DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 910 CE 049 599

AUTHOR Lewis, Morgan V.
TITLE Vocational Education--Job Training Partnership Act Coordination. Second Annual Report.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 88
GRANT G008620030
NOTE 95p.; For the first annual report, see ED 284 075.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Job Training; National Surveys; Postsecondary Education; Program Improvement; *School Business Relationship; School Districts; Trend Analysis; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Service Delivery Areas

ABSTRACT

A telephone survey of 610 service delivery areas (SDAs) and a mail survey of a national sample of 983 postsecondary institutions were conducted to assess the status of local-level coordination between vocational education and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs. Ninety-seven percent of the SDAs were engaged in some type of collaborative effort with public vocational education institutions in the year ending June 1987. Ninety-one percent of the SDA administrators described their relationship with public vocational-technical programs as satisfactory or better. Almost 90 percent of the postsecondary institutions included in the study have some relationship with the JTPA, with 68 percent providing direct services and an additional 19 percent providing facilities or instructors for JTPA programs they do not conduct themselves. A history of good relationships and shared goals were the two main factors cited by JTPA administrators as facilitating good coordination between vocational education and JTPA. The degree of coordination achieved within SDAs was not systematically associated with any of the economic and demographic characteristics of the SDAs that were analyzed. The JTPA administrators urged vocational educators to keep the SDA information about vocational programs, do more joint planning, be more responsive to labor market needs and more flexible concerning program lengths and entry and exit times, coordinate better within vocational education itself, and accept performance-based contracts. Appendices provide 11 data tables on the SDAs and the two survey forms. (MN)

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Providing information for national planning and policy
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

For further information contact:

Program Information Office
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

Telephone: (614) 486-3655 or (800) 848-4815
Cable: CTVOCEDOSU/Columbus, Ohio
Telex: 8104821894

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION-
JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP
ACT COORDINATION
Second Annual Report

Morgan V. Lewis

The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

1988

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Vocational Education-Job Training Partnership Act Coordination Study
Grant Number:	G008620030
Project Number:	051BH70001
Act Under Which Funds Administered:	Card D. Perkins Vocational Education Act P.L. 98-524
Source of Contract:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, D.C. 20202
Contractor:	The National Center for Research in Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090
Executive Director:	Ray D. Ryan
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view of opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education Project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

List of Tables--Continued

List of Tables--Continued

Appendix Table

FOREWORD

On behalf of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, I am pleased to present to the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Labor our second annual report on joint planning and coordination of programs assisted by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act. The responsibility for this report was assigned to the National Center by the Perkins Act.

The report presents estimates not previously available on the number of participants being served under title IIA of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) who received classroom training in public vocational-technical programs. It also provides estimates of the amount of title IIA funds contracted to public vocational-technical institutions.

The estimates are based on a survey of 590 of the 610 JTPA service delivery areas in this country. The National Center provided funds for the National Alliance of Business to expand its 1987 survey to obtain information from all service delivery areas on their relationships with public vocational-technical institutions. Elaine Brady, Senior Manager for Human Services Integration Research for the National Alliance of Business, directed this effort.

We extend thanks to those who served on the technical panel that advised on the conduct of the study. Lynn Brant, Director of Planning, Job Training Partnership, Ohio Bureau of Employment Services; James Caradonio, Director of Vocational, Adult, and Alternative Education, Boston Public Schools; Joan Howard, Director of Employment and Training, Sullivan County, New York; Rodney Riffel, Program Development Specialist, National Education Association; Robert Sorensen, State Director, Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education; and David Stevens, Professor of Economics, University of Missouri-Columbia.

A draft of this report was reviewed by two National Center staff members Frank Pratzner, Senior Research Specialist and Suzanne Laughlin, Program Assistant, and by Joann P. Bitney, Program Analyst, National Commission for Employment Policy.

The project was funded by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. The report was produced in the Evaluation and Policy Division which is directed by N. L. McCaslin. Morgan Lewis, Research Scientist, directed the project. In the preparation of this report he was assisted by Belle Chen and Frank Bennici, Graduate Research Associates, and George Cox, an independent consultant. Others who contributed to the project were Michael Card and Lee Norton, Graduate Research Associates; Sidney Sims, Student Programmer, and Pratika Patel, who served as the project secretary and performed the word processing on the

many drafts that resulted in this report. The editorial review of the report was conducted by Marcia Howden.

Our appreciation is extended to all those who assisted in the conduct of the study and the preparation of this report.

Ray D. Ryan
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the second report on the joint planning and coordination of programs assisted by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) prepared by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The Perkins Act requires that the National Center submit these reports on an annual basis to the Congress, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Labor. The first report focused on state-level coordination; this report focuses on local-level coordination.

The main sources of the data presented in this report were a telephone survey of the 610 service delivery areas (SDAs) in the United States and a mail survey of a representative national sample of 983 postsecondary institutions. The telephone survey was conducted by the National Alliance of Business and yielded 590 usable interviews (97 percent response). The mail survey was conducted by the National Center and yielded 509 usable questionnaires (52 percent response). Additional information on the status of coordination was obtained from a review of reports prepared by 47 state councils on vocational education.

Major Findings

The level of coordination reflected in the three sources is more encouraging than much of the public debate about vocational education-JTPA relationships would lead one to believe. Some of the major findings are as follows:

- Almost all (97 percent) of the SDAs in this country engaged in some type of collaborative effort with public vocational education institutions during the program year that ended in June 1987.

- Almost all (91 percent) of the SDA administrators described their relationship with public vocational-technical programs as satisfactory or better. Almost three-fourths (71 percent) described the relationship as good, very good, or excellent.

- Almost 90 percent of the postsecondary institutions in the study have some relationship with JTPA. Two-thirds (68 percent) provide direct services and an additional 19 percent provide facilities or instructors for JTPA programs they do not conduct themselves.

- Over half of the JTPA title IIA clients assigned to classroom training during the 1985 program year received that training in public vocational-technical prog

- The major factors that JTPA administrators cite as encouraging coordination are a history of good relationships in the SDAs and shared goals.

- The major factors that postsecondary representatives cite as encouraging coordination are the compatibility between the mission of their institutions and the purposes of JTPA and personal relationships among staff.

- The degree of coordination achieved within SDAs was not systematically associated with any of the economic and demographic characteristics of the SDAs that were analyzed.

Implications

The extent of coordination of vocational education with JTPA in a given SDA is dependent on particular conditions within that SDA. In most SDAs the two systems appear to be working together fairly well. Serious problems appear to be limited to about 10 percent of all SDAs and less serious problems to another 10 to 20 percent.

The situation in those SDAs that are experiencing problems can best be approached on a case by case basis. The state agencies that administer Perkins and JTPA are in the best position to address these local problems, if they can overcome differences over roles and authority--turf disputes--that often separate them. The assistance these agencies give to local areas can be guided by the following suggestions to foster increased coordination.

JTPA administrators offered these suggestions to vocational educators:

- Improve communication, keep the SDA informed about programs, have joint meetings.

- Do more joint planning.

- Be more responsive to labor market needs, upgrade and update programs, put more emphasis on placement of JTPA participants.

- Be more flexible and responsive to the needs of JTPA, offer more short-term and open-entry/open-exit programs, be less defensive.

- Become better informed about JTPA.
- Improve relationships among state agencies and between state and local agencies.
- Coordinate better within vocational education itself.
- Fund programs jointly.
- Accept performance-based contracts.
- Serve those outside the normal school population.

Vocational educators offered these suggestions to JTPA administrators:

- Expand their concept of training, shift focus from on-the-job training to more in-depth instruction.
- Reduce documentation and paperwork to simplify the process of serving JTPA clients.
- Conduct more joint planning.
- Keep an open mind when selecting service providers.
- Reduce the political influence on private industry council decisions.

It is, of course, far easier to offer these suggestions than to implement them. Nevertheless, the evidence presented in this report indicates that in many areas of this country vocational education and JTPA programs are working together well.

CHAPTER 1

EXAMINING COORDINATION

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act requires that the National Center for Research in Vocational Education report annually on the extent, efficiency, and effectiveness of joint planning and coordination of programs conducted under that act and the Job Training Partnership Act [PL. 98-524, sec. 404 (b)(8)]. This is the second of these annual reports. The first report focused on the status of state-level coordination; this report focuses on local-level coordination.

In general, the first report found that relationships between vocational education and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs were good, but there were many areas where improvements were needed. Many JTPA clients received skill training in public vocational education programs, but rarely were these programs jointly planned. Instead, JTPA officials decided upon the types of training to offer and selected public vocational institutions to conduct the training.

Almost three-fourths of the directors of the state agencies that administer the Perkins Act and JTPA and the chairpersons of the state councils established by these acts think coordination is better now than it was under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act that JTPA replaced. The directors and council chairs attribute the level of coordination achieved primarily to personal factors--a willingness of people to work together and leadership by key individuals such as a governor or the director of a state agency. Mandates in the two acts intended to encourage coordination were also frequently mentioned, including the requirement for a member of the State Job Training Coordination Council to serve as a member of the State Council on Vocational Education.

There was a high level of consensus among all respondents on the factors that have most seriously hindered efforts to increase coordination--turf issues. This term is almost always encountered in discussions of interagency relations. It refers to the tendency of a bureaucracy to defend its authority and autonomy. Often vocational educators feel that JTPA officials are trying to tell them how to run their programs. Many JTPA officials, in turn, feel they must attempt to change traditional vocational programs that they see as unresponsive to the needs of their clients and employers.

These perceptions reflect a basic disagreement on how best to serve individuals with serious barriers to employment. Most vocational educators feel these individuals need fairly long-term training programs that provide in depth knowledge of an occupational area in which future career shifts can be made. Vocational educators tend to be skeptical of the value of much of the on-the-job training JTPA participants receive. In the opinion of vocational educators, JTPA participants could have gotten many of

these jobs on their own, and the training contracts are mainly subsidies to employers.

JTPA officials, for their part, question the value of much of the training that vocational education provides. Often, they claim, it is not relevant to the needs of the labor market, and students cannot find jobs after completing the training. They further contend that even if the training is appropriate, few JTPA clients can afford the loss of income that long-term, full-time training requires.

Despite these differences, the information developed for the first report identified many ways in which the two systems worked together. These included the use of the same occupational information system, financial agreements, nonfinancial written agreements and joint or reciprocal technical assistance and staff meetings. It proved difficult, however, to obtain evidence at the state level on the number of JTPA clients who were served by public vocational programs. In most states these data are not reported to either the JTPA or vocational education agencies.

During the site visits to local service delivery areas (SDAs) conducted as part of the research for the first report, estimates of the number of JTPA clients served by public vocational education were usually available. The administrative entities did not have specific records that identified service providers, but they knew which of their subcontractors were public vocational institutions and the number of clients these subcontractors were committed to serve. These site visits also suggested that there was more coordination at the local level than at the state level. Bureaucratic concerns were less common, and there was more of an atmosphere of colleagues working toward shared goals.

These impressions were formed from a limited sample of 26 SDAs. Consequently, in planning the research for the second annual report it was decided to focus on local-level coordination. Specifically, it was decided to contact the administrative entities for all JTPA service delivery areas, and a nationally representative sample of postsecondary institutions offering occupational education programs. The information obtained from these surveys is presented in this report. The next section of this chapter summarizes the procedures used to collect the data, and the final section presents an overview of the other chapters.

Approach

The procedures used to collect the data for this report capitalized on other research activities being conducted by the National Center and by the National Alliance of Business. When the research for this report was being planned, another project at the National Center was preparing a broad examination of the delivery of postsecondary occupational education. Questions on services to JTPA clients were added to the questionnaires used in the postsecondary study, and a supplemental sample of

postsecondary institutions was selected and surveyed. The National Alliance of Business conducts annual surveys of SDAs on selected topics. The topic of the 1987 survey was relationships between JTPA and related agencies including the Employment Service, welfare, economic development, and vocational education. The National Center provided funds for the National Alliance of Business to expand its survey of JTPA relationships with vocational education to all SDAs in the 50 states. Collecting the data for this report in cooperation with these other research efforts reduced costs and the demands upon the respondents who supplied the information.

Postsecondary Survey

The main study of postsecondary occupational education with which this study cooperated is presented in a report by Hollenbeck and others (1988). That study contacted a representative national sample of 725 institutions offering occupational education programs below the baccalaureate level. From that sample, 377 (52 percent) of the institutions returned information that could be used in this study. In the main study, the questions on services to JTPA clients were contained in questionnaires that covered several topics relative to the planning and delivery of occupational instruction.

To increase the number of SDAs with postsecondary institutions, a supplemental sample was selected. This sample was generated by identifying the SDAs in which the postsecondary institutions in the main sample were located. Any SDA that was not represented in the original sample became a candidate for the supplemental sample. The total listing of postsecondary institutions was then examined to determine if there were institutions in the unrepresented SDAs. If there was more than one institution in an SDA, the one to be included in the supplemental sample was selected at random.

This procedure yielded an original sample of 199 additional institutions. The questionnaire reproduced in Appendix B was mailed to these institutions during the last week of April 1987. During the last week of May 1987, a second mailing was made to those who had not responded to the first mailing and to an additional 59 institutions from SDAs where no response had been received. At the end of June 1987, telephone calls were made to a 10 percent sample of those who had not yet responded. These calls yielded few additional responses, so no further efforts were made to increase the response rate. At the close of data collection, usable questionnaires had been received from 13% of the sample of 253,* a 52 percent response.

*Responses were received from three institutions of higher education that do not offer occupational education and two high schools that should not have been included in the original sample.

All but three of the questions in the form sent to the supplemental sample were identical to those that were asked in the main postsecondary survey. The three additional questions asked in the supplemental survey were not included in the main survey. In the main study, however, the questions were contained in two separate questionnaires that included items concerning many other topics in addition to service to JTPA clients.

To test whether the focused content of the questionnaire sent to the supplemental sample caused institutions serving JTPA clients to be more likely to return questionnaires, comparisons were made between the responses from the main survey and those from the supplemental sample. These are summarized in table 1.1. There was only one statistically significant difference in the indicators of different types of involvement with JTPA shown in table 1.1, but all of the results on funding and enrollments were significantly different. Not all of these differences showed the supplemental sample providing more services. Respondents in the main sample reported higher enrollment in classes conducted under subcontracts that were open only to JTPA clients.

Due to the complexity of the data collection in the main survey, there were considerably more missing responses to the questions on JTPA involvement from the primary sample. The answers shown in the table were calculated with the missing responses deleted. Similar comparisons were made with the missing responses considered to be negative answers. This was to test whether these items were skipped by those institutions that provided no services to JTPA. This analysis yielded results very similar to those shown in table 1.1. Comparisons of other variables indicated the separate samples represent institutions with similar characteristics. Consequently, for the remainder of the analyses in this report, the two samples were combined.

Service Delivery Area Survey

The National Alliance of Business collected the information from SDAs on their relationships with public vocational education. The decision to use the National Alliance of Business (NAB) was based primarily on an assessment of its credibility with the respondents it would contact. NAB is one of the foremost advocates and providers of service to the employment and training community. It has conducted annual surveys of SDAs since JTPA was enacted. It seemed likely that JTPA respondents would be more willing to cooperate and to express their honest opinions in a telephone interview conducted by NAB than in one conducted by an interviewer from a vocational education center. When talking with someone identified as a representative of vocational education, the respondents would have a natural tendency to soften criticism and lean toward a more positive description of relationships with vocational institutions.

TABLE 1.1

COMPARISONS BETWEEN SUPPLEMENTAL AND MAIN SAMPLE OF POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Institution's Involvement with JTPA	Supplemental	Main
	Percentages	
Acts as administrative entity for SDA	7	10
Conducts intake, assessment, counseling, and referral	45	44
Certifies eligibility for JTPA services	18	17
Writes on-the-job training contracts with employers	20	14
Runs job clubs	21**	8
Conducts job development	47	39
Provides support services	37	34
Is formally represented on PIC	69	59
Base for percentages	119 to 132	264 to 377
	Means	
Funding from JTPA	$ 175,646**	$ 73,341
Clients in special JTPA classes	47.92**	128.15
JTPA clients in regular occupational classes	85.33**	45.47
JTPA clients in basic or remedial classes	46.39**	22.65
Priority ranking on linkages with JTPA (1=highest to 9=lowest)	4.43	4.72
Base for means	96 to 113	342

**Difference is significant at the .01 level.

The judgment that SDA respondents would be willing to talk with NAB interviewers was certainly verified by the response rate. The directory of SDAs used to make the telephone interviews was published in the Employment and Training Reporter issue of July 30, 1986. This directory lists 610 SDAs in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. NAB contacted all 610 and completed usable interviews with 590, a 97 percent completion rate. The questionnaire used in the telephone interviews of SDAs is reproduced in Appendix B.

State Council Reports

The third source of data on coordination presented in this report was quite different from survey data. This source was the biennial reports prepared by the state councils on vocational education. The Perkins Act (section 112) requires that each state establish a state council as a condition for receiving federal vocational education funds, and it specifies nine functions to be performed by these councils. One of these functions is to evaluate at least once every two years the vocational programs assisted by the Perkins Act and JTPA and to make recommendations on the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination. The state councils are required to advise the various state and federal officials responsible for vocational education and JTPA programs of their findings and recommendations.

The first of these biennial reports was due on March 31, 1987. Following that date, staff from the coordination study contacted each state council and requested a copy of its report. By October 1987, copies had been received from 47 states. The three that did not provide reports had requested extensions of the due date because of staff turnover that had prevented completion.

The 47 reports that were received are described and summarized in this report. About half of the councils conducted special studies of coordination that included original data collection from vocational education and JTPA respondents. Thus, even though these are reports of state councils, many present data collected from local-level respondents. Where possible, similar questions from these studies were compared. The summary of the council reports provides an additional perspective on the status of coordination.

Overview of Report

The major findings from the three sources of information assembled for this study are presented in chapters 2, 3, and 4. Chapter 2 presents the data from the NAB survey of SDAs. This chapter includes estimates of the number of JTPA clients nationwide who received classroom training from public vocational education institutions and the amount of title IIA funds that were contracted to these institutions. The chapter also presents

information on the perceptions of SDA administrators regarding their relationships with vocational education and the factors that influence these relationships, including the effectiveness of legislative provisions designed to encourage coordination.

Chapter 3 examines local-level coordination from the perspective of postsecondary institutions. It describes the involvement of these institutions in terms of the types of services provided to JTPA clients, the number of clients served, and the amount of JTPA funding received. Factors influencing coordination and suggestions for improvement are also discussed.

Chapter 4 is the summary of the state council reports on coordination. This chapter describes the amount of attention addressed to coordination in the contents, conclusions, and recommendations of these reports, as well as the sources of information that were drawn upon to examine coordination. Overall conclusions and recommendations are derived from a synthesis of those offered by the separate states.

Chapter 5 integrates the findings from the three data sources to present an overall assessment of the status of joint planning and coordination. On the basis of this assessment, needed improvements in coordination are discussed, and steps that would move vocational education and JTPA toward these improvements are suggested.

CHAPTER 2

COORDINATION AT THE SERVICE DELIVERY AREA LEVEL

Vocational education has provided services to clients of employment and training programs since their inception. From the beginning, however, there has been a continuing tension between the two systems. Employment and training officials have often claimed that vocational education is not responsive to the needs of their clients. Vocational educators have countered that the employment and training system duplicates services that established programs and facilities could provide.

In the midst of this continuing debate, many local officials from both systems have found ways to work together, and researchers who have examined their interaction have found considerable usage of vocational education by employment and training programs. Riffel (1981), for example, concluded from his review of previous studies that "by even the most conservative estimates, the flow of CETA* dollars into educational institutions is very large" (p. 43).

It has proved difficult, however, to establish the actual amount of this flow, as well as the percentage of employment and training clients who are receiving services from vocational education. The first of these annual reports (Lewis, Ferguson, and Card 1987) attempted to collect such data at the state level, but most states could not provide them. Site visits to service delivery areas (SDAs) found that local JTPA administrators could provide estimates of the number being trained by vocational institutions but had no records in their information systems that would enable them to provide an actual count.

The judgment was made that estimates of the number of JTPA clients served by vocational education would provide a more objective indication of the degree of coordination being achieved than verbal reports or ratings. Consequently, arrangements were made with the National Alliance of Business (NAB) to supplement its 1987 survey of SDAs. NAB officials had originally planned to survey approximately one-third of all SDAs and interview the chair of the Private Industry Council (PIC) and the director of the administrative entity for JTPA concerning coordination with four separate agencies: the Employment Service, welfare, economic development, and vocational education. The National Center provided funds to enable NAB to interview the directors of all SDAs in the 50 states concerning relationships with vocational education. As was reported in chapter 1, the NAB interviewers were able to complete interviews with 590 (97 percent) of these SDA directors.

*The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act was the federal legislation replaced by the Job Training Partnership Act.

Thus, from the statistical perspective, the results in this chapter are based on a census (minus refusals) rather than a sample. This means they are not subject to sampling error. They are still subject to errors in reporting, but fortunately there are criteria against which two of the answers in the survey can be tested. The SDA administrators were asked total clients served and total expenditures under title IIA during program year 1985, July 1985 through June 1986.* These answers were compared to the figures in the JTPA Annual Status Reports filed by SDAs with the U.S. Department of Labor. A special tabulation (dated December 23, 1987) of these reports was prepared for the National Center by the Division of Technical Assistance, Employment and Training Administration. The number of clients served and total expenditures as reported in the survey were compared to total participants and total program costs under title IIA as reported to the U.S. Department of Labor. These comparisons were made for all SDAs in 10 selected states, one for each federal region, that answered the survey questions, 87 percent of the total SDAs in these states. Some SDA administrators did not provide expenditure data because they reported no financial agreements with public vocational institutions, and some simply did not answer the question. Table 2.1 summarizes the results of these comparisons.

There is a high degree of agreement between the survey and Department of Labor figures. The correlation coefficients are close to their maximum of 1.00. The evidence, therefore, for two questions whose validity could be tested suggests that the survey responses accurately describe conditions within the SDAs.

The chapter is organized into two main sections. The next section presents information on the status of coordination as described by SDA administrators and in terms of objective indicators of services to JTPA clients by public vocational education. The other main section examines factors that influence the degree of coordination achieved. The administrators were first asked an open-ended question concerning "the major factors that have worked to produce or hinder effective coordination between the SDA and the vocational education system." They were then asked about the effects of specific legislative provisions, such as the 8 percent set-aside of JTPA title IIA funds. Each of these answers was analyzed in terms of selected economic and demographic characteristics of the SDA as reported by the U.S. Department of Labor (1987). This chapter presents these analyses.

---

*Interviews with the SDAs began in February 1987 when over one-third of program year 1986 was still remaining. Consequently, the question could not ask about PY 1986 expenditures.

TABLE 2.1

TITLE IIA CLIENTS SERVED AND EXPENDITURES FOR PROGRAM YEAR 1985 AS REPORTED IN SURVEY AND TO U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BY SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS IN 10 STATES

Variable	Survey Results	Annual Status Report	Correlation Coefficient
Clients served	272,208	286,490	.94
SDAs reporting	172	172	
Expenditures (in millions)	$ 446,682	$ 485,694	.95
SDAs reporting	184	184	

Status of Coordination

The site visits conducted as part of the research for the first annual study had suggested that coordination appeared to be better in smaller cities and rural areas and in areas that had large poverty populations and fewer state and local resources to address the problems of these populations. Indicators of these conditions were obtained from the following statistics on SDA characteristics published by the U. S. Department of Labor: (a) population density of an SDA, (b) percent of families in SDA with income below poverty level, (c) average wages for area, and (d) unemployment rate for area. Appendix table A-1 provides the frequencies and percentages of these data for the 590 SDAs included in the NAB survey.

The procedure used to analyze the SDA administrator responses involved running cross-tabulations of these responses with selected economic and demographic characteristics of SDAs and calculating chi-square statistics (X^2) or correlation coefficients (r). In a statistical sense, any relationship between variables based on census data is significant because all possible observations are included. The NAB data approaches a census since 97 percent of the contacted SDA are included. For many questions however, responses were not obtained. In addition, in tables with multiple columns and rows, it is often difficult to detect a systematic relationship between two variables. For these reasons the conventional statistical tests were applied and are reported. Note that these statistical tests are rough approximations since they compare only one variable to another without controlling for other

possible intervening variables. Also, they are sensitive to the manner in which responses were categorized for analysis. Many more analyses were conducted than are presented in this report. The tables that are included contain basic findings or test relationships suggested by previous research and observation.

Expenditures/Enrollments to Vocational Education

With these caveats in mind, table 2.2 provides the SDA reported title IIA expenditures and enrollments and the amount of these expenditures and number of clients directed to vocational education. The figures in this table are as reported in the NAB survey. It should be noted that although the administrators for 590 SDAs were interviewed, the number providing the information in this table decreases with each additional level of specificity requested. The number providing information on enrollments in secondary and postsecondary programs, for example, is only one-third of the total taking part in the survey.

To provide a better basis for estimating actual contracting with vocational eduction, the figures reported in table 2.3 were calculated. These figure are the total expenditures and clients served only for those SDAs that also provided estimates for these figures with vocational education. When the estimates are limited to the SDAs providing estimates for vocational education, they indicate that 22 percent of IIA expenditures were contracted to vocational institutions and 30 percent of clients received classroom training in these institutions. These are inflated percentages, however, for SDAs without contracts with public vocational education naturally did not report these figures.

The column labeled "National Estimates" in table 2.3 provides lower-limit estimates of title IIA activity with public vocational education. These estimates were made by assuming first that total expenditures and clients served in nonreporting SDAs were equal to the means in reporting SDAs.* The second assumption was that there was no service to JTPA clients by public vocational education in the nonreporting SDAs. Therefore, the amounts shown for expenditures and clients under vocational education are the same as those reported in the survey. These amounts were divided by national estimates of total expenditures and clients which yielded lower-limit estimates of the percentages contracted with and served by vocational institutions.

*This assumption yielded a figure for client served in between the total number of participants, 1,071,000, and total number of termination, 802,000, reported to the U.S. Department of Labor on the JTPA Annual Status Reports for Program Year 1985. The estimate for total expenditure is less than the reported figure of $ 1,541,987,000.

TABLE 2.2

TOTAL TITLE IIA EXPENDITURES AND ENROLLMENTS AND ESTIMATED AMOUNTS CONTRACTED OR ENROLLED WITH PUBLIC VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, PROGRAM YEAR 1985

Title IIA Indicators	Expenditures	Enrollments
Total	$ 1,101,861,000	758,256
Mean	2,063,410	1,490
Number responding	534	509
Total to Vocational Education	205,890,000	191,627
Mean	447,537	447
Number responding	460	429
Total to Secondary	51,876,000	27,809
Mean	213,481	138
Number responding	244	201
Total to Postsecondary	69,295,000	55,325
Mean	287,531	277
Number responding	241	200

Because of the missing data, it is not possible to give an exact figure on title IIA activities with public vocational education. The results obtained do, however, allow ranges to be provided. These indicate that between 16 and 22 percent of IIA funds were contracted to public vocational education and between 21 and 30 percent of IIA clients received classroom training in these institutions.

During the 1985 program year, the U.S. Department of Labor (1986) reported that 37 percent of title IIA participants were initially assigned to classroom training. A comparison of this figure to the lower-limit estimate of 21 percent of JTPA clients trained in vocational institutions indicates that, at a minimum, over half (57 percent) of IIA clients received their classroom training from public vocational education. There are no national figures on expenditures for classroom training against which the survey results can be compared.

In the cross-tabulation presented in the appendix tables it was assumed that missing data represented no activities with vocational education. These tables thus represent the most conservative assumption about the extent of usage of vocational education by SDAs.

TABLE 2.3

REPORTED AND ESTIMATED TITLE IIA EXPENDITURES AND CLIENTS SERVED BY PUBLIC VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM YEAR 1985

Title IIA Activity	Reported in Survey	National Estimates
Expenditures	$ 939,654,000	$ 1,258,681,000
Total		
Contracted to vocational institutions		
Number	205,890,000	205,890,000
Percent	22	16
SDA included	460	610
Clients Served		
Total	629,662	908,746
By vocational institutions		
Number	191,627	191,627
Percent	30	21
SDA included	429	610

NOTE: Estimates assume total clients served and expenditures in nonreporting SDAs were equal to the means from the SDAs that provided data and that no clients were served by vocational education in nonreporting SDAs.

Appendix tables A-2 to A-5 provide cross-tabulations of population density of SDA with total title IIA expenditures, expenditures directed to vocational education, expenditures directed to secondary vocational education, and expenditures directed to postsecondary vocational education. There is little variation across SDAs with different population densities in terms of total title IIA expenditures. Similar results were found for expenditures directed to vocational education.

Appendix tables A-6 to A-9 provide cross-tabulations of population density of SDA by number of title IIA clients and the number of these clients served through vocational education, secondary vocational education and postsecondary education. Three-fourths of the SDAs responding had 500 or more title IIA clients; 15 percent had fewer than 100 clients. Although there is some variation among the SDAs of various population densities in

terms of the number of clients served through vocational education, no pattern emerges to permit generalizations.

One of the cross-tabulations that yielded a clear pattern of differences was on a question involving collaborative efforts between SDAs and public vocational institutions. This question revealed that 97 percent of the SDAs reported some type of financial or nonfinancial agreement with vocational institutions (table 2.4). Financial agreements were more common in high population density areas and both financial and nonfinancial were more common in lower density areas. Virtually all of the collaborative efforts covered by these agreements involve classroom training, primarily for occupational skills (61 percent), and secondarily for basic skills either at the remedial or General Equivalency Diploma level.

TABLE 2.4

SDA CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT WITH VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Type of Contractual Agreement	Percentage of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
Financial	55	48	63	75	75	59
Nonfinancial	3	2	0	0	1	2
Both	39	48	31	25	20	36
None	2	2	6	0	4	3
Base for percentages	260	130	51	32	113	586

Chi square = 33.10 (significant at the .001 level)

Administrators' Perceptions

In addition to estimates of expenditures and enrollments, the SDA administrators were asked their overall perception "of the nature of the relationship between the SDA and public vocational/technical programs" since JTPA's implementation. Their responses were recorded and then classified into the categories

shown in table 2.5. Almost all the administrators responded to this question, and 71 percent described the relationship as good or better; only 9 percent described it as fair, poor, bad, or nonexistent.

TABLE 2.5

ADMINISTRATORS' DESCRIPTION OF NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP OF SDA WITH PUBLIC VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL PROGRAMS SINCE JTPA IMPLEMENTATION

Nature of Relationship	Percent of SDAs
Excellent, very good	27
Good	44
OK, satisfactory, fair to good	17
Fair	5
Poor, bad, nonexistent	4
Improved	3
No comment	1
Base for percentages	590

Appendix tables A-10 and A-11 provide cross-tabulations of the nature of the relationships SDAs have with vocational education by population density and percent of families below the poverty level. Neither of these analyses confirmed the impressions formed during site visits that relationships appeared to be better in less populated SDAs and those with larger poverty populations.

As a follow-up to the question on the overall nature of the relationship with vocational education, the SDA administrators were asked if there was a history of cooperation and working together in their areas. Because of the follow-up nature of this question, most administrators (61 percent) did not respond to this question. Of those that did respond, almost three-fourths (73 percent) reported that the history was good.

The administrators were asked if relationships in their SDAs were changing, and if they wanted to work more closely with vocational education agencies. Forty-one percent reported no change, but one out of every five who gave this answer added that the SDA

had always worked closely with vocational education. An additional 44 percent said that they did want to work more closely or that the relationship was improving. Almost all the remaining answers endorsed working more closely but added qualifications such as the need for vocational education to improve its performance.

Influences on Coordination

The administrators were asked several questions about factors that might influence the level of coordination achieved in their SDAs. The first question was open-ended and asked respondents to cite "the major factors that have worked to produce or hinder effective coordination between the SDA and the vocational education system". Positive factors were mentioned more than twice as frequently as negative factors. Almost three-fourths (73 percent) of the administrators cited a positive factor compared to one-third (34 percent) who cited a negative factor. Table 2.6 summarizes the main factors mentioned.

Most of the categories in the table are self-explanatory, but it should be noted that characteristics of schools were cited as both positive and negative factors. The answers classified as

TABLE 2.6

ADMINISTRATORS' ASSESSMENTS OF MAJOR FACTORS INFLUENCING COORDINATION BETWEEN SDA AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Factors	Percent of SDA
Positive	
History/climate in SDA	30
Good communications	16
Characteristics of schools	12
PIC involvement	7
Characteristics of SDA	7
Other	1
Negative	
Performance-based contracts	6
Characteristics of schools	6
Vocational education not interested	5
State imposed restrictions	4
Vocational education not placement oriented	4
Turf concerns	3
Vocational education too expensive	2
Other	4
Base for percentages	590

positive included comments that vocational education meets our (SDA's) needs, the schools are flexible, and they want JTPA money. Negative characteristics included outdated programs and equipment and inconvenient hours.

The most positive single factors mentioned by the administrators were shared goals/mutual need in the SDA (12 percent) and a history of good relationships (10 percent). Both of these comments were included in the "history/climate" category. Education members on the PIC was cited by 6 percent of the administrators and included in the "PIC involvement" category.

Legislated Provisions to Encourage Coordination

In addition to the open-ended question on influences, the administrators were asked about several specific provisions in the Perkins and JTPA legislation designed to encourage coordination. The strongest of these is the 8 percent setaside of JTPA title IIA funds (section 123) intended to be used under cooperative agreement with education and training institutions. Table 2.7 reports the major ways SDAs are involved in the administration of the 8 percent funds. In the SDAs that receive and administer an 8 percent allocation, 84 percent do so under cooperative agreements.

The ways that states choose to administer the 8 percent funds have been examined in other studies that were discussed in the first annual report of the National Center (Lewis, Ferguson, and Card 1987) That report concluded that the net result of the 8 percent has been positive. It has caused the two systems to develop cooperative agreements and has funded many innovative efforts.

The Perkins legislation contains several provisions to encourage joint planning and coordination between programs assisted by Perkins and JTPA. Those directed to the local level include making available to each PIC within a state a listing of all vocational programs assisted by Perkins [section 111 (c)], coterminous planning periods [section 113 (a)], and the requirement that local applications for Perkins funds describe coordination with programs conducted under JTPA [section 15 (a)(b)]. The SDA administrators responded to questions about each of these provisions, and about the presence of vocational education representatives on PICs. Their answers are summarized in table 2.8.

A slim majority of the administrators reported they conducted joint planning that led to improved coordination. About the same percentage said that their SDAs had been provided with a list of programs assisted by the Perkins Act and that the lists had been useful. The primary usage was for referral of clients to programs

TABLE 2.7

SDA INVOLVEMENT WITH ADMINISTRATION OF SECTION 123, 8 PERCENT FUNDS

Type of Involvement	Percent of SDA
SDA receives allocation, decides on programs	33
SDA does not receive allocation, PIC reviews applications in SDA	29
SDA not involved, all 8 percent handled by state agency	14
SDA receives funds for special projects under 8 percent	8
Other arrangements	14
No answer, not sure	2

and for informational and funding purposes. Both of these uses were cited by about one-fourth of the administrators. Use of the lists to avoid duplication of programs was mentioned by only 4 percent.

Many administrators were unsure about the review of applications from local educational agencies for vocational education funds. Less than one-half gave an unqualified yes to the question. Over one-fourth said they did not review the applications because their SDAs never received them. Many of those who qualified their negative answer said the local applications were sent to the SDA for informational purposes only.

PIC membership is clearly a major contact point between vocational education and JTPA. Virtually all (92 percent) administrators reported that they have a representative from a vocational institution on their PIC and in most cases (82 percent) this representative is a vocational educator. Those who represent vocational institutions but are not vocational educators are usually presidents of community colleges or superintendents of schools. Nine out of ten (89 percent) of the administrators felt that the presence of these education representatives has fostered greater coordination.

TABLE 2.8

IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGISLATED PROVISIONS TO ENCOURAGE JOINT PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Provision	Percent of SDAs
Conduct joint planning	
Yes, yielded improved coordination	53
Yes, no improvement	7
Informal contact	7
No joint planning	27
Other	6
SDA provided list of programs assisted by Perkins Act	
Yes, comment on how used	59
Yes, list not very useful	11
Yes, no comment on use	6
No	15
Not sure, don't know	5
Other	5
PIC reviews applications from local education agencies	
Yes	42
Yes, qualified	7
No	13
No, qualified	22
Never receive application	14
Not sure, don't know	2
PIC has representative from vocational institutions	92
PIC has vocational educator	82
Base for percentages	590

From the local perspective, the provisions in the Perkins Act that require state-level coordination have not affected the local level. Three-fourths (75 percent) of the SDA administrators said that the Perkins legislation has had minimal or no impact on local JTPA decisionmaking. On the positive side, however, virtually the same proportion (74 percent) of administrators said they were not aware of any federal or state law, regulations, or policies that impede efforts to coordinate with vocational education. The impediments that were reported mainly involved state imposed requirements (7 percent), bureaucratic delays, red tape (5 percent), and insufficient mandate for coordination or conflicting requirements in Perkins (5 percent).

Suggestions for Improvement

Finally, the administrators were asked to suggest the major things the vocational education community could do to foster collaboration. Their answers were grouped into the categories presented in table 2.9.

TABLE 2.9

MAJOR SUGGESTIONS TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COMMUNITY TO FOSTER COLLABORATION PROVIDED BY SDA ADMINISTRATORS

Suggestions	Percent of SDAs
Increase communication, joint planning	21
Improve quality, responsiveness of training programs	17
Broaden concept/definition of role	12
Change policies	11
Recruit/refer to JTPA	3
Joint funding, support services	3
Things are fine, no problems	29
Base for percentages	590

NOTE: Total is less than 100 because not all administrators provided suggestions.

Perhaps the most surprising result in table 2.9 is that over one-fourth of the administrators had no suggestions because they were satisfied with conditions in their SDAs. Comments such as the following were included in this category:

Locally--very good; not much more they can do

Fine as is.

Probably nothing more they can do, they have been very helpful so far.

Nothing, as they are extremely responsive to us

The most frequent individual suggestions for improving collaboration, each coming from 7 percent of the administrators, were

to keep the SDA informed and to conduct more joint planning. Other suggestions in this category were for vocational educators to become more informed about JTPA, to hold more joint meetings, and to place PIC members on vocational education advisory committees.

Several of the suggestions concerned the type and quality of training provided by vocational education. Increased responsiveness to employers and the needs of the labor market were frequently mentioned in recommendations such as these:

> *Vocational education needs to strengthen ties with the employer community.*
>
> *Continue to establish and gear programs toward the needs of the labor market.*
>
> *Be more willing to update and change curricula to meet current labor market needs.*
>
> *They need to be more sensitive and responsive to demand occupations so they are offering training in areas that really need it. For example, we don't need many more nurses aides right now.*

Other recommendations were for a greater emphasis on placement and more open-entry/open-exist and short-term training programs.

The suggestions grouped under the "broaden concept" and "change policies" categories are the most difficult to implement because they address basic structural differences between the two systems. They recommend that vocational education be more flexible and responsive to the needs of JTPA, that it serve those outside the normal school population, and that it coordinate better within itself, especially high schools with community colleges. One SDA administrator commented: "There really is no voc ed community--there are so many definitions and players, including a large private provider population." Another said: "Community colleges and voc ed need to coordinate. They are under different systems in [state name deleted] and that creates problems." Calls for more coordination among state agencies and a willingness to accept performance-based contracts were also included in these categories.

The many suggestions for improvement should not overshadow the overall positive findings in this chapter: over 97 percent of SDAs have entered into some type of collaborative effort with public vocational institutions; at least half of all title IIA clients in classroom training in program year 1985 received their training from public vocational institutions; about 9 out of 10 SDA administrators described their relationships with vocational-technical education as satisfactory or better, and almost all PICs have representatives of vocational education institutions as members. The information in this chapter indicates that from the

JTPA perspective, coordination with vocational education is working well in most SDAs. The next chapter presents the perspective of representatives of postsecondary institutions.

CHAPTER 3

POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS AND JTPA

Most public postsecondary institutions, particularly community colleges and technical institutes, have as a basic goal the teaching of skills needed in the labor force. Since these are also the skills needed by most JTPA clients, postsecondary institutions would appear to be well positioned to serve these clients. In the service delivery areas (SDAs) that were visited for the first of these annual reports, postsecondary institutions were more actively involved with JTPA than were secondary vocational schools. In one state, in fact, community colleges were the grant recipients and administrative entities for half of the SDAs in the state. This is the highest degree of involvement possible, but it is not characteristic of very many postsecondary institutions.

To determine the extent to which postsecondary institutions provide services for JTPA clients, a survey was conducted of a nationally representative sample of these institutions. As was stated in chapter 1, this survey was conducted in cooperation with a major study of postsecondary occupational education being undertaken at the National Center. The procedures that were followed were presented in chapter 1. A total of 509 usable questionnaires were returned from institutions in 387 SDAs. The information from these questionnaires forms the basis for this chapter, which addresses the following two basic questions:

- What are the characteristics of postsecondary institutions that are involved with JTPA, and how do they differ from those that are not involved?
- What kinds of services are provided under JTPA?

In addition to information relevant to these questions, the chapter presents the perceptions of postsecondary officials on those factors that encourage or discourage their institutions from working with JTPA. Suggestions from these officials to foster more coordination are also discussed.

Institutions Involved in JTPA

To compare the differences between postsecondary institutions that are involved with JTPA and those that are not involved, the 509 questionnaires were divided into two groups on the basis of their responses to questions on JTPA related activities. Institutions that received funds under JTPA and provided training to JTPA clients during the past program and academic year were defined as JTPA service providers; those that did not were defined as nonproviders. These classifications yielded 347 (68 percent) institutions that were JTPA service providers and 162 (32 percent) institutions that were nonproviders. The characteristics of these

two groups of institutions are compared in this section of the chapter.

Area Served

The postsecondary respondents were asked about the type of area in which their institutions were located. JTPA service providers appear to be a little more likely to be in rural areas, but the difference is not statistically significant. These responses are summarized in table 3.1. The respondents were also asked to estimate the approximate population in the areas served by their institutions. As would be expected from their responses on their locations, 20 percent of the nonproviders were in areas with populations of 500,000 or more compared to 14 percent of the providers.

TABLE 3.1

TYPES OF AREAS IN WHICH INSTITUTIONS ARE LOCATED

Type of Area	Percent of Institutions	
	Service Providers	Non-Providers
Rural area	50	41
Suburban area	29	29
Urban area	21	30
Base for percentages	344	121
Chi square	2.48 (not significant)	

Additional questions were asked to determine racial and economic characteristics of the populations served. The responses, both for JTPA service providers and nonproviders, show relatively low percentages of minorities in the populations served. As summarized in table 3.2, there appear to be fewer economically disadvantaged persons in the areas served by the nonproviders, but this difference also is not significant.

TABLE 3.2

PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION SERVED
THAT IS ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

Percentage Economically Disadvantaged	Percent of Institutions	
	Service Providers	Non-Providers
Greater than 50	13	9
40-49	5	3
30-39	10	7
20-29	18	13
10-19	24	17
Less than 10	30	51
Base for percentages	347	162
Chi square	9.20 (not significant)	

Enrollment

After questions on the structure of the population served, the respondents were asked the size of their institutions' enrollments of full-time and part-time students by program type for 1985-86. The answers, which are summarized in table 3.3, show that service providers have larger enrollments in occupational programs, both full-time and part-time. Enrollment patterns in transfer or general programs are similar for providers and nonproviders.

Questions on student characteristics were also asked. Both JTPA service providers and nonproviders have equal proportions of males and females as students. Minorities represent less than 10 percent of enrollments for both providers and nonproviders.

The respondents were also asked the percentage of special needs students enrolled in the programs offered. The questions on family income, handicapped, and single parents indicate that JTPA service providers enroll a larger percentage of special needs students than do nonproviders. Only in the case of limited English-proficiency (LEP) were enrollments similar. The detailed responses are summarized in table 3.4.

TABLE 3.3

SIZE OF THE ENROLLMENT OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME STUDENTS BY PROGRAM TYPE FOR 1985- 986

Size of Enrollment	Percent of Institutions							
	Occupational Programs				Transfer or General Programs			
	Full-time		Part-time		Full-time		Part-time	
	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provider	Non-Provider
2000 or greater	11	8	18	9	9	12	15	12
900-1999	17	7	18	6	11	10	11	8
700-899	9	4	5	0	4	2	4	2
500-699	8	4	8	4	8	5	3	2
300-499	18	4	7	5	8	5	5	4
100-299	17	9	13	7	9	11	9	8
less than 100	20	64	31	69	51	55	53	64
Base for percentages	347	162	347	162	347	162	347	162
Chi square	52.25**		31.19**		2.30		2.88	

** Statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 3.4

SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT

Percentage of Special Needs Students	Percent of Institutions									
	Disadvantaged				Handicapped		Limited English-Proficiency		Single Parent	
	Family income below $10,000		Family income between $14,999 and $10,000							
	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provider	Non-Provider	Service Provide	Non-Provider
60 or greater	6	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
50-59	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
40-49	6	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	2
30-39	7	2	8	2	0	0	1	0	5	0
20-29	9	4	13	4	1	0	2	1	11	2
10-19	22	10	23	20	10	2	5	4	18	10
9 or less	47	79	47	72	88	97	90	92	60	86
Base for percentages	347	162	347	162	347	162	347	162	347	162
Chi square	21.83**		20.88**		5.66*		.24		19.38**	

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

Funding

The total institutional budget of nonproviders was higher than the budget of providers. The means were $13,032,942 for nonproviders and $11,071,734 for providers. These funds also tend to come from different sources. As shown in table 3.5, more of the funding of JTPA service providers comes from state and community/county sources, while the funding of nonservice providers comes more from tuition and other private sources. Specific questions were asked on the amount of money the institution would receive under the Perkins Act and JTPA during the 1986-87 school year. The results are summarized in table 3.6. A majority of both the JTPA service providers and nonproviders received more than $100,000 for the 1986-87 school year from the Perkins Act. Obviously, since JTPA funding was one of the criteria used to classify the returned questionnaires, the nonproviders did not receive any funds under JTPA.

In summary, the institutions that received funds from JTPA or that enrolled JTPA participants tended to be more heavily funded from public sources and to have somewhat lower total budgets and enrollments. As would be expected, however, the enrollments of the service providers in occupational programs are higher than the nonproviders as are their percentages of economically disadvantaged, handicapped, and single parent students.

Services under JTPA

The services that postsecondary institutions provide to JTPA participants cover the whole range of activities authorized by the law. As shown in table 3.7, a few institutions act as grant recipients and administrative entities for their SDAs. A few more carry out activities that are usually thought of as typical functions of employment and training programs, such as certifying eligibility for services, running job clubs, and writing on-the-job training contracts with employers.

Job training services are the ones usually associated with postsecondary institutions, and a majority of the institutions in the study provided these services. A little over half of the institutions enrolled JTPA participants in regularly scheduled classes. One-third of the institutions conducted classes under subcontracts that were limited to JTPA participants. Over half (60 percent) of the institutions that conducted such classes did so under performance-based contracts. (The occupational skills taught in these classes are reported in table 3.8.). Less than half of the institutions also enrolled participants in basic or remedial education classes or General Equivalency Diploma (GED) programs.

The numbers served in these three types of classes ranged widely. Most institutions served less than 100 JTPA clients in their regular and basic or GED classes during the 1985-86 academic

TABLE 3.5

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BUDGET BY SOURCE OF FUNDS

Percentage of Total Budget	Percent of Institutions											
	Community /County		State		Federal		Tuition		Private Donation/Gifts		Other	
	Type I	Type II	Type I	Type II	Type I	Type II	Type I	Type II	Type I	Type II	Type I	Type II
60 or greater	2	2	43	27	0	1	3	13	0	0	0	0
50-59	4	1	14	5	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	2
40-49	6	1	13	3	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0
30-39	9	2	11	6	2	0	13	10	0	2	1	3
20-29	10	6	6	3	4	4	18	14	1	4	3	6
10-19	15	4	3	1	16	4	27	12	1	6	7	8
9 or less	52	84	10	55	78	91	36	45	98	88	89	80
Base for percentages	347	162	347	162	347	162	347	162	347	162	347	162
Chi square	23.10**		48.79**		13.96**		17.31**		4.13*		.70	

NOTE: Type I = JTPA service providers; Type II = nonproviders
* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

TABLE 3.6

FUNDING RECEIVED UNDER PERKINS ACT AND JTPA

Funding	Percent of Institutions			
	Perkins Act		JTPA	
	Service Providers	Non-Providers	Service Providers	Non-Providers
$ 100,000 or greater	62	69	43	0
70,000-99,999	12	0	11	0
40,000-69,999	13	12	16	0
10,000-39,999	11	16	23	0
9,999 or less	3	2	8	0
Base for percentages	266	42	265	

TABLE 3.7

SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER JTPA BY POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Services	Percent of Institutions
Training provided	
Enrollment in regular classes on individual referral basis	56
Classes conducted for JTPA clients only	33
Basic/remedial education; GED classes	40
Other services	
Facilities and/or instructors for classes not conducted by institution itself	64
Intake, assessment, counseling, referral	33
Job development	31
Support services	26
Eligibility certification	13
On-the-job training contracts	11
Youth competency programs	10
Job clubs	9
Acts as administrative entity for SDA	7
Base for percentages	509

NOTE: Total exceeds 100 percent because many institutions provide more than one service.

TABLE 3.8

OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS TAUGHT IN PROGRAMS
CONDUCTED ONLY FOR JTPA CLIENTS

Occupational Area	Percent of Programs
Office, business, computer	40
Mechanical, technical, trade	26
Health	10
Job seeking skills	5
Consumer/personal service	4
Transportation	3
Child care/food production/clothing	3
Marketing and distribution	2
Others	8
Base for percentages	339

NOTE: Percentages are based on total number of programs offered, not percentage of institutions offering these programs.

year, but a few institutions served several hundred. As would be expected, the numbers in classes conducted under JTPA contracts and limited to JTPA clients were considerably larger. The distribution of enrollments for the three types of classes is shown in table 3.9.

The most frequent service to JTPA is to provide facilities or instructors for classes that the institutions do not conduct themselves. Almost two-thirds of the institutions (64 percent) reported that they provide this service. Even among those that reported they received no funds from JTPA and enrolled no participants, almost two-thirds (60 percent) said they provided facilities or instructors. When these institutions are added to those that provided direct services, 87 percent of the institutions in the study had some type of relationship with JTPA.

Over half of the institutions that provide no direct services under JTPA (54 percent) were formally represented on PICs compared

TABLE 3.9

ENROLLMENT OF JTPA CLIENTS IN THREE TYPES OF CLASSES DURING 1985-86 ACADEMIC YEAR

Enrollment	Percentage of Institutions Conducting These Classes		
	Regular classes	JTPA only	Basic, GED
9 or less	10	1	15
10 to 49	37	16	44
50 to 99	26	10	23
100 to 199	18	21	11
200 to 299	4	16	4
300 to 499	4	13	2
500 to 699	1	12	1
700 or more	1	10	-
Base for percentages	286	173	204
Mean	86.30	283.24	61.48
Standard deviation	113.20	257.04	78.89
Range	1 to 947	6 to 920	2 to 610

to two-thirds (65 percent) of the institutions that received JTPA funding or enrolled JTPA clients. The overall figure for the study was 61 percent of postsecondary institutions formally represented on PICs.

A type of linkage encouraged by the Perkins Act (section 115) is the opportunity for JTPA administrative entities to review applications from postsecondary institutions and other recipients eligible for funds provided under the act. Half (49 percent) of the institutions responding to this question reported that their applications were reviewed. This was one of the questions asked only of the supplemental sample.

Influences on Coordination

From the perspective of postsecondary institutions, what are the obstacles to providing services under JTPA and what are the factors that encourage them to do so? This section summarizes the answers received to those questions and the suggestions from postsecondary respondents on how JTPA could foster more collaboration.

Obstacles

The respondents in the study were asked to indicate whether the six potential obstacles listed in table 3.10 hinder their institutions from providing services to a major degree, a minor degree, or not at all. The answers from these respondents were divided into those from institutions that provided services under JTPA and those that did not.

TABLE 3.10

OBSTACLES HINDERING POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS FROM PROVIDING SERVICES UNDER JTPA

Obstacles	Percent of Institutions			
	Service Provider		Non-Provider	
	Major	Minor	Major	Minor
Uncertainty, delays in contracting process	24	35	23	28
Restrictions on eligibility, services	25	32	20	32
Amount of documentation, paperwork required	25	32	27	29
Policies, politics of PIC	25	27	28	27
Performance-based contracts	21	26	13	31
Lack of knowledge of Act and regulations	5	19	7	15
Base for percentages	347	347	162	162

The patterns of responses from the two groups were almost identical. About half of each group cited uncertainties and delays in contracting, restrictions on eligibility and services, amount of documentation, and policies and politics of PICs as obstacles. Slightly fewer felt performance-based contracts were obstacles, and about one-fourth cited lack of knowledge of the act and its regulations. There is no apparent explanation why two groups of institutions so different in their experiences with JTPA should be so similar in their perceptions of obstacles encountered with the act.

Encouraging Factors

The opposite of an obstacle, of course, is a factor that encourages institutions to provide services under JTPA. In the same way that respondents were asked to evaluate potential obstacles, respondents in the supplemental sample were asked to rate factors that might encourage their institutions to provide services under JTPA. There were too few respondents in the supplemental sample to divide their answers into those from institutions that do and do not provide services.

As shown in table 3.11, the most influential factor, rated as a major or minor factor by almost three-fourths (73 percent) of the respondents, was the agreement between the mission of the institutions and the purposes of JTPA. Postsecondary institutions that provide occupational education take very seriously their responsibility for service to the communities that support them. This commitment was reflected in the percentage that cited their mission as a major influencing factor.

The other factors rated as major or minor by over half of the respondents were personal relationships among staff of the institutions and the JTPA agencies, and scarcity of resources. Pressure from state agencies was rated a major factor by only 11 percent of the institutions.

For another measure of influences on coordination, the postsecondary respondents were asked to rank the priority that their institutions place on establishing linkage with the nine types of organizations shown in table 3.12. The respondents assigned a rank of one to the type of organization that was highest priority to the institution, two to the second highest, and so on. The means of these rankings are reported in the table. Generally, the means reflect the same priorities for institutions that provide services for JTPA and those that do not. JTPA's mean rank places it sixth in priority for both groups. Linkage with JTPA is clearly a higher priority than linkage with organized labor, the military, and proprietary schools, but it is just as clearly a lower priority than close ties with business and industry and secondary schools.

TABLE 3.11

FACTORS ENCOURAGING POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS TO PROVIDE SERVICES UNDER JTPA

(Supplemental Sample Only)

Encouraging Factors	Percent of Institutions	
	Major	Minor
Mission of institution consistent with purposes of JTPA	51	22
Personal relationships among staff of institution and JTPA	36	26
Scarcity of resources	32	27
Priority given to public institutions by PIC	22	20
Declining enrollments	21	22
Push from state agencies	11	29
Base for percentages	132	132

Suggestions to Foster Cooperation

The final question asked of the supplemental sample of postsecondary institutions concerned suggestions for "things JTPA could do to foster more collaboration." The responses were categorized as shown in table 3.13. An attempt was made to divide these responses into two groups according to whether or not the institutions provided services to JTPA, but only five suggestions were received from nonproviders.

TABLE 3.12

PRIORITY RANKING OF LINKAGE WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations	Mean Ranking	
	Service Providers	Non-Providers
Business and industry (other than for customized training)	1.98	2.02
Secondary schools	3.17	2.67
Customized training for business and industry	3.98	4.07
Community-based organizations	4.11	4.23
Other postsecondary institutions (public or private nonprofit)	4.21	3.84
JTPA	4.60	4.89
Organized labor organizations	6.41	6.21
Military	6.53	6.71
Proprietary schools (for profit)	7.44	6.91
Base numbers for means	286-318	119-139

NOTE: 1 = highest priority; 9 = lowest priority. The base numbers for the various organizations vary because not all respondents ranked all nine organizations. There were many more missing responses for proprietary schools. Those means were calculated on a base of 188 for service providers and 74 for nonproviders.

TABLE 3.13

MAJOR SUGGESTIONS TO JTPA TO FOSTER COLLABORATION PROVIDED BY POSTSECONDARY RESPONDENTS

(Supplemental Sample Only)

Suggestions	Percent of Institutions
Broaden concept/definition of training	26
Reduce/simplify documentation, loosen restrictions	21
Increase communication joint planning	12
Reduce political influence	8
Other	14
Things are fine, no problems	10
Base for percentages	132

NOTE: Total is less than 100 percent because not all institutions provided suggestions.

The most frequent suggestions for fostering collaboration concerned the nature of training offered by JTPA. As was noted in Chapter 1, vocational educators tend to be skeptical of the value of much of the training JTPA recipients receive. Their suggestions for improving collaboration, therefore, often involve improving the quality of this training. Some of the detailed suggestions include the following:

> *Sponsor clients in established, proven training programs; stop trying to solve hard-core, long-term problems with quick-fix, short-term nonsolutions such as OJT [on-the-job training] which has no substance.*

> *Refine OJT programs--develop and implement quality standards for OJT similar to standards for institutional training programs.*

> *Our PIC distributes most of its funds to business and industry which provide low-paying OJT's. Educating people to acquire a new skill, or to receive remedial education before they can be accepted into a training program, is very low on*

the PIC's list of priorities. Somehow our PIC must be convinced that educating people for new careers is a much better investment than providing them with minimum wage jobs with high turnover on factory assembly lines

There were many other recommendations along the same lines calling for increased use of existing programs and facilities and for longer-term training.

The second most frequent category of suggestions called for reducing the documentation, paperwork, and restrictions accompanying JTPA. This category included suggestions regarding performance-based contracting such as the following:

When working with postsecondary institutions, JTPA should make exceptions to performance-based contracts.

We must treat all students equally and cannot provide preferential placement assistance to students who are funded by JTPA. Performance-based contracts severely limit possible collaboration between our institution and JTPA.

The typical suggestions in this category were more terse such as, "Reduce the red tape and paperwork," or "Streamline paperwork process; establish consistent guidelines; maintain consistency in personnel administering programs."

The other suggestions summarized in table 3.13 primarily involve steps to increase cooperation in planning and to reduce the amount of political influence on JTPA program decisions. As indicated in the table, 8 percent of the postsecondary respondents perceived their PICs to be controlled by local elected officials or representatives of community-based organizations. Such control, they feel, has caused their institutions to be excluded from providing training to JTPA participants.

The final category in table 3.13 reports the number of postsecondary respondents who had no suggestion to improve collaboration, but did comment about the high level of cooperation in their SDA. Some examples follow:

"Our relationship with JTPA is excellent because our PIC values training and basic education as well as job placement."

"This institution has an ideal relationship with the PIC staff.

"Collaboration in this SDA is more than satisfactory."

"Nothing at present-very pleased with cooperation and collaboration!"

"The working relationship with the three JTPA offices is good and students are being served through the collaboration of both parties."

Comments such as these, and similar ones from the JTPA respondents reported in chapter 2, demonstrate that while there are many basic differences between the vocational education system and the employment and training system, it is possible to do much more than just overcome the differences. It is possible to achieve relationships that both parties are proud of.

CHAPTER 4

THE STATE COUNCIL REPORTS ON COORDINATION

To ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness of programs assisted by the Perkins Act and JTPA, Congress mandated specific means by which the systems should be linked together in coordinated efforts to fulfill the intent of the legislation. One of these mandates is contained in section 112(a) of the Perkins Act, whereby, as a condition of participating in the vocational education programs authorized by the act, a state must establish "a State council, which shall be appointed by the Governor . . . composed of 13 individuals, and shall be broadly representative of citizens and groups within the State having an interest in vocational education."

The act enumerates a variety of responsibilities for each state council, spelling out whom it should advise regarding statewide plans and policies for strengthening vocational education, as well as providing analysis, consultation and recommendations "to ensure and enhance the participation of the public in the provision of vocational education at the local level . . . ."

Section 112,(d)(9) of the act states further that once in existence:

> Each State council shall . . . (A) evaluate at least once every two years (i) the vocational education program delivery systems assisted under this Act, and under the Job Training Partnership Act, in terms of their adequacy and effectiveness in achieving the purposes of each of the two Acts and (ii) make recommendations to the State board on the adequacy and effectiveness of the coordination that takes place between vocational education and the Job Training Partnership Act and (B) advise . . . of these findings and recommendations.

The biennial reports from the state councils were to be transmitted to the recipients specified in the law on March 31, 1987. In May, 1987, the National Center contacted all state councils and requested copies of their reports.

The Perkins Act allows the state councils wide latitude in carrying out their responsibilities. It does, however, place a constraint on the amount of funds available for such activities, stating in Section 112 (f) (1) (A) that "no State council shall be allotted less than $120,000 nor more than $225,000 for each fiscal year." In general, low population states receive the lesser amount, with the maximum going to states that are heavily populated. These amounts must cover all expenses of the councils. It is obvious that with this amount of funding, large-scale

studies requiring extensive data collection are not possible using only council funds.

This chapter summarizes the reports that have been received from the state councils regarding the results of their evaluations of vocational education-JTPA coordination. Although all 50 states were requested to participate in this study, 3 states had not completed their reports and therefore are not included in the findings and analysis.

The reports are reviewed first in total, noting the variety of reporting procedures adopted by the states in terms of length, complexity and scope. This is followed by a comparison of the empirical data contained in the reports, showing the degree of thoroughness achieved by a number of the councils. Finally, there is a synthesis of the overall conclusions and recommendations, with suggestions for future reports.

Overview of the Reports

All of the reporting states indicated an awareness of the congressional mandate to evaluate, biennially, the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination within their jurisdictions. Approximately 45 percent, however, elected to submit statements that dealt in generalities or failed to provide quantitative measures of the status of this coordination. Of these, two chose to define and discuss coordination in terms of the JTPA section 123 8 percent set-aside funding. Several others used their reports as a vehicle to advance gubernatorial plans and policies.

On the other hand, 26 states, or better than half, submitted relatively extensive analyses of coordination as they saw it or measured it, and two-thirds of those states adhered to the specific mandate to report at length on the status of coordination between JTPA and vocational education.

The length of the submitted reports varied considerably, from 2 that were only 7 pages in length, to a single report that exceeded 200 pages. The average length of the 47 reports, however, was slightly over 38 pages. Of those that seriously addressed their mandate to evaluate coordination, 4 devoted their entire length to their survey findings, conclusions and recommendations, and another required some 80 pages to explore the matter fully with text and graphic displays. On the whole, the reports devoted a full third of their pages to coordination (34 percent) with an average of 13 pages per report.

Understandably, the states that did not conduct surveys or otherwise report tangible evidence on the status of coordination (21 out of the 47) had little on which to base conclusions and recommendations for future actions. More than a third of these states (eight) offered no recommendations. For all of the submitted reports, however, an average of 15 percent of each

report was allotted to discussion and analysis of joint planning and various remedial steps that could help eliminate barriers to improved relationships and create more effective coordination in the future.

Sources of Data

The states used a variety of methods to obtain information regarding the status of coordination between vocational education and JTPA. When a special study was made in the form of a survey of a sample of involved individuals, almost all of the states conducting such studies had sufficient confidence in the results to consider only the data gained from them. In several instances, however, telephone interviews were used either to follow up on results that needed to be clarified or to obtain information from persons who had neglected to return their questionnaires by mail. As might be expected, surveys that used systematic methods provided data that enabled the reporting states to be more specific in their conclusions and recommendations. The methods used by those councils that conducted special studies are described in the following section.

Special Studies of Coordination

Approximately half of the reporting states (26 out of 47) collected original data in order to report on the status of coordination, and to seek the opinions of local and regional administrators regarding problem areas and suggested ways to generate higher levels of cooperation in the future. Table 4.1 shows the frequency of the methods employed.

TABLE 4.1

DATA COLLECTION METHOD USED BY STATES THAT COLLECTED ORIGINAL DATA ON COORDINATION

Method Used	States Using Method
Mail survey	16
Existing state reports	12
Hearings and/or site visits	12
Telephone interviews	10

NOTE: Total exceeds the number of states that conducted special studies (26), since some states used more than one method.

Of the 16 states that used a mail survey, the majority used a specially developed set of questions that, generally, followed the style used by the National Center for the first annual report. These states also gave thought and attention to the compilation of their mailing lists, selecting agencies and individuals that would provide a fair sampling of opinion across the lines of JTPA and vocational education, as well as the views of representative people at regional and state levels.

Not all of the state councils reported on the number of questionnaires mailed out in their respective surveys. Of those that did, however, the largest survey involved over one thousand individuals, while the smallest number contacted was 89. Of the states that did report a response rate, the returns ranged from a low of 40 percent to a high of 100 percent, with an average of 63 percent.

Two states coupled their mail surveys with a telephone follow-up to clarify results where necessary or to gather information from nonrespondents. Three of the states used telephone interviews exclusively as a format by which a set of prepared questions was directed to a selected cross-section of individuals. Two used the opportunities provided by site visits to conduct telephone interviews, while four state councils used a combination of questionnaires, hearings, site visits and telephone interviews.

One of the councils took advantage of a statewide workshop to distribute a questionnaire to those attending. Another state developed and employed a somewhat different and complex method consisting of committees composed of a broad range of professional people and interested citizens. Each of these "self-study committees" used special data collection booklets to compile and record in-depth information about administrative functions, educational programs and services at their local center. The data were then reviewed by teams put together by the state Department of Education, verified through on-site visits, and ultimately placed into a written report.

The most detailed analyses of coordination at local levels came from states whose methodology centered around questionnaires that were, with one exception, mailed to balanced lists of agencies and individuals. The exception involved a state that distributed its questionnaire to one half of its survey sample during a group interview, but mailed it to the remainder.

For the most part, the questionnaires were created with the assistance of in-state agencies. They ranged in length from a 2-question survey to 1 that asked a total of 31 questions, but the majority ran no longer than 2 pages and consisted, on average, of approximately 10 questions. Designed to be completed with relative ease and speed, the most often used question techniques were the multiple-choice variety, and rating scales that required the respondents to select from a range such as excellent to poor,

strongly agree to strongly disagree, or most effective to ineffective. Each of the questionnaires did, however, contain several questions that asked the respondents to discuss at length their own views. Among these were questions that asked them to identify or cite examples of successful coordination or planning efforts and then to elaborate upon their choices with reasons why those examples succeeded.

Summary of Reports

Even when one or a combination of several information sources was used to gather data regarding the status of coordination, a large majority of the states contirued to rely heavily on the observations and opinions accumulated over a period of time by state council members and staff. These views were used essentially to supplement, or explain, certain findings from studies and other sources, although in a number of cases (15), they constituted the entire basis of the reports.

Without exception, the states introduced their discussions of coordination by citing the provisions set forth in the Perkins Act. Given the number of reports and the varying perceptions of federally mandated programs that exist from region to region, it is to be expected that these discussions reflected a wide range of attitudes and reactions. Several were quite frank in their appraisals of the status of coordination within their jurisdictions, with one reporting that "a long history of infighting" has resulted in a "disservice to the people who need work training" and concluding that "fundamental obstacles to coordination still pervade local programming."

However, 21 states (45 percent) made specific references to improved attitudes toward coordination at the local level. Table 4.2 summarizes the results from four state surveys that asked similar questions regarding local-level coordination. Each of these states surveyed vocational educators and JTPA administrators and in some cases personnel from related human service agencies. The results reflect differences across the states, but also show a strong tendency to describe coordination as satisfactory or better.

The reports also demonstrated that administrators and staff, within education agencies and public sector groups, recognize the importance of finding ways to improve coordination. They are conscious that through coordination their programs can reach a broader segment of the total client population with far more effective results. Most also admit that regardless of the state of local-level coordination, there are significant opportunities still to be realized that can stimulate greater cooperation between vocational education and JTPA.

TABLE 4.2

RATING OF COORDINATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND JTPA
ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSES COMBINED

Ratings	Percentage of Respondents			
	State 1	State 2	State 3	State 4
Excellent	16	26	7	34
Very good	34	40	37	28
Satisfactory	36	26	39	a
Less than satisfactory	12	6	16	19
Non-existent	3	*	2	8
Base for percentages	96	401	224	93

* Less than one-half of one percent
a Response option not provided

Some Pertinent Conclusions

A careful analysis of all of the submitted reports finds certain areas cited repeatedly as promising the means to increase coordination between local agencies and organizations. Without question, the most frequently mentioned is joint participation on advisory and planning boards and committees. All of the states have accepted the mandate in the Perkins Act to ensure that vocational education and PICs have joint representation on state councils and state-level advisory groups. While the same mandate naturally applies at regional and local levels, it has not been as effectively applied. Report after report, although admitting that coordination is "generally satisfactory," suggests that there is, as one phrased it, "still a ways to go to bring it to the level of effectiveness that can help both programs."

This apparent contradiction is explained by the fact that most local programs have been created out of existing systems. There has not been sufficient time or experience with JTPA and Perkins to negate opinions and prejudices built up over many years. A significant proportion of the state council reports concluded that many job training councils and local JTPA agencies need to gain a better understanding of the role and philosophy of education, particularly vocational education.

This was balanced by survey findings showing that educators are not without their own faults, and exhibit a lack of understanding of JTPA and its importance. In fact, a prevailing theme of the reports, while difficult to quantify, is one of educators resisting the changes that may be necessary in order to provide vocational training that can prepare disadvantaged youth and adults to meet the changing needs of local job markets. Among the reasons given for this resistance is the educators' "fear" of the decision-making powers held by the service delivery areas. Another factor cited by the reports is the view that educators harbor "personal prejudices" against private sector interventions into school planning and resent what they perceive to be "redundant" requirements of the PICs.

One area mentioned frequently as an influential factor to develop further coordination is the belief shared by JTPA administrators as well as vocational educators that coordination and cooperation cannot exist without adequate and effective communication. This was particularly evident where special studies provided the respondents with an opportunity to specify what factors, in their opinion, contributed most to good coordination, as well as those factors that most inhibited coordination. Virtually every report mentioned the importance of communication in one form or another, referring to successful coordination as a result of "good communications," and attributing bad or non-existent coordination to failed communications among the agencies and organizations. Table 4.3 presents results from three separate state studies showing typical responses.

Accordingly, when asked to select ways to facilitate better coordination, the most frequent answer dealt with suggestions for improving communications. Most often, the respondents felt that including vocational and community college educators in PIC planning sessions, or allowing more private input into educational planning, would serve to foster good communications. Another popular suggestion involved state-sponsored workshops, seminars, and similar meetings whereby local administrators and staff could meet on some neutral ground to exchange information and discuss mutual needs and problems.

Other factors frequently mentioned as having a positive impact on communications and, in turn, coordination were greater trust and respect as well as providing literature and specialized programs that would enable JTPA and vocational education administrators to gain knowledge about their respective roles and responsibilities. Included were suggestions for the development of college-level courses that would help lay the groundwork for better understanding for those who ultimately enter educational fields.

TABLE 4.3

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO OR INHIBITING COORDINATION
FROM SPECIAL STUDIES IN THREE STATES

Factors Contributing to High Level of Coordination	Percent of Respondents		
	State 1	State 2	State 3
Communications	59	59	68
Staff personalities	58	69	53
Mutual clients	31	40	37
Written agreements	21	24	29
State directives	4	8	4
Legislated coordination	5	5	4
Base for percentages	421	93	227
Factors That Most Inhibit Coordination			
Lack of communication	51	42	59
Insufficient resources	38	41	48
Turf maintenance	26	40	35
Conflicting/dissimilar legislative mandate	19	29	23
Staff personalities	20	24	20
Base for percentages	421	86	222

NOTE: Percentages exceed 100 since respondents checked more than one category.

Other Inhibiting Factors

Additional factors often mentioned as inhibiting coordination were "personalities," turf maintenance, an over-abundance of red tape and regulations, and insufficient funding. For the most part, these negative factors were recognized as significant, whether they came from private sector individuals or education administrators.

The view of one state council is worth noting. This report placed considerable importance on positive expectations. It found "almost unanimous indication" that successful coordination is "a

reflection of the agency's or organization's positive feelings about what is going to happen." It went on to point out that there seemed to be a direct correlation between success and the involvement of many agencies and organizations in a coordinated effort that allowed them to "feel positive about the experience."

Summary of Council Recommendations

As already mentioned, an exceptionally high percentage of the state reports contain data or express a belief that better communications between JTPA contractors and educational institutions would produce better coordination between and among the same groups. This attitude is strongly expressed in their recommendations for future courses of action. Many simply call for vocational education and JTPA agencies to work together more closely. However, two-thirds of the reports contain recommendations that call for the state councils and agencies to promote and encourage interaction and cooperation. Most often, the recommendations specifically mention the need for such actions to improve relationships between the service delivery areas and secondary schools. In general, the recommendations reflect a belief that people will naturally work together if they share responsibility for planning, as well as for the operation of programs. In this sense, many reports recommend that both the PICs and the vocational education institutions should voluntarily invite one another to sit on advisory committees and participate in planning processes.

There is strong local belief, already referred to in a preceding paragraph, that more workshops and seminars would contribute to better relationships and greater interaction between and among JTPA and vocational education agencies and organizations. This belief was reiterated with equal frequency in recommendations for future statewide actions. Many of the respondents to council surveys believe that actions such as annual regional conferences for JTPA and vocational education administrators would lead to "more effective avenues of communication."

Mandating interagency coordination. A smaller, but no less significant, group of states believe that interagency coordination needs to be mandated. This is moderately surprising, in that much of the data in the reports gave evidence of real or implied resentment of direction from a higher level of authority. Yet several reports strongly recommend that their state councils, preferably through the governor, make coordination a top priority, rewording state regulations, if necessary, to require common planning. In particular, the JTPA 8 percent set-aside funding was mentioned as a method which states can use to require joint planning. One approach would require "appropriate elected officials" to appoint vocational education administrators to PICs as a means of ensuring joint understanding and planning.

Other approaches. Some of the state recommendations for improving coordination at the local level were not as frequently cited but deserve mention:

- Establish a "working review committee" that would oversee matters related to coordination between vocational education and JTPA.
- Identify specific examples of coordination between two or more agencies/organizations and disseminate them as "model activities."
- Develop a brochure outlining purposes and responsibilities of the two systems and options for achieving cooperation and coordination so that a common understanding can begin to be developed.
- Provide JTPA staff professional training regarding vocational education; revise teacher/school administrator training to include classwork on JTPA.

Finally, one state believes strongly that the root of the problem with coordination lies in the existence of two separate pieces of federal legislation. It recommends that Congress consider development of new legislation that "will fold together VEA (Perkins) and the JTPA."

Overall Conclusions

The reports submitted by the state councils during 1987 gave a strong indication that coordination is a priority goal in virtually every state. At all levels--state, regional, and local--efforts are being made to reduce the barriers that inhibit coordination between JTPA and vocational education and that continue to exist. Of the 47 submitted reports, 26 addressed the subject of coordination with a serious effort either to (a) understand it better, (b) determine what hinders it within their jurisdictions, or (c) obtain input suggesting how coordination can truly be improved.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that efforts to achieve coordination have had to overcome ideas and attitudes that have existed for many years. The very fact that the Congress felt compelled to strengthen provisions in the legislation to encourage more effective coordination underscores this point. Many of the reports express concern about these attitudes and give an indication that the individuals concerned are determined to address them.

Two approaches suggested by the state councils are worth reiterating in this connection. One is to recognize that there need to be greater incentives to achieve higher levels of coordination, beyond the nebulous "better working relationships."

Perhaps the best incentive might be a negative one: withholding funding, for example, for those that fail to make sincere efforts toward better coordination. The second is for the Congress to take a hard look at both Perkins and JTPA to eliminate discrepancies that exist between the two laws and to equalize funding where inequities exist.

For the future, the results of the state council reports for 1987 should become a part of each state's guidelines for use in their decision-making efforts. Considering the broad diversity of subject matter in these reports and the equally diverse methods used to survey local agency staff, one other suggestion might be made for the future: the state councils may wish to work together to develop a set of standardized questions and sampling guidelines that could be adopted by any council that chose to use them. Following standardized procedures would produce results suitable for analysis, comparison, and aggregation across the states.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This is the second annual report on joint planning and coordination of programs assisted by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) prepared by the National Center. This report focuses primarily on coordination at the local level. It draws upon information from 590 Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) and 509 postsecondary institutions and summarizes information on coordination presented in reports from 47 state councils on vocational education.

The information from these sources presents a generally encouraging picture of the status of local-level coordination, but also a picture of great variability across SDAs. This variability can best be demonstrated by quoting the responses of the administrators of four SDAs in one state to the first question in the telephone survey. That question asked: "Since JTPA's implementation, what has been the nature of the relationship between the SDAs and public vocational/technical programs?" The administrator from one SDA replied:

> *Varies depending on level. We have an excellent relationship with the community college, but terrible relations with voc ed schools, and just ok with high schools*

In another SDA, geographically close to the first, the administrator said:

> *Our relationship is basically good with all voc ed, but not with the community college. We have a good history of working with voc ed, especially with the city high schools. The community college doesn't seem interested in working with the PIC.*

A third administrator replied:

> *Superb. The fact the SDA is small helps a lot*

A fourth administrator described the relationship as follows:

> *Fair to nonexistent. There is very little relationship between the two systems; vocational education is just not placement oriented.*

Admittedly, these are extreme examples selected from one state with a large number of SDAs. Nevertheless, they underscore the variability in four SDAs within one state operating under the same state policies, serving similar populations, in similar geographic settings. All 4 SDAs serve mainly rural areas and smaller cities; none of the four has a city with a population over

60,000. In this state, as in the nation as a whole 70 percent of the administrators described the relationships between their SDAs and vocational education as good or excellent. Still as some of the examples demonstrate, there are areas where the relationships are poor or, in the words of one administrator, "nonexistent." Overall, however, the indicators of coordination presented in this report are much more positive than negative. In this chapter the main findings are reviewed and the policy implications of these findings are discussed.

Status of Coordination

In almost three-fourths of all the SDAs in this country the relationship of the administrative entity with public vocational-technical institutions was described by the administrator of the SDA as good or excellent. Virtually all the SDAs (97 percent) were involved in some type of collaborative efforts with public vocational institutions during the 1986 program year.

The percentage of title IIA participants who received classroom training in public vocational education institutions during the program year that ended in June 1986 is estimated to be at least 20 percent. In that same program year the U.S. Department of Labor (1986) reported that 37 percent of title IIA participants were initially assigned to classroom training. Using the most conservative assumptions, these figures indicate that almost 200,000 IIA participants, over half of all those assigned to classroom training, took their training in public vocational-technical institutions.

The flow of title IIA funds to vocational institutions is also substantial. Here, as with the estimates of clients served, the estimates cannot be precise because one-third of the SDAs did not provide data on the amount of IIA expenditures contracted to public vocational education. If it is assumed that the SDAs that did not report expenditures had no contracts with vocational institutions, the amount of title IIA funds going to vocational institutions is estimated to be $206 million, or 16 percent of total IIA expenditures.

The SDA administrators were asked what major factors have worked to encourage or hinder effective coordination between the SDA and the vocational education system. Positive factors were mentioned more than twice as often as negative ones. Later in the interview the administrators were asked to suggest things that the vocational education community could do to foster coordination. The most frequent answer to this question, volunteered by over one-fourth (28 percent) of the administrators, was that things were fine, no improvements were necessary.

On the vocational education side, information from a nationally representative sample of 509 postsecondary institutions is also encouraging. Nine out of ten (87 percent) of these institutions had some type of relationship with JTPA programs. Two-thirds (68 percent) were defined as service providers because they received direct JTPA funding or enrolled JTPA clients in regular classes or in programs conducted especially for JTPA. An additional 19 percent of all the institutions reported that they provided facilities or instructors for JTPA programs they did not conduct themselves. This 19 percent represented over half of all the institutions in the nonprovider category.

Almost three-fourths (73 percent) of the postsecondary respondents cited the compatibility between their mission and the purposes of JTPA as a factor encouraging their institutions to provide services under JTPA. Other important factors reported by about 60 percent of the respondents were personal relationships among the staff of the institutions and the JTPA agencies, and scarcity of resources.

A review of the biennial reports of the state councils on vocational education provided further evidence on the status of coordination. Overall these reports reflect a high level of concern for coordination. Those states that conducted special studies yielded results very similar to those from the two surveys presented in this report.

The results from these three sources lead to the following conclusions.

- Almost all of the SDAs in this country engage in some type of collaborative efforts with public vocational-technical institutions.

- In 90 percent of the SDAs in this country, representatives of the JTPA system are satisfied with the level of coordination they are experiencing with the public vocational-technical system.

- Almost all postsecondary institutions enroll JTPA clients or provide facilities or instructors for JTPA programs the institutions do not conduct themselves.

- Half or more of JTPA title IIA clients who are assigned to classroom training receive that training in public vocational-technical institutions.

- The major factors that encourage coordination are a climate of shared goals and a history of good relationships within an SDA.

- The major barriers to further coordination are disagreements between vocational educators and JTPA administrators on the most appropriate kinds of training for hard-to-employ individuals.

How do these conclusions measure up against the criteria of extent, efficiency, and effectiveness specified in the Perkins Act? On extent and effectiveness they measure up quite well. There is some degree of formal contact between the two systems in almost all SDAs, and public vocational facilities are being used extensively. In almost all cases the JTPA administrators are satisfied with the level of coordination being achieved.

It should be noted that in this context effectiveness refers to the effectiveness of the coordination process, not to the ultimate outcomes of the programs that are being coordinated. Van de Ven (1976) defines effectiveness in terms of the extent to which agencies carry out their commitments and believe their relationships are worthwhile, equitable, productive, and satisfying. The evidence indicates that in a large majority of the SDAs in this country this definition is being met. On the criterion of efficiency little can be said. An assessment of efficiency requires measures of the effort required to produce a given outcome as well as measures of the outcome itself. The data assembled for this study yielded little information on the effort required to reach the levels of coordination achieved. It is unlikely that large scale surveys of the type presented in this report can produce useful estimates of the efficiency of the coordination process. Case studies will be needed of the actual amount and kinds of interaction between the vocational education and JTPA systems. When these kind of data are available, they can be compared to measures of the degree of coordination achieved and estimates of efficiency will be possible.

Implications

The information regarding the coordination of vocational education and JTPA presented in this report is encouraging. There is a higher degree of interaction and usage of public vocational facilities by JTPA agencies than much of the public debate on this issue would lead one to believe.

Even if there is some degree of distortion caused by a tendency to give more "acceptable" answers in a survey, the level of reported satisfaction with coordination is quite high. As was mentioned above, the interviews with SDA administrators were conducted by the National Alliance of Business (NAB), a leading advocate of the employment and training system, because it was felt that JTPA respondents would be more candid in their answers about their relationships with vocational education when talking to NAB interviewers. Furthermore, the satisfaction levels found in surveys conducted by state councils on vocational education were very similar to the NAB results.

The "coordination problem," therefore, appears to be concentrated in about 10 percent of the SDAs in the country where coordination is poor or nonexistent and, to a lesser degree, in another 10 to 20 percent where considerable improvement is possible. The study was unable, however, to identify any general characteristics of SDAs that were reliable predictors of low levels of coordination. High and low levels were found in rural, sparsely populated areas and large cities, in areas with many or few families living in poverty and in SDAs with varying unemployment rates and wage levels. The level of coordination achieved in a given SDA appears to be determined primarily by the history of relationships in the area and the particular combination of individuals who must work together. As such, these conditions are largely independent of broad policy actions designed to improve coordination.

Rather than attempting to fashion new national policies to encourage coordination, a better approach may be to focus efforts on SDAs where coordination is not occurring. This is, of course, more a state than a federal role. The agencies responsible for administering Perkins and JTPA know those areas in their own states where vocational education and JTPA programs are working well together and where they are not. If these agencies could agree among themselves, admittedly a big "if," they could focus technical assistance designed to encourage coordination or those SDAs where the two systems are not working together. This assistance could be guided by the suggestions obtained from JTPA administrators and vocational educators in the surveys conducted for this study.

If vocational educators were to take seriously the suggestions of JTPA administrators, they would do the following:

- Improve communications, keep the SDA informed about programs, have joint meetings.
- Do more joint planning.
- Be more responsive to labor market needs, upgrade and update programs, put more emphasis on placement of JTPA participants.
- Be more flexible and responsive to the needs of JTPA, offer more short-term and open-entry/open-exit programs, be less defensive.
- Become better informed about JTPA.
- Improve relationships among state agencies and between state and local agencies.
- Coordinate better within vocational education itself.

- o Fund programs jointly.
- o Accept performance-based contracts.
- o Serve those outside the normal school population.

If JTPA administrators were to take seriously the suggestions of vocational educators, they would do the following:

- o Expand their concept of training, shift focus from on-the-job training to more in-depth instruction.
- o Reduce documentation and paperwork; simplify the process of serving JTPA participants.
- o Conduct more joint planning.
- o Keep an open mind when selecting service providers.
- o Reduce the political influence on PIC decisions.

It is one thing to list such suggestions; it is quite another thing to implement them. Some of the suggestions address key differences between the two systems that have existed since the original employment and training programs. Nevertheless, the evidence presented in this report demonstrates that these differences have been overcome in many areas. Achieving comparable levels of coordination in more areas will require that the particular circumstances of each area be examined and addressed. There are, unfortunately, no universal solutions to be applied in every area experiencing problems.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TABLES

APPENDIX TABLE A-1

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR EXPLANATORY ECONOMIC OR DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SDAs

Economic or Demographic Characteristics of SDAs	Frequency	Percentage
o Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)		
Less than 1	261	44
1 - 2.9	131	22
3 - 4.9	51	9
5 - 6.9	32	5
7 or more	114	19
o Percent of Families in SDA with Income Below Poverty Level		
Less than 9%	324	55
9 - 13.9	189	32
14 - 20.9	67	11
21 - 26.9	8	1
27 or more	1	1
o Average Annual Wages for SDA (in thousands of dollars)		
Less than 13	8	1
13 - 18.9	419	71
19 - 24.9	155	26
25 or more	7	2
o Unemployment Rate for SDA		
Less than 6%	181	31
6 - 7.9	171	29
8 - 9.9	107	18
10 - 11.9	76	13
12 - 30.4	55	9

APPENDIX TABLE A-2

TOTAL TITLE IIA EXPENDITURES BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Total Title IIA Expenditures (in thousands of dollars)	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 10	9	7	8	19	14	10
10 - 99	1	1	0	0	0	1
100 - 499	5	5	4	0	2	4
500 - 999	22	17	22	16	9	18
1000 or more	63	71	67	66	75	68
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 21.20 (not statistically significant,
r = .25 (statistically significant at the .0001 level)

APPENDIX TABLE A-3

TOTAL TITLE IIA EXPENDITURES DIRECTED TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Total Title IIA Expenditures Directed to Vocational Education (in thousands of dollars)	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 10	24	17	25	41	30	25
10 - 99	9	8	8	3	9	8
100 - 499	47	44	49	28	33	43
500 - 999	13	23	14	13	22	17
1000 or more	7	8	4	16	6	7
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 27.01 (significant at the .05 level)
r = .04 (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX TABLE A-4

TOTAL TITLE IIA EXPENDITURES DIRECTED TO SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Total Title IIA Expenditures Directed to Secondary Vocational Education (in thousands of dollars)	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 10	81	65	73	75	68	74
10 - 99	7	8	8	9	7	7
100 - 499	10	21	14	9	21	15
500 - 999	2	7	6	6	4	4
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 21.27 (significant at the .05 level)
r = .05 (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX TABLE A-5

TOTAL TITLE IIA EXPENDITURES DIRECTED TO POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Total Title IIA Expenditures Directed to Postsecondary Vocational Education (in thousands of dollars)	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 10	71	60	65	69	63	66
10 - 99	7	7	8	3	8	7
100 - 499	18	26	22	22	17	20
500 - 999	5	8	6	6	12	7
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 13.58 (not statistically significant)
r = .09 (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX TABLE A-6

NUMBER OF TITLE IIA CLIENTS BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Number of Title IIA Clients Served	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 100	14	11	18	22	18	15
100 - 299	5	3	2	0	1	3
300 - 499	8	5	12	6	4	7
500 - 999	23	28	24	16	27	25
1000 or more	49	52	45	56	50	50
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 16.62 (not statistically significant)
r = .16 (significant at the .001 level)

APPENDIX TABLE A-7

NUMBER OF TITLE IIA CLIENTS SERVED THROUGH
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Number of Title IIA Clients Served Through Vocational Education	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 100	41	35	47	41	38	39
100 - 299	27	24	33	25	25	26
300 - 499	14	18	12	6	18	15
500 - 999	13	17	6	16	11	13
1000 or more	5	5	2	13	8	6
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 15.34 (not statistically significant)
r = .05 (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX TABLE A-8

NUMBER OF TITLE IIA CLIENTS SERVED THROUGH SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Number of Title IIA Clients Served Through Secondary Vocational Education	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 100	90	86	90	91	81	87
100 - 199	4	5	4	6	4	4
200 - 299	2	8	0	3	10	5
300 or more	4	2	6	0	5	4
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 21.42 (not statistically significant)
r = .06 (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX TABLE A-9

NUMBER OF TITLE IIA CLIENTS SERVED THROUGH POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY OF SDA

Number of Title IIA Clients Served Through Postsecondary Vocational Education	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
< 100	83	76	84	81	70	79
100 - 199	7	7	4	9	10	8
200 - 399	6	8	10	0	11	7
400 - 999	3	8	0	6	4	4
1000 or more	0	2	2	3	5	2
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

n = 589
X^2 = 28.24 (significant at the .03 level)
r = .23 (significant at the .001 level)

APPENDIX TABLE A-10

NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SDA AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY POPULATION DENSITY

Nature of Relationship	Percent of SDAs					
	Population Density of SDA (thousands per square mile)					
	< 1	1 - 2.9	3 - 4.9	5 - 6.9	7 or more	Total
Excellent	25	34	25	34	24	27
Good	48	35	35	44	45	43
Satisfactory	19	18	12	16	17	17
Fair	3	5	12	3	5	5
Poor	3	4	12	0	5	4
Improved	2	3	4	3	3	3
No comment	1	2	0	0	2	1
Total	44	22	9	5	19	100

$n = 589$
$\chi^2 = 27.95$ (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX TABLE A-11

NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SDA AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

Nature of Relationship	Percent of SDAs				
	Percent of Families in SDA with Income Below Poverty Level				
	< 9%	9 - 13.9	14 - 20.9	21 or more	Total
Excellent	33	22	12	22	27
Good	36	48	61	67	43
Satisfactory	16	19	18	11	17
Fair	6	4	3	0	5
Poor	4	4	5	0	4
Improved	3	3	2	0	3
No comment	2	1	[illegible]	0	1
Total	55	32	11	1	100

n = 588
χ^2 = 30.94 (not statistically significant)

APPENDIX B

Questionnaires Used in Service Delivery Area and Postsecondary Institution Surveys

National Alliance of Business

Service Delivery Area Survey

1987 SUPPLEMENTARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE*

I would like to talk about your relationship with the public vocational/technical institutions in your SDA. When I refer to vocational education, I mean all public vocational programs including those offered through community colleges.

STATE _____

Name of SDA _____

ADDRESS _____

Telephone _____

Name of Interviewee _____

Title _____

Name of Interviewer _____

Date _____

*Rearranged; the original questionnaire was on 8.5 by 14 inch pages and there was more space between questions for recording answers.

A. Since JTPA's implementation, what has been the nature of the relationship between the SDA and public vocational/technical programs? Is there a history of cooperation and working together?

A1. Are things changing? Do you want to work more closely with vocational education agencies and institutions?

B. When talking about coordinating and collaborating with the vocational education system, are you talking mainly about the secondary, post-secondary, or adult levels? All three? Are you interested in working with one level more than the others?

C. Has your SDA entered into any collaborative efforts with public vocational educational inscitutions this year? If yes, what are they? Which ones are covered by financial or non-financial agreements. (Note which are financial/non-financial). Note which ones are not covered by any formal agreement.

C1. If the SDA has entered into any financial agreements with the public vocational educational system: What was your total Title IIA expenditure during program year '85?

C2. If yes to IIC, what percentage (or actual amount) of your Title IIA money was contracted to public vocational education during program year '85? (Break down according to secondary and post-secondary vocational education.)

C3. If yes to IIC, how many IIA clients did you serve in all activities in program year '85?

C4. If yes to IIC, what percentage of your Title IIA clients are receiving classroom training in public vocational education institutions? (Break down according to secondary and post-secondary vocational education.)

D. What do you think have been the major factors which have worked to produce or hinder effective coordination between the SDA and the vocational education system?

E. Has your SDA been provided with a list of all vocational education programs operating in your SDA? If yes, has this list been helpful? If so, how has it been helpful?

F. When local education agencies apply to the state for vocational education funds, those applications may be reviewed by the PIC. Has your PIC reviewed applications from local educational agencies for vocational education funds? If no, why not?

G. How is the SDA involved with programs funded by the 8% monies? Is this done under cooperative agreement?

G1. If SDA was involved, how many clients were served under the 8% in program year '85?

G2. If SDA was involved, what was your 8% allocation in program year '85?

H. The Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act requires that federally funded vocational education programs be coordinated with JTPA through state-level planning and policies. What impact did this legislation have on the local JTPA decision-making process?

I. Did you conduct any joint planning sessions/discussions with those in the vocational education system? If yes, explain. If yes, what impact did the discussions have on the SDA's plan/operation?

J. Are you aware of any federal or state laws, regulations, or policies which impeded efforts to coordinate with the vocational education system?

K. What are the major things that the vocational education community could do to foster collaboration?

L. Are there any representatives from vocational education institutions on your PIC? If yes, how many and what level?

L1. If yes, has his/her/their presence fostered greater coordination between the vocational education community and JTPA?

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS AND JTPA

Why we need your help....

Your institution has been selected for a national study of the involvement of postsecondary institutions in Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs. Your answers to the questions that follow are very important. They will provide a basis for describing how postsecondary institutions work with JTPA and should also provide support for future improvements.

How you can help....

On the pages that follow you will find a number of questions about your institution and its involvement with JTPA programs. These questions can be answered quickly by placing an "X" or a check mark "✓" in the "[ ]" next to your answer or by filling in the blank spaces provided. (See the examples shown in the box below.) Please answer all the questions as accurately as possible. Please use a pen to mark your responses.

EXAMPLE 1:

o Nationally, about what percentage of high school students drop out each year?

[1] Between 4% and 8%
[2] Slightly less than 15%
[X] About 28%
[4] Over 50%

EXAMPLE 2:

o About what percentage of the students in your institution are:

(a) Females? 53 %
(b) Males? 47 %

Please enter the following information:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____ Date of completion _____

Would you like a summary report of this study? [ ] Yes [ ] No

All information obtained in this questionnaire will be kept strictly CONFIDENTIAL; no data will be associated with the name of any institution or individual in any report. All answers will be aggregated across institutions and presented in summary form.

Community Characteristics

1. Type of area in which your institution is located?
   [1] Rural
   [2] Suburban
   [3] Urban

2. What is the approximate population in the area served by your institution?

   _____ people

3. Approximately what percentage of the population in the area served by your institution is--

(a) American Indian or Alaskan Native?	_____%
(b) Asian American or Pacific Islander?	_____%
(c) Black, not of Hispanic origin?	_____%
(d) Hispanic?	_____%
(e) White, not of Hispanic origin?	_____%
(f) Other	_____%
	100%

4. Approximately what percentage of the population in the area served by your institution is economically disadvantaged? _____%

Institutional Characteristics

5. What was the size of your institution's enrollment of full-time and part-time students, by program type for 1985-86?

	(i) Full-time	(ii) Part-time
a) In occupational programs	_____	_____
b) In transfer or general programs	_____	_____

6. What are your institution's admission requirements?

   _____

   _____

7. Is your institution formally represented on the Private Industry Council for your JTPA service delivery area?

   [1] Yes
   [2] No

8. Is your institution formally represented on a regional or area vocational education planning committee attended by representatives of secondary or other postsecondary institutions?

   [1] Yes → (a) Do representatives of the JTPA service delivery area attend meetings of this planning committee?
   [2] No
   [1] Yes
   [2] No

Student Characteristics

9. Selected student body characteristics

a) Gender - _____% Females
_____% Males

b) Ethnicity/ Race
_____% Native American or Alaskan Native
_____% Asian American or Pacific Islander
_____% Black, not of Hispanic origin
_____% Hispanic
_____% White, not of Hispanic origin
_____% Other

c) Handicapped - _____%

d) Limited English proficiency - _____%

e) Estimated family income -
_____% above $25,000
_____% between $15,000 and $25,000
_____% between $10,000 and $14,999
_____% below $10,000

f) Students who enter, but leave prior to receiving degrees or certificates - _____%

g) Students who are single parents - _____%

Funding

10. a) What is your institution's total operating budget for its current fiscal year? $_____

b) What percentage of the budget is funded by the following sources:

Community/county	_____%
State	_____%
Federal	_____%
Tuition	_____%
Private donations/gifts	_____%
Other	_____%
TOTAL =	100%

c) How much money will your institution receive under the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act for the 1986-87 school year?
$_____

d) How much will come from JTPA? $_____

Activities Under Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

11. During the 1985-86 academic year, how many JTPA clients were enrolled in:

a) Special class-size occupational training programs conducted only for JTPA clients? _____ clients

(1) Were these conducted under performance based contracts? Yes [1] No [2]

(2) What occupational skills were taught in these classes? (e.g., word processing, building maintenance) _____

b) How many JTPA clients were enrolled in regular occupational programs on an individual referral basis? _____ clients

c) How many JTPA clients were enrolled in basic/remedial education or GED programs? _____ clients

12. Does your institution provide any of these services under JTPA?

	Yes	No
a) Acts as the administrative entity for SDA	[1]	[2]
b) Conducts intake, assessment, counseling, and referral	[1]	[2]
c) Certifies eligibility for JTPA assistance	[1]	[2]
d) Writes on-the-job training contracts with employers	[1]	[2]
e) Runs job clubs	[1]	[2]
f) Conducts job development	[1]	[2]
g) Provides support services (e.g., day care, transportation allowances)	[1]	[2]
h) Provides facilities or instructors for JTPA funded programs the institution does not conduct itself	[1]	[2]
i) Other [Describe _____]	[1]	[2]

13. To what degree do the following obstacles hinder your institution from providing services under JTPA?

	Major obstacle	Minor obstacle	Not an obstacle
a) Lack of knowledge of Act and regulations	[1]	[2]	[3]
b) JTPA restrictions on eligibility, services	[1]	[2]	[3]
c) Amount of documentation, paperwork required	[1]	[2]	[3]
d) Performance-based contracts	[1]	[2]	[3]
e) Uncertainties, delays in contracting process	[1]	[2]	[3]
f) Policies, politics of PIC	[1]	[2]	[3]
g) Other (Describe _____)	[1]	[2]	[3]

14. To what degree do the following factors encourage your institution to provide services under JTPA?

	Major Factor	Minor Factor	Not a Factor
a). Push from state agencies	[1]	[2]	[3]
b). Personal relationships among staff of institution and JTPA	[1]	[2]	[3]
c). Scarcity of resources	[1]	[2]	[3]
d). Declining enrollment	[1]	[2]	[3]
e). PIC gives priority to public institutions	[1]	[2]	[3]
f). Mission of institution consistent with purposes of JTPA	[1]	[2]	[3]
g). Other (Describe: _____ _____)	[1]	[2]	[3]

15. Are your applications for funds from the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act reviewed by the JTPA administrative entity in your service delivery area?

[1] Yes
[2] No

16. For the following list, please rank order the organizations that your institution places highest priority on in establishing linkages. **(The institutions you place highest priority on should be ranked 1, the next highest a 2, etc.)**

	Rank
a) Organized labor organizations	_____
b) Military	_____
c) Business and industry (other than for customized training)	_____
d) Customized training provision	_____
e) JTPA service provision	_____
f) Community-based organizations	_____
g) Other postsecondary institutions (public or private nonprofit)	_____
h) Proprietary schools (for profit)	_____
i) Secondary schools, public or nonprofit	_____

17. What are the main things that JTPA could do to foster more collaboration?

_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your cooperation.

REFERENCES

Congress of the United States. Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. (PL 98-524) 98th Congress 2nd session, 1984.

Hollenbeck, Kevin M.; Belcher, James; Dean, George D.; Rider, Betty; and Warmbrod, Catherine. Postsecondary Occupational Education Delivery: An Examination. Columbus. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1988.

Lewis, Morgan V.; Ferguson, Marilyn; and Card, Michael. Vocational Education - JTPA Coordination, First Annual Report. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1987.

Riffel, Rodney. Coordinating Federal Programs: Vocational Education and CETA. Vocational Education Study Publication No. 7 Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Education, August 1981.

U. S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation. Summary of JTLS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During Program Year 1985 (July 1985-June 1986). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Labor, 1986.

U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development. Guide for Setting JTPA Title II-A Performance Standards for PY '87. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Labor, 1987.

Van De Ven, Andrew H. "On the Nature, Formation, and Maintenance of Relations among Organizations." Academy of Management Review. 1, no 4 (1976): 24-36.

"END OF DOCUMENT"