education have come from state and federal leadership, not local action. The levels of funding for state administration and leadership must be maintained at their current percentage levels. The proposed 60% reduction at the same time you are asking states to take on more accountability is unacceptable.
3. **Restore the maintenance of effort provisions** – Reducing the maintenance of effort requirement will undermine the important state and local resources needed to accomplish the legislation's provisions. Some provision could be made to allow such reductions if they are comparable to overall education funding reductions, but no reduction should be automatically permissible.
4. **Don't limit career information to high-wage, high skill occupations** – Career information should be all encompassing and complete when provided to youth and adults. Putting a particular narrow focus on this information is tantamount to censorship. I would encourage members of Congress to recognize the intelligence of Americans to choose their careers once provided a full set of information. Generally, acquiring college information is the least of high school students' problems. They are inundated with this information on a regular basis. What they lack is good, complete career information and information about alternatives to college as a means for life long learning. Business and labor led opportunities for continued learning are especially hidden from youth and adults. Also remember there are many important high skill occupations that would not be considered high wage such as teaching. The proposed restrictions would seriously hamper local efforts to provide students with complete information.

Breakthrough opportunities

The following breakthrough concepts could further enhance the proposed act. I encourage you to explore inclusion of each of these in the reauthorized legislation.

1. **Support for career-technical assessments** – Advancements in academic assessments have dramatically improved our ability to guide local operations toward higher quality academic instruction. Career-technical education needs the same opportunity. Some provision should be made in the legislation to clearly support volunteer efforts to create high quality, valid end-of-course and end-of-program assessments focused on career-technical competence. These efforts should be encouraged to be national in scope so as to assure efficiency in production. Clearly, no state should be required to participate. These assessments should measure the extent to which students are able to
    a. Demonstrate understanding and application of essential technical content, terms, concepts, and procedures in a field of choice
    b. Find solutions to community problems and to perform necessary tasks
    c. Read, analyze, interpret, communicate, and use writing in a field of choice
    d. Apply the processes and skills of science to real world problems
    e. Use mathematics to solve problems encountered in a field of choice
2. **Clarify data collection options** – While the legislation is right on target regarding accountability; much of the data needed to report quality results is hidden from the local and state education community because of incorrect interpretations of the FERPA regulations. States like Florida have gotten it right when it comes to high quality, privacy protecting, data sharing systems. Their ability to report exceptionally high quality data with very low administrative costs is well documented. The legislation should do whatever is reasonable to support better data collection processes and at least provide some venue for best practice discussions among states.
3. **Encourage voluntary national benchmarking efforts** – Continuous improvement requires organizations to be able to benchmark their performance against other high quality schools. Butler Tech is struggling with the challenge of finding high quality student and process performance data on a national scale. The creation of a national benchmarking initiative could be a part of the national research agenda, thus providing a way for local education agencies and postsecondary institutions to connect with their colleagues around America. The result would be a voluntary effort to push program and organizational quality forward.
4. **Start an educational efficiency dialogue** – Student performance is very important and the legislation supports this notion. The next generation of performance however will have to include measures of program efficiency. The measurement of cost of performance is in its infancy and therefore must not be identified as a performance measure, but the legislation could call for voluntary involvement in the creation of what Butler Tech refers to as the Kalmus Ratio©. The Kalmus Ratio© is the intersect between student performance and expenditures. It is literally the cost per performance unit. It is a dramatic improvement over the outmoded cost per pupil which only rewards cost cutting regardless of impact on student performance. Standard and Poors has begun some work in this area as has Butler Technology and Career Development Schools.
5. **Address the nontraditional issue as an information problem** – Today's nontraditional gender enrollment problem is real and must be addressed. However, the problem now lies less in barriers to program participation and more in lack of quality information for young women and men. Too often, educators' desires to enroll young women in high skill technical programs are thwarted by young women's lack of good information about successful women in these careers. The new legislation should put especial focus on career information provisions for nontraditional careers. The legislation should encourage dissemination of career information, especially earnings possibilities, to parents as well.

---

[1] The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition

Local accountability

Although the rest of the legislation is important, the quality and completeness of the accountability provisions is the most important issue facing Congress. If you get the accountability system right, all the other mandated and permissive components will occur naturally.

The accountability system's measures must

a. Come from the act's purpose
b. Have funding support their improvement
c. Be concise and results oriented
d. Provide for comparison among providers and states
e. Be collectable
f. Must be tailored to the key customer and provider groups supported by the act

Further, the accountability system must

g. Result in consequences, both positive and negative, for locals and states that do not perform
h. Be applied system-wide
i. Be affordable

Purpose (a)

The purpose addresses academic, vocational, and technical skill attainment. The performance measures in the accountability provisions directly relate to these attainment objectives. Specifically, the secondary and postsecondary measures both contain provisions for academic attainment and career-technical attainment. Both must exist in the final act if the purpose is to be achieved.

Further, the transition measures of employment and higher education attendance are indicators of whether or not youth and adults received the prerequisite skills needed to be successful. These are spelled out at both the secondary and postsecondary levels to be

- Higher education attendance rate
- Employment
  - Civilian
  - military

These performance measures must exist in the final act. Some provision should be made for a composite "Positive post program" measure that recognizes success in multiple ways.

Funding (b)

It appears most of the funding is directly targeted to accomplishment of the performance measures and, in turn, the act's purpose. Bringing the Tech Prep funding into the basic grant further enhances the act's focus on accountability. Section 118 funding could be further aligned by including it within the basic grant comprehensive planning process rather than having it as a separate process.

I would encourage you to change the current method of distributing the performance incentive funds from the proposed Secretary of Education controlled process to one that directly sends funding to states and locals who improve performance. Let those who have figured out how to improve performance figure out how to spend the incentive funds!

Concise and results oriented (c)

The separation of the secondary and postsecondary measures has improved the concise nature of the measures. The author is to be commended for this approach. Most of the measures are results oriented, but the one related to higher education credit while in high school is not. Research shows that college credit acquisition at the high school level is highly correlated to college attendance after graduation. Therefore the credit measure is redundant to the higher education attendance rate measure. I strongly recommend eliminating the credit measure and focus schools like mine on the higher education attendance rate measure. Doing so will encourage us to seek college credit for our high school students PLUS do many other important activities that are also correlated to college attendance.

Comparable (d)

The current provisions in the act will make it very difficult to compare performance across states. This may be politically necessary, but every effort should be made to encourage states to work together to produce comparable data. At the very least, the secondary and postsecondary levels should be required to use career-technical assessments as the way to show career-technical competency attainment. These assessments could be written- or performance-based and could take advantage of industry credentialing.

Collectable (e)

Most of the measures being requested are very collectable for states with solid statewide data systems. The college credit measure would be problematic for many.

Tailored to the customer and provider group (f)

The current Perkins legislation supports three major educational delivery systems in most states

- secondary schools (high school students),
- adult workforce education (adults seeking industry certifications, retraining through non-credit courses, and customized business training).
- community colleges (credit seeking students and adults seeking retraining through non-credit courses), and

The performance measures address the secondary programs and high school students well.

The measures do not adequately address the adult workforce education systems operating in over 35 states. They could easily do so with some adjustment for non-credit coursework completion and success rates. Clarity about industry credentialing would also assist with this problem.

The measures do a solid job of addressing for-credit efforts at community colleges, but the non-credit side is not very well addressed. Further work is recommended.

Another alternative would be to decide whether or not you want the act to support training that is not directly tied to industry certification, credentialing or degree attainment. In some respects, focusing only on programs resulting in industry certifications, credentials, or degrees would assure clarity of purpose and would assure more adequate funding. WIA could be relied upon as the federal system for supporting other adult training.

Consequences (g)

The proposed language provides an invaluable provision for consequences if the local or state agency does not make performance progress. This provision was missing in the previous legislation and should result in more intense focus on student performance. The provisions requiring local education providers to establish annual performance improvement targets are an important and positive improvement. This provision was missing in the last legislation and left the states with little control over their own negotiated levels of performance.

I would strongly encourage an immediate provision for withholding funds from any local or state entity that cannot put a quality data system in place to provide the data required by the act. Any state that does not now have a quality data system in place after 5 years of Perkins should not receive continued support. It is a clear indication they are not serious about career-technical education.

Some will say this overreaches federal authority, but I would suggest locals and states should have data systems in place to monitor student performance regardless of federal legislation. Butler Tech is currently creating a data warehouse to address data needs that include all the measures in this legislative proposal and much more. We see no reason why all quality providers shouldn't be held to the same quality expectation for data systems.

Systemwide (h)

This issue does not appear to be addressed. I would encourage a provision that would require any recipient of funds from this act to be required to report performance data on all their programs. Without this provision, you will not be receiving a full picture of the quality of services provided by your fund recipients. Ohio has a long tradition of this approach the data collection. Again, this is an indication of seriousness about career-technical education. Locals and states not showing this seriousness, should not receive federal support.

Affordable (i)

This issue will always be debated, but I consider the accountability system being proposed a reasonable one. I would encourage a change in the negotiations process between the state and locals as a way of further improving affordability. The negotiations should be done every two years of the 6 year legislation. States that properly implemented the Perkins Act already have some form of negotiation process in place and thus the negotiation process should be able to start immediately upon reauthorization. States who are not adequately prepared to carry out the negotiations process should be provided immediate, intense technical assistance.

Critical recommendations

The following are critical recommendations for further enhancing the Perkins reauthorization proposed in H.R. 4496.

1. Stay the course on the accountability system. Make the minor adjustments recommended herein, but don't make dramatic changes. States are well positioned to produce high quality, reliable data. Locals are becoming increasingly savvy at turning data into actionable improvement. Let the systems put in place during the Perkins Act start to produce results.
2. Be sure the accountability system maintains a strong career-technical component. NCLB addressed academics, let the Future Act add career-technical competence to the public education agenda. After all, rigorous and challenging academics are necessary, but no longer sufficient for citizens to be productive. Demand more from American education by expecting strong academic and career-technical performance. The question should not be academics OR career-technical skills, because it is possible to acquire academic AND career-technical skills. Rigorous academics AND career-technical skills are vitally important to our citizenry.
3. Support strong state leadership. Ohio has great career-technical education because of visionary state leadership and a network of creative local leaders tied together by a state infrastructure.
4. Provide help for creating a new generation of career-technical assessments that are valid, reliable, rigorous, and highly correlated to industry needs.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Dr. Sommers.

Mrs. Oliver.

STATEMENT OF KATHERINE M. OLIVER, ASSISTANT STATE SUPERINTENDENT, CAREER, TECHNOLOGY AND ADULT LEARNING, MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Ms. OLIVER. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Woolsey, and members of the Subcommittee.

Thank you for this opportunity to highlight successes in Maryland's career and technology education system, and to express my

support specifically for the model sequences of courses as proposed in H.R. 4496.

You've heard about what my responsibilities are in Maryland, but, in addition, I'm also a member of the Independent Advisory Panel for the National Assessment of Vocational Education, and serve on the board of directors of the National Association of the State Directors of Career Technology Education Consortium.

My colleagues around the country and I commend you for the introduction of H.R. 4496, and support many of its recommended provisions. We believe the bill will ensure that our country can meet the needs of our education and economic systems by encouraging program improvement and innovation in career and technology education, while building on the successes of the current law.

Specifically, we applaud the updated definition of vocational-technical education as it better reflects today's CTE program, the strength and accountability provisions, and the alignment of tech prep under the basic state grant. We also strongly support the model sequence of courses as outlined in the bill. This will be the focus of my testimony today.

H.R. 4496 seeks to more fully develop the academic technical and employability skills of students, to promote rigorous course-taking and to increase linkages between secondary and post-secondary education. Model sequences of courses will help achieve these goals. Model sequences help students navigate the world of opportunity. They're like road maps that display the various routes for the journey to one's destination. They outline the classes necessary for high school graduation, and highlight the additional academic and CTE courses, as well as recommend other experiences, such as internships, that supplement classroom learning.

Model sequences of courses help students investigate a variety of career options, while developing the academic and technical knowledge required for post-high school success. In Maryland, students are required to develop a 4-year high school plan of study, that includes the steps to prepare for careers that are appropriate to individual interests and experiences.

Model sequences of courses help students as they develop this plan. They become a tool for parents to quickly and easily help their children make confident and informed decisions, and they serve as a tool, much like a compass, to make sure that students are headed in the right direction to achieve their goals.

Maryland has a long and successful history with career and technology education programs of study. The inclusion of model sequences in Federal legislation will allow us to take this initiative to scale. In 1989, the Maryland Commission on Vocational-Technical Education called for a new model of CTE that prepared students for both employment and further education.

Maryland has developed policies and procedures for state approval of local CTE programs. Only state-approved programs are eligible for state and Federal funding. This came about over a decade ago, when the Maryland State Board of Education identified the completion of an approved sequence of CTE courses as one of the capstone requirements to obtaining a Maryland high school di-

ploma, placing it on a par with completion of the admission requirements for entry into the state university system.

This designation has sent a very clear signal that state-approved CTE programs must be of sufficient academic rigor to prepare students for success in post-secondary education in the contemporary workplace. Our Maryland Higher Education Commission imposes a similar approval requirement for post-secondary CTE programs.

Project Lead the Way, pre-engineering program, is an instructional pathway that prepares students for further education and careers in engineering and engineering technology. It includes a model course matrix, including the required CTE courses, and the recommended academic and elective courses to complete a student's educational experience. It's provided in my written testimony.

A key factor in ensuring a quality CTE system is the important balance between state-approved programs of study and local control over the delivery and innovations of that program. In Maryland, a visionary panel for better schools recommended a voluntary state curriculum to guide local school system academic courses of development. Likewise, model sequence of courses can provide a framework for local CTE program development as well.

While the state directors of CTE and I are generally supportive of H.R. 4496, we do not and cannot support the proposed 60 percent cut in state and local administration funds. This cut is especially troublesome in light of increased responsibilities assigned to the state under the bill.

In conclusion, H.R. 4496 enables states to advance progress started under Perkins III, while promoting new innovations such as these model sequence of courses. These changes will drive improvement in CTE, and we think these model sequences will focus the Federal investment on effective programs that meet the needs of our students and economy. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Oliver follows:]

Statement of Katharine Oliver, Assistant State Superintendent, Career, Technology and Adult Learning, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Woolsey, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to highlight successes in Maryland's career and technology education (CTE) system, and to specifically express my support for model sequences of courses as proposed in H.R. 4496 — *Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act.* As the Assistant State Superintendent for Career Technology and Adult Learning at the Maryland State Department of Education, I am responsible for career and technology education, adult education and literacy services, and correctional education programs providing educational and library services to inmates in the State's adult prison program. I am also a member of the Independent Advisory Panel for the National Assessment of Vocational Education and serve on the Board of Directors of the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium.

CTE is a vital part of the nation's education system and is critical for economic and workforce development. In Maryland, over 100,000 students at the secondary level are enrolled in CTE programs. This represents fifty percent of all high school students. At the post-secondary level, over 50,000 students are enrolled. An additional 1,259 are enrolled in occupational programs through the state's correctional institutions. Maryland's CTE programs are delivered in a variety of settings in 24 local school systems which include nine technical high schools, fifteen career and technical centers, 220 comprehensive schools, sixteen community colleges, and nine correctional institutions.

BUILDING ON SUCCESS

My colleagues around the country and I commend you for the introduction of H.R. 4496 and support many of its recommended provisions. We believe the proposal seeks to ensure that our country can meet the demands of our education and economic systems by encouraging program improvement and innovation in CTE, while building on the successes of current law. We support the updated definition of vocational and technical education as it better reflects today's CTE programs. Removing the restriction to support only CTE programs that prepare students for careers that 'require less than baccalaureate degree' will do much to eliminate the stigma that CTE programs are preparing students for "dead-end jobs." We also strongly support the bold steps H.R. 4496 takes to strengthen accountability provisions and align Tech Prep under the Basic State Grant. Finally, we strongly support model sequences of courses as outlined in the bill; this will be the focus of my testimony today.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF H.R. 4496

H.R. 4496 seeks to more fully develop academic, technical, and employability skills of students; promote rigorous course-taking; and increase linkages between secondary and post secondary education. Model sequences of courses help achieve these goals. As a framework for instruction, they can improve transitions between secondary and post secondary education by aligning coursework and reducing remediation. They support the integration of academic and career technical studies and help broaden career awareness. Model sequences of courses can help educators establish consistent expectations for student performance and connect classroom experiences to student's learning and goals. Finally, model sequences of courses can reinforce the historic federal role of driving innovation, program improvement and quality in CTE.

WHY MODEL SEQUENCES OF COURSES? THE DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC IMPERATIVE

Changing U.S. demographics make the alignment of careers with educational experiences an imperative. Our economy could once tolerate the decade that many young adults took to "find themselves," delaying the start of a career until their late twenties. With an aging population and a changing economy, the country no longer has this luxury. "These [demographic] developments pose potential problems for employers and the economy generally, as the possible loss of many key experienced workers could create shortages … with adverse effects on productivity and economic growth."[1] Our nation's employers are already facing skills shortages in technical areas:

- *"Information technology firms need 425,000 additional workers now — and more than 1.2 million by 2005.*
- *The automotive industry reports that 60,000 service technician jobs are unfilled.*
- *Some 22,000 installation, repair, and service jobs in the air conditioning and refrigeration field are empty.*
- *The construction industry reports over 250,000 openings.*
- *Eighty percent of employers in hospitality, health care, printing, transportation, and manufacturing industries claim moderate to sever shortages."* [2]

As a nation, we desperately need to expand the pipeline of qualified individuals to fill these shortages. The country's economic health relies on a balanced demand for and supply of skills. We must engage students (and their parents) earlier and more actively in their career and educational decisions. Model sequences of courses will help achieve this necessity by aligning student interest with viable careers options.

WHY MODEL SEQUENCES OF COURSES? INCREASED OPTIONS, INFORMED DECISIONS, AND IMPROVED QUALITY

►INCREASED OPTIONS

"[E]ducation providers can give their students much greater exposure to career options by creating a structure and offering activities that provide meaningful connections between education and the world of work."[3] Model

---

[1] United States General Accounting Office. "Older Workers: Demographic Trends Pose Challenges for Employers and Workers." (November 2001), page 1.

[2] Elliott, Kathy Jo. "American's Workforce Crisis: Skills Lacking – Not Jobs." January 2003.

sequences of courses highlight career and educational options and prepare students and their parents to make informed decisions. They help students navigate the world of opportunity by highlighting what courses to take to reach diverse career and educational goals. Model sequences of courses are like road maps that display the various routes for the journey to one's destination. They outline the classes necessary for high school graduation and highlight additional academic and CTE courses, as well as recommend other experiences, such as internships, that supplement classroom learning. They also help high school students focus on their own future and provide the information needed to make decisions about high school and college.

"Students' career choices are most often based on personal interest."[4] Research tells us students are more motivated when their learning relates to an area of personal interest and when they understand "why" they are learning something. When students are motivated, their performance improves and doors open, increasing the educational and employment options available. Model sequences of courses expose students to the panoply of careers. Through model sequences of courses, students gain an understanding of how their academic and technical studies compliment and enhance each another. They become aware that learning in high school is a foundation for their post secondary and career success.

Some may worry that model sequences of courses will limit options; I believe quite the contrary. Model sequences of courses allow students to investigate a variety of career options while developing the academic and technical knowledge and skills required for post-high school success. Students are not bound by an initial career selection. Model sequences of courses help students focus on their options. Since model sequences of courses do not hinder students' completion of a strong high school program of study, there is no limiting effect on students meeting high school graduation requirements.

▶ INFORMED DECISIONS

Parents play a very important role in the decisions their children make regarding course selection, post secondary options, and careers. A recent study from Ferris State University found that "parents are the primary adult influence on career decisions."[5] Parents have limited time and access to information with which to help their children make these decisions. "[M]*ore than two-thirds (70 percent) [of the students interviewed for the Ferris State study] claimed to have spent three hours or less in the past few months discussing careers with their parents.* That's not much guidance on which to base a life decision."[6]

In Maryland, students develop a four-year high school plan of study that includes — as required under statute — steps to prepare for careers that are appropriate to individual interests and experiences. Model sequences of courses help students as they develop this plan; they are a tool for parents to quickly and easily help their children make confident and informed decisions. Additionally, model sequences of courses serve as a tool, much like a compass, to assure students are heading in the right direction to achieve their goals.

Model sequences of courses can also be of economic benefit. It takes five or six years for an average student to attain a "four-year college degree" and the costs of higher education continue to soar.[7] Having a clear educational path charted through high school and culminating in post secondary education will reduce duplication of coursework and efficiently maximize resources and time spent in post secondary education.

▶ IMPROVED QUALITY

In order to coordinate continuous, state-wide improvement of the Maryland CTE system, model sequences of courses are an integral part of the state's program approval process. The Maryland State Board of Education formally recognized the value of CTE over a decade ago by identifying the completion of an approved sequence of CTE courses as one of the capstone requirements to obtaining a Maryland high school diploma, placing it on par with the completion of the admission requirements for entry into the state university system. This designation has sent a very clear signal that state-approved CTE programs must be of sufficient academic rigor to prepare students for success in post-secondary education and the contemporary workplace, not unlike H.R. 4496's focus on creating a model sequence of courses. The Maryland Higher Education Commission imposes a similar approval requirement for post secondary CTE programs. The two agencies work collaboratively to ensure their pathways to careers build on one another.

Maryland has a long and successful history with model sequences of courses; their inclusion in federal legislation will allow Maryland to take this innovation to scale. In 1989, in concert with the release of the report of the Maryland Commission on School Performance, the Maryland Commission on Vocational-Technical Education issued recommendations calling for a new model of CTE education that prepared students for both employment and further education by ensuring access to challenging CTE programs that provide academic, technical, and workplace skills. The Commission's recommendations provided the impetus for the establishment of CTE completer programs. These programs include: sequential programs of study guided by industry standards that result in students learning all aspects of the industry; the implementation of a system of career development; the use of blended or integrated instruction to ensure that students develop academic knowledge and skills as part of their technical programs; and linking learning levels through articulated programs. The Commission's recommendations have translated into the design of high quality programs that contribute to the continuous improvement of the broader system of education for all students.

A key factor in ensuring a quality CTE system is the important balance between state approved programs of study and local control over the delivery and innovations of that program. In Maryland, A Visionary Panel for Better

---

[3] Ferris State University Career Institute for Education and Workforce Development. "Decisions Without Direction: Career Guidance and Decision-Making Among American Youth. Executive Summary." (May 2002). Page 7.
[4] Ibid, page 2.
[5] Ibid, page 2.
[6] Ibid, page 3.
[7] Levin, Driscoll, and Fleeter. "On the Money – Vol. 125, No. 37. Big 10 Tuition Education Costs and Student Earnings." (May 28, 2004). Page 6.

Schools, comprised of a key group of stakeholders, recommended a Voluntary State Curriculum to guide local school system academic course development. Likewise, model sequences of courses may provide a framework for local CTE program development.

In order to achieve a quality CTE system, policies and procedures for state approval of CTE programs were developed. Once state approved, programs are eligible for state and federal funding. A set of eight Core Principles assist local school systems in the development of state approved CTE programs. They are described in Resource A and include things such as stakeholder involvement, multiple options for students, rigorous academic, employability and technical skills and outcome data.

One example of a state approved program is in the field of engineering. Maryland sought out and provided incentives for local school systems to offer Project Lead The Way's (PLTW) pre-engineering program. Thirteen of Maryland's twenty-four school systems offer this program. PLTW is an instructional pathway that incorporates the standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the International Technology Education Association. Consisting of five courses divided into three groups (Foundation, Specialization, and Capstone), the program prepares students for further education and careers in engineering and engineering technology. PLTW students are expected to:

1. Develop thinking skills by solving real-world engineering problems;
2. Use computer software to produce, analyze, and evaluate models of project solutions;
3. Use industry-standard computer software in testing and analyzing digital circuitry;
4. Use three-dimensional computer software to solve design problems. They assess their solutions, modify their designs, and use prototyping equipment to produce 3-D models; and
5. Work in teams to complete challenging, self-directed projects. Mentored by engineers, students design and build solutions to authentic engineering problems.

A sample course matrix — including the required CTE courses for program completion and the recommended academic and elective courses to complete a student's educational experience — is provided in the attached Resource B. Please note the rigorous math, science and foreign language courses contained in the matrix. These courses exceed the University System of Maryland entrance requirements and provide students with the preparation necessary to pursue careers in engineering. Students completing this program are both University System of Maryland and Career and Technology completers, or what Maryland calls "Dual Completers." Forty-one percent of all students who complete a CTE program of study also meet the requirements for entrance into the University System of Maryland. Maryland's goal is for all CTE completers to be prepared for further education and careers. Model sequences of courses will help us attain this goal.

The Maryland State Department of Education identifies and funds the implementation of model programs, resulting in the promotion of added value for students through rigorous academic and technical course sequences. This added value is defined as the attainment of industry recognized credentials, articulated credit at the post-secondary level, or both. Maryland has broadened these efforts by providing a series of targeted grants, aimed at leveraging local funds, to implement high quality programs that utilize such model sequences. Substantial technical assistance and professional development opportunities have been provided by the state to ensure that implementation succeeds. This strategy has improved student performance and closed achievement gaps. (Resource C)

KEY CONCERNS – STATE ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

While the state directors of CTE and I are generally supportive of H.R. 4496, we do not and cannot support the sixty percent cut in funding for state and local administration. This cut is especially troublesome in light of increased responsibilities assigned to states under H.R. 4496. States rely on this funding to effectively and efficiently carry out the administrative responsibilities required under the legislation, such as state plan development; the review, approval, and monitoring of local plans, including all fiscal and accountability requirements; the effective management of financial responsibilities related to the federal grant; etc. In addition, adequate funding for state administration and leadership is necessary to ensure a state's ability to identify and implement best practices and programs. Without sufficient funds to underwrite this, efforts to increase rigor and relevance in CTE will be severely hampered.

Maryland's success with model sequences of courses is due, in no small part, to effective state leadership. Our continued ability to expand these quality programs will be hampered or, worse yet, halted with the proposed sixty percent cut in state administration funds. A reduction in these funds offers states the opportunity to invest less of their own funds because federal administration dollars must be matched, one-to-one, with state dollars. I encourage you to reinstate current law and allow five percent for state administration. In addition, I recommend restoring the maintenance of effort provisions as they are under current law —anything less would be an easy "out" for states to reduce their investment in America's future workforce and economic development.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 4496 enables states to advance the progress started under Perkins III. Change in education reform is often slower than we anticipate or prefer, however, great progress and results are being made. By supporting H.R. 4496, CTE will be well served in this great nation, ensuring well-prepared individuals who are ready for both further education and the workplace.

Model sequences of courses drive innovation in CTE. They ensure that students who choose to participate in CTE are prepared with the academic and technical skills needed for success in further education and careers. They arm parents, students, and educators with better information with which to make career and educational decisions. This improved capacity for career and education decision-making will focus postsecondary educational experiences (both time and money), and positively impact our nation's economic growth. In short, model sequences of courses will focus the federal investment on effective programs that meet the needs of our students and economy.

Thank you for the opportunity to share Maryland's CTE successes, and specifically how model sequences of courses better prepare students for further learning and careers. I look forward to providing any additional information you may need or to answer any questions you may have.

Resource A: Maryland's Eight Core Principles for CTE Programs

1. CTE programs are developed in conjunction with all relevant stakeholder groups.

   Each local school system works closely with a CTE local advisory council (LAC) to continuously improve the local system of career and technology education. Program advisory committees (PACs) exist for each program or group of closely related programs within the local school system. The PAC members work directly with instructors at each school to provide advice on program enhancements. These committees involve parents; students; instructors; postsecondary partners; representatives of business, industry, and labor organizations; partners in local workforce and economic development; and representatives of special populations. Responsibilities include the development, implementation, and evaluation of high-quality CTE programs.

2. CTE programs are organized under broad categories, based on all aspects of an industry, designed to help students make informed decisions regarding career pathways.

   Broad categories share a common core of knowledge and skills that provide students with an understanding of all aspects of the industry that they are planning to enter. For each program area, these include planning, management, finances, technical and production skills, underlying principles of technology, labor issues, and health and safety. Learning and instruction are supported by appropriate career development activities aligned with the Maryland Career Development Model to help inform students' decisions and prepare them for lifelong learning.

3. Economic market demands, both current and projected, constitute the criteria for identifying value-added opportunities.

   Issues of economic development and workforce preparation are considered in order to determine the need for CTE programs. CTE program developers' document labor market demand for the clusters and pathway programs offered to students. Labor market information is gathered at local, regional, state, and/or national levels. CTE programs provide value-added opportunities for students, including entry into careers and further education.

4. CTE programs are developed in response to an identified opportunity to add value to students' overall educational programs.

   CTE program developers seek out and provide accurate information about opportunities that add value to a student's educational program. CTE programs provide students with a planned, sequential program of study that blends academic, technical, and workplace skills to prepare them for careers and further education. Program completers have career options that are not available to students who have not completed a CTE program.

5. CTE programs are based on the most appropriate, reliable and valid technical standards available.

   CTE programs include a coherent set of academic, employability and technical skills, based on national and state standards that provide students moving directly to employment with a value-added competitive advantage. The program advisory committee validates the most current technical standards and adopts or adapts those appropriate for the needs of the program. Where no appropriate standards exist, the program advisory committee, in conjunction with the local school system, outlines standards to define the academic, career, and technical skills required for completion of the program. The academic skills are based on Maryland's voluntary state curriculum.

6. CTE programs provide multiple options for students as they prepare for entry into careers and further education.

   CTE programs are developed in conjunction with representatives from higher education, businesses, industries, labor organizations and apprenticeship programs. This ensures curricular alignment, often accomplished through articulation agreements, so that there is a seamless transition for students moving directly to employment or postsecondary education. CTE programs designated as Tech Prep programs provide students a planned sequential program of studies combining academic and technical courses beginning in high school and continuing for two or more years of postsecondary education.

   The nature of the contemporary workplace requires that supervised work-based learning opportunities are made available to students to help them make informed career decisions. These placements are designed to provide meaningful work experience as an integral part of the CTE program to extend, reinforce, and validate students' learning. They are organized in partnership among the local school system, businesses and industry, labor organizations, community agencies, and the family.

7. CTE programs are measured against student attainment of rigorous academic, employability and technical skills and student success in further education and employment.

   CTE students meet state-established academic standards based on Maryland's high school voluntary state curriculum. CTE students also have the prerequisite skills for entry into postsecondary education as evidenced by reducing the number of students needing remediation; increasing the number of CTE students meeting the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) rigorous course indicators; and increasing in the percentage meeting University System of Maryland (USM) admissions requirements.

CTE students attain the state-established *Skills for Success* as represented by students successfully transitioning into employment, further education, or both. To fulfill this principle, programs include technical skill development and leadership experiences for students through Career and Technology Student Organizations (CTSOs) or other appropriate professional associations.
CTE students complete a rigorous end-of-program assessment combining academic and technical skills. Where recognized national, state, or local certification or licensure programs exist, they are utilized. Where certification examinations do not exist, local school systems work with their local advisory councils and program advisory committees to identify appropriate assessments. End-of-program assessments inform instructors of students' achievement and provide evidence for changes needed in the instructional program.

To ensure that all students have the opportunity to attain the necessary knowledge and skills, support services for members of special populations are identified and provided in all CTE programs, including related instruction.

8. Outcome data for CTE programs are reported and utilized.

   Local school systems and local advisory councils collect and analyze data on student attainment of rigorous academic, employability, and technical skills. Outcome data are used to drive a process of continuous improvement for all CTE programs, including decision-making regarding the viability of such programs. State and local outcome data for CTE programs serve as a means of benchmarking program performance and closing performance gaps.

Resource B: Sample "Model Sequence of Courses"

MCPS Pre-Engineering Program Sequence Matrix (Includes High School AS)				
CTE credits are indicated by placing the number of credit in parentheses after the CTE course title. An asterisk (*) identifies the concentrator course.				
Pathway/Program:	**Manufacturing, Engineering and Technology**		**CIP Number 15500**	
Graduation Requirements	**Grade 9**	**Grade 10**	**Grade 11**	**Grade 12**
English – 4	English 9	English 10	English 11	English 12
Social Studies - 3	US Government	World History	US History	Government and Economics
Mathematics – 3	Algebra 1	Geometry	Algebra 2	Trigonometry or Pre-Calculus
Science – 3	Physical Science	Biology	Chemistry	Physics
Physical Education -.5 Health Education - .5	.5 PE	.5 Health		
Fine Arts – 1	.5 Fine Arts	.5 Fine Arts		
Technology Education – 1	Principles of Engineering			
CTE Completer Program – 4 *concentrator course		*(Foundation course)* Introduction to Engineering Design (1)	*Digital Electronics (1) Computer Integrated Manufacturing (1)	Engineering Design and Development (1)
Foreign Language - 2 and/or Advanced Tech Ed – 2	Language Spanish I	Language Spanish II	Language AP Spanish	Advanced Technology Education
Two Year College Program Sequence				
Montgomery College's Engineering Program for the Associate of Science Degree – 64 credits required – Upon completion of the Engineering curriculum, students are encouraged to transfer to a B.S. degree program in engineering, or enter the job market as well-prepared, high-level engineering and physical science technicians. Articulated credit is awarded to high school students who complete the five-course PLTW program sequence.				
Recommended Sequence				
Semester 1			**Semester 2**	
Principles of Chemistry I Introduction to Engineering Design (IED articulated credit) Calculus I Techniques of Reading and Writing I Humanities – General Ed			General Physics I Engineering Science Elective Calculus II General Engineering Physics I Behavioral and Social Sciences Distribution	
Semester 3			**Semester 4**	
Multivariable Calculus General Physics II Health Foundation Behavioral and Social Sciences Distribution Engineering Science Elective			Differential Equations General Physics III Arts Distribution Engineering science Elective	
Examples of careers students are preparing to enter: Engineering Technician or Engineering Technician Assistant (Provides as engineering background for students who plan to pursue an advanced degree in engineering.)				

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Mrs. Oliver. We appreciate that. Ms. Lufkin?

STATEMENT OF MIMI LUFKIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR PARTNERSHIPS IN EQUITY, COCHRANVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA

Ms. LUFKIN. Good afternoon, Chairman Castle, Congresswoman Woolsey, and other Committee members. Thank you for the invitation to appear before you today.

I bring you the perspective of someone who has been involved in vocational education since the late 1970's at the local, state and national level, as a high school agriculture teacher, a teacher educator, a state educational agency staff member and, for the past 10 years, as the Executive Director of the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity.

I will focus my testimony on issues in H.R. 4496 that impact the participation and success of special population students in career and technical education. I compliment the Subcommittee on its use of current law as the basis for the development of H.R. 4496. By starting from current law, the Committee has the opportunity to continue the field's efforts in improving the quality and effectiveness of CTE, which started in 1988, while making the appropriate changes to re-focus these efforts in a way that prepares all students for the future.

H.R. 4496 substantially increases the role and responsibility of states while decreasing the amount of state administration funding by 60 percent. To expect states and locals to do more with less is unrealistic. The elimination of the requirements that a state's equity coordinator in 1998 illustrates the fact that these kinds of cuts can have devastating effect on states' ability to provide leadership. No state continues to have a full-time person in this position. It is certain that asking states to do more with less resources will continue to negatively impact their ability to focus on their responsibility of ensuring the success of special population students in CTE. We urge the Subcommittee to restore the amount of funding for state and local administration and the maintenance of overt language to current law.

Throughout H.R. 4496, language is consistently added to emphasize the transition of secondary students to post-secondary education. At least 82 percent of high school graduates either work exclusively or work while attending college. We must give students more options, not less. We urge the Committee to strengthen language throughout the bill to include employment upon graduation from high school as a positive outcome for secondary CTE students.

The bill does little to address the needs of adults re-entering the workforce or in need of skill upgrading for career advancement. Post-secondary CTE plays a vital role in the nation's economic and workforce development system, and is the most reliable way out of poverty for many adults. We urge the Committee to include programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, to attain marketable skills for high-wage, high-skill occupations, leading to self-sufficiency as a required use of local funds.

H.R. 4496 makes substantial changes to the accountability system. While separating secondary and post-secondary accountability

measures is a positive step, the elimination of the indicator related to participation and completion of CTE programs that lead to non-traditional careers at the secondary level is a serious mistake. Fortunately, the Subcommittee has indicated its reconsideration of this decision and the likelihood that the indicator will be reinstated.

Sex segregation in CTE programs continues to be an issue across the nation. These stark patterns are not the product of independent choices made by young men and women alone. The data show that schools have not adequately fulfilled their responsibilities to monitor and address the various forms of discrimination that can limit girls' and boys' access to non-traditional CTE programs.

Ultimately, this results in substantial disparities in wage earnings, starting females on the pathway to economic disadvantage. We cannot ignore 50 percent of the potential workforce of our nation's economy if this nation is to remain globally competitive.

We urge the Committee to reinstate participation and completion of CTE programs that lead to non-traditional careers as a performance measure for secondary programs, to include support services for students pursuing non-track careers as a required use of local funds, to include provisions in Section 118, Occupational and Employment Information, that ensure unbiased career guidance and academic counseling, and to include provisions in national activities that support research and dissemination on the participation and outcomes of students in CTE, and the identification of model programs and practices that eliminate sex bias and stereotyping.

H.R. 4496 retains the current provisions in the Perkins Act for special population students but makes no additions for improving the ability of states and locals to ensure their success. States are required to report on the performance of special population students on the core indicators, but are not held accountable for their improvement. As a result, data is not systematically used to drive program improvement efforts.

We recommend that the Committee include language in Section 113 requiring states and locals to disaggregate student performance data and to make continuous and substantial improvement in the performance of special population students, to also include provisions in the incentive grants to give special consideration for awarding grants for those locals and states that effectively close performance gaps of special populations, and make programs for special populations a required use of local funds.

In closing, let me again thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts that will help ensure success of all students in career and technical education. This legislation has the opportunity to help fulfill the mission of the Federal role in education, which is to assure access to equal educational opportunity for every individual. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Lufkin follows:]

Statement of Mimi Lufkin, Executive Director, National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, Cochranville, Pennsylvania

Good Afternoon Chairman Castle, Congresswoman Woolsey and other members of the House Subcommittee on Education Reform. I am Mimi Lufkin, Executive Director of the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity. Thank you for the invitation to appear before you today to discuss H.R. 4496, The Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, the bill currently being considered by this Subcommittee to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (Perkins Act).

In my testimony today, I will speak as someone who has been involved in vocational education, more recently called career and technical education (CTE), since the late 1970s at all levels of the system. My career in education started as an agriculture teacher in a small rural high school in Northern California, then as a teacher educator in agriculture education at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, California, then as a consultant to the California Department of Education on agriculture education and gender equity, and for the past ten years as the Executive Director of the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity.

In all of these capacities I have been involved in the implementation of the federal vocational education legislation at the local, state, and national level. As a teacher I partnered with another teacher at my school to implement a gender equity grant focused on eliminating sex bias and stereotyping in instructional practices and worked with other CTE teachers to increase the enrollment of females in nontraditional CTE programs. Later I implemented a single parent/displaced homemaker grant and ran a support group that helped women transition to school and employment, move off public assistance, and take control of their lives. As a consultant to the California Department of Education I worked with teachers and administrators as a technical assistant for all the schools in Northern California receiving gender equity and single parent grants and later became the Director of the state's Gender Equity Professional Development Project. Now, as the Executive Director of the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, I work with state agencies, local educational agencies, and community-based organizations on federal education and workforce development policy issues including providing them with information and assistance in implementing the equity provisions in the Perkins Act.

The National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity (NAPE) provides leadership, technical assistance, and professional development about equity issues in education and workforce development, including career and technical education. NAPE is a consortium of state agencies, businesses, and other organizations whose missions include promoting equity in education and workforce development. NAPE's annual program of work includes advocacy at the federal level, policy analysis, information and resource sharing, curriculum development, research, and professional development. NAPE provides its members with services to assist them in implementing quality education and workforce development programs.

For the purposes of today's hearing, I will focus my testimony on issues in H.R. 4496 that impact the participation and success of special population students in career and technical education. According to current law, "The term 'special populations' means – (A) individuals with disabilities; (B) individuals from economically disadvantaged families, including foster children; (C) individuals preparing for nontraditional training and employment; (D) single parents, including single pregnant women; (E) displaced homemakers; and (F) individuals with other barriers to educational achievement, including individuals with limited English proficiency."[1]

Building from Current Law

Let me start by complementing the Subcommittee on its use of current law as the basis for the development of H.R. 4496, The Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act. When Perkins was reauthorized in 1998 Congress made substantial changes to the law that caused the CTE community to undertake a major shift. These include the development of a national, state, and local accountability system to evaluate the effectiveness of CTE; the emphasis on integrating academics and CTE to improve student achievement; the development of standards-based educational reform in CTE; the development of Tech Prep programs improving the ease of transition of CTE students from secondary to postsecondary education; and the elimination of the funding for gender equity programs and including these outcomes as part of the accountability system. By starting from current law, the committee has the opportunity to continue the field's efforts in improving the quality and effectiveness of CTE started in 1998, while making the appropriate changes to current law to refocus these efforts in a way that prepares all students for the future, as the name of the new bill implies.

While H.R. 4496 makes some appropriate changes to current law, I would like to draw your attention to six areas of the bill that require additional consideration and adjustment. These six areas include:

- Increased state and local administrative and leadership responsibilities with less funding.
- The role of CTE at the secondary level.
- The role of CTE at the postsecondary level.
- Support for students pursuing nontraditional careers.
- Ensuring the success of special population students.
- Model sequence of courses—state role versus local role.

Increased State and Local Administrative and Leadership Responsibilities with Less Funding

H.R. 4496 substantially increases the role and responsibility of states while decreasing the amount of funding available to states for this purpose by 60 percent. The bill also changes the maintenance of effort provisions,

[1] Special populations definition from Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, Section 3 (23)(A-F).

creating a loophole for a one-time, 10 percent penalty-free reduction in funds, and then lessens the penalty if states cut more than this. In addition, the local allowable expenditure of funds for administration is cut from 5 percent to 2 percent. All of these provisions result in substantially less funds available for state and local level administrative activities while at the same time increasing the state and local administrative responsibilities including:

- Negotiating with each local educational agency (LEA) or postsecondary recipient on each of the 13 indicators.
- Collecting data on secondary school student attainment of postsecondary credits.
- Providing technical assistance to locals as a mandated state leadership activity.
- Developing model sequences of courses for vocational and technical content areas.
- Evaluating and implementing local program improvement plans with locals not making substantial progress in achieving the local adjusted levels of performance.
- Awarding of incentive grants to locals for exemplary performance.

The addition of these provisions is a step in the right direction to ensure the continuous improvement and quality of CTE programs across the nation. However, to expect states and locals to take on these substantial additional responsibilities while cutting the amount of funding available for them to do so is irresponsible.

Although the language in current law for state administration, planning and leadership regarding special populations, which is retained in H.R. 4496, is relatively strong, the change made in 1998 to eliminate the requirement for a State Sex Equity Coordinator has had a devastating effect on states' abilities to provide leadership in this area. No state continues to have a full-time person in this position with a majority of those state staff with this responsibility spending less than 50 percent of their time on these issues. Also less than 20 states are using the maximum state leadership reserve for supporting students preparing for nontraditional careers. It is certain that asking states to do more with less resources will continue to negatively impact their ability to focus on their responsibility of ensuring the success of special population students in CTE.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Return the amount of funding for state administration to 5% of the state allotment.
- Return the maintenance of effort language to current law.
- Return the amount of funding for local administration to 5% of the local allocation.

The Role of CTE at the Secondary Level

Throughout H.R. 4496 language is consistently added to increase the rigorous and challenging academic content of secondary CTE programs and emphasize the transition of secondary students to postsecondary education. The new secondary performance measures also follow the same suit emphasizing academic achievement and postsecondary transition. References to career guidance and counseling only for postsecondary options limits the assistance that can be provided to middle-level students as they select high school coursework, a critical element in ensuring post-school success. All these provisions indicate a lack of support for CTE as a way for secondary school students to attain both academic and technical skills that can prepare them for employment upon graduation. At least 82 percent of high school graduates either work exclusively or work while attending postsecondary education after graduation. [2] In a recent report from the Casey Foundation, one out of every six young adults ages 18-24 are not employed, have no degree beyond high school, and are not enrolled in school.[3] We must give students more options not less. Not preparing students to be successful in the workplace upon graduation from high school is a disservice to our nation's youth and employers.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Include unbiased career guidance and counseling that increases student awareness of high skill/high wage and nontraditional careers leading to economic self-sufficiency as a required use of local funds.
- Strengthen language throughout the bill to include employment upon graduation from high school as a positive outcome for secondary CTE students.

The Role of CTE at the Postsecondary Level

Although it appears that H.R. 4496 emphasizes the importance of postsecondary education, it does so in a very traditional way, as the immediate step from secondary school. The bill does little to address the needs of adults reentering the workforce or in need of skill upgrading in order to move up a career ladder. Postsecondary CTE plays a vital role in the nation's economic and workforce development system and is the most reliable way out of poverty for many adults. CTE has historically provided funds for single parents and displaced homemakers, many of whom are welfare recipients, to participate in CTE programs. One year after the implementation of the 1998 Perkins Act and the elimination of the gender equity setasides, schools who had previously received federal vocational education funding for single parent/displaced homemaker programs, reported a significant decrease in student services, program funding and support from state and local agencies.[4] This trend has continued

[2] "Washington State Graduate Follow-up Study: Class of 2000 All Graduates First Year After Graduation Statewide Results," Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, WA.

[3] "2004 KIDS COUNT Data Book," Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD, June 2004, www.aecf.org/kidscount/databook/

[4] Invisible Again: The Impact of Changes in Federal Funding on Vocational Programs for Women and Girls, National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, October 2001, www.ncwge.org.

throughout the implementation of the 1998 Perkins Act and must be turned around. Preparatory services (such as counseling, assessment, life skills development, career exploration, transferable skill identification) and support services (such as transportation, childcare, dependent care and needs-related payments necessary to enable participation) must be made available.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Include programs for single parent/displaced homemakers to attain marketable skills for high-wage, high-skill occupations leading to self-sufficiency as a required use of local funds.

Support for Students Pursuing Nontraditional Careers

H.R. 4496 makes substantial changes to the accountability system. While separating secondary and postsecondary accountability measures is a positive step, the elimination of the indicator related to participation and completion of CTE programs that lead to nontraditional careers at the secondary level is a serious mistake. Fortunately, the subcommittee has indicated its reconsideration of this decision and the likelihood that the indicator will be reinstated. This measure is extremely important at the secondary level as students begin to explore their career options by taking CTE courses in various career pathways.

Unfortunately, sex segregation in CTE programs continues to be an issue across the nation, particularly in programs at the high school level. In a study conducted by the National Women's Law Center, data reported by states demonstrated that female students make up 96 percent of the students enrolled in Cosmetology, 87 percent of the students enrolled in Child Care courses, and 86 percent of the students enrolled in courses that prepare them to be Health Assistants in every region in the country. Male students, on the other hand, comprise 94 percent of the students in training programs for plumbers and electricians, 93 percent of the students studying to be welders or carpenters, and 92 percent of the students studying automotive technologies. These stark patterns of extreme sex segregation are not the product of independent choices made by young men and women alone. The data show that schools have not adequately fulfilled their responsibilities to monitor and address the various forms of discrimination that can limit girls' and boys' access to nontraditional vocational programs, whether through career counseling that relies on gender stereotypes, recruitment focused on the gender traditionally enrolled in that program, or failure to correct classroom conditions that undermine equal opportunity.[5] Ultimately, this sex segregation results in substantial disparities in the wages earned by female and male graduates of CTE programs— starting females on the pathway to economic disadvantage.

The Department of Labor's High Growth Job Training Initiative[6] has identified seven targeted industries that are predicted to have the most growth and greatest demand for skilled workers in the future. These seven industries include: Automotive, Biotechnology, Construction, Geospatial, Health Care, Information Technology, and Retail. Five of the seven industries are considered to be nontraditional for females. CTE plays an important role in informing students and parents of the opportunities in these areas, giving students the chance to explore these career areas, and preparing students for employment in these high growth, high-demand industries. We cannot ignore 50 percent of the potential workforce if our nation's economy is to remain globally competitive.

Inclusion of the performance measure for the participation and completion of students pursuing nontraditional careers as part of the accountability system when Perkins was reauthorized in 1998 was an innovative way to hold locals accountable to this issue. Unfortunately, the elimination of the setasides funding these programs, no mechanism in the law for states to hold locals accountable for their performance, and no requirement to use local funds for this activity was a strong message to locals that this was no longer an important issue. The changes suggested in H.R. 4496 giving states the ability to hold locals accountable for their performance goes a long way in strengthening this message. However, more could be done to ensure adequate attention is paid to this issue.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Reinstate participation and completion of CTE programs that lead to nontraditional careers as a performance measure for secondary programs.
- Include support services for students pursuing nontraditional careers as a required use of local funds.
- Include provisions in Section 118 Occupational and Employment Information that ensure career guidance and academic counseling utilizes strategies to expose all students to full and complete information regarding career options that lead to high-skill, high-wage and nontraditional careers that lead to economic self-sufficiency, and provide programs that help break down gender stereotypes.
- Include provisions in Section 114–National Activities that support research and dissemination on the participation and outcomes of women and girls in CTE and the identification of model programs and practices that eliminate sex bias and stereotyping in CTE.
- Include provisions in Section 114(d)–Incentive Grants for Eligible Agencies whereby the secretary would give special consideration in awarding grants to an eligible agency effectively increasing the participation and completion of students pursuing nontraditional careers.

---

[5] "Title IX and Equal Opportunity in Vocational Education: A Promise Still Owed To The Nation's Young Women," National Women's Law Center, Washington, DC, June 2002, www.nwlc.org.

[6] http://www.doleta.gov/BRG/JobTrainInitiative/

Ensuring the Success of Special Population Students
H.R. 4496 retains the current provisions in the 1998 Perkins Act for special population students but makes no additions for improving the ability of states and locals to ensure their success. Accountability continues to be the vehicle for program improvement in H.R. 4496 and could also be the vehicle for improving the outcomes of special populations. Currently states are required to report on the performance of special population students on the core indicators of performance but are not held accountable for the improvement of their performance. As a result, the data collected on the performance of special population students is not systematically used to drive program improvement efforts at the state and local level, it is only reported.

Following the lead of No Child Left Behind, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act must strengthen its accountability system to support CTE's role in closing the achievement gap for special population students. Accountability and disaggregated student data collection must be the cornerstone for planning and funding decisions at both the state and local level. This nation can no longer afford to leave groups of students unprepared to succeed in college and work.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Include language in Section 113–Accountability that
  - requires states and locals to report student performance data disaggregated by gender, race, ethnicity, age, socio-economic status, and each special population, and
  - requires the states and locals to make continuous and substantial improvement in the academic and vocational and technical achievement of vocational and technical education students, including special populations.
- Include provisions in Section 114(d)–Incentive Grants for Eligible Agencies whereby the secretary would give special consideration in awarding grants to an eligible agency effectively closing performance gaps of special populations on the core indicators of performance.
- In Section 135 – Local Uses of Funds, move "to provide programs for special populations" from allowable to a required use of funds.

Model Sequence of Courses- State Role vs. Local Role
H.R. 4496 introduces the concept of the states developing a model sequence of courses for vocational technical content. There appears to be conflicting language in the bill regarding whether the implementation of the model, as developed by the state, will be required by all local educational agencies. Language in Section 12–State Plan indicates "the model sequence of courses **may** be adopted by local educational agencies" while later in the same section states are asked to "describe the process by which the eligible agency will ensure that all vocational and technical education programs…include…elements of the model sequence of courses." Also, later in the bill, Section 16–Local Plan indicates, "the local plan shall describe how the eligible recipient will offer the appropriate courses of at least one of the model curricula." In addition, Section 9–Prohibitions specifically states, "nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize …the Federal government to mandate, direct or control…a school's curriculum…." While a model sequence of courses to guide the development of curriculum in CTE and to ensure that the curriculum includes challenging and rigorous academic and technical content is a good thing, the proposed legislation needs clarification. The development of these models and implementation, adoption, and evaluation of the sequence of courses at the local level will take time and resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Give states time to develop the model sequence of courses and locals the time to implement, adopt, and evaluate their use.
- Clarify legislative intent through clear language as to whether this activity is mandated or encouraged at the local level.

Closing
In closing, let me again thank you for the opportunity to share with you my thoughts and recommendations on ways to strengthen the provisions in H.R. 4496 that will ensure the success of special population students. This legislation has the opportunity to help fulfill the mission of the federal role in education—to strengthen the commitment to assuring access to equal educational opportunity for every individual.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Ms. Lufkin.

And Ms. White.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you. Good afternoon, Congressman Woolsey—excuse me, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Woolsey, and other Committee members. It's not on? Oh, thank you. Can we start again?

STATEMENT OF ROBIN WHITE, SENIOR PROGRAM AND POLICY DIRECTOR, ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR WORK AND LEARNING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ms. WHITE. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Woolsey, and other Committee members.

As noted by Chairman Castle, I am here today to provide testimony on Tech-Prep research conducted as part of the NAVE funding and accountability study. This evaluation, conducted with colleagues, AED and Westat, included written surveys of state vocational education and Tech-Prep administrators, telephone interviews with state vocational administrators, and case studies at the state and local levels.

The evaluation focused primarily on implementation of the new Perkins Funding and Accountability Provisions. However, my colleagues and I expanded the scope of our study at the request of NAVE staff to take a broader look at how Tech-Prep definitions and implementation strategies relate to measurements of participation and outcome. More detailed information will be available in our forthcoming report, The Structure and Challenges of Vocational Funding and Accountability Systems.

I'm honored to be here today to describe the findings of this study and possible implications for policy, specifically, the re-authorization of the Perkins legislation.

Our survey results focused primarily on state mechanisms for allocating Tech-Prep funds and definitions of Tech-Prep programs and students. Case studies and telephone interviews offered opportunities to explore how Tech-Prep was actually implemented in specific states and consortia, and how implementation was affected by the Perkins III funding and accountability provisions.

Taken together, these data suggest that Tech-Prep is essentially a catch-all term, used to describe a wide array of activities, initiatives and efforts, most of which appear to fall considerably short in one or more respects of the statutory definition of a Tech-Prep program. We found that Tech-Prep programs that followed a distinct cohort of students through a four- or 6-year sequence of instruction were scarce. The absence of viable mechanisms for tracking high school Tech-Prep students into community colleges by area of vocational study was a major impediment to defining a seamless two plus two career pathway, and therefore to documenting student outcomes. A majority of state survey respondents indicated that they required local consortia to use specific approaches and definitions that should result in well-defined Tech-Prep sequences, but site visits and interviews produced few examples where this actually occurred.

Tech-Prep reporting was generally inadequate at both the secondary and post-secondary levels. Although states typically defined secondary Tech-Prep students in terms of enrollment in or completion of articulated vocational courses or program sequences, many still struggled with the concept of what exactly constitutes a post-secondary Tech-Prep student. Even where definitions were in place at both levels, many consortia were unable to count the number of students who met the definition.

Although most states supported having a definition of a Tech-Prep student, the study team found little evidence to support the widespread use of these definitions or alignment of these definitions with statutory intent. Definitions of what it meant to participate in Tech-Prep appeared to vary within states and even within consortia, and the applications of definitions sometimes failed to distinguish Tech-Prep students from other vocational students.

In states with loose definitions of Tech-Prep, high schools sometimes identified 60–100 percent of their vocational students as Tech-Prep participants, regardless of whether they were enrolled in programs with articulation agreements.

In survey responses, nineteen states reported that students who took or completed one or more vocational courses, whether articulated or not, met the criteria for Tech-Prep classification. Another eight states reported that all vocational students were considered Tech-Prep, while one state indicated that all secondary students who had not chosen college prep were considered Tech-Prep. Two states avoided the issue entirely by counting all secondary students as Tech-Prep.

The number of Tech-Prep students who actually received articulated credit at the post-secondary level appears to be quite low. The reasons given for this included requirements that a student complete additional courses or score at a certain level on placement tests, the length of time elapsed between high school completion and college enrollment, and policies that required the students to identify the collegiate courses they had taken and make four more requests for credit.

Because the two plus two and two plus four programs of study were scarce, Tech-Prep efforts frequently overlapped those of regular vocational education. Study team found that many states have worked to develop articulated course sequences for vocational education outside the context of Tech-Prep. It was noted previously, state and local reporting on Tech-Prep participation and outcome frequently fail to distinguish Tech-Prep students from others.

Finally, the reported uses of Tech-Prep funds typically for equipment, supplies, salaries, and the startup of new programs were quite similar to those reported for Perkins Title I basic grants.

In conclusion, I want to give you the recommendations that our forthcoming report includes concerning Tech-Prep. We suggested three options that Federal policymakers might want to consider. Requiring states and consortia to document rates of student completion of four- and 6-year Tech-Prep sequences; investing in the development of software and other mechanisms to facilitate tracking secondary Tech-Prep students into post-secondary institutions; and eliminating Tech-Prep as a separate title and re-allocating Tech-Prep funding to a wider range of vocational education reform initiatives at the state and local levels. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. White follows:]

Statement of Robin White, Senior Program and Policy Director, Academy for Educational Development, National Institute for Work and Learning, Washington, DC

Good afternoon. My name is Robin White. I am the senior program and policy director at the Academy for Educational Development's National Institute for Work and Learning. I have been engaged in the design, delivery, and evaluation of career preparation programs for nearly 20 years.

Between 2000 and 2004, I served as co-director and lead author for an evaluation commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education as part of the congressionally mandated National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE). This evaluation, conducted with colleagues at AED and Westat, Inc., included written surveys of state vocational education and Tech-Prep administrators, telephone interviews with state vocational administrators, and case studies at the state and local levels. This evaluation focused primarily on implementation of the new Perkins funding and accountability provisions. However, my colleagues and I expanded the scope of our study at the request of NAVE staff to include a broader look at how Tech-Prep definitions and implementation strategies relate to measurements of participation and outcomes. More detailed information will be available in our forthcoming report, *The Structure and Challenges of Vocational Funding and Accountability Systems.*

I am honored to be here today to describe the findings of this study and the possible implications of these results for policy, specifically the reauthorization of the Perkins legislation.

Background on Tech-Prep

First funded in 1990 under Perkins II, Tech-Prep programs are supposed to link secondary and postsecondary education to provide a "seamless career pathway."[1] Articulation agreements were identified in the legislation as the vehicle through which secondary and postsecondary institutions would collaborate to offer a non-duplicative sequence of courses leading to a degree or certificate in a technical field. Both academic and vocational courses were to be included and "integrated" to provide students with applied learning experiences that would engage their interests and enhance their skills. Tech-Prep funding was to be distributed only to consortia composed of districts, area vocational schools, and postsecondary institutions, among others.

The 1990 legislation specified that Tech-Prep programs were to include two or four years of secondary education and two years of higher education or apprenticeship following high school graduation. The 1998 Perkins legislation (Perkins III) eliminated the two-year cap on the postsecondary component, calling instead for programs that consist of at least two years of secondary education and *at least* two years of postsecondary education or apprenticeship, and explicitly encouraged the development of Tech-Prep programs that link secondary schools and two-year postsecondary institutions with four-year institutions to offer 2+2+2 programs.

Key Research Findings

While survey results focused primarily on states' mechanisms for allocating Tech-Prep funds and definitions of Tech-Prep programs and students, case studies and telephone interviews offered opportunities to explore how Tech-Prep was actually implemented in specific states and consortia and how Tech-Prep implementation was affected by the Perkins III funding and accountability provisions. Taken together, these data suggest that Tech-Prep is essentially a catch-all term used to describe a wide array of activities, initiatives, and efforts—most of which appeared to fall considerably short, in one or more respects, of the statutory definition of a Tech-Prep program.

Tech-Prep programs that followed a distinct cohort of students through a four- or six-year sequence of instruction were scarce. The absence of viable mechanisms for tracking high school Tech-Prep students into community colleges by area of vocational study was a major impediment to defining a seamless 2+2 career pathway and therefore to documenting student outcomes. A majority of state survey respondents indicated that they required local consortia

[1] We use the term "seamless career pathway" as shorthand for programs that lead to an associate degree or 2-year certificate; provide technical preparation in a specified field of study; build student competence in mathematics, science, and communications through a sequential course of study; and lead to placement in employment.

to use specific approaches and definitions that should result in well-defined Tech-Prep sequences, but site visits and telephone interviews produced few examples where this actually occurred.

Tech-Prep reporting was generally inadequate at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. Although states typically defined secondary Tech-Prep students in terms of enrollment in or completion of articulated vocational courses or program sequences, many still struggled with the concept of what exactly constitutes a postsecondary Tech-Prep student. Even where definitions were in place at both levels, many consortia were unable to count the number of students who met the definitions. Case studies and telephone interviews suggested that the fundamental problems in defining, counting, and tracking Tech-Prep students resulted in flawed reporting on the full range of Tech-Prep student outcomes.

Although most states reported having a definition of a Tech-Prep student, the study team found little evidence to support widespread use of these definitions or alignment with the statutory intent. Definitions of what it means to participate in Tech-Prep appeared to vary within states and even within consortia, and the application of the definitions sometimes failed to distinguish Tech-Prep students from other vocational students. In states with loose definitions of Tech-Prep, high schools sometimes identified 60 to 100 percent of their vocational students as Tech-Prep participants, regardless of whether they were enrolled in programs with formal articulation agreements and clear course sequences. In survey responses, 19 states reported that students who took or completed one or more vocational courses, whether articulated or not, met the criteria for Tech-Prep classification. Another eight states reported that all vocational students were considered Tech-Prep, while one state indicated that all secondary students who had not chosen College-Prep were considered Tech Prep. Two states avoided the issue of criteria by counting *all* secondary students as Tech-Prep.

Definitions of postsecondary Tech-Prep students were even more problematic, as state and local administrators readily conceded that they were applied inconsistently. Either implicitly or explicitly, most states defined postsecondary Tech-Prep participation in terms of continuation of an articulated program of study begun at the secondary level. Such definitions posed significant reporting challenges when consortium officials were unable to track individual participants from high school into specific vocational programs at postsecondary institutions. For example, one case study state used secondary Perkins follow-up studies to identify students who took articulated courses in high school and subsequently enrolled in community college, but the postsecondary institutions could not determine if these students were enrolled in the same vocational program. A postsecondary administrator in another state reported that the state's definition of a postsecondary Tech-Prep completer allowed the college to count all students who completed an articulated occupational program at the college level, regardless of whether they took courses in these programs while in high school.

In some instances, development of articulation agreements appeared to have taken priority over implementation of coherent 2+2 or 2+4 programs. Articulation agreements were one of the few common threads that ran through most Tech-Prep programs the study team examined. Although many of these agreements outlined well-defined four- or six-year sequences on paper, available evidence suggests that less emphasis was placed on the development and delivery of viable programs. One state Perkins administrator reported that "local folks are a lot more focused on articulation in general than either a 2+2 or 2+2+2 model." In two case study states, local consortium directors tended to define success by the number or breadth of articulation agreements in place, rather than the availability of coherent programs of academic and vocational courses around a career theme or the number of students who actually used these articulation agreements to complete a four- or six-year sequence.

The number of Tech-Prep students who actually received articulated credit at the postsecondary level appears to be quite low. The reasons given for this included: requirements that a student complete additional courses or score at a certain level on placement tests in order to have the credits appear on the postsecondary transcript; the length of time elapsed between high school completion and college enrollment; and policies that required students to identify the collegiate level courses they completed in high school and make formal requests for articulated credits.

In many of the local communities in case study states, Tech-Prep programs operated primarily at the high school level, with only theoretical links to the community college. The programs were defined by articulation agreements that were rarely used by participating students to gain advanced standing, if and when they entered postsecondary institutions. Secondary and postsecondary "partners" were typically connected by only a funding stream and, sometimes, a Tech-Prep coordinator. In some states, the federal Tech-Prep funds were allocated separately to secondary and postsecondary institutions, which created very little incentive for cross-level collaboration. Most states and consortia found it extraordinarily difficult to track secondary Tech-Prep students into postsecondary institutions. As a result, some states considered students who had completed the secondary level courses in a Tech-Prep sequence to be "completers"—a notion that contradicts the statutory stipulation that Tech-Prep programs include at least two years of education or training at the postsecondary level.

Because true 2+2 or 2+4 programs of study were scarce, Tech-Prep efforts frequently overlapped those of regular vocational education. The study team found that many states have worked to develop articulated course sequences for vocational education outside the context of Tech-Prep. As noted previously, state and local reporting on Tech-Prep participation and outcomes frequently failed to distinguish Tech Prep students and programs from other aspects of vocational education. Finally, the reported uses of Tech-Prep funds—typically for equipment, supplies, salaries, and the start-up of new programs—were quite similar to those reported for Perkins Title I (basic) grants. Noting the constant need to update equipment, one local administrator cited Tech-Prep funds as "the only discretionary money we get for vocational education."

There was little consistency across states with regard to Tech-Prep funding procedures. Perkins III gives states considerable flexibility in how they distribute Tech-Prep funds to local programs. Not all states awarded funds to consortia as defined by Perkins III. A few states provided Tech-Prep funds separately to both secondary and postsecondary programs, while others distributed funds to community colleges, regions, or statewide consortia. In some states that funded consortia that brought together secondary and postsecondary partners, the partnerships appeared to be consortia in name only.

Most states used a formula to allocate grants to local consortia or schools, either alone or in combination with a competitive application process. However, only two states reported using poverty-related data as a basis for Tech-Prep allocations—a sharp contrast to the heavy weight accorded to poverty indicators in the distribution of Perkins Title I (basic) grants.

Conclusion

More than ten years after the initial authorization of Tech-Prep, there are few reliable data available on the number of students who participate in Tech-Prep or who have completed four- or six-year Tech-Prep sequences. Most Tech-Prep programs have yet to realize the legislative vision of a seamless career pathway beginning in a student's junior year in high school and culminating in a postsecondary degree or certificate in a technical field. None of those interviewed for our study reported the existence of reliable mechanisms for tracking high school Tech-Prep students into community colleges or baccalaureate institutions. Instead of documenting a distinctive cohort of students who have completed an articulated sequence of academic and vocational courses, Tech-Prep administrators have focused largely, if not exclusively, on creating articulation agreements (or related options such as dual and concurrent enrollment) that allow secondary students to earn college credits while still in high school. To date, there is little or no evidence linking this proliferation of articulation agreements to students' completion of four- or six-year Tech-Prep sequences of instruction—and little evidence that these sequences exist beyond the form of written agreements.

While many of you, and many of us in the field, would like to know whether Tech-Prep is effective in improving student outcomes, it seems premature to be asking that question. At this point, based on our and other evaluations, Tech-Prep remains so loosely implemented that studies examining the outcomes of students considered "in Tech-Prep" would be very difficult to interpret. Moreover, the results could not be generalized beyond the individual local

program or state on which the analysis is based, because the school, consortium, or state next door could be using its Tech-Prep funds in a vastly different way.

In light of these findings, in the forthcoming report the AED research team suggests that federal policy makers might consider:

- Requiring states and consortia to document rates of student completion of four- and six-year Tech-Prep sequences, which would necessarily entail stronger adherence to the statutory definition of a Tech-Prep program.
- Investing in the development of software and other mechanisms to facilitate tracking secondary Tech-Prep students into postsecondary institutions.
- Eliminating Tech-Prep as a separate title in forthcoming Perkins reauthorization and reallocating Tech-Prep funding to a wider range of vocational education reform initiatives at the state and local levels.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Ms. White, and thank you for sort of rushing through there at the end.

We appreciate the information all of you gave. Actually, there's a lot included in that 20 minutes of testimony that you gave us, and I'm sure staff is going to have a field day trying to go over it all and trying to figure it all out. But I'm going to keep my question a little more general. I'm going to try to take another 45 seconds for this question, and give you each a minute, and I'm going to ask you about 10 minutes' worth of question here, so be careful.

I think, Mrs. Oliver, you mentioned parents, but I want to make sure, you know, legislation, that we are not doing anything that would—well, not only would harm having the parental involvement, but also would encourage parental involvement, and also the early choice of children. I very often worry about that in terms of some of our vocational education, enforcing early choices and where we're going with it. I want to make sure that we're not doing anything to harm that legislation or comments you have on that in general.

I'm also concerned about the academic versus the vocational side of all this. I just noticed that, in my judgment, the state of Delaware, the educational side, the academic side of vocational side has just improved dramatically in recent years, which I think is great. But I also realize, in terms of jobs, that young people have to be trained for, in some cases, economically more advantageous, and if some went to college, there's some argument for that, and I'm trying to make sure that we're not throwing out the baby with the bath water. I don't think every vocational school in the United States needs to become Harvard, and I am concerned about anything our legislation may have that impacts that.

And the other question may not be directly related to our legislation, but, in commenting on your own schools, I mentioned on, and always on the subject on full-time versus part-time, in vocational education schools, if you have comments on that, I would appreciate it. I'm going to try to go down the row, you've got about a minute each, so answer what you will, in that minute. Dr. Sommers.

Dr. SOMMERS. Yes. First of all, parents are always involved. If you think about it, all of programs are choice. If we don't connect with parents and students, we're not going to have students enrolled. And so that one's solved. Too early a choice, we actually

think the greatest challenge is that students don't think about careers soon enough. Most of our students don't choose specific careers. We work in broad career clusters.

We've never had any complaints from parents that kids are going to work too quickly and being productive. We have noticed that a lot of parents complained about what they call NIKEs, No Income Kids with an Education. So we've really pushed career development early on, not as a forced issue, but as a choice that they make.

By the way, we don't seem to have any trouble at all forcing kids to make a single path choice of college prep, which only has a single mode of operation that's successful, and that's to succeed in college. We prefer the college prep plus, where we have more options when they leave, including college.

The academics, we don't have too much focus on academics, we have too much focus on academic classes. Lowell Milken put out, at the Milken Institute, that the NAPE assessment has been virtually unchanged over the last fifteen years, while, at the same time, we've had dramatic increases in the number of academic courses taken. I think we've made a tremendous error in equating course-taking with academic prowess, and that career technical education captures the excitement of a student's mind, and engages them so that academics come naturally. So if we can get those two together, and quit looking at them as either-or, and make them integrated, we'll be in good shape.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you. Mrs. Oliver.

Ms. OLIVER. My comments indicated, I think it's important that parents are a part of their children's educational programs. We—it is one of our goals at the Maryland State Department of Education to ensure that there are strategies for parental involvement. We can do that at the policy level by helping that they, ensuring that they help us develop our programs and are knowledgeable of what, what is there to be offered there for their students and that they visit their schools on a regular basis and sign off on those students' programs of study. We do that in our high schools at work sites, and it's a very effective practice.

In terms of early choice, I prefer us to look at it as focus, helping students focus and see relevance on what study, in terms of academics and technical subjects, is all about, helping them see that high school is a means to an end, not an end in itself, and that their future is not just getting into a college, but it's getting into a college to do this. So I would look at meeting to ensure we have lots of flexibility for our students to make a variety of choices, but to help them focus.

I don't think it's academic versus technical education. I beg to differ with you. I think that—

Chairman CASTLE. Hey, you're not differing with me, I was just asking a question.

Ms. OLIVER.—that in today's world, our employers are telling us that for us to be a force for their employees to be successful that our graduates need to come to the workplace with a new set of academic skills. Basic math is not computation, basic math is far more sophisticated than that, and every student deserves to have the opportunity to match—

Chairman CASTLE. Integration for the workplace, basically.

Ms. OLIVER. Integration. And, last, full-time versus part-time. In Maryland, we deliver career and technology education in a variety of settings. Some of them are full-time career technical high schools, others are shared-time facilities. Both can work, and both just need to be—we need to exploit—

Chairman CASTLE. Is one better?

Ms. OLIVER. I—it's easier for me to have performance data from the full-time, so I tend to like that.

Chairman CASTLE. OK.

Ms. OLIVER. But I think that if we—

Chairman CASTLE. Dr. Sommers is shaking his head. One is not better than the other, so—

Ms. OLIVER. If we ensure—

Chairman CASTLE. I don't want to start a debate there, but—

Ms. OLIVER. If we ensure that our systems in place work for our students, then it doesn't make a difference whether it's full-time or shared-time.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you.

Ms. OLIVER. As long as the process fits the student.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you. Ms. Lufkin, Ms. White, I'm going to have to ask you to be relatively brief, since I'm sort of out of time here.

Ms. LUFKIN. OK. Well, I'll just say that everything that my former colleagues have mentioned I would support whole-heartedly, and want to sort of focus a little bit on the parental issue, because, when it comes to the selection of non-traditional careers or looking at career option, the parents are very important, and having them involved is one of the key elements that we've discovered in terms of looking at this issue.

The other thing is about what we would like to see is students to have more choices and to explore careers in a broader range for themselves, and all of those, I think, are supported within the bill, especially the strengthening of language in the career guidance and counseling section.

Chairman CASTLE. Good, thank you. Ms. White.

Ms. WHITE. Yes, thank you. Since our study did not look at parental involvement, I will save you some time on that one, Mr. Chairman.

With regard to the early choice issue, I would just like to underscore our concern about the choices made by students who enter Tech-Prep with the goal of entering post-secondary ed with advanced standing. As I indicated in my very rushed testimony, we found that very few students actually appeared to gain those credits when they entered post-secondary education.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you. Thank you all very much, and we'll turn to Ms. Woolsey now.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Van Hollen has—would like to say something about Mrs. Oliver, and then he has to leave.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ms. Woolsey, and thank you for holding this third in a series of hearings on this important issue. I want to thank all of the witnesses.

I just wanted to especially thank Mrs. Kathy Oliver from the state of Maryland for being here, and I appreciate all the work that you've done with our office and your input on many issues, includ-

ing what you've talked about at the hearing. But I just wanted to welcome you and thank you for the work you've done in our state on these important issues. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Mr. Van Hollen. Ms. Woolsey, do you want to go now, or should I go to Mr. Osborne and come back to you?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I prefer you go to Mr. Osborne.

Chairman CASTLE. OK. Mr. Osborne, are you prepared, sir?

Mr. OSBORNE. I'm sort of prepared.

Chairman CASTLE. Well, I knew you were prepared, but I didn't know if you were prepared to go at that moment.

Mr. OSBORNE. I don't have a game plan, so thanks for asking. Thank you for being here today and, I guess, Ms. Lufkin, I would just, it seemed like you had—I think I counted 25 recommendations. And so, I guess, my thought is, do you like the basic bill, or do you think we ought to start over? This is not a facetious question. I mean, it did seem like you had a lot of objections, and also I'm a little bit concerned about what the cost of your—have you added up what it might cost to implement some of these recommendations?

Ms. LUFKIN. First let me say that I think—I complimented the Subcommittee on starting from current law, because I think the current law has some very strong provisions in it regarding support for special population students. Most of the suggestions that I made are minor language tweaks in the law which basically just continue to emphasize issues around serving special population students and the inclusion of language that encourages locals to provide programs for them.

The accountability system in current law and in the bill that you are offering basically requires that there's a disconnect with the language in the accountability system and the local uses of funds.

So the suggestion in terms of providing required uses of fund language around supporting special population students and providing programs for students pursuing non-traditional careers really is supported in the accountability section.

As far as the amount of money it would take to do any of these programs, I wouldn't expect that it would shift resources in any other way, other than to emphasize recruitment activities and support services for students already in career technical education that need those additional supports to be successful.

Mr. OSBORNE. OK, well, I'm not conversant enough with the bill to separate out minor technical changes from what was made here, so I assumed that you were looking at quite a few changes that were fairly significant.

One other question, and this would be for Dr. Sommers and Mrs. Oliver. What do you feel accountability looks like for vocational and technical education? I mean, I understand what accountability looks like under No Child Left Behind, you know, grades three through eight, but I'm not totally very understanding of what this might mean for vocational and technical education, and I know you both mentioned that it's desirable, but how do we achieve it?

Dr. SOMMERS. The question of what it looks like is very similar to No Child Left Behind except that we focus on career technical education. Career technical is a body of knowledge just like math,

science, English. It requires a certain amount of programming and success on the student's part to acquire that knowledge and information and skill sets.

And so, to the extent that we can develop high-quality career technical assessments, either performance or written, to the extent that we can clearly identify that as an objective in the legislation, which it does, you can drive us to design curriculum program services and everything else to make that successful for all the students that enroll and choose to.

The actual performance measures are the key indicator of whether we're making progress. And actually I encourage any kind of parts of the legislation kind of focus on that, but actually leave lots of flexibility at the local level, because if I can deliver it in many different ways—for example, full-time and part-time.

I actually run a full-time campus where full-time students are engaged in lots of programs including high-end academics. I've got a whole cadre of faculty that teach in part-time programs. They both meet a unique student population that, if you forced us to do one or the other, we would fail miserably at. So the performance measures actually drive what we do.

You just build them right on top of the academics and No Child Left Behind and we'll be very successful.

Mr. OSBORNE. But these would be formulated by you folks, is that correct?

Dr. SOMMERS. Actually, in most cases, we would coordinate that with the state and the local. I strongly encourage some specificity in the performance measures which allows for national comparability and for us to have the opportunity to find first-class programs.

Ms. OSBORNE. Again I don't know enough about it to ask an intelligent question, but do you have a corresponding test of some type that would correspond with the NAPE, or would you be involved with the NAPE test at the high school level at all?

Ms. OLIVER. In Maryland, we have aligned our career and technology education accountability system with our K–12 accountability system, so that it is in lock-step with that. Our approach to program improvement with our local recipients at both the secondary and post-secondary level mirrors—has those systems determining every year what their improvement will look like, and how they will be using their Perkins dollars, their local dollars, their state dollars, to support the strategies to increase that improvement.

Right now, the NAPE is not available to us in terms of, in our state, for twelfth-grade students in career and technology education programs. However, we are a member of The High Schools that Work initiative, where we do use a NAPE-like assessment that measures twelfth-grade achievement in reading, math and science, and that is a very valuable tool for career and technology education as we look to improving academic performance, because we are able then to—we assess these students in the January of their senior year, and it provides us, in addition to teacher surveys and student surveys and transcript surveys, an opportunity to really dig into the data that will direct the strategies that need to be put into place to improve student achievement.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Mr. Osborne. Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Lufkin and all of you, really. I want to know how students are advised in these programs. I mean, how do they influence—how do you know there is going to be a job there after they go in a particular direction? Are you doing outreach with your communities? I'll start with you, Mimi.

Ms. LUFKIN. Certainly. I think you're talking about sort of the career guidance and counseling procedures that occur and how students make decisions regarding their career choices. And I think if you were to go across the country and walk into any secondary school or post-secondary institution, you would see something potentially different. And some of them are more successful than others, and I think those who target resources toward these efforts are more successful.

Dr. Sommers and Mrs. Oliver both mentioned workplace learning as part of an effective CTE program, and we also believe that students having access to job shadowing experiences, mentoring activities, role models, the real world, is really very important.

I don't know that I would say that that's happening in every career and technical education program across the country, but the kinds of language that's been included in this bill certainly would continue to drive those kinds of positive efforts. It's very, very important, because what typically happens in a lot of situations is that students will choose a career based on peer pressure or on media pressure, and not necessarily on informed decisionmaking. And that's something that is very important to us, particularly as it revolves around access to careers that could lead to economic self-sufficiency and students making decisions that are long-term decisions about their own future. And oftentimes that kind of information is not available.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Ms. White?

Ms. WHITE. Yes, thank you. OK, one of the things that concerned us, particularly as we looked at Tech-Prep in implementation across the country, was the inability to get a clear picture of the outcome achieved by these programs. By statute, Tech-Prep programs are supposed to lead to high-skill, high-wage employment or further education. Since so many states and consortia were unable to determine who was participating in a Tech-Prep program, it was very hard to track whether they actually got a job, much less one that would be meeting the statutory requirements.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Is part of that requirement that there are actual jobs in the community?

Ms. WHITE. They are supposed to develop the articulation agreement and the programs—the consortia are supposed to develop these programs by looking at the labor market area. Originally, in the Perkins II legislation, Tech-Prep programs focused primarily on technical education programs. More recently, they have expanded into a much broader array of vocational offering child care, human resources, fashion and interior design, for example.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Dr. Sommers?

Dr. SOMMERS. Yes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. When you are answering, I also want to know if, for example, if there's a shortage of auto repair people that know anything about technology. I mean, that's a big—is that—tell me if that's what we're talking about.

Dr. SOMMERS. Mr. Chairman, Ms. Woolsey, I can answer the question pretty simply, because I'm at the local level and we deliver this, so I'm going to tell you, we start with a career development program, we invest about 350,000 a year in K–8 for career exploration, career information, not to force kids into a career, but to make sure they understand the full array.

Literally, the best program enrollments are the where the TV shows are, and we're trying to correct that. I mean, I've got forensics and biotechnology out my ears because of CSI. So we've got to put real clear performance measures—when we beat those odds, then we're in good shape.

Career development then leads into programming. We know well in advance what the students' interests are and also we have business advisory councils both at the program level and at the broad-based level. We actually hire labor market analysts that constantly measures labor markets, not only the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but also our internal community operations. And so we adapt programs to high-demand, high-wage jobs. And also in demand, sometimes they're not high-wage. We've got teacher education academies, after all, but we look for places where we have needs and services, and we try to match those two up.

We see career development as the single most important factor in meeting the non-traditional enrollment problem. We've made progress in that at Butler Tech. In fact, in our adult enrollments, we've got some of the highest percentages of non-traditional in the state, and we're proud of that. So all those fit together. Good career development, high quality programs that are tailored to long-term needs, and finally the labor market analysts guiding us. In all of those, we try to do our best to make sure that students have choices of college and careers in the local regional areas.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Can Mrs. Oliver answer that? Thanks.

Ms. OLIVER. In order for a CTE program to be approved in our state, labor market demand has to be documented. We work collaboratively with our Department of Labor Licensing and Regulation and our Department of Business and Economic Development, as well as our business communities, to help us further refine and identify the specifics of that demand. In addition, we are now in Maryland working with industry shortage areas. We had a health care summit last year. We're working on aerospace, on manufacturing, other key areas that are of importance to Maryland's economy and to the opportunities that are available for its citizens.

We are—students are advised in a variety of ways. We have a career development model that provides outcomes for our school systems to work with to ensure that students understand who they are, what their interests are, how to explore career opportunities. We also promote teacher advisor programs, because clearly there are just not enough guidance counselors to go around.

So we have many of our high schools that are working on improvement opportunities, converting to teacher advisors, where teachers work with a group of students beginning in the ninth

grade and all the way through their twelfth-grade experience, to advise students on all aspects of their high school program, but career development in particular.

Ms. WOOLSEY. So I'm sure you're all going to say yes. Part of this is, like, you can encourage a kid to learn to be a technician knowing that they really in the long run want to be an engineer, but they could be the Tech-Prep at the lower level and then go on? I mean, it's not an end in and of itself.

Dr. SOMMERS. Fifty-four percent of all the students that are completers in our programs attend higher ed. They're there 9 months later, compared to our high schools in the area, we're the second highest, if you compare their actual attendance, not what they say they're going to do, but actual attendance. So we're very pleased at the choices they have. By the way, the majority of them are employed at the same time, because they have to pay for the process.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Ms. Woolsey. Now, let me just ask a follow-up question or two. And that is, about the testing. I just want to make sure I understand the testing. I assume that—and it was actually Mrs. Oliver answering this question—but I assume that your students participate in the NAPE testing as it is applicable in the sampling that's done for the NAPE in your various jurisdictions. And I assume on No Child Left Behind that most of it is not applicable, because of the age related, because of the testing in grade three through eight, but that as it is applicable in high school, that you, again, you would participate and be graded on that basis for that. Is that also correct?

Are there are other, are there specialized, first of all, are there any specialized tests on a national level that you take that would be similar to NAPE or No Child Left Behind for vocational education in particular?

Dr. SOMMERS. Actually, there's a whole series—NAPE, of course, has a very finite set of courses—math, science, English, that sort of thing. Career technical tends to be a little more diverse, and so you have a variety, but we rely heavily on the industry credentialling. We also have standardized career technical assessments in the state of Ohio that have been developed by the state. We think that one of the things this piece of legislation could do is push for some kind of voluntary national career technical assessment that actually is lined out by Jean Bottoms and some communications with you.

Chairman CASTLE. Is there anything like that now?

Dr. SOMMERS. There's no across the board, and I think that would be an excellent first step to kind of get at those things. We also—by the way, the No Child Left Behind requirements, OGT, are not sufficient for our programs. We have to rely on ACT and Compass for academics, because most of the graduation tests that comply with No Child Left Behind are actually at about the tenth or eleventh grade, to give them time to assess, and our programs tend to be at the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade.

Chairman CASTLE. Mm-hmm. Very good.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I have one more question. The Perkins Act—how much of the funding goes to adult education? I mean, once, a re-entry, a woman.

Ms. OLIVER. In our state, funding is not designated by—our funding goes to both post-secondary and to secondary, and that's how the funding is split. Adult students can participate in either a program at the secondary or post-secondary level. I wouldn't have data on what is exactly spent on adults.

Ms. WOOLSEY. But it is available?

Ms. OLIVER. It could be available.

Ms. WOOLSEY. What does that mean?

Ms. OLIVER. Well, it would, we would have to—it depends upon the definition of an adult. I mean, in general, all of our post-secondary programs do serve adults, but we do not have adult programs like Ohio has, that is a, really a third system in terms of CTE or a third delivery mechanism. In Maryland, it's through one of two deliveries, but adults are welcomed in both areas. It would be difficult for me to be able to disaggregate spending on adult learners.

Dr. SOMMERS. Yes. Actually, in the state of Ohio, it's about 85, 80–85 percent secondary, 15 percent split between community colleges and adult workforce. We actually serve more adults in the adult workforce than the community colleges do in our state.

As I recall, you tend to vary in the west. They tend to be much more on the post-secondary side; in the east, it tends to be more on the secondary, most because of population densities. It's harder to do career technical in very small schools. So, actually adult workforce works very closely with community colleges in the state of Ohio and as long as you provide flexibility in the formula as it is now, it will be adaptable.

Ms. LUFKIN. I can talk to California, the way California does it. And that is, it sounds to me like it's fairly similar to Ohio. When the Perkins Fund comes to California, it's split 50–50 between the State Department of Education and the California community college chancellor's office. There are in secondary schools, adult education programs that are available for adults to participate in career and technical education on secondary school campuses, typically, and in regional occupational programs throughout California.

As far as the post-secondary component, then those, the 50 percent of the funds then go to community colleges. As far as adult re-entry programs or re-entry programs for women, for example, many of those programs typically are found at the community college campuses. And I think that's probably more likely true across the country. And also, at the secondary level, you would more likely see teen parent programs with—in terms of trying to access career and technical education. And oftentimes when those programs are held at alternative education sites, those students do not have access to quality career and technical education, which is an issue, especially for young parents.

But in terms of the resources being available, they are available for adult women typically in the community college system.

Ms. WHITE. Our forthcoming NAPE report includes a chart that indicates the split between secondary and post-secondary Perkins expenditures in each of the states and territories. I don't remember the exact breakdown. I do not have that chapter with me. But more states spent the majority of their money at the secondary level. If you would like, I can send that chart to you.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, that's good information. OK. I'd like to have that. Thank you. Thank you, very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman CASTLE. Thank you, Ms. Woolsey. And let me thank the panel.

I think we've run out of members and questions at this point, so we'll bring this to a close. We are going to be voting actually fairly soon on the floor. Again, your original testimony was chock-full of all kinds of information that we will take under consideration as we continue to review the legislation. As Ms. Woolsey has indicated, this is, even though we've introduced it, we're still in the stage where we can refine it, if you will. And we are going to be working on that. So your testimony is very valuable in helping with that.

We do appreciate each of you being here today. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:35 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

Statement of United Tribes Technical College, Submitted for the Record

United Tribes Technical College submits this statement regarding H.R. 4496, legislation to reauthorize and amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act.

For 35 years United Tribes Technical College (UTTC) has been providing postsecondary vocational and technical education, job training and family services to Indian students throughout the nation. We receive critical funding through Section 117 of the Perkins Act without which we could not operate. Section 117 is, as you know, the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions portion of the Act.

UTTC is owned and operated by five federally recognized tribes situation wholly or in part in North Dakota – the Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe, Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa. Control of the institution is vested in a ten-member board of directors comprised of elected Tribal Chairpersons and Tribal Council Members.

I. United Tribes Technical College

We summarize our Perkins reauthorization recommendations in this statement. We have also attached a paper which has our proposed amendments in legislative language and which compares them to current law. But we would first like to tell you more about what we are accomplishing at United Tribes Technical College. One of this Subcommittee's hearings focused on the successes of vocational and technical education programs and we want to share our successes with you as well. We bring to your attention the following facts about UTTC, an institution with:

- An 89 percent retention rate
- A placement rate of 90 percent (job placement and going on to four-year intuitions)
- A projected return on federal investment of 11 to 1 (2003 study comparing the projected earnings generated over a 29-year period of UTTC Associate of Applied Science graduates with the cost of educating them)
- The highest level of accreditation. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools has accredited UTTC again in 2001 for the longest period of time allowable – ten years or until 2011 and with no stipulations. We are also the only tribal college accredited to offer on-line associate degrees.

For the Spring Semester 2004, we enrolled approximately 600 students from more than 45 tribes and 17 states. The majority of our students are from the Great Plains states, an area that, according to the 2001 BIA Labor Force Report, has an Indian reservation jobless rate of 75 percent.

In addition, as of the Spring Semester 2004, we serve 185 children in our Theodore Jamerson Elementary school, and 133 children in our infant-toddler and pre-school programs, bringing the population for whom we provide direct services to 979. These are primarily the children of our adult students.

We believe that one of the keys to our success is the provision of quality education in a family-friendly environment and in a cultural setting in which students feel comfortable and can work to their potential.

UTTC course offerings and partnerships with other educational institutions. UTTC offers 14 vocational/technical programs and awards a total of 24 two-year degree and one-year certificates. We are accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Below is a description of a few of our courses.

Injury Prevention. Through our Injury Prevention Program we are addressing the injury death rate among Indians, which is 2.8 times that of the U.S. population. We received assistance through Indian Health Service to establish the only degree granting Injury Prevention program in the nation. Injuries are the number one cause of mortality among Native people for ages 1-44 and the third for overall death rates. IHS spends more than $150 million annually for the treatment of non-fatal injuries, and treatment of injuries is the largest expenditure of IHS contract health funds. (IHS FY 2004 Budget Book).

Early Childhood Education. We offer an AAS degree in Early Childhood Education, and provide training to Head Start and other early childhood education teachers and aides by providing them the necessary training so that they can meet the required Early Childhood standards. Some of our courses are available on-line.

Computer Support Technician Program. In the first year of implementation, the Computer Support Technician program is at maximum student capacity. In order to keep up with student demand, we will need more classrooms, equipment and instructors. Our program includes all of the Microsoft Systems certifications that translate into higher income earning potential for graduates.

Nutrition and Food Services. UTTC will meet the challenge of fighting diabetes in Indian Country through education. It is well known that the rate of diabetes is very high in Indian Country, with some tribal areas experiencing the highest incidence of diabetes in the world. About half of Indian adults have diabetes (Diabetes in American Indians and Alaska Natives, NIH Publication 99---4567, October 1999)

We offer a Nutrition and Food Services Associate of Applied Science degree in an effort to increase the number of Indians with expertise in nutrition and dietetics. Currently, there are only a handful of Indian professionals in the country with training in these areas. Future improvement plans include offering a Nutrition and Food Services degree with a strong emphasis on diabetes education and traditional food preparation.

We also established the United Tribes Diabetes Education Center to assist local tribal communities and our students and staff in decreasing the prevalence of diabetes by providing diabetes educational programs, materials and training. We published and made available tribal food guides to our on-campus community and to tribes.

Tribal Government Management/Tourism. Another of our new programs is tribal government management designed to help tribal leaders be more effective administrators. We continue to refine our curricula for this program.

A newly established education program is tribal tourism management. UTTC has researched and developed core curricula for the tourism program and are partnering with three other tribal colleges (Sitting Bull, Fort Berthold, and Turtle Mountain) in this offering. The development of the tribal tourism program was well timed to coincide with the planned activities of the national Lewis and Clark Bicentennial last year. As you may know, Lewis and Clark and their party spent one quarter of their journey in North Dakota. UTTC art students were commissioned by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation to create historically accurate reproductions of Lewis and Clark-era Indian objects using traditional methods and natural materials. Our students had partners in this project including the National Park Services and the Peabody Museum at Harvard University. The objects made by our students are now part of a major exhibition in the Great Hall at Monticello about the Lewis and Clark expedition

Distance Education. We are working to bridge the "digital divide" by providing web-based education and Interactive Video Network courses from our North Dakota campus to American Indians residing at other remote sites and as well as to students on our campus. In the Spring 2004 semester we had 47 students (15.5 FTE) taking on-line courses. We are accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools to provide on-line associate degrees. We were invited by North Central to share our experiences in gaining on-line accreditation at their March 2004, meeting in Chicago.

At this point, nearly half of the students taking on-line courses are campus-based students. On-line courses provide the scheduling flexibility students need, especially those students with young children. Our on-line education is currently provided in the areas of Early Childhood Education and Injury Prevention

UTTC now offers at least 65 courses online. More to the point, UTTC's courses are unique – we developed them particularly to meet the experiences of Indian people. For instance, our injury prevention course addresses the high morbidity and mortality rates in tribal communities. No other school offers a similar program. Our early childhood education program places much emphasis on the unique cultural context and Indian language issues in tribal childcare and Head Start programs. By providing courses relevant to its students, UTTC fulfills its mission.

The college is also proud of its preparation efforts to launch three AAS degree programs that are to be offered completely online. Many aspects of the programs – health information technology, elementary education, and nutrition & food service – are sorely needed in Indian Country. For example, the Department of Health and Human Services mandated that health information and business office staff at the Indian Health Service and Veterans Administration medical facilities have professional health information management credentials. Many affected personnel are not within driving distance to UTTC. Moreover, there are more jobs needed than there are skilled individuals to fill the vacancies.

Our recently polled distance learning students expressed a high level of satisfaction with coursework, instruction, and activities. Most importantly, student outcome assessments show that our students score as well online as in site-based courses.

Job Training and Economic Development. UTTC is a designated Minority Business Center serving Montana, South Dakota and North Dakota. We also administer a Workforce Investment Act program and an internship program with private employers.
Economic Development Administration funding was made available to open a "University Center." The Center is used to help create economic development opportunities in tribal communities. While most states have such centers, this center is the first-ever tribal center.

Transferability of UTTC Vocational and General Education Credits. UTTC works with other institutions to ensure the transferability of our General Education and Vocational Education credits. Below are examples:

Art/Art Marketing: Articulation agreement with Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA). Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Associate of Applied Science degree requires 68 semester credits. All courses transfer to IAIA. Within the State of North Dakota the General Education courses transfer (23 credits). Art Marketing courses transfer when there is common course and description numbering which after the curriculum review this year will involve the majority of coursework.

Computer Information Technology. All vocational and general education coursework will transfer to the University of Mary, Bismarck, ND and also with Minot State University, Minot, ND. The CIT is an authorized Microsoft Information Technology Academy Program Member. Therefore within the Microsoft Academy schools transferability of coursework would happen. The program is also an authorized Cisco Networking Academy Program Member.

Criminal Justice-Students that continue to a 4-year college go to Minot State University, Minot, ND. The General Education courses transfer and the majority of the Criminal Justice courses (32 of 38 hours) transfer. Courses that don't transfer relate to physical training and coursework unique to UTTC.

Elementary Education (64 Semester Credits) and Early Childhood Education (63 Semester Credits) The Education program has been very astute with regard to course descriptions and course numbers in order to align with North Dakota Colleges and Universities and report that General Education courses transfer with the exception of General Math (Intermediate and College Algebra transfer). EE and ECE coursework transfers in most cases depending on the person at the receiving college and their interpretation of coursework. It can differ depending on the receiving person. In 95 percent of the time the student is successful.

In addition to our partnerships with colleges in North Dakota, we have a partnership with the University of North Dakota and Sinte Gleska University in South Dakota for transfer of our credits to their four-year teacher education program.

Health Information Technology. All course work will transfer to area colleges and universities especially if the student has a 3.0 GPA or better. There are 63 semester hours in this program.

Injury Prevention. This program is unique to UTTC. Very few students go on to four year colleges but if they do the General Education credits will transfer. The Injury Prevention classes are admitted as electives in most cases. The Injury Prevention program is looking at extending to a four--year program when the accreditation time is appropriate. The program has online coursework that is drawing students across the United States.

Practical Nursing. The Nursing department has articulation agreements with Med-Center One Nursing College and University of Mary, both from Bismarck, ND. All General Eds and Nursing coursework transfers to these colleges and transferability to University of North Dakota and North Dakota State University is successful as well.

Small Business Management. Students who transfer to the University of Mary, Bismarck, ND will transfer all 65 credit hours. At other colleges and universities within the North Dakota system, the General Education credits will transfer and 90-95 percent of vocational coursework will transfer. Again, the transferability is often at the discretion of the receiving college representative and can differ from time to time. In most cases the result is successful.

II. Perkins Reauthorization Recommendations

H.R. 4496 would make only one change to Section 117 of the current law, and we consider this portion of the bill as a placeholder. H.R. 4496 would delete required reports with regard to budget, facilities and training needs of Section 117 grantees. We oppose this provision. And H.R. 4496 would, inadvertently we expect, have a FY 2005 authorization level for of $4 million (the same as the FY 1999 authorized level and well below the FY 2004 appropriation of $7.2 million).

Many of our recommendations are drawn directly from existing Indian education laws, all of which were considered by what is now the House Education and the Workforce Committee. We believe these amendments, many of which are technical in nature, would benefit all Section 117 grantees.

1) Credit Hour Distribution of Funds. While discussions are ongoing regarding a possible change in the manner that Section 117 funds are distributed, we have proposed that the Act be amended to distribute funds on the same basis as is done under the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities Act – that is, based on credit hours taken by Indian students. Twelve credit hours equal one Indian Student Count (ISC). The count of Indian students and their credit hours would be done in the fall and spring.

Both Crownpoint Institute of Technology (CIT) and UTTC (the section 117 grantees) provide Indian student credit hour information annually to the BIA (OIEP Form 22), so this information is readily available.

Under current law, when Department utilizes the formula set out in Section 117, funds are distributed based on Indian full-time equivalents (FTE). If two Indian students are each taking 18 hours, that is counted as 2 FTE. It is based on the number of Indian students taking 12 or more hours.

But under a credit hour system – whereby 12 credit hours equals one Indian Student Count (ISC), the same two students each taking 18 hours would constitute 3 ISC (36 hours divided by 12 equals 3). Most vocational and technical education fields of study require more than 12 hours per semester in order for a student to receive a certificate or degree in one or two years. Most vocational students take 15 or 18 hours per semester and often attend summer school in order to complete their degrees in a timely manner. So while an institution may have the expense of providing classes for a student taking 18 hours, the distribution of funds does not recognize that student as being any more expensive to educate than one taking only 12 hours.

Should one or more other institutions meet the eligibility criteria for Section 117 a hold harmless provision would protect UTTC's and CIT's funds at the prior year level plus inflation. Any newly eligible institution (s) would receive any remaining amount on a pro rata basis. If the amount of the appropriation increases to the point that there is enough funding so that the newly eligible institution(s) would be able to receive the same amount per Indian Student Count as CIT and UTTC, then the funds would be so distributed.

2) *Hold Harmless Provision.* Provision should be made for the possibility that another institution(s) may qualify for Section 117 funds, however remote that may be. Under current law the colleges funded under the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act are ineligible for Section 117 funds. An institution, in order to quality for Section 117, may not be a TCCU and it must be controlled or chartered by an Indian tribe or tribes, offer a technical degree or certificate granting program, be governed by a board a majority of whom are Indian, have been in operation for at least three years, hold accreditation or be a candidate for accreditation for postsecondary and vocational and technical education and enroll not less than 100 full-time equivalent students a majority of whom are Indian.

Should one or more other institutions meet the eligibility criteria for Section 117 the proposed hold harmless provision would protect UTTC's and CIT's funds at the prior year level plus inflation.

3) *Uses of funds.* The "grants authorized" provision in Section 117 should be amended to make it clear that the funds can be used for the various allowable expenses listed elsewhere in the current law. The"use of grant" provision would also be amended to provide not only, as under current law, use of funding for vocational and technical education programs, but also for institutional support.

Both UTTC and CIT have had disagreements with the Department over uses of Perkins funds, with the Department often taking the stance that even though something is listed in the Act as an allowable expense that is discretionary on the Department's part whether it will allow such use.

4-5) *Indirect Costs*. Two amendments are proposed concerning indirect costs.

a) Consistent with the language in the FYs 2002 through 2004 Labor-HHS Education Appropriations acts, Section 117 Perkins grantees would not be required to use a restricted indirect cost rate. This language should be included in the Perkins reauthorization bill as opposed to us having to work to get it annually in an appropriations bill. The requirement that a restricted indirect cost rate be used by Perkins grantees was really aimed at intuitions that receive state-appropriated vocational funds and is an inappropriate requirement for tribal grantees who do not have a tax base and who do not receive state-appropriated funds.

By way of background in 2001 the Department of Education, for the first time, directed Indian grantees (both Section 116 and 117 grantees) to apply a "restricted indirect cost rate" to their grants. This means each tribal grantee must obtain another indirect cost rate --exclusively for its Perkins Act grant -- from its cognizant federal agency (which in most cases is the Inspector General for the Department of the Interior.)

The Department gave two reasons for applying a restricted rate to these Perkins Act Indian programs: 1) The 1998 Amendments to the Perkins Act (Sec. 311(a)) prohibits the use of Perkins Act grant funds to supplant **non-federal funds** expended for vocational/technical programs. This "supplement, not supplant" limitation previously applied to State grants, only; and 2) A long-standing Department of Education regulation (promulgated years before the 1998 Perkins Amendments) automatically applies the restricted indirect cost rate requirement to any Department of Education grant program with a "supplement, not supplant" provision.

UTTC has no quarrel with the bases and objectives of the "supplement, not supplant" rule and seeks no change to this statutory provision. The primary targets of this rule are states and possibly local government entities that run vocational education programs with state or local funds.

By contrast, however, UTTC has little or no ability to violate this rule, as we have no source of non-federal funds to operate vocational education programs. Unlike states, we have no tax base and no source of non-federal funds to maintain a vocational education program. We depend on federal funding for our vocational/technical education program operations. Despite our inability to violate the supplanting prohibition, we are, nonetheless, being disadvantaged by a Department of Education regulation intended to enforce the prohibition against states who do have the ability to supplant.

Impact of new requirement on grantees. Under DoEd regulations, a "restricted indirect cost rate" makes unallowable certain indirect costs that are considered allowable by other federal programs. Primarily, these are costs that DoEd believes the grantee would otherwise incur if it did not receive a Perkins grant, such as the cost of the grantee's chief officer and heads of departments who report to the CEO, as well as the costs of maintaining offices for these personnel.

Prohibiting the Perkins grant from contributing its appropriate share to the grantee's indirect cost pool will most likely mean that other federal programs operated by the grantee would be expected to pick up a great share of the indirect cost pool. This outcome may well result in objections from the other program agencies that do not want to bear costs properly attributable to the Perkins grant.

Except for the exemption in the annual Education Appropriations acts we would be caught between conflicting federal agency requirements and will find ourselves unable to recover the necessary share of indirect costs attributable to each of the federal programs we operate.

b) Consistent with the language in the Indian Self-Determination Act, language is recommended providing that for purposes of under recovery and over recovery determinations by any Federal Agency, that Section 117 Perkins funds will not be taken into consideration.

6-7) *Advance Payments/Investment*. The Secretary would be required to make payments to each institution in a lump sum no later than July 1, as opposed to the current system of frequent draw downs of money.

Section1 117 Perkins grantees would be allowed to invest those funds and earn interest as allowed by the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Tribally Controlled Schools Act and the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act.

8) *Applications*. The application process for current Section 117 grantees should be made more automatic and less time-consuming. If an institution is a grantee on the date of enactment ,all that institution has to do to get Section 117 funds is to certify to the Secretary that it continues to meet the definition of "tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institution," notifies the Secretary that it wants to continue to receive a grant and submits its Indian student count data as required by the Secretary.

9) *Accounting*. We recommend amending the Act to enable Section 117 grantees to meet Perkins accounting requirements by providing annually to the Secretary a statement regarding the OMB cost principles approved and an annual financial audit conducted pursuant to the Single Audit Act. These are things the grantees already do so they should be able to be used for the Perkins requirements. Anything additional filed with the Secretary should only be necessary if there are Perkins expenses and costs not covered by the annual audit conducted under the Single Audit Act. We are trying to eliminate duplicate work.

Under current law the institutions provide accounting reports as required by the Secretary.

10-11) *Facilities and Needs Reports*. We have two recommendations:

a) We recommend that the current law's required annual report by the Secretary on the needs of the grantees be submitted as part of the Department's annual budget and that a copy be supplied to the eligible institutions. The Department has not been submitting annual needs reports.

b) An amendment would combine the current law's requirements that the Secretary undertake short-term and long-term facilities needs studies of the grantees. The study would be done every five years beginning in FY 2005. The Department has undertaken two facilities reports and they are helpful with efforts to access federal and private funding.

By way of background, the 1998 Vocational Education and Applied Technology Act required the Department of Education to study the facilities, housing and training needs of our institution. That report was published in November 2000 ("Assessment of Training and Housing Needs within Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions, November 2000, American Institute of Research"). The report identified the need for $17 million for the renovation of existing housing and instructional buildings and $30 million for the construction of housing and instructional facilities.

We continue to identify housing as our greatest need. We have a waiting list of students some who wait from one to three years for admittance. For the first time in its history, in the 2002-2003 year, we were forced to find housing off campus for our students. Enrollment for the 2002-2003 year increased by 31 percent; and in 2003-2004 our enrollment increased another 20 percent. In order to accommodate the enrollment increase, UTTC partnered with local renters and the Burleigh County Housing Authority. Approximately 40 students and their dependents were housed off campus. The demand for additional housing also presents challenges for transportation, cafeteria, maintenance and other services.

UTTC has now completed a new 86-bed single-student dormitory on campus. This dormitory is already completely full as are all of our other dormitories and student housing. To build the dormitory, we formed an alliance with the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the American Indian College Fund, the Shakopee-Mdewakanton Sioux Tribe and other sources for funding. Our new dormitory has at the same time created new challenges such as shortages in classroom, office and other support facility space. However, more housing must be built to accommodate those on the waiting list and to meet expected increased enrollment.

Some of our housing must be renovated to meet local, state, and federal safety codes. In addition some homes may be condemned which will mean lower enrollments and fewer opportunities for those seeking a quality education.

12) *Appeal Process*. We propose an appeal process whereby an applicant may appeal to the Secretary with a hearing before an administrative law judge the following decisions: 1) a determination that the applicant is not eligible for a grant; 2) a dispute regarding the calculation of the grant; and 3) an exception or problem sited in the required audit. The appeal must be filed within 30 days of receipt of the decision and must identify the amount of funding that gives rise to the appeal. The amount that a new applicant could appeal would be the amount remaining after the hold harmless provision was applied to the current Section 117 grantees.

13) *Authhorization Level.* H.R. 4496 would maintain the current law's authorization level of $4 million for FY 2005 and such sums as necessary in the out years. We expect this is an oversight, as the FY 2004 appropriation or section was $7.2 million, or well above the authorization level in the bill. We recommend a $12 million authorization level for FY 2005 and such sums as necessary in the out years.

Thank you for your consideration of our recommendations. We look forward to continuing to work with the Education Reform Subcommittee and the full Education and the Workforce Committee on reauthorization of the Perkins Act.

Statement of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Submitted for the Record

The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians submits this statement on reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.

We are one of the current tribal grantees under the Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program (NAVTEP) which is authorized under Section 116 of the current Act. Under Section 116, 1.25 percent of Perkins appropriations are reserved for a competitive grant program for tribes. We are pleased that the Administration's proposal and the pending House vocational education bill, HR 4496, would continue the tribal-specific authorization.

We would like to tell you about the benefit the Perkins program has brought to our tribal members. Our Perkins grant is allowing us to train 351 bilingual tribal members for what we can accurately say is the guarantee of a job. Over the past 30 years the Tribe has developed a diversified economy that has created employment opportunities for every Tribal member in the workforce. The Tribe employees approximately 8,000 people in a wide variety of industries and professions, about 35 percent of whom are Indian. The fact that we have been successful in developing and attracting businesses does not mean that we have a fully trained Choctaw workforce; we thus have a need for Perkins and other education programs. The Choctaw Vocational Education Program provides opportunities for training in professions that reflect the tribe's needs and available job opportunities. The training components were determined through a formal labor market study and the consideration of the tribe's on-going and planned economic development initiatives.

Our Perkins grant allows our tribal members to receive quality training in the following areas: nursing, gerontology technology, horticulture technology, landscape management, travel and tourism management technology, culinary arts technology, hotel and restaurant management technology, accounting technology, microcomputer technology, office system technology, marketing management technology, industrial maintenance trades, high school business and computer technology, and administrative office management. Some of these courses are offered using the Tribe's vocational center, while others are offered at near-by accredited post-secondary institutions. The Choctaw Vocational Education Program also provides critical counseling, educational evaluation, and individualized career planning.

The Choctaw Vocational Education Program is not an entity unto itself, but rather has formal relationships with several local community colleges and also coordinates with our other work-related programs (i.e., Native Employment Works, Workforce Investment Act, Vocational Rehabilitation). The maintenance of the continuity of our vocational education program contributes to the stability of the other programs with which we partner.

Increased Tribal Allocation. Absent a major increase in appropriations for the Perkins Act – which we believe is greatly needed – we recommend increasing the Section 116 tribal allocation from 1.25 percent to 2.0 percent. The 2000 Census shows that 32.5% of Indian and Alaska Native persons nationally, age 16 and older, had no work experience at all in 1999. In a number of reservation areas, that percentage rose to over 50 percent. The 2000 Census data shows that Native people in 1999 had a poverty rate of 25.7% -- twice the national rate. The job and related academic and skills training that can be provided by a well-designed Perkins program will make a positive difference for many Indian people.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.