



Scott Himmelstein
Director

Frank Kemerer
Associate Director

FINAL REPORT

A Study of Career and Technical Education and Funding in California and San Diego County

May 2008

Principal Investigators:

Fred Galloway
Associate Professor
School of Leadership and Education Sciences
University of San Diego

Richard Seder
Consultant and Former Policy Fellow
Office of the Secretary of Education
The State of California

Funded by a grant from the Girard Foundation

A Study of Career and Technical Education Programs and Funding in California and San Diego County

May 2008

Center for Education Policy and Law
University of San Diego

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to enhance understanding of the policy, program, and funding environment involved with California career and technical education (CTE) at the state and San Diego County levels. The research involved two main areas of inquiry. First, the researchers conducted a broad review of public agency documents for information about federal and state funding programs and, for each program, the funding agency, eligibility requirements, delivery mechanism, amount funded, and unique programmatic features. Second, the researchers conducted a survey and follow-up interviews with key stakeholders in San Diego County regarding their knowledge of funding programs, the extent to which they apply for and are awarded CTE funding, and what recommendations they have for improving the flow of funding to students who are most in need of CTE education.

Key findings emerging from the study are as follows:

1. An estimated \$2.5 billion was available to California's public schools, charter schools, and community colleges in 2007 for CTE programs.
2. In the past two years, state funding for CTE has increased 18 percent. Most of this increase is attributed to the passage of SB 70 in 2005 and its scheduled funding through the 2013-2014 fiscal year.
3. Initial scheduled SB 70 funding for 2007-08 was \$52 million, though the final allocation is still subject to budget negotiations.
4. Proposition 1D (2006) includes \$500 million to build new and refurbish existing CTE facilities.
5. CTE is funded through a fragmented maze of programs and funding streams with multiple applications and program requirements.
6. There is no central clearinghouse that provides easily accessible information about California CTE programs and shows how the funding flows to them.
7. From a population perspective, San Diego's fair share of CTE funding should be somewhere between 8.0 and 8.5 percent.
8. Based on the eight CTE programs that were examined, four areas in which San Diego County is obtaining at least its fair share are the federal Perkins funding grants (8.80 percent), Special Education Workability Grants (8.76 percent),

Regional Occupation Programs (8.54 percent), and CTE equipment and supplies (8.11 percent). Areas where the county is particularly deficient include funding under Title I and II of the Workforce Investment Act (5.55 percent and 4.91 percent, respectively), California Partnership Academies (4.28 percent), and Agricultural Incentive Grants (3.89 percent).

9. Based on conversations with almost 50 county CTE stakeholders, three themes emerged: (1) the CTE application process is extremely burdensome and retards participation; (2) there is an absence of stability and integration among CTE funding sources; and (3) the larger the organization seeking CTE funding, the more likely funding will be sought and received.
10. There is a great need for a simplified way to learn about CTE funding sources and their amounts, program criteria, and the application process.

To address the need for a better way to access information about career and technical education funding sources and apply for funding, the researchers have constructed a user-friendly computer-based map of programs and funding to increase CTE utilization in California and particularly in San Diego County.

I. Introduction

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 first allocated federal funding for career and technical education (CTE), then known as vocational education. More recently, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, which was reauthorized in 2006, provides federal funding to improve CTE programs, integrate academic and CTE instruction, serve special populations, and meet gender equity needs. For fiscal year 2007, federal funding amounted to more than \$129 million in Perkins state basic grants to California (more than \$1.1 billion total nationally) with over \$51 million going to California school districts and more than \$16 million going to California Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs).

Over the past several years there has been an increased focus on the need to rebuild and reinvigorate career and technical education in California and San Diego County. Over those two years state funding for CTE has increased by 18 percent. In his 2005 State of the State address, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger identified CTE as his educational priority and, through passage of Senate Bill 70 (SB 70) and subsequent signing of Senate Bill 1130, funding is committed to CTE programs through the 2013-14 fiscal year. As part of that commitment, voters approved Proposition 1D in November of 2006 that included \$500 million to build new and refurbish existing CTE facilities. At the program level, the Governor's proposed 2007-08 state budget included \$52 million for CTE through SB 70 – \$20 million in ongoing funding and \$32 million in new funding to reform CTE instruction in high schools and community colleges.¹

¹ The 2007-08 budgeted amount of \$52 million and ongoing funding is subject to year-to-year budget negotiations. Given the budget circumstances in 2008, preliminary negotiations have reduced the amount of funding to \$42 million.

Funding is available for CTE from a variety of sources to support a range of activities in traditional public schools, public charter schools, community colleges, four-year colleges, and other community-based organizations and businesses. One such program, California Partnership Academies (CPAs) – small learning academies designed around a specific career or industry theme -- serve more than 30,000 students in grades 10-12 in 290 high schools statewide. According to a 2008 MDRC evaluation of CPAs across the nation, there are more than 2,500 career academies operating across the nation. Therefore, California houses more than one-quarter of all career academies operating in the nation. In California, the CPAs are supported through a competitive grants process, not through formula-based funding. According to the latest directory, 13 CPAs operate throughout San Diego County and focus on business, hospitality and tourism, recreation, arts and entertainment, and other program areas. By contrast, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Riverside counties and had the most CPAs in the state with 66, 24, and 23 CPAs, respectively. However, only about one-quarter of the school districts in the state and fewer than 20 percent of comprehensive high schools have these programs.

Despite the renewed focus, funding for CTE remains segregated into numerous programs with multiple applications and program requirements. Examples include the afore-mentioned federal Perkins grants and state-funded California Partnership Academies grants. The Regional Occupational Centers/Programs (ROCPs) generate program funding through the revenue-limits formula. One-time allocations for such things as CTE equipment and supplies and minor facility reconfigurations were made available to districts for school year 2006-07.

Local education agencies, county offices of education, ROCPs, and community colleges must navigate through a maze of state and federal programs, each with its own applications and requirements, to deliver CTE to California's secondary and adult students. Currently, there is neither a central clearinghouse of easily accessible information about all of these programs nor a transparent map of the funding flows for CTE programs. School and district administrators, program heads, board members, policymakers, and the general public are hard-pressed to find clear, understandable information about how CTE is provided in the state and then determine if their district or county is getting its "fair share."

The primary goal of this project is to provide a clear understanding to educators, policymakers, philanthropies, and the general public of how CTE is funded in the state so that they can make more-informed decisions about the programs and funding streams available. The project team accomplished this desired outcome through the following set of activities:

1. Researched, analyzed, and documented federal, state, local, and major philanthropic funding streams for CTE in California
2. Researched and analyzed the extent to which San Diego County is receiving its "fair" share of available CTE dollars

3. Created a user-friendly map detailing the sources of funding for CTE in California including allowable uses of funding (available as separate PowerPoint deck).

In addition, the project team will convene a forum for San Diego educators, policymakers, and stakeholders to present findings and discuss how the current funding models contribute or detract to the creation and implementation of high-quality CTE programs.

By increasing the transparency of the CTE funding processes, the project team believes it has provided a valuable tool for local educators and other CTE stakeholders to use to increase the number and quality of CTE programs. Better and more accessible CTE programs will improve the overall quality of California schooling.

In the next section, an overview of the programs used to deliver career and technical education in California will first be presented, followed by a more in-depth look at each of the particular vehicles used. Information will be presented that describes for each program the funding agency, eligibility requirements, amount funded, unique programmatic features, and a general description of the program and its delivery mechanism. Section IV follows up on this information by detailing the federal and state program funding received by school districts and other CTE delivery organizations in San Diego County.

II. DELIVERING CAREER-TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

California career and technical education has been provided through a variety of programs and service providers. The range of service providers extends from middle schools and high schools in local school districts and charter schools to community colleges, four-year universities, and finally, private-sector employers working in partnership with the aforementioned education institutions. Public funding for these programs comes from a variety of sources, including state and local funding for elementary and secondary schools (e.g., the approval of Proposition 1D in 2006 for school facilities resulted in a \$500 million being dedicated to building CTE facilities in high schools), state and local funding for colleges and universities, and federal funding for workforce development. The largest federal funding source for CTE-related programs and activities is the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

As part of a recent needs-assessment conducted for the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), the following 12 primary vehicles for providing CTE in California (WestEd, 2006) were identified:

Table I: CTE Service Vehicles

CTE Funding Vehicles	Description Section (To Follow)
Elementary School Awareness and Middle School Introductory CTE Courses	A1
High school CTE courses (delivered individually or in a sequence via general fund revenues)	A2.1
Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs)	A2.2
Career Partnership Academies & Thematic Schools/Programs	A2.3
Apprenticeship & Work Experience Education (in school districts and community college)	A2.4
Adult Education (in school districts and community colleges)	A2.5
Middle College High Schools	B1
Community College Vocational Education and Economic Workforce Development Programs	B2
Federal Perkins Basic Aid Grant	C1
Federal Perkins Tech Prep/2+2 Programs	C2
Workforce Investment Act	C3
Governor’s CTE Initiative	D1-D6

In addition to these primary vehicles, there exist at least three other important programs and service providers, including:

- Continuation high schools and court and community schools
- Incarcerated youth through the Division of Juvenile Justice at the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
- Workforce Investment Board (WIB)-coordinated services funded through the U.S. Department of Labor’s Workforce Investment Act (WIA).

For purposes of this study, no detailed analysis was conducted on those programs in continuation high schools, court and community schools, or offered through the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Nor does this report explore the private-sector market of higher education even though many of these institutions may be eligible for state or federal higher education grant programs such as Cal Grants or federal Pell Grants.

In the following section, the 12 primary delivery mechanisms are divided into three broad categories defined by the primary agency with responsibility for program administration. These include the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO), and Other Agencies. Section C provides descriptions of the WIA and Perkins programs. Finally, Section D describes the multiple intended program development and expansion initiatives contained in the Governor’s Career-Technical Education Initiative, also known as SB 70.

III. THE INDIVIDUAL CTE DELIVERING ENTITIES

This section of the report provides a detailed look at the individual vehicles for delivering CTE programs in California. For each, a description of the sponsoring agency, amount funded, eligibility requirements, and unique features is provided in addition to a general description of the program. The section will conclude with a discussion of California’s renewed commitment to career and technical education and the additional program funding streams made available through Senate Bill 70 (SB 70, 2005).

Each of the funding sources is labeled as either as “funding stream” or “program funding.” A *funding stream* can best be characterized as flexible dollars from federal, state, or local sources that can be used in a variety of ways to help fund the programs chosen by the school or college district. *Program funding*, on the other hand, is funding from federal or state sources that must be used to deliver specific types of programs. These are often categorical programs with tight restrictions on how monies can be spent. Examples of program funding are Career Partnership Academies (CPAs) and Regional Occupation Centers/Programs (ROCPs) as described below.

A. California Department of Education

1. Elementary and Middle Schools

Funding Source(s):	State and local school district general funds
Funding Amount:	No disaggregated estimates available
Funding Type:	Funding Stream
Eligibility Requirements:	Funded through ADA allocation

Although public elementary and middle schools are all identified as service providers, the reality in California is that most of the courses offered in these grades are of an introductory nature, with occasional sequencing between middle schools and high schools.

2 High Schools

Funding Source(s):	Individual School Districts, County Offices of Education, and California Department of Education	
Funding Amount:	School District General Fund (estimated)	\$898,762,000 ²
	Regional Occupational Centers/Programs	\$457,608,000
	Career Partnership Academies	\$ 23,490,000
	Adult Education	\$117,350,000
	Agricultural Vocational Education	\$ 5,128,000
Funding Type:	Funding Streams and Program Funding	

² The California Department of Finance estimates that 4 percent of school district revenue-limit funding is devoted to CTE classes and programs delivered by school districts.

Although the needs-assessment conducted for the California Department of Education and California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office disaggregated the various service-delivery vehicles for high schools into the above categories, it is helpful to think about these vehicles together as well, given the ubiquity of general funds for programmatic delivery. Here we examine the uniqueness of each one individually. We begin by looking at the individual schools funded through school district general funds and follow with state categorical programs for more specific CTE program delivery mechanisms.

2.1 Individual school, non-partnership with general fund revenues

Funding Source(s): State and local school district general funds
Funding Type: Funding Stream
Eligibility Requirements: All public high schools

Traditional high schools and public charter schools across the state offer both individual CTE courses as well as a sequenced series of CTE courses that provide both practical and theoretical exposure to vocational career learning opportunities. Although these courses can be offered in partnership with higher education, business, and other community-based stakeholders, only those courses funded through the school districts’ general fund based on average daily attendance (ADA) are encompassed here. Interestingly, these courses and programs may also be eligible for federal Perkins Career and Technical Education Act funding.

2.2 Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs)

Funding Source(s): State Categorical Funding (dedicated revenue-limit funding)
Funding Type: Program Funding
Eligibility Requirements: Application required

Given the significant geographic and enrollment diversity that exists in California’s schools, regionalization of programs provides opportunities to make efficient use of funding as well as human and capital resources. In fact, since 1967 Regional Occupational Centers and Programs have provided this type of regionalization for CTE programs in California. These ROCPs can take one of three forms:

- County Office of Education offering services to school districts,
- School districts participating under a joint powers agreement (JPA), or
- Individual school districts.

What makes the ROCPs so unique is that the educational and training programs are designed and offered in collaborative partnerships between high schools, businesses, community colleges, public agencies, and other service providers. In addition, some ROCPs have worked directly with labor organizations to develop and deliver certification and apprenticeship programs in skilled trades. However, all ROCPs must first submit course and program

outlines for approval by the California Department of Education through an application/certification process, and approved programs are funded via apportionment funding (i.e., average daily attendance – ADA). ROCPs are also eligible to receive federal Perkins Act funding as well as California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) funding. There are 74 ROCPs delivering programs across the state to more than 460,000 students. For more information about ROCPs, visit: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/rp/>.

2.3 Career Partnership Academies (CPAs) & Thematic Schools/Programs

Funding Source:	State Categorical Funding
Funding Type:	Program Funding
Eligibility Requirements:	Application required

In an effort to better integrate career-technical education and traditional academic programs, the state has funded 290 Career Partnership Academies (CPAs) and other similar programs. These CPAs are funded through a competitive grant process that serves students in grades 10-12; furthermore, each academy must have local business partners involved with the design and implementation of the program. In fact, part of the funding agreement with the state is that the school district and its business partners together must match 100 percent of state funding, and funding from the state is contingent upon students meeting an 80 percent attendance and 90 percent credit requirement threshold. The curricular focus at CPAs is intentionally broad, with the spotlight on larger industry issues rather than on individual jobs, providing real value for those industries with well-defined career ladders. For more information about Career Partnership Academies, see: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/cpagen.asp>.

2.4 Apprenticeships & Work Experience Education

Funding Source(s):	State, school district, and community college district general funds; state categorical program(s)
Funding Type:	Funding Stream
Eligibility Requirements:	Apprenticeship certification required; Work Experience Education program application required

Embedded within many Career Partnership Academies, ROCPs and programs offered through the California Community Colleges, apprenticeships are an integral part of the CTE programs that provide students with work and trade experience. Overseeing the eligible apprenticeships is the California Department of Industrial Relations, where approximately \$12.7 million was allocated in state funds for related and supplemental instruction (RSI) programs associated with apprenticeships at the community college level.

Similar to formal apprenticeships, school districts and other local education agencies can develop Work Experience Education (WEE) opportunities for students. Approximately

29,000 students participated in WEE programs in 2006. School districts are required to have WEE program plans identifying the related classroom instruction programs, the credits to be offered, and approved teacher-coordinator(s) identified by their local governing boards and submitted to the California Department of Education.

For more information about apprenticeship programs and standards, visit the California Department of Education website, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/ap/>, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office website, <http://www.cccco.edu/SystemOffice/Divisions/EconDevWorkPrep/CTE/ApprenticeshipProgram/tabid/534/Default.aspx>, or the Department of Industrial Relations website, <http://www.dir.ca.gov/das/das.html>. For more information about WEE, visit either <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/we/> or the California Association of Work Experience Educators website at <http://www.cawee.org/>.

2.5 Adult Schools

Funding Source(s):	State, school district, and community college district general funds; Supplemental Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funds
Funding Type:	Funding Stream
Eligibility Requirements:	General fund dollars have no requirements; approved WIA (if applicable)

According to the California Department of Education, adult schools provide lifelong learning opportunities for adults of all ages, ranging from such basic literacy courses such as adult basic education (ABE) to individual CTE-related courses that provide education and skills for entry or transitional re-entry into the workforce. In addition, adult schools provide supplemental opportunities for individuals pursuing their high school diploma. CTE-related courses can also be coordinated and supplemented with federal WIA funding.

For more information about California adult education, see <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ae/po/>.

B. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

1. Middle College High School Programs

Funding Source(s):	State Categorical Program
Funding Amount:	\$1,778,000
Funding Type:	Program Funding
Eligibility Requirements:	Competitive Grant Process

The Middle College High School Program involves high schools located on, and integrated into, the community college environment, and merges high school and community college curricula in an effort to enhance academic success. The program is particularly targeted to high-potential, at-risk students. Under this program, high school students attend classes at a community college and earn dual credit towards both a high school diploma and a

postsecondary degree. Doing so also gives them the opportunity concurrently to take college courses and to receive more intensive counseling and administrative attention. Across the state, 13 programs currently receive state funding serving approximately 2,000 students, with a typical grant of about \$127,000. For more information, visit <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/mchs/mchs.htm>.

2. *Community Colleges Vocational Education and Economic Development Programs*

Funding Source(s):	State and community college district general funds; state categorical program(s)	
Funding Type:	Funding Stream	
Funding Amount:	Post-Secondary Vocational Education	\$655,164,000 ³
	Economic Development Program	\$ 46,790,000

The California Community College system offers more than 5,700 CTE programs of 18 or more credit units in more than 270 occupational program areas. These programs range from a handful of courses to two years of coursework towards an associates degree or matriculation opportunities through the university system. In addition to the CTE-based occupational programs, the California Community Colleges also offer non-credit programs that provide lifelong learning opportunities for adults; these can be considered the equivalent of school-district delivered adult school classes. The range of learning opportunities offered through the California Community Colleges is similar to those administered through the California Department of Education, including apprenticeships, articulation programs such as Tech Prep, and local business partnerships.

For more information about CCCCO CTE programs, visit <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/cte/cte.htm>.

C. Other Agencies

In addition to the state- and locally funded programs listed above, the state also administers several programs whose funding originates from the federal government and are administered through several California state agencies. The three programs that have direct impact on CTE program provisions across the state are the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act – Basic Grant, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act – Tech-Prep Grant, and the Workforce Investment Act. Though the Perkins Grants originate in the U.S. Department of Education, state administration of these grants is shared between both the California Department of Education and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. Because of this dual governance, the research team determined it best to identify these programs separately from the CDE or CCCCO headings listed above.

³ The California Department of Finance estimates that 22 percent of CCCCO general apportionment funding is devoted to CTE classes and programs delivered by community colleges.

1. Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, Basic Grant

Funding Source:	U.S. Department of Education
CA Administering Agency:	California Department of Education; California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Funding Amount:	\$106.7 million (Basic Grant, FY 2008)
Funding Type:	Funding Stream
Eligibility Requirements:	Application required by school districts and community college districts

Federal basic aid grants help state and local schools offer programs to develop the academic, vocational and technical skills of students in high schools, community colleges, and regional technical centers. Funds from this program can be used for a broad range of programs, services, and activities designed to improve career and technical education programs and ensure access to students who are members of populations with special needs.

Of the funding provided directly to states, 85 percent must be distributed by the state for local CTE programs (51 percent to districts to administer ROCPs and 34 percent to postsecondary institutions), 10 percent allocated for leadership activities, and 5 percent for administrative activities. The Perkins Act requires funding to be allocated via formula, with 30 percent based on total K-12 enrollment and 70 percent based on the number of K-12 students eligible for the federal free- and reduced-priced lunch program.

States receiving Perkins funding must adhere to a number of requirements, including the development of a statewide plan and accountability measures. For more detailed information, go to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Web site, <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/cte/Perkins/Perkins1.html>, or the California Department of Education website, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/pk/>.

2. Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, Tech-Prep Grant

Funding Source:	U.S. Department of Education
Funding Amount:	\$10.6 million (Tech-Prep Grant, FY 2008)
Funding Type:	Funding Stream
Eligibility Requirements:	Application required by school districts and community college districts

According to the U.S. Department of Education Web site, the Perkins Act requires that Tech-Prep programs have the following seven elements:

- An articulation agreement between secondary and postsecondary consortium participants,
- A two-plus-two or a four-plus-two (only four- or six-year programs are authorized) design with a common core of proficiency in math, science, communication, and technology,

- A specifically developed Tech-Prep curriculum,
- Joint in-service training of secondary and postsecondary teachers to implement the Tech-Prep curriculum effectively,
- Training of counselors to recruit students and to ensure program completion and appropriate employment,
- Equal access for special populations to the full range of Tech-Prep programs, and
- Preparatory services.

As states consider allocations to local education agencies, they are required to give priority consideration to Tech-Prep programs that offer effective employment placement; allow students to transfer to 4-year baccalaureate programs; address dropout prevention, re-entry, and the needs of special populations; and are developed in consultation with business, industry, labor unions, and institutions of higher education that award baccalaureate degrees.

In California, Tech Prep has been administered through a partnership between the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO). The CCCCCO manages Tech Prep implementation through noncompetitive grants to the state’s 80 local consortia, including all 108 community colleges with funds from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1998 (Perkins III). In turn, CDE manages funding that supports innovation in Tech Prep education through 25 Targeted Use grants that have been awarded to selected local consortia; currently, CDE administers two types of Targeted Use grants -- Industry Sectors and Innovative Practices and Programs.

For more information, visit any of the following three websites: U.S. Department of Education, <http://www.ed.gov/programs/techprep/index.html>, California Department of Education, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/tp/>, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/cte/programs/techprep/tech_prep.htm

3. *Workforce Investment Act (WIA)*

Funding Source:	U.S Department of Labor, Employment & Training Administration, California Employment Development Department
Funding Type:	Funding Stream
Funding Amount:	\$426 million (2008-09); \$131.5 million for WIA youth activities

Although not identified as a primary vehicle for delivering CTE in the needs-assessment conducted by WestEd, a well-designed and integrated plan produced by the local Workforce Investment Board (LWIB) would include a partnership between businesses, community groups, K-12 education, and higher education. Of the available funding, 85 percent is allocated to the 49 LWIBs (which serve as one-stop service centers) for program activities. Fifteen percent is reserved for to the State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB) for various

activities. Currently, as emphasized by the Governor, SWIB and 49 LWIBs are charged with working with education systems to:

- Increase the number of high school graduates, particularly within groups that now have lower than average completion rates;
- Strengthen the career technical and vocational education components within K-12 education, high schools, adult schools, and community colleges;
- Establish coordinated strategies for improvement that include K-12, community colleges, adult education, the California Secretary of Education, and the University of California and California State University systems; and
- Use labor market and economic information in new and innovative ways to guide curriculum reforms in education and training.

The state's WIA strategic plan articulates the Governor's three broad priorities for the \$426 million received from the federal government: recruiting and creating high wage, high-growth jobs; advancing workers with barriers to employment; and focusing on industries and sectors experiencing statewide shortages of workers.

According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), WIA programs are available to eligible youth who are between 14 and 21 years of age, low income, and meet at least one of six specific barriers to employment. More than \$131 million is available for these youth activities. A year-round youth program emphasizes attainment of basic skills competencies, enhances opportunities for academic and occupational training, and provides exposure to the job market and employment. Activities may include instruction leading to completion of secondary school, tutoring, internships, job shadowing, work experience, adult mentoring, and comprehensive guidance and counseling. The program emphasizes services for out-of-school youth.

For more information regarding the WIA, visit any of the following four websites:

The California Employment Development Department, <http://www.edd.ca.gov/wiarep/wiand.htm>, the California Workforce Investment Board, <http://www.calwia.org/>, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/cte/programs/wia/wia.htm>, or the San Diego WIB Consortium, www.sandiegoutwork.com/.

D. Senate Bill 70: The Governor's CTE Initiative

In his 2005 State of the State address, Governor Schwarzenegger announced his commitment to career and technical education. The cornerstone of the Governor's interest and investment in CTE was the Governor's Career Technical Education Initiative, also known as Senate Bill (SB) 70, sponsored by Senator Jack Scott. In addition, the Governor hosted a CTE education summit in the spring of 2007 to showcase initiatives and programs across the state.

SB 70 encompasses several initiatives designed to further develop and strengthen CTE programs in school districts and county offices of education, community colleges, and private-sector business partners. SB 70 is divided into six thematic areas:

- Career Planning and Development
- Career Pathways and Articulation
- New Program Development
- Expanding Business and Industry Engagement in CTE
- CTE Teacher Recruitment and Professional Development
- Capacity Building and Research and Evaluation

From a funding perspective, SB 70 was initially funded for six years, from 2005-06 through 2011-12; specifically, funding in 2006-07 was \$20 million, increasing to \$52 million in 2007-08 and then increasing to \$58 million in each of the next four years.⁴ Subsequent legislation, SB 1130, extended the state’s commitment to CTE by taking funding through the 2013-14 fiscal years. Below are brief descriptions of the six thematic areas included in SB 70. The 2007-08 funding amounts listed in this section are preliminary budgeted amounts. The budget negotiations taking place due to the state’s fiscal circumstances leaves these funding levels preliminary and subject to decreases. Please see Appendix A for a look at the breakdown of preliminary 2008 figures for each SB 70 theme area and subcomponent program.

1. Career Planning and Development

2007-08 Funding: \$1.5 million
 Maximum Award: \$150,000

This initiative was designed to provide career awareness, exploration, and occupational experiences to middle school students as well as to develop high school educational programs that incorporate postsecondary and career goals.

2. Career Pathways and Articulation

2007-08 Funding: \$31.059 million

This initiative was intended to accomplish the following two goals: (1) increase the number and quality of CTE pathways and courses that link high school with ROCP, CTE, and community college vocational programs, and (2) increase student enrollment in high school CTE programs to expand school and/or career opportunities. This thematic area is broken down into the following nine separate initiatives:

- Workforce Innovation Partnerships: 2+2 partnerships between school districts and community colleges in areas such as advanced transportation and biotechnology. 2007-08 funding totaled \$4 million.
- CTE Sectors: To strengthen or re-establish CTE by developing model programs with

⁴ As part of ongoing 2008 budget negotiations, SB 70 funding has been preliminarily reduced to \$42 million. The final budgeted allocations are subject to change.

set-aside funds specifically for construction trades and allied health to meet critical workforce needs. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$18 million.

- Quick Start Partnerships: To fund exemplar projects first funded under the CTE Pathways Initiative. In 2005-06, 25 projects were funded for a two-year period; however Quick Start projects will no longer be funded after the 2007-08 fiscal year.
- Distance Learning Pilot: To develop CTE distance learning opportunities for students in rural areas. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$500,000.
- Entrepreneurship Career Pathway Project: Approximately 40 centers statewide designed to provide young adults and adults with information regarding entrepreneurship in a global economy. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$2 million.
- Curriculum Planning for Emerging Industries: Funds forward-looking studies that develop a plan to deliver education services to emerging industries. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$559,000 with funding scheduled to end in 2008-09.
- Statewide Career Pathways School-to-Community College Articulation: Designed to engage high school, ROCP, and community college faculty in the development of articulated pathways and information assistance. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$1.5 million.
- K-12 Health Pathways: Develop and enhance health-related career pathway programs in grades 7-12. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$2.5 million.
- CTE Online: Expand Web-based systems for CTE teachers to improve course content. Funding in 2007-08 totaled \$1 million.

3. *New Program Development*

2007-08 Funding: \$3.766 million

This initiative was intended to develop new program models and enrollment capacity, particularly in key student groups. This initiative builds on the Career Partnership Academies (CPAs) and Career Advancement Academies (CAAs) models. Slightly different than CPAs, Career Advancement Academies are targeted to adults age 18 to 30 who require focused general education and CTE training to prepare them to effectively enter or re-enter the workforce. Additional funding for CPAs will increase from \$3.766 million in 2007-08 to \$15.291 million in 2011-12.

4. *Expanding Business and Industry Engagement in CTE*

2007-08 Funding: \$3.7 million

This is intended to increase the participation of business and industry in CTE programs. Funding in this stream is divided into three main activities:

- CTE Business and Industry Advisory Committees (\$200,000) – convene statewide business and industry advisory committees for each of the 15 industry sectors.
- CTE Student Organizations (\$2,000,000) – subject-based extracurricular activities for secondary/post-secondary CTE students that will strengthen and expand leadership,

- participation levels, etc.
- Connection to Economic and Workforce Development Program Initiatives (\$1,500,000) – build a statewide system to link businesses and economic development work with CTE efforts.

5. *CTE Teacher Recruitment and Professional Development*

2007-08 Funding: \$6.850 million

This is intended to increase the number of students in CTE teacher preparation programs while also developing a variety of in-service strategies for new and existing teachers. Funding will increase over the next five years culminating in \$7.254 million in 2011-12.

6. *Capacity Building and Research and Evaluation*

2007-08 Funding: \$125,000

This initiative is intended to provide technical assistance to program leaders across the state. In addition, beginning in 2008-09, \$300,000 will be dedicated to the formal evaluation of these initiatives.

E. CTE Funding Vehicles Summary

The state continues to dedicate ever-increasing amounts of funding to revitalize and expand career and technical education across the state. By continuing established programs such as ROCPs and CPAs to expanding the opportunities and programs available through legislation such as SB 70, the Governor and Legislature have shown their commitment to the issue. Changes continue to be made to the system to make it more effective for students and for those delivering the programs. For instance, the California Community College Chancellor's Office has revised some of the request for proposal processes associated with SB 70. Based on feedback from the field that there were too many applications to fill out, the Chancellor's Office consolidated two of the themes into one – Career Planning and Development with Career Pathways and Articulation. Several of the sub-programs in these two themes were also consolidated into a single program called CTE Community Collaboratives including the following components: Career Technical Education Sectors, Career Exploration and Model Program Development for 7th and 8th Graders, Teacher and Faculty Externships, and Professional Development.

Because the SB 70 programs are relatively new, only preliminary reports are available on the programs funded. Some of those preliminary reports of programs funded in San Diego County are included in Appendix B. The study team will continue to monitor all of the funding sources and their allocations to San Diego County programs to continue to inform the educators, policymakers, and other stakeholders in the County.

IV. CTE FUNDING IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY

In this section of the report, the focus shifts from California to San Diego County -- specifically, the extent to which San Diego County has benefited from the myriad of programs and service providers that deliver career and technical education in California. This section begins with a brief demographic overview of San Diego County and then, using the most recent data available, describes CTE funding levels for the various programs and their recipients. Throughout the discussion, we pay special attention to the relative share of funds received by San Diego County, so that any areas where the county seems to be doing better or worse than the rest of the state can be identified. These areas will be revisited in the last section of this report when we report the results of our on-line survey and extended conversations with stakeholders.

A. San Diego County Demographics

San Diego County, one of the original 27 counties that existed when California became part of the United States in 1850, is currently the third largest county in California by population and the sixth largest in the nation. Based on the most recent Census Bureau estimates, in 2006 the population in the county was 2,941,454, representing about 8.0 percent of the total population in California. However, the population share of those most likely to benefit from the delivery of CTE services in San Diego County was slightly greater than 8 percent in 2006; specifically, San Diego County has a little more than 8.1 percent of all individuals 24 years of age or less in the state and almost 8.5 percent of those in the 15-24 year-old category. Interestingly, although San Diego County is the third largest county in the state, its 4.5 percent rate of growth since the millennial census is considerably less than the statewide average of 7.6 percent over the same 2000-2006 time period.

In addition to being one of the largest counties in the state, San Diego County is also wealthier and at least for those over 25 years of age, more educated than the rest of the state. For example, the median household income of \$51,939 in the county is 4 percent larger than the statewide average and the number of individuals below the poverty line is 2.3 percentage points less. Similarly, in terms of educational attainment, 82.6 percent of county residents age 25 and older were high school graduates in 2000 (compared with 76.8 percent statewide), and 29.5 percent held a bachelor's degree (compared to 26.6 percent statewide). The educational system in place to support county residents includes 43 separate K-12 districts that serve almost 494,000 students; the largest single district is San Diego Unified with more than 135,000 students. In addition, there are four large four-year universities that serve more than 75,000 students in the county (San Diego State University; the University of California, San Diego, California State University San Marcos, and the University of San Diego), a community college system that has five districts and serves almost 200,000 students, and assorted other non-profit and for-profit educational enterprises.

B. CTE Funding in San Diego County

Although the unique demographics of San Diego County may ultimately help explain local CTE funding patterns, we first need to describe exactly what those funding levels and patterns are. In this section we describe funding levels, recipients, and San Diego's share of funding for the following California Department of Education and/or California Community College Chancellor's Office administered programs:

- The Basic Aid and Tech Prep grants of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act
- Title I of the Workforce Investment Act
- Sections 225, 231 and Literacy and Civics Education of Title II of the Workforce Investment Act.
- Agricultural Vocational Incentive Grants for High Schools.
- California's Partnership Academies.
- CTE Equipment and Spending for Grades 7-12
- Regional Occupation Centers/Programs Total Apportionment.
- Special Education Workability I Grants.

Throughout the discussion, we use the most recently published state data available. In most cases this is for FY 2007-08; however, FY 2005-06 data is used once, and data from FY 2006-07 is used twice. We begin the discussion with local funding for the two CTE-relevant sections of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act using FY 2007-08 data provided by the California Department of Education.

1. Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act

As mentioned above, there are two CTE-relevant sections of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act to consider – the Basic Aid grant and the Tech Prep grant – which cover the distribution of funds to secondary school participants (school districts and consortium participants), and the distribution of funds for postsecondary vocational and technical education programs (consortium participants and agencies). These allocations, along with the number of participating districts and/or agencies as well as the share of state funding received by the county are shown below in Table 2. Sections 131 and 132 are the funding vehicles to high schools, adult schools, and Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs) participating as individual school districts or through a consortium. These funds flow through the California Department of Education and are considered Basic Grants. The Postsecondary Allocation is administered through the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, while the Tech Prep grants are administered jointly by the CDE and CCCCCO at 31 percent and 69 percent, respectively.

Table 2: FY 2007-08 Perkins Funding for San Diego County

Relevant Section of the Perkins Act	Districts/Agencies Served	Total Funds Allocated for California	Total Funds Allocated for San Diego County	San Diego County's Share of Total
131 Districts	14	\$47,802,854	\$ 2,730,191	5.71%
131 Consortiums	2	\$ 2,125,963	\$ 547,161	25.74%
131 TOTAL	16	\$49,928,817	\$ 3,277,352	6.56%
132 Consortiums	0	\$ 3,851,334	0	0%
132 Agencies	3	\$10,305,974	\$ 1,217,636	11.81%
132 TOTAL	3	\$14,157,308	\$ 1,217,636	8.60%
Postsecondary	5	\$42,647,803	\$ 4,754,319	11.15%
Tech Prep (CDE)	1	\$ 3,274,125	\$ 461,000	14.08%
Tech Prep (CCCCO)	5	\$ 7,281,560	\$ 612,184	8.41%
PERKINS TOTAL	19	\$117,289,613	\$10,322,491	8.80%

Examination of this table reveals that taken together, San Diego County received more than \$10.3 million in Perkins funds during FY 2007-08, representing about 7 percent of all Section 131 and 132 Perkins funds allocated in the state. The greatest relative successes for the county were in the 131 funding for consortiums and in the CDE-funded Tech Prep Grants where they received, respectively, 25.7 percent and 14.1 percent of the state Perkins allocations; conversely, the areas in which the county performed the worst were the 132 consortium funding and the 131 funding for districts where they received, respectively, 0 percent and 5.7 percent of available state Perkins funds.

2. Title I of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

During the 2007-08 year almost \$287 million in formula-based funding for adult programs, youth programs, and dislocated worker programs was allocated to California through Title I of the WIA, with about 34 percent going toward adult programs, 37 percent toward youth programs, and about 28 percent for dislocated worker programs. However, during this period San Diego County received only 5.5 percent of this amount (\$15.9 million), which was somewhat evenly split among the three programs (5.3 percent for adults, 5.5 percent for youth, and 5.9 percent for dislocated workers).

Total California Funding:	\$286,933,068
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 15,916,886
San Diego's Share	5.55 percent

3. Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

The three sections of Title II of the Workforce Investment Act that are relevant to CTE are Sections 225, 231, and EL Civics (which covers citizenship preparation and civic participation). Together they were responsible for more than \$66.2 million in grants in California during 2007-08. During this period, however, San Diego County received only 4.9 percent of these dollars (\$3.2 million), designed to fund eight school districts, two

community college districts, and three other groups. Especially notable is the fact that all of the monies received by the county under Title II of the Workforce Investment Act were in Section 231 and EL Civics, with zero dollars received through Section 225.

Total California Funding:	\$66,211,543
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 3,248,787
San Diego's Share	4.91 percent

4. *Agricultural Vocational Incentive Grants for High Schools*

During FY 2007-08, slightly more than \$5 million in Agricultural Vocational Incentive Grants were awarded from the California Department of Education to high schools in California. San Diego County received less than 4 percent of this total; moreover, since the monies were designed to fund 15 schools in twelve districts this works out to an average award of \$13,285 per school.

Total California Funding:	\$5,128,000
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 199,280
San Diego's Share	3.89 percent

5. *California's Partnership Academies (CPAs)*

Created in 1984 through state legislation, California Partnership Academies incorporate many features of the high school reform movement including a close family-like atmosphere, integrating academic and career technical education, and establishing viable business partnerships. In FY 2006-07, there were 290 such academies in the state, although only 13 of them were in San Diego County (representing less than 4.5 percent of all CPAs statewide). From a funding perspective, San Diego County received slightly less than a million dollars out of more than \$22 million statewide, which funded ten schools in six districts.

Total California Funding:	\$22,360,000
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 956,700
San Diego's Share	4.28 percent

6. *CTE Equipment and Supplies*

According to the California Department of Education, a total of \$37.5 million was spent statewide during FY 2006-07 for CTE equipment and supplies for grades 7-12. Of this amount, San Diego County received a little over \$3 million, which was split largely among a number of different districts (73 percent) and regional occupation programs (26 percent).

Total California Funding:	\$37,500,000
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 3,041,873
San Diego's Share	8.11 percent

7. Regional Occupation Centers/Programs (ROCP) Total Apportionment

As described in the first section of this report, ROCPs are unique in that their educational and training programs are designed and offered in collaborative partnership between high schools, businesses, community colleges, public agencies, and other service providers. In FY 2005-06, almost \$391.8 million was apportioned in the state for ROCPs, with San Diego County receiving slightly more than \$33.4 million, representing an 8.54 percent share of total ROCP funds apportioned in the state.

Total California Funding:	\$391,791,265
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 33,455,740
San Diego's Share	8.54 percent

8. Special Education Workability I Grants

For FY 2007-08, the California Department of Education awarded more than \$10.1 million in Special Education Workability I Grants. In San Diego County, five districts were funded for a total of \$886,593, representing an 8.76 percent share of total CDE grants made in FY 2007/08.

Total California Funding:	\$10,122,685
Total San Diego County Funding:	\$ 886,593
San Diego's Share	8.76 percent

Summary

Now that this snapshot of local CTE funding has been presented, to get some sense of whether or not San Diego County is receiving an appropriate or “fair share” of total state CTE funding, the funding information presented in this section has been gathered together in one table for ease of presentation. Table 3, which presents this information for the eight programs previously discussed, is ordered by funding amount so that readers can have a sense of scale when viewing funding amounts together with San Diego County's share of totals state funds. To help interpret this table, recall that San Diego County's share of the total state population varied between about 8.0 and 8.5 percent in 2006, depending on whether we were using all ages (8.0 percent), those 24 years of age or less (8.1 percent) or those ages 15-24 (8.5 percent). As such, we might expect San Diego County's share of total state CTE funding to be in the 8.0-8.5 percent range as well.

Examination of Table 3 shows that, on balance, the county receives slightly less average funding than its per capita share. In fact, while four of the eight relative shares fall below the 8.0-8.5 percent range, three of them exceed it. However, it is worth noting that in two of the three largest funding categories – ROCPs and federal Perkins funding – San Diego County receives more than its per capita share, which, of course, helps the county tremendously from a “fair share” perspective. However, in the next two largest categories, Title I and Title II of the Workforce Investment Act, the county received a significantly smaller share than other counties in California, and while this was particularly acute for Title I of Workforce

Investment Act funding (5.55 percent), this may be explained (at least in part) by the funding formula’s reliance on four separate unemployment measures, on which San Diego County usually fares better than the rest of the state. In addition, San Diego County also lags behind in funding for Title II of the Workforce Investment Act at 4.91 percent, which unlike Title I, is not formula-based. While the county appears to be doing average in terms of spending on CTE equipment and supplies (8.11 percent), the county received significantly less funding for California’s Partnership Academies than what would be expected vis-à-vis per capita share, capturing only 4.28 percent of available state dollars; equally telling is the fact that as the third largest county in the state, only 13 of the state’s 290 academies reside in San Diego County. And finally, although the county appears to receive higher than average funding for the special education Workability I grants (8.76 percent), the county falls significantly behind the rest of the state in agricultural vocational incentive grants (3.89 percent).

Table 3: CTE Programs Funded in San Diego County, Ordered by Funding Amount

CTE Programs Funded In San Diego County	Amount Funded in San Diego County	San Diego County Share of State Funding
Regional Occupation Centers/Programs	\$33,455,740	8.54%
Title I Workforce Investment Act	\$15,916,886	5.55%
Carl D. Perkins Voc/Tech Act	\$10,322,491	8.80%
Title II Workforce Investment Act	\$ 3,248,787	4.91%
CTE Equipment and Supplies	\$ 3,041,873	8.11%
California’s Partnership Academies	\$ 956,700	4.28%
Special Education Workability Grants	\$ 886,593	8.76%
Agricultural Vocational Incentive Grants	\$ 199,280	3.89%

C. Conversations with San Diego County CTE Stakeholders

To provide some context for the distribution of CTE funding in San Diego County, we spent almost three months soliciting the views of a diverse group of San Diego County CTE stakeholders, including public high school principals, superintendents, community college chancellors, and other local CTE professionals. We collected this information through the use of an on-line survey hosted by a commercial website as well as through a series of follow-up interviews with key stakeholders. In both incidences the individuals were asked a short series of questions soliciting their views regarding the policies, programs, and funding environment for career and technical education in San Diego County. The results of these conversations are reported in this section of the report, organized around the following themes that emerged from our data gathering efforts: the ease of the CTE application process, the stability and integration of CTE funding streams, and the relationship between organization size and funding success. We begin this discussion with a brief explanation of our data gathering efforts and then discuss each of the three themes sequentially.

1. *How We Gathered Data*

To provide some context for the fair-share findings that we presented in the last section, we solicited the opinions of a subset of local CTE stakeholders through the use of an on-line survey and structured follow-up interviews. We identified local stakeholders as those directly involved in the administrative provision of career and technical education in San Diego County. These individuals included local public high school principals, district superintendents, community college chancellors, and other CTE professionals. Taken together, our list included almost 160 local stakeholders – the majority of whom were public high school principals.

We began data collection by sending an e-mail invitation to stakeholders that described the goals and objectives of our study and requested their participation. The invitation included a statement of consent and an electronic link directing them to a commercial website that hosted our short survey. This survey, which consisted of eleven basic questions, was designed to capture important CTE demographic information from respondents, including funding opportunities attempted, funding successes, CTE programs offered, and the organizations with which the respondent had partnered. In addition, the survey also asked about ease of application processes and the respondent's ability to enter into strategic partnerships. Ultimately, we had slightly more than 40 complete responses, for an approximate response rate of 25 percent.

Based on the information provided in the on-line survey, we then selected key CTE stakeholders for interviews where more detail and context could be provided regarding specific aspects of the various programs and application processes, including suggestions for improving the delivery of CTE in San Diego County. These interviews were typically conducted in the stakeholders' offices, and to ensure that individuals felt comfortable in honestly sharing their opinions with us, we felt it necessary to guarantee anonymity to all our respondents. This means that nowhere in the report do we provide a comprehensive list of respondents; however the views of almost fifty San Diego County CTE stakeholders are represented in the following three themes now discussed in more detail.

2. *The Ease of the CTE Application Process*

As mentioned earlier, in both our on-line survey and follow-up interviews we specifically queried respondents about the ease of CTE application processes. Although the questions were worded slightly differently, the thrust in both cases was similar: Respondents were asked to describe/rate the ease of the application process for the CTE programs for which they had applied, from getting information about the program to the final submission of the application. In answering these questions, survey respondents were offered a choice of five possible answers, ranging from *very easy* to *very difficult*. For the follow-up interviews, the question was left open-ended.

The results of both our survey and follow-up interviews strongly suggest that the application processes associated with CTE funding could be made easier. In fact, only one in five survey respondents rated the process as *fairly easy* and no one rated the application processes as *very*

easy. However, almost two out of every five respondents felt that the processes were either *fairly difficult* or *very difficult*, lending support to our contention that the CTE application processes could be made more user-friendly. These comments were also echoed in the follow-up interviews where we were told that the two most problematic CTE application processes were the newest version of the Perkins Act, which requires more tracking and follow-up data than before, and the SB 70 funds, where some districts have reported logistical challenges in working with the Community College Chancellors Office.

The follow-up interviews also revealed something quite interesting: while some of the application processes for CTE funding could be fairly difficult, the more resources that a particular organization has, the easier the application process. In other words, for those organizations with sufficient resources to devote to career and technical education, the application processes were easier than for resource-poor organizations. And although we will return to this point in more detail later in this section, one important caveat needs to be mentioned regarding our estimates of the difficulty associated with CTE application processes. We asked respondents to comment only on those programs for which they had officially applied. This most assuredly biases our difficulty estimates downward, because we were told on several occasions that some CTE programs were too difficult to even think about preparing an application. This strengthens the case for making the CTE application processes easier, especially for Perkins and SB 70 monies.

3. *The Stability and Integration of CTE Funding Streams*

Although not addressed directly in our on-line survey, a number of survey respondents took the time to respond to the last question on the survey that asked, “Are there any final comments or insights regarding career and technical education programs that you’d like to share with the research team?” A review of these responses suggests that one of the most popular themes was the lack of stability and integration of CTE funding streams. In particular, some survey respondents felt that the current mix of available CTE programs, many with different applications, eligibility requirements, and funding streams, could be better coordinated. In fact, one highly-placed respondent argued strongly that CTE’s varied programs needs to be significantly better coordinated to maximize the efficient use of the area’s resources, while another asserted that the three most important words of advice are “coordination, coordination, coordination.” In addition, both of these high-placed respondents also strongly asserted that funding stability should be a priority rather than the episodic funding they had experienced over the last several years.

To further investigate this emerging theme, we made it a point in our follow-up interviews to ask about this very point and found that almost to a person respondents felt that the lack of stability and integration of CTE funding streams was, at least to some extent, troubling. Although the strength of this opinion varied among respondents, we found that those with the most experience in career and technical education (who also, not surprisingly, tend to have the most resources at their disposal) typically have the fewest problems and those with the least experience and resources have the greatest. However, an important additional finding was that even among the most-experienced CTE professionals, there was the realization that even though *they* had figured out how to navigate the often-changing CTE funding

landscape, those with less experience would surely be operating less efficiently, suggesting that increased stability and integration of the CTE funding streams would result in overall gains in efficiency for potential grantees and their organizations.

4. The Relationship between Organizational Size and Funding Success

Our survey did not directly ask respondents whether organizational size affects funding success. However, a number of respondents raised this issue in the final open-ended question on the survey. For example, one principal operating in a large urban K-12 district mentioned that although she didn't know that much about career and technical education, her district was large enough to have an office specifically devoted to CTE to help out individual schools. We heard just the opposite from several principals in rural districts who felt that their small size and rural location put them at a distinct CTE funding disadvantage. Since this reinforced our earlier finding that economies of scale exist for some of the CTE application processes, we decided to incorporate this potential finding in our follow-up interviews.

In our follow-up interviews, virtually everyone we spoke with either directly or indirectly reinforced the importance of the relationship between organizational size and funding success. With their ability to construct special CTE shops, larger organizations seem to fare better in terms of funding successes than smaller organizations. This was apparent at both the K-12 level as well as in the community colleges, which are heavily involved in the delivery of career and technical education. We also found that smaller organizations, especially those located in rural areas, have a number of size and distance-related problems including increased transportation costs for their students, greater difficulty in finding appropriate partnering organizations, and less available resources. Taken together, this suggests the presence of economies of scale in CTE funding successes in San Diego County – an issue that may be introducing an element of inequity in the distribution of CTE funding.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It is evident from this study that in recent years rebuilding and invigorating career and technical education has occurred in California. State funding for CTE has increased in the past two years, in part because Governor Schwarzenegger and key members of the legislature are strong proponents and in part because of increased pressure on educators to make CTE education meaningful to today's students and the corporate community. At the same time, the program-by-program descriptions detailed in the first section of this report demonstrate how fragmented CTE is into numerous federal and state programs with varied funding streams and requirements. This makes it difficult for school districts, charter schools, county offices of education, regional occupational centers, community colleges, and others to navigate the CTE maze.

In San Diego County, between 8 and 8.5 percent of the population is most likely to benefit from CTE services. These include persons between 15 and 24 years of age. At the same time, the county is wealthier and, for those over 25 years of age, more educated than the rest of the state. These demographics help explain variances in local CTE funding patterns for programs

administered by the California Department of Education and/or California Community College Chancellor's Office as detailed in the second section of the report. A review of funding for these programs reveals that in four of the eight areas, the county is receiving less than its population share would dictate. These programs are Agricultural Incentive Grants (3.89 percent), California's Partnership Academies (4.28 percent), and Titles I and II of the Workplace Investment Act (5.55 percent and 4.91 percent, respectively).

A survey administered to key CTE stakeholders in San Diego County and follow-up interviews with selected respondents reveal that the biggest problem they face is the complexity of the CTE application process. The two most difficult are the newest version of the Card D. Perkins Act and SB 70 funds involving collaboration between school districts and the Community College Chancellors Office. The more staffing a particular organization can devote to the CTE process, the more likely the organization will complete applications and receive funding. Respondents agreed that accessing information about CTE funding programs is complicated by the mix of CTE programs, application processes, eligibility requirements, and funding streams.

To assist with accessing information about CTE programs and the application process, the research team has designed a user-friendly computer-based map. The map brings together all sources of CTE funding, descriptions, and application processes onto a single PowerPoint platform that is relatively simply to navigate and much easier to understand than current agency websites.