

FAST FACTS: STATES' 5-YEAR PERKINS IV PLANS—WHAT'S NEW?

THE MERGE ISSUE

Let's compare: In the transition plans 21 states merged and of those 21 states that made the decision to combine Tech Prep and Title I funding streams, 90% had already decided to make this transition permanent. This year, **four more states** decided to merge funding streams. What was the rationale given?

- The District of Columbia merged so that all CTE programs of study meet the standards of Tech Prep programs.
- Florida decided to take the opportunity to merge in order to infuse the recognized core Tech Prep elements into a statewide systematic framework.
- Oregon said the needs of the state would be best served by combining funds.
- Minnesota has gone to a new single consortium structure that now utilizes combined funds.

No states that had merged during the transition year opted to un-merge. However, for those states that did not merge during the transition, 46% reserved the right to revisit the issue after the transition year. So what are they thinking now?

Not merging...yet

- Iowa is determining whether it prefers Tech Prep funds to be subject to Title I rules (if combined) or to retain the flexibility of competitive grants.
- **SHOW ME THE DATA:** CTE advisory committees have challenged some states to provide data that will support the need to keep Tech Prep as a separate funding source. If data outcomes cannot support Tech Prep initiatives, the funds will be merged.

No way, no how: Many unmerged states, such as Oklahoma, say they do not want to change the recipe for their state's success. These states are firm in not merging and instead focused on building upon best practices and articulation agreements via Tech Prep consortia. Indiana will keep funds separate because secondary funds are distributed through the Department of Education and postsecondary funds through Workforce Development.

FUNDING SPLIT—ANY CHANGES? ↔

Transition year: average split was 64% secondary, 36% postsecondary

*5-Year Plan: The average split remained 64 % secondary, 36 % postsecondary. It appears to be a wash, **but** some shifting back and forth has occurred. Six states increased secondary funding percentages slightly, while 9 states shifted to slight increases in postsecondary funding. Identical funding percentages from one year to the next were reported by 31 states.*

NON TRAD

Slightly over half of states allocated the minimum \$60,000 toward non trad, with 8 states allocating the maximum \$150,000 toward this effort. The balance of the states submitted amounts in between.

RESERVE FUND

Thirty states utilized the reserve fund option, with an average of 8.9 % being placed into the reserve fund.

Note: Information was collected from 46 state 5-year plans for this document. 9/2008