

## PERKINS REAUTHORIZATION TECH PREP SUB-COMMITTEE

Meeting at Valencia Community College-West Campus  
November 16, 2006  
9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

### PARTICIPANTS

Beverlee	Andrews	Valencia Community College
Billie	Birdsong	Lake County Schools
Julie	Summerlin	Lake County Schools
Susan	Burnett	St. Petersburg College
Angie	Clifford	Santa Fe Community College
Elizabeth	Livingston-Eassa, Co-Chair	Indian River Community College
Jack	Pause	Lee County Schools
Barbara	Wall	Pensacola Junior College
Gayle	Manley, Co-Chair	Florida Department of Education
Kathleen	Taylor	Florida Department of Education

### MEETING OVERVIEW

Co-Chair Elizabeth Livingston-Eassa (Libby) welcomed the group to Orlando and shared the plan and expectations of the day. Participants were provided with a matrix (please see attached) to lead the discussion and provide a structure upon which to build issues/concerns. Libby also indicated that participants would be limited to two minutes per issue and were instructed to stay on point as much as possible. A goal of the day was for each attendee to state a position regarding consolidation or separation. The position(s) expressed at the conclusion of the meeting would be shared with the full subcommittee during a conference call to be scheduled after the Thanksgiving holiday.

Co-Chair Gayle Manley welcomed the group and brought greetings from Tallahassee. She made the point that linking secondary and postsecondary education is a priority in Perkins IV and reaffirmed Tech Prep's fifteen year history of secondary and postsecondary linkages. She instructed the group to reach consensus on how Tech Prep should look in Florida irrespective of consolidation or remaining separate under Title II.

After a brief introduction of all participants, the group considered issues summarized below.

### **Discussion Issue #1:**

Libby cautioned that the issues under “Discussion Issue #1” were purely administrative in nature and should not drive the decision but rather serve as important considerations. Libby, Gayle, and Kathleen confirmed what is required in the Basic State Grant vs. what would be required under Title II.

Gayle explained the locals would be required to write an additional plan if Tech Prep remained separate. Susan indicated many Tech Prep coordinators also serve as district CTE directors and write and manage two plans currently. A concern was raised on how one plan would impact the relationship between postsecondary and secondary.

The group reviewed the requirements in the law pertaining to: Number of Accountability Systems, Number of Sets of Performance Indicators, Administrative and Leadership Costs, and the Administrative Cap of 5%.

### **Discussion Issue #2: Consequences of Tech Prep Infrastructure Loss**

#### *Bridge between Secondary and Postsecondary:*

The discussion centered largely around the potential loss of the existing infrastructure (bridge between secondary and postsecondary) if consolidation occurs and the concern that a Tech Prep-like infrastructure won’t necessarily be mandated by the state in the Basic Plan. The group agreed the infrastructure must be protected and that would be a point of negotiation should the state be inclined to consolidate.

The current Tech Prep structure under Perkins III has specific responsibilities assigned and those are tied to funding. Therefore it has fiscal impact.

#### *Structure for negotiating/maintaining articulation:*

Susan shared a concern that 15 years of solid work with measurable outcomes under Tech Prep could be lost under a single plan. The group concurred that a structure must be “spelled out” and tied directly to funding or else it will disappear in certain areas.

#### *Insulated, inward focus:*

The group discussed the fact that while articulation is defined in the Basic Plan there are no specific requirements. Libby expressed that a singular focus among secondary agencies and postsecondary agencies will contribute to a potential lose of collaboration over time. Billie shared that Tech Prep is embedded in CTE in Lake County. There was consensus that CTE would not be complete without Tech Prep or a Tech Prep-like structure.

The group also discussed Tech Prep’s role in collaborative professional development for secondary and postsecondary, and its critical role with coordination of business/industry, apprenticeships, work-based learning: Again, consternation was expressed as to how this would be maintained under consolidation.

**Discussion Issue #3 – Preservation of Funding (How will Tech Prep be different if changed?)**

The group agreed that a loss of funding will mean a loss of identity for Tech Prep. Billie shared that once a categorical program is cut it is “gone for good.” She shared the example of School-to-Work funding. Gayle indicated that Perkins IV is the actual categorical program and that Tech Prep Title II is simply a set-aside within the Perkins categorical program.

The group expressed concern about the preservation of funds should consolidation occur.

**Discussion Issue #4- Flexibility of Funds**

The group discussed carryover, allocation, and formula under the current structure versus within the Basic State Grant.

**Discussion Issue #5 -Must meet 9 criteria of Section 135 and then 203(e)**

See attached matrix for contents of Section 135 and 203 (e)

Kathleen read from the law to clarify questions from the group regarding the nine criteria that must be fulfilled before funds are expended on “permissive” items.

**Discussion issue #6: Programmatic Considerations:**

The group expressed concerns regarding the feasibility of meeting the 135 “9” and then 203 (e). Under the Basic State Grant there is no permitted use of funding for remediation/development while Title II permits it.

A concern was raised regarding funding of preparatory services. While it is mandatory under Title II, it is considered “permissive” in the Basic State Grant once the other 9 mandatory uses of funds have been fulfilled. The current Tech Prep consortia structure is the only place where preparatory services for transition between secondary and post-secondary exists.

A concern was raised regarding counseling/guidance activities. While it is mandatory under Title II, it is considered “permissive” in the Basic State Grant once the other 9 mandatory uses of funds have been fulfilled. The group feels strongly that guidance and counseling is a core element of services offered in Tech Prep.

The group also discussed other funding issues including: fiscal requirements: supplement not supplant; duplicative purchases; monies may only be expended for "improvement" and enlargement of consolidated funds.

### **Accountability and Sanctions:**

The group reviewed the law for clarification regarding the issue of sanctions which is summarized as follows.

- 1) Sanctions: failure to meet 113(b) performance levels
- 2) Sanctions: failure to meet 123 (90%) on each core indicator
- 3) Sanctions: failure to meet 204 (e)

The group discussed the new performance indicators required under Title II. Questions arose about DOE's capacity to track this information through its existing system and how will the DOE/Consortia check and monitor. The group discussed data disaggregating by NCLB and confidentiality issues and FERPA. Concerns were also expressed regarding measuring placement in related fields of employment.

### **State Plan Criteria for Cross-System Collaboration Infrastructure:**

The group agreed that cross-system collaboration include the following:

- 1) Requirements applicable to all recipients
- 2) Definitive responsibilities of secondary & postsecondary systems
- 3) Creation of regional/career pathways consortia
- 4) Coordination of planning activities

### **Additional/Alternative Elements of creating consortia structure:**

Other elements in cross-system collaboration could include:

- 1) Requirement for all Fund I recipients to join a consortia
- 2) Consortia administered by secondary districts or community colleges
- 3) Establish parameters for consortia directors to control funding/activities
- 4) Establish role and authority of Regional Coordinator
- 5) Address the 5% local admin cap that would affect use of funds for salary

Upon discussing the issues summarized above, the group discussed some ideas of how Tech Prep could continue to remain separate as the innovator of Career and Technical Education. The following ideas were discussed:

- Promotion and expansion of statewide articulation, regional and cross-regional articulation
- Strengthen regional professional development opportunities for guidance and counseling
- Collaborate with the Regional Centers of Excellence to identify targeted occupations in order to develop specific Programs of Study
- Make Business/Industry leaders true consortium partners
- Strengthen POS by collaboration and articulation with 4 yr degree institutions

The following is a recap of the stated positions regarding consolidation vs. separation:

Jack Pause- Separate

Susan Burnett- Separate

Billie Birdsong- Separate

Julie Summerlin – Separate

Barbara Wall- Separate  
Angie Clifford – Separate  
Beverlee Andrews- Consolidate  
Elizabeth Livings-Eassa- Consolidate

The group agreed this should be taken to the full Tech Prep Subcommittee as half of the members were unable to meet in Orlando. The group recommends we develop 2 separate sets of recommendations: 1) Recommendations for maintaining a separate plan to improve the Tech Prep delivery system 2) A consolidated plan that would include recommendations to incorporate the Tech Prep principals and structure to improve the achievement of CTE students.