DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 728 CE 082 797

AUTHOR Kister, Joanna
TITLE State Leadership for Career Technical Education.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium, Washington, DC.; National Vocational Technical Education Foundation, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY DeWitt Wallace/Reader's Digest Fund, Pleasantville, NY.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: http://www.nasdvtec.org/conferences/kisterbook.pdf.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Change Agents; *Educational Administration; Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Educational Research; Federal State Relationship; Financial Support; Interviews; *Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; *Leadership Training; Literature Reviews; National Surveys; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; *State Programs; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Directors; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Career and Technical Education; Ohio

ABSTRACT

This document is comprised of two main parts: (1) Role and Nature of State Leadership; and (2) Developing Leaders. Issues related to state leadership for career and technical education (CTE) were studied. CTE-related research, policy, and practice were reviewed. State directors of CTE were surveyed, and 39 individuals considered opinion leaders in CTE, various stakeholders in CTE, and leadership development program providers were interviewed. The roles and responsibilities of state directors were identified. The main concerns cited by the state directors of CTE were as follows: reduced staffing; turnover; lack of vision and implementation; their role in organizational structure; multiple systems of governance; political issues; and inexperience in CTE. The following were among the study's 21 recommendations for developing state leaders for CTE: (1) request greater investment by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education; (2) develop content or curriculum for a leadership program from the work and emerging roles of state directors; (3) incorporate a leadership component in graduate CTE programs; and (4) seek corporate sponsorship of a leadership program for state directors and senior leaders. (The bibliography lists 37 references. The following items are appended: a list of the individuals interviewed; the survey instrument; and information about the Danforth Foundation Program, the Ohio Career-Technical Education Leadership Institute; and the National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education Leadership Institute.) (MN)

State Leadership for Career Technical Education:

- Role and Nature of State Leadership
- Developing Leaders

Joanna Kister

The National Association of State Directors
of Career Technical Education Consortium
The Hall of States
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 830
Washington, DC 20001

State Leadership for Career Technical Education:

- Role and Nature of State Leadership
- Developing Leaders

by
Joanna Kister

Supported by a grant awarded to the National Vocational Technical Education Foundation
by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund

Full text available at www.nasdvtec.org

The National Association of State Directors
of Career Technical Education Consortium
The Hall of States
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 830
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 737-0303
Fax: (202) 737-1106

2001

Contents

Foreword

Founded in 1920, the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium (NASDCTEC) is the Washington DC-based professional society of the state and territory agency heads responsible for career technical education. The state directors are committed to leadership and results. The association has a growing membership of over 200 members who share the state directors' commitment to high-quality education at the secondary, postsecondary, and adult levels.

This paper was developed under a grant from the Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund to the National Vocational Technical Education Foundation to address state leadership for career technical education. The paper is not about "generic" leadership; rather, it is situated in the context of leadership for career technical education at the state level. The paper is intended to inform both policymakers and practitioners of the role, nature, and value of state leadership for career technical education and to make recommendations for developing state leaders.

NASDCTEC would like to thank Dr. Joanna Kister for her work on this paper. Dr. Kister recently held elected offices in NASDCTEC. She was formerly the State Director for Career-Technical and Adult Education in Ohio and is now a consultant for education and workforce development. She holds an adjunct appointment at The Ohio State University.

The following people are acknowledged for their critical review of the manuscript prior to publication: Mike Rush, State Administrator for Professional-Technical Education in Idaho; Christopher Lyons, Education Program Specialist with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education in the United States Department of Education; and Kimberly Green, Executive Director, NASDCTEC.

Author's Notes

The term *career technical* is used to describe what was vocational education. However, the term *vocational education* is used in historical references and attributions.

Thank you to the state leaders and many others who have informed this paper. Because so little has been written about state-level leadership for career technical education, I canvassed both current and past state leaders as well as persons representing key policy organizations, trade associations, professional organizations, business persons, policymakers, university faculty, local educators, and persons considered national opinion leaders in career technical education.

I'm happy to say there were recurring themes that brought some consensus to the conversation about the need, status, and future of state-level leadership for career technical education.

Joanna Kister

Overview

Warren Bennis says about leadership that never has so much been written about so little:

> *The young attack it and the old grow wistful for it. Parents have lost it and police seek it. Experts claim it and artists spurn it, while scholars want it. Philosophers reconcile it (as authority) with liberty and theologians demonstrate its compatibility with conscience. If bureaucrats pretend they have it, politicians wish they did. Everybody agrees that there is less of it than there used to be.* (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 1)

Much has been written about school leadership as well. Much less about state leadership. Even less about leadership for career technical education.

The context for career technical education, situated in the worlds of educational improvement, workforce development, and economic development, is complex, global, and changing at an exponential rate. Increasing public demands for accountability challenge state career technical administrators. Bennis (1989) says leaders must master the context or surrender to it. How do you envision and lead a change agenda of this complexity and magnitude? And how do you prepare leaders who can do the work of envisioning and leading a change agenda?

Some suggest we are experiencing a crisis in educational leadership of both quality and quantity. At the local level, few school districts have made it a priority to identify and groom potential leaders, despite a wave of impending retirements and chronic difficulties in finding candidates (Olson, 2000).

Nearly half of current community college presidents indicate they will be retiring in the next six years. That figure jumps to nearly 80 percent in the next 10 years. Thirty-three percent of presidents believe that one-fourth or more of their chief administrators will retire in the next five years (Shults, 2001).

The problem of the labor market pool for state-level leaders, particularly the state director position, is exacerbated by the expectation for persons to have had senior-level administrative experience. The median age of state leaders tends to be higher than that of school leaders in general.

The leadership problem is not new. Over a decade ago, Moss and Liang (1990) reported that vocational education did not have the number of leaders that were urgently needed nor was there a systematic effort to develop them. They express this with poetic license:

> *There may be a better system*
> *Than the one we now have.*
> *But, whatever it is,*

If the people to lead it well are not there,
A better system will not produce a better society.
Robert K. Greenleaf
Or, better vocational education. (p. 2)

Theorists distinguish the semantics of "*leaders*" and "*leadership*." Although a leader may be described as a person in a position of formal authority, an administrative appointment does not automatically confer leadership upon the holder. Leadership must be demonstrated. Followers must be earned. Bennis (1989) places responsibility for the effectiveness of organizations on the leader. He posits these qualities for leaders: a guiding vision, passion, integrity, trust, curiosity, and daring.

Leadership is currently the focus of several large-scale efforts by philanthropic organizations, government, and education policy organizations. As part of its new focus on leadership in the 21st century, the Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund has made a commitment to a multiyear initiative on school leadership fostering a national movement to attract, prepare, and keep high-quality school leaders, particularly superintendents and principals (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2001). Based on the premise that it is a state responsibility to ensure that each school has the leaders required for effective 21st century student performance, the Funds have launched the "State Action for Education Leadership" project with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

CCSSO established a national consortium of five state-based organizations whose members have primary responsibility for education policy: the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Education Commission of the States, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Governors Association.

> *After years of work on structural changes—standards and testing and ways of holding students and schools accountable—the education policy world has turned its attention to the people charged with making the system work.* (Olson, 2000, p. 1)

Olson says that the sheer abundance of such activity reflects a widespread—and growing—recognition that without strong leaders at the helm, large-scale efforts to improve student achievement will likely falter, if not fail entirely.

Leadership in the private and public sectors continues to be a topic of interest and debate. A task force report on the state role in public education (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001a) claims that education is the most salient domestic policy issue and that today's state educational leaders are tackling some of the toughest assignments in the recent history of public education. "*The current opportunities for state leadership may be unprecedented in our history.*"

Purpose of the Paper

The paper addresses issues related to state leadership for career technical education and develops recommendations to improve state leadership. The first part of the paper describes the role, nature, and value of state leadership for career technical education for the present and future. This section includes concerns and issues. At the turn of the 21st century, the paper highlights the challenge of leading change in the futuring context of education improvement, workforce development, and economic development. The second part of the paper identifies and encourages actions that will increase the number and quality of state leaders for career technical education.

Guiding questions for the study:

1. Is there evidence of the value of state leadership? If so, what?
2. What is problematic with state leadership? What evidence? What impact?
3. How has the role of the state director for career technical education changed?
4. What is the "work" and the change agenda for career technical education in states? What is needed to effect the change?
5. What factors and/or qualities of state leadership for career technical education make a difference? Knowledge/content? Skills/processes?
6. What is being done to develop leaders in career technical education nationally? In states? What evidence of results?
7. What elements (components) of leadership training make a difference? Knowledge/content? Skills/processes?
8. What recommendations should be made for developing leaders for career technical education?

Methodology

The paper includes a review of research, policy, and practice related to leadership for career technical education, particularly focused at the state level. Although there is extensive literature on school leadership, the literature review yielded little data on **state** leadership for career technical education.

Data were collected from several sources. During the spring of 2001, state directors of career technical education responded to a survey (Appendix B) related to their roles and responsibilities, their vision, and the change agenda for career technical education in their state.

Other sources included a purposeful cross-section of persons considered opinion leaders in career technical education, persons representing key policy organizations, trade associations, business leaders, professional organizations, policymakers, university faculty, educators, and leadership development program providers. Face-to-face and telephone interviews were held with a number of the sources. Others e-mailed responses. A list of persons contributing to this paper is in Appendix A.

A constant comparative method was used for data analysis. Categories and themes emerged throughout the research process.

Part I: Role and Nature of State Leadership for Career Technical Education

Part I examines the role and nature of state leadership for career technical education. It begins with the need and concern for the quality and quantity of leaders, an historical perspective, and a profile of state directors.

Paul Houston (2001), executive director of the American Association of School Administrators, said of education leadership:

> *There are really just four problems with the current leadership system: the job is impossible, the expectations are inappropriate, the training is inadequate, and the pipeline is inverted. The job is impossible because the expectations are unrealistic. We want one individual to be all and know all in a complex system. Furthermore, while we tend to centralize responsibility in education, authority is widely dispersed. We ask superintendents what they are going to do about a particular matter, while we spread the power to do something across a system that includes boards, unions, and community groups. Of late, governors, legislators, and judges have also taken a bite out of the authority apple.* (p. 432)

Houston says the profession cannot wait for people who choose to be leaders, but that we must identify, nurture, and mentor those with potential. We must call the next generation of leaders to duty.

Gordon Ambach, former Executive Director of the Council of Chief State School Officers, lamented in an *Education Week* interview (Olson, 2001):

> *There's been a lot of energy put into improving the quality of teaching the past few years. The states have not put nearly as much energy into improving the practice of school leaders.*

State legislators and governors echoed this concern when they told Mary Lee Fitzgerald, director of education programs for the Wallace-Reader's Digest Foundation, that their education improvement efforts are being stymied because they don't have the right people in the right places to do the implementation that's necessary (Olson, 2001). Fitzgerald asserts that state action is critical because "*states control so many of the levers that could help attract or discourage strong educational leaders.*"

State constitutions assign to each state the specific responsibility and legal authority for public education.

> *The centrality of the state's role in closing the gap between educational reform and state educational capacity cannot be understated. It begins with leadership and the creation*

and promulgation of a state vision for education that will guide policy and decision-making at every level. (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001a, p. 1)

The former state director of vocational education for Ohio, Byrl Shoemaker, said he has *"lived from the first generation of state directors."* He is a strong proponent for building capacity for state leadership for vocational education during his tenure:

> *If broad change is going to happen, it will happen from a state and national base. There are good programs that happen locally, but you don't make major change except through a broad power structure.*

This lack of human resource development is now showing up in lots of education arenas. (Betsy Brand)

James McKenney, Director of Economic Development for the American Association of Community Colleges, describes the leadership problem as *"acute at the presidential level"* and *"unnerving at the level of Deans and Department Heads."* As a result, AACC recently commissioned a paper and held a summit on leadership for community colleges.

Betsy Brand, Co-Director of the American Youth Policy Forum, believes there has been a very limited investment in developing leaders in education at all levels, not just career technical education. *"This lack of human resource development is now showing up in lots of education arenas."*

History

Bennis (1989) calls to mind the haunting melody of the folk song, "Where have all the flowers gone?" when he asks, *"Where have all the leaders gone? Churchill, Schweitzer, Einstein, Gandhi, the Kennedys, Martin Luther King?"* This theme was echoed in interviews with those who have been in the career technical field for many years. They describe a golden era, a halcyon time of strong, sustained state-level leadership for vocational and technical education and strong leaders. Charles Prosser and David Snedden were described as early leaders in vocational education who formed a concept of what they believed vocational education should be and persevered until the vision became a reality (Wirth, 1972).

Several sources recalled the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 (EPDA). The EPDA Act provided study opportunities for teachers and teacher educators. The act was amended in 1968 as part of the Vocational Education Amendments with two goals: (1) to develop a cadre of vocational education leadership personnel, meeting the needs of all the states equitably; and (2) to promote the development of comprehensive graduate programs in vocational education to train the needed leadership personnel. For the first time, the federal government supported *"the development of a systematic, long-term program for preparing leaders for every area of the vocational education enterprise"* (Unger, 1988, p. 26).

A report from Southern Illinois University (1975) documents positive results of the EPDA fellowship program in which fellows completed coursework, leadership devel-

opment seminars, internships, and other experiences such as working in the state department of education.

Unger (1988) reports "striking" positive differences in the work settings and level of employment reported before and after EPDA participation. His study recommends strong support for reinstituting an EPDA-style leadership development program in subsequent Perkins reauthorizations.

The EPDA legislation brought the universities on board according to Ron McCage, Executive Director of V-TECS. McCage says of the demise of the EPDA legislation that the field *"lost a way to refresh and continuously build leadership."* Although subsequent higher education legislation contains provisions to develop leadership, *"it never gets to vo ed."*

Charles Buzzell, former Executive Director of the American Vocational Association and former assistant commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, says that before EPDA, *"universities wouldn't give you two cents for vocational education."* He credits EPDA with providing a funding incentive to universities that resulted in developing leadership for vocational education.

Shoemaker also credits the leadership intern program (which was established at Kent State University) through EPDA with building a strong infrastructure for leadership throughout Ohio. *"The best investments I made were training of leaders for vocational education."*

Profile of State Directors

A survey of state directors of career technical education conducted for this paper yielded the following profile:

	Number	Percent
Gender		
Males	25	50%
Females	25	50%
Employing agency		
State department of education	36	72%
Higher education board	7	14%
Other (board for career technical education and state workforce board)	7	14%
Average years as state director	3.9	
Median years	3.0	
Average years of predecessor	6.3	
Median years	5.0	

Only one director has served over 10 years. Among predecessors, seven served over 14 years, three leaving with 20 years. Most current directors served in administrative positions in secondary and postsecondary institutions prior to becoming state director. The majority of state directors are housed in state departments of education with direct responsibility for secondary career technical education.

Gary Hoachlander, President of MPR Associates, recalls that when he first began to attend state directors meetings in the late seventies,

> *there was one woman and no minorities. It was a group that saw vocational education in very traditional ways. The primary emphasis was preparation for entry-level, sub-baccalaureate employment. No one questioned that mission. The focus was primarily secondary. Not much postsecondary representation.*

The National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium has evolved with broader representation.

What Are the Responsibilities of State Directors?

The categories that describe the work are based on an analysis of job descriptions and interviews of current state directors. Major variables that affect the degree to which these categories fit and the priority they were given were the type of governance structure in a state (secondary, higher education, or workforce board) and the degree of local or state control. However, most directors indicate that their jobs included roles or responsibilities in these areas:

1. **Policy**—developing standards for career technical education; preparing information, budget and policy recommendations for state board and legislature. Policy recommendations include both standards for programs and design, methods of state funding, and budget

2. **Program Design**—analyzing labor market data, developing program standards based on academic standards and industry credentials, developing models for program delivery, and developing program approval criteria

3. **Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**—developing, promoting, overseeing curricular frameworks, technical assistance to school districts and institutions to strengthen the quality of curriculum, instruction, and assessment for career technical education

4. **Professional/Staff Development and Teacher Education**—providing professional development opportunities for state staff; overseeing professional develop ment efforts for local career technical educators; working with teacher education institutions

5. **Evaluation, Accountability, and Reporting**—evaluating state and local programs; developing, implementing, and maintaining a state performance accountability system; overseeing local district accountability systems; preparing state and federal reports, including the development and maintenance of data systems

6. **Strategic Planning**—developing a strategic plan for career technical education; coordinating with agency plans; developing state plan required in federal legislation

7. **Monitoring**—ensuring required monitoring of local school districts and institutions

8. **Management of the Organization**—managing resources, including budget and personnel

9. **Public Information and Marketing**—providing public information, responding to media; promoting programs

10. **Collaborations**—developing collaborative relationships in areas including academic and technical education; secondary and postsecondary institutions; with business and industry, with workforce development

11. **Student Organizations**—advocating for and overseeing management of career technical student organizations.

How Has State Leadership for Career Technical Education Changed?

The former state directors interviewed described the sixties and seventies as a period of developing state systems, including facilities for vocational education. In many ways the challenges to vocational education leaders during that period paralleled that of district educational leaders. During the first half of the 20th century, district management was defined by "the four Bs"—*Bonds, Budgets, Buses, and Buildings*. By the 1970s it was "the four Rs"—*Race, Resources, Relationships, and Rules*. Priorities shifted in the 1980s and the contemporary school reform movement was described in terms of "As and Cs"—*Academic standards, Accountability, Autonomy, and Ambiguity and Collaboration, Communication, Child advocacy, and Community building* (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001b).

How State Leadership Has Changed:

Politicization of the work
Change in state governance structure
Collaborations
Increased accountability
Shift from regulatory to service role

When state directors were asked how their roles have changed, a dominant theme was the **politicization of the work**. They acknowledged the concomitant need for a "*strong understanding of the political system*" and the ability to work in a more complex and sophisticated political environment. One director said it succinctly: "*role much more political.*" A director from a large state said, "*Let's face it. In the current environment at the state level, the job is 80% politics and 20% knowledge.*"

A second area of change was in **state governance structures**, including mergers of technical and community colleges in the postsecondary system. These mergers sometimes resulted in an increased level of responsibility for the state director. Others, however, reported being downsized in the agency structure, for example, from that of Assistant Commissioner reporting to the Commissioner of Education to team leader reporting to an intermediary. Some suggest the duties and responsibilities of the state director have increased in their state, but the decision-making authority has diminished. One state reported a constitutional amendment that transferred the Perkins administrative responsibility to the community and technical college system.

A third theme was that of **living and working collaboratively**. Specific areas of collaboration cited were between secondary and postsecondary education systems, business and education, and academic and technical education. A director from a large state said:

> *The major shift is from vocational education being separate from the academic side of schooling. We are now structured so that I have responsibility for high schools, including everything. This was intended to convey that the old way of doing business, especially in the new economy, is not going to result in academic improvement for all students. We need to make the academic standards come alive through the context that vocational education courses/programs and applied learning can offer.*

The major shift is from vocational education being separate from the academic side of schooling.

Another director said:

> *Career and Technology Education has taken a—perhaps "the"—lead role in {state's} capacity building efforts for high school improvement. Leadership for initiatives such as school-to-careers and HSTW [High Schools That Work] has resulted in my sphere of influence broadening to include all of K-12.*

The other significant area of collaborations is with business and industry and among state agencies, particularly for workforce development. One director said her title has changed to that of Director of Workforce Development and that she is working more with the Departments of Human Services and Labor. Others said,

> *My role has changed from the previous director's role in that career technical education has moved into the mainstream planning of workforce education through the Governor's office and state-level economic groups. Secondary career technical education is recognized as one key to attracting new high-tech industry.*

> *Expected to be the leader of Department of Education's role in defining education's role in state's workforce development system.*

The fourth theme was that of **increased accountability**—for both federal and state programs. State directors work to position career technical education with the overall academic standards, assessment, and school accountability systems in their states.

Another theme from the surveys was **the shift in emphasis in agencies and/or in director roles from regulatory to service.** One director said his role has shifted "*from monitor to program development and improvement facilitator and long-term business plan developer with postsecondary technical institutes.*" A director from a large state said, "*The role has changed from one of telling school districts what they must do to have a quality career and technology education program to one of assisting them.*"

Most described increased responsibilities with decreased staff:

> *Visibility of career and technical education is up. Staff has been dramatically reduced.*

The job description has broadened to include school to work; there is more accountability to the feds and the state legislature. The staff has decreased in size and the job demands have increased so we are trying to work smarter as well as harder. "*The role is broader with much more responsibility and less staff.*"

> *With the decrease in the size of the bureau and staff assigned to career technical education, it has been necessary to look for ways to effect greater collaboration.*

What Is the Value Added?

Lusi (1997) concluded from a study of complex educational reform in state departments of education that "*leadership matters.*"

> *This leadership must focus not only on presenting and leading reform externally but also on building departmental capacity internally. There cannot be a disjunction between the principles and goals of the reform effort and the principles and goals of the department because one reflects the other.* (p. 157)

Leaders of national career technical education reform movements stated unequivocally that state leadership is key to successful implementation. For example, in states that are successful in the Southern Regional Education Board's High Schools That Work network, state directors support technical assistance visits, coordinate assessments, use data to inform practice, provide staff development, and communicate the initiative across the Department of Education.

On the workforce side, reform is equally challenging and complex. With the Workforce Investment Act, state directors are taking a more active role in reforming state workforce development systems. Most directors serve on governors' workforce boards or staff committees for the boards.

Systemic Change

Research questions posed by Peters (1987) asked what are the identifiable factors at the state level that influence the quality of a state's vocational education system. He further probed what factors have a dominant influence. Based on a case study of three

states identified as having a high-quality state vocational education system, Peters described seven factors that have a major influence on the quality of a state's vocational education system: (1) continuity of leadership; (2) administrative structure; (3) mission of the state agency; (4) leader; (5) delivery system; (6) quality factors; and (7) reputation.

By channeling additional funding to local sites, the 1990 Perkins Act overlooks the vital role of state governments in supporting vocational education reform. (NAVE)

The most significant influencing factor was the continuity of leadership including tenure of the state superintendents as well as the state directors of vocational education. There were also orderly transitions from one state director to the new director, with the appointment of state directors relatively free of political pressures. Peters said of the directors emeriti interviewed that the long tenure and the fact that all were former vocational teachers may have resulted in clear vocational philosophy, which leads to a clear mission statement for the state's vocational system.

The three state directors in Peters' study also had strong support from a state superintendent and independent authority to make policy, allocate funds, initiate change, and evaluate programs within the system. One recommendation from the study was for new directors to study high-quality programs in other states at the time they assume a state director role.

Effective Use of Federal Resources

According to the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) report (U.S. Department of Education 1994), state support for reforms was strongly and significantly related to academic and technical curricular integration and performance standards. Districts that said they had good state support for integration took more steps to integrate than those saying they have little or no support. Districts reporting very good state support for performance assessment used 2.4 more performance measures than those with little or no support. Local administrators valued state services.

State support for Perkins reforms and state leadership were strongly and positively related to vocational enrollments. Of all the state variables, the one most strongly related to enrollment changes is "*state leadership in general.*" Districts that report good leadership from their states are substantially more likely than others to have increasing enrollments. The report says that states can play a valuable role in promoting deeper more systemic reforms.

The independent advisory panel for the National Assessment of Vocational Education in 1994 said in the final report to Congress:

> *By channeling additional funding to local sites, the 1990 Perkins Act overlooks the vital role of state governments in supporting vocational education reform. States represent the most promising way to achieve vocational education reform on the scale necessary to have an impact on workforce quality.* (USDE, 1994, p. 3).

The panel recommended that the next Perkins Act should capture a new federal role in vocational education by—

> *once again emphasizing the* ***state role*** *(bold added) in vocational education reform. States should have considerable flexibility in designing the systems and structures to accomplish federal goals and desired outcomes—but they should be held to making these reforms. States hold the key to achieving vocational education reform at a pace and scale sufficient to affect national workforce quality.* (p. 6)

This recommendation was supported in the full report:

> *Evidence from our surveys and case studies show that* ***states*** *(bold added) can be effective education reformers if they are resolved to do so, and a number of states are already pursuing such reforms vigorously. We think that state leadership is the best bet to give context, shape, and direction to the diverse local reform activities already under way, and more broadly, to convert them to coherent career preparation programs.* (Boesel & McFarland, 1994, p. 58)

Coordination and State Contact for Business and Industry

Business looks to state directors to coordinate business education partnerships that benefit career and technical students and employers. In 1995 General Motors Chairman Jack Smith announced that General Motors would implement a pilot project, Automotive Youth Educational Systems (AYES). The automotive industry and the automotive dealers partnered with education to address the critical skill shortage of automotive technicians. AYES has now expanded to 10 manufacturers and operates in 40 states with 232 schools. Don Gray, President of AYES, says:

The next Perkins Act should capture a new federal role in vocational education by...once again emphasizing the ***state role*** *in vocational education reform. (NAVE)*

> *We see State Directors as key to the implementation of our business and education partnerships...this concept with our AYES model has been tremendously successful in not only improving the automotive education process, but providing career opportunities for many students that would otherwise not have had the opportunity.*
>
> *Every successful business and organization has a key individual that takes a leadership role. We see the State Directors as playing this vitally important role. As successful as our AYES initiative is, I believe that we have only scratched the surface in terms of its true potential. One of our most rewarding aspects of this initiative has been to see what can be accomplished when business and education leaders work together to accomplish a common goal.*

Cisco Systems, Inc. has also established a working relationship with state directors to plan, deploy, and support the Cisco Networking Academy Program. Gene Longo, Senior Manager, U.S. Field Operations for the Cisco Networking Academy Program says:

> *The State Vocational Directors have been tremendous resources to collaborate and assist with how to best implement the academy program in their state. Examples in-*

clude aligning the curriculum to state standards and integrating the offerings into Information Technology tracks. In many states, we have worked closely with the state directors to engage the business community to provide work-based learning experiences for students.

State directors have the intellect and foresight to reach out to the business community and to parents—to bring together the education and workforce development systems. (Barbara Orwig and Jim Dick)

Richard Blais, Executive Director of Project Lead the Way, a national alliance for pre-engineering programs with foundation funding, suggests it is difficult for individual schools to develop curriculum and provide staff development for innovative projects. Project Lead the Way relies on states to provide leadership and support to schools. According to Blais, there is a direct correlation between schools that have adopted Project Lead the Way and commitment and leadership from state departments of career technical education.

Barbara Orwig and Jim Dick of Career Communications, Inc. believe that state directors have the *"intellect and foresight to reach out to the business community and to parents—to bring together the education and workforce development systems."*

Value to Local Career Technical Educators

One local career technical education director looks to the state department for a vision and mission for career technical education. He praised his state department for leadership for promoting and disseminating innovative programs. Another director said the state provides a crucial coordinating role that provides consistency between regions—the upstate vs. the lower state.

All local leaders mentioned the important role for state leaders to advocate for legislation and budget.

Value to Teacher Educators

One teacher educator said she believes the role of the state director is to establish a vision and develop a team to implement the vision. A university-based faculty member said the quality of state leadership was important to his choices of universities in which to work. He believes that state career technical education leadership *"affects teacher and administrator preparation in profound ways. It impacts practice in the field in both secondary and postsecondary institutions."*

Value to the United States Department of Education (USDE)

USDE staff say state directors are their primary customers. In their view state directors bring key players to the table. Directors are a communications conduit—they inform others in a state.

Rob Muller, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Vocational and Adult Education in the U.S. Department of Education, sees the role of state directors as *"connecting the parts in the system."* USDE staff said that states are the system—*"that's how change or improvement will happen."* One USDE staff member noted that the United States does not have a national system of education as is true in many other countries. Leadership should occur at the state level.

Most of the USDE staff who were interviewed indicated that state directors are leading reform, although there is still some residue of old views of traditional vocational education. One of the USDE staff observed that there is a group of state directors who are *"forward thinking and involved in national issues."* Another staff member said, *"State directors are more willing to address high school reform."* Another member of the USDE staff added that state directors are providing vision for career technical education, which encompasses a connection to a *"larger vision,"* referring to that of education reform.

> *States that have downsized and are trying to handle the huge task of administering student organizations are not succeeding. (Tim Lawrence)*

Some of the USDE staff also said they believe state directors are more involved nationally and less inclined to be parochial. They hear less of the refrain, "My *state is different," or "In my state, I can't..."* They suggest state directors are becoming more proactive in serving on national commissions. One USDE staff member added that state directors are flexible and willing to take on new challenges and accept risks.

Value to Career Technical Student Organizations

State directors are key stakeholders for career technical student organizations, says Tim Lawrence, Executive Director of SkillsUSA-VICA. He also notes that where there are strong student organizations, there is state department support. He describes that support as states that still have program specialists and that have staff levels to provide technical assistance to the field. *"States that have downsized and are trying to handle the huge task of administering student organizations are not succeeding."*

Value in Leading National Educational Reform

State directors sustain a presence, according to Gene Bottoms, Senior Vice President, Southern Regional Education Board. *"In some states, directors are very successful in connecting career technical education to the larger reform movement. They see their role as adding value to academic achievement in the context of a broad career field."*

> *Only strong leadership at the state level can bridge the gap between national policymakers/ administrators and local practitioners to energize change and drive needed reform. (Dan Hull)*

Hoachlander said the value added by state leadership is setting direction and defining and managing the mission and purpose. *"State directors play an important role in facilitating and coordinating and leading the wide variety of players at the state level—not only the executive level, but with business, employer groups, associations."*

The value of state leadership is to give a unified voice to local vocational programs, and to bring new knowledge and expertise to local programs. (Jack Jennings)

The ability to represent the interests of the career technical education systems and its clients—both students and employers, in relationships with other state agencies, local education agencies, and as part of national career technical education initiatives represents the value of state leadership says Dan Hull, CEO of CORD. Local career technical education leaders—

have traditionally been slow to pick up on the need for globally benchmarked curricula, for quality teaching and adequate, effective professional development. Only strong leadership at the state level can bridge the gap between national policymakers/administrators and local practitioners to energize change and drive needed reform.

According to Peter McWalters, Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education in Rhode Island and President of the Council of Chief State School Officers, strong state leadership for career and technical education means designing and implementing a career development program that translates into comprehensive success for all students.

The central aims are achievement of high academic standards, preparation for employment in an industry characterized by high skills and high pay jobs, and the opportunity for continued learning and growth via a promising career path and additional study.

Value as Advocate for Career Technical Education

Jack Jennings, former General Counsel for the Education and Labor Committee, United States House of Representatives, and currently with the Center on Education Policy, says:

The value of state leadership is to give a unified voice to local vocational programs, and to bring new knowledge and expertise to local programs. Generally, local administrators are so busy running things that they do not have time to learn of broader changes, and state leadership can help to bring them that knowledge, e.g. the effects of the national movement to set job skill standards.

What Is Problematic in State Leadership?

Reductions in Federal Funding

Since the inception of vocational education legislation, from the Smith Hughes Act of 1917 to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (Perkins III), the states have been charged with administration of vocational education. However, despite increased expectations for states, the funding levels for state administration and leadership have decreased over time.

One of the more contentious issues in recent Perkins legislation has been the allotment of funding to states to support state-level activities in administration and leadership. Testimony was presented to Congressional committees in opposition to reducing state administration and leadership funds. Those testifying argued that the level of increased funding at the local level would result in a minimal impact for local districts, but would have a serious impact on state level programs and services. A dollar spent at the state level for state or regional services can be leveraged to produce a greater impact at the local level. Thomas Schultz (1997), Superintendent of Auburn Career Center in Ohio, supported funding for state-level activities in his testimony before the House of Representatives Committee on Education and the Workforce:

> *State-level activities make an important contribution to my program. I understand your goal to have Federal dollars benefit classrooms and students. But improving programs sometimes means coordinating activities of school districts and sharing resources.*
>
> *If state-level funds are reduced, it would affect the activities such as business-industry involvement, student leadership through youth organizations, teacher education and professional development. As a local administrator, even with more funding, I will not be able to replicate these services.*
>
> *I want to assure you that these funds do reach the teachers and students of Auburn's classrooms, and they do make a difference.* (pp. 39-40)

If state-level funds are reduced, it would affect the activities such as business-industry involvement, student leadership through youth organizations, teacher education and professional development. As a local administrator, even with more funding, I will not be able to replicate these

The final NAVE report (USDE 1994) to Congress examined the role of states in administering the 1990 Perkins Act. The report cited a decline of 28 percent in funding for state agencies between 1990 and 1992. The 1990 Perkins Act reduced the maximum proportion of Perkins funds for state administration from 7 to 5 percent, and effectively reduced the proportion of funds for statewide projects from 13 percent to 8.5 percent. Funds were redirected to local programs.

Two-thirds of states reported a substantial decline in state staffing, primarily at the secondary level. The average size office decreased from 36 to 28 FTE employees. Survey data did not show comparable declines in state staffing at the postsecondary level. The report noted that what stands out in the data—

> *is a small subset of states that have experienced declines in staffing to the point where it is questionable that they have sufficient staff to implement federal policy.* (p. 33)

The report noted that with downsized staffs and an increased workload, less priority was given to areas such as curriculum development, technical assistance, funds monitoring, program evaluation, responsibilities concerning special populations, and responsibilities concerning vocational student organizations. For postsecondary state offices, changes were less evident, but in some cases postsecondary offices experienced staff reductions as well.

The final report purported that simply allocating more money to the local level does not guarantee good outcomes and indeed that implementation of some of the Perkins reforms was shallow and often ad hoc. The report called for increased funding for state-level activities.

Career technical education requires a more centralized system to deliver than is feasible in most individual school districts. State-level operations provide economies of scale as well as size and scope of products and services required for quality. Several sources stated that loss of state activities would require all school districts to expend more money to comply with the most basic Perkins requirements, particularly planning, assessment, accountability, and reporting.

Although nearly all sources cited the reduction of federal funding for state administration and leadership as a concern, one source suggested that federal funding is both a curse and blessing. He believes that states became dependent on the funding and now are suffering from the withdrawal of funds.

The following concerns were expressed:

I. Reduced Staffing

One interviewee expressed it simply: "*You don't know who to call.*" Given reductions in funding for state staffs, there may be no one there who has the expertise needed. Although states may not have large staffs, those interviewed for this paper agreed that states need to have persons with expertise in curriculum, assessment, and staff development for career technical education.

When asked what was problematic with state leadership, a local director responded that the state agency was understaffed and could not attract topnotch staff. In some states, local districts pay more. One source said,

> *In some states the leadership provided to career technical education is virtually nonexistent, with almost all of the career technical education funding flowing to local education agencies. All of these shifts have diluted the attention state directors can give to career technical education and the vision and leadership they can offer.*

One former national figure in vocational education said that the reduction in career technical staffing at the state level is evident in loss of programs at the local level in his state. This concerns him because he says industries in his state, as in most states, are experiencing a shortage of skilled labor. He believes that states are suffering from the impact of federal legislation that has diminished support for state leadership for vocational education.

A leader of a national organization noted that historically there was a strong research and curriculum development capacity for career technical education in state agencies.

State staff had a major role in dissemination and professional development to local districts. Now with reduced state staffs, there is little capacity to develop products. His organization is having to work directly with locals rather than the more efficient "train the trainer" model.

Another source asked:

> *Do we have the capacity at the state and local level to provide the kinds of direction and leadership to implement what Congress sees as a goal—a country competitive in the world economy with a world-class workforce that is efficient when it arrives on site? The answer is no.*

Concerns of State Leadership

1. *Reduced staffing*
2. *Turnover*
3. *Lack of vision and implementation*
4. *Role in organizational structure*
5. *Multiple systems of governance*
6. *Political issues*
7. *Inexperience in career technical education*

USDE staff confirmed that the decrease in state staff has had a negative impact. They cited states in which *"there simply are not the staff to carry out the basics required to administer Perkins and certainly not to provide leadership for a new vision for career technical education."*

Another source said very few states have enough staff to keep the focus on quality. In one state that does have strong career-tech programming, there is both strong staffing at the state level and an infrastructure of local administrators for career technical education.

Concerns were expressed by local career technical educators as well. One local administrator described a state department of career technical education that was less than one-quarter of the size it had been in earlier days. He said his state—

> *should have someone who understands the need for career development and career preparation in schools; who can make the case and advocate for career technical education in the state legislature, with the state commissioner of education, and with the state workforce board; who will provide leadership and coordination for program planning and design, technical standards, curriculum, and professional development.*

Another local administrator complained that "*each school is doing its own.*" He echoed a comment of a source cited earlier in the paper: "*When I call, there's no one there or there's no one there with answers and support.*"

It should be noted that reduction in state staff is systemic. The Institute for Educational Leadership report (2001a) says that today state education agencies are almost too lean. "*Reduced budgets starting in the 1980s stripped them of their capacity to fill many vacancies.*" The report states that in 1965, as much as 80% of state education payrolls were federal dollars. That figure is now around 47 percent.

2. Turnover

Nearly all sources cited problems related to turnover. USDE staff, in particular, lamented the problems created by what they say are increased rates of change in state

directors. They cite capacity to deal with the complexity of the state accountability systems required in Perkins III as particularly problematic.

One person said in his view, leadership is weaker. "*The heads of vocational education are being changed more than in the past and they seem to be less aggressive.*" Another source noted that reform initiatives slip in states where there is a long period before permanently filling the position. This observation is supported in the Peters' research cited earlier in this paper.

3. Lack of Vision and Implementation

Although vision was most frequently cited as a strength for career technical education leaders, there were some who saw lack of vision in some leaders as a weakness. At issue are both vision and implementation. In a study of workforce development systems, Grubb et al. (1999) assert that "*in many states, the state's vision is more powerful than its implementation.*" The report also suggests that implementation has failed, in many cases, because of poor choices in leadership.

Hoachlander concurs: *State leadership around vocational education is very ambivalent and uncertain about where the enterprise is going.*" He adds, "*If there is a transition underway, it's far from halfway completed.*" Speaking of implementation, "*it's not just enough to promote integration or accountability or secondary and postsecondary articulation. You have to know how to do that. There's much variability among states in that capacity.*"

Although some of the retired vocational educators lamented a loss of vision and weaker state leadership, Ray Ryan, CEO and President of the National Occupational Competency Testing Institute (NOCTI) and a former state director, believes that current state directors are more talented and more attuned to the total educational environment than the previous generation. In his view, a different set of skills is needed for this new environment.

4. Role in Organizational Structure

In some states, positions for directors of career technical education have been elevated in the organizational hierarchy. However, in other states those positions have been demoted, moved to a less visible or powerful slot. McCage said that some of the problems in state leadership are not with the person, but because they are "*buried in the agency.*"

Hull agrees, observing that in many states, the state career technical education director position—

> *has been pushed down several levels from state decision-making authority in education, making it increasingly harder for the state career technical education director to act unilaterally in behalf of career technical education, to exhibit strong leadership, and to access funding for career technical education.*

Gray, describing the partnership of AYES with states, observed that the role of state director varies from state to state. "*Where the state director does not have authority to orchestrate and direct personnel involvement, we find our efforts to develop a productive partnership a challenge at best and in some cases practically impossible.*"

Bottoms expressed another view. He cites states in which directors are not in the top tier of administrators, but who have been able to create change and impact both policy and practice.

5. Multiple Systems of Governance

States may have a chief administrator for Perkins, a state director for secondary education, and a state director for postsecondary education. In some states, that may be the same person. In other states it's three different persons. The potential and reality for "disconnects" between these entities, all of which have an interest in career technical education, is great. As noted in the profile of state directors, the majority are located in state departments of education. However, there are some directors in postsecondary agencies, in state boards of career technical education, and state workforce boards.

One source says that state directors are dominated by a secondary focus, that there is "*not a lot of innovative thinking about vocational education at the postsecondary level.*"

One source expressed concern for "nominal state directors," which he defined as directors who have no power or authority. USDE staff noted a problem with communications to states and the problem in ensuring that both secondary and postsecondary departments are informed.

This issue is also reflective of broader state governance issues. The legal authority for educational governance can differ, often profoundly, from state to state.

6. Political Issues

Following the impetus of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, many players entered the arena of school reform—governors, legislatures, boards, business interests, and the mass media—often at the expense of state educational agencies (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001a). In some cases, state education agencies were marginalized as others got into the game. However, state agencies are now taking the lead and being charged with standards-based reform and accountability.

Sources surveyed and interviewed for this paper cited the political context in states as problematic. One interviewee stated that some governors do not understand the relationship of the career technical education system to workforce development. He said some governors do not recognize career technical education as a critical driver for the state's economic engines. Another said that governors do not realize it is important to select and recruit people and provide resources for career technical education.

State directors historically were advocates and spokespersons for vocational education in Congress and state legislatures. Given the current political environment, Congressman John Peterson (2001) from Pennsylvania expressed his concern: "*State directors can't say anything their governors aren't saying.*"

Another source said that state directors are less likely to "*venture off on the limb.*" In his view, some directors are less confident and less connected to power. Another source said, "*State directors have the ability to move career technical education to another level. However, they are afraid to speak out too much. They have governors and chief state school officers to report to.*"

7. Inexperience in Career Technical Education

Although there is some debate about the need for career technical education background and experience as a prerequisite for being a state director, the majority of those interviewed believed that lack of understanding of career technical education is problematic. One university-based faculty member said,

> *Persons from general education don't understand the workforce development system, but more importantly they cannot bridge between workforce development and academic education. They don't know the questions to ask or the dialogue to sort it out.*

Hoachlander observes that for some new directors, vocational education was not their first priority. It was an assignment they were given. As a consequence, "*they don't bring a clear purpose, mission, vision.*"

Floyd McKinney, Director of the National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education, also believes that some state directors don't have experience in career technical education. He said, "*It's hard to provide leadership when you don't have the context of the field.*"

8. Other

A local director said that in his state, "*everything is a priority.*" When asked what the priority should be, he said "*teaching and learning.*" Several sources expressed concern about the quality of teachers and the loss of teacher preparation programs.

Several of the interviewees recalled earlier vocational education legislation that required a state director position and stated that state leadership was stronger as a result of that mandate.

State leadership has been too compartmentalized by programs and funding streams, says Brand. When your focus is on a single program,

> *it is hard to see how the whole system should work and difficult to influence the larger system because you aren't in charge of it.*

What Is the Change Agenda in States?

The literature on leadership for education is critical of a missing dimension in leadership development programs—the core values, purpose, or content of education. Barkley (2001) says leadership (or lack of it) always shows. "*Leaders' daily decisions about investments of time, energy, money, and resources send a loud message about what is considered important.* (p. 12).

Directors agree that the career technical education system should prepare students for work and continued education. The new vision paper by the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education (2001) states:

> *Career and Technical Education is an essential component of the total educational system, offering career-oriented benefits for all students.*

A uniqueness is that career technical education draws its curricula, standards, and organizing principles from the workplace. Career technical education is also a critical and integral component of the workforce development system, providing the essential foundation for a thriving economy.

Directors defined their change agenda as follows:

1. Integration of career technical education in the total mission of education and education reform—
   - leading career technical education into a mainstream educational choice for all students
   - aligning PK-16 continuum, including full school-to-careers options in all high schools
   - aligning career technical standards with state academic standards
   - implementing or expanding High Schools That Work
   - assisting districts in embedding the state's academic standards into appropriate career technical education courses
   - elevating the value of applied learning in every school district by including career technical educators at all school improvement discussions
   - working across divisions in state agencies

2. Building a strong workforce, economic development, and education partnership—
   - strongly positioning career technical education with workforce investment boards
   - aligning planning for career technical education in states with workforce board regions
   - working with employers and trade associations to ensure currency of curriculum
   - acting as liaison between employers and education

3. Integration of academic and technical education through—
   - new delivery strategies, such as career academies, career pathway high schools, magnet schools

- career clusters for organization schools and curriculum
- curriculum—linking academic standards to career technical education courses, applied coursework, embedded credit for academics, new courses of study emphasizing academics, tech prep
- continuum of work-based experiences for students, including job shadowing, fully mentored internships, co-op work, and apprenticeships
- endorsements, e.g. advanced career technical diploma endorsement
- inservice training for administrators and teachers

4. Business/industry certification of all career technical programs, secondary and postsecondary including—
   - standards and curriculum, ensuring current industry recognition and validation for all courses
   - technical updating for teachers
   - technical advisory councils

5. Reliable and valid accountability system, including positioning career technical education assessments in high stakes state accountability system

6. Secondary/postsecondary articulation through such strategies as articulation agreements, statewide articulation agreements, tech prep

7. Expansion of career technical education by—
   - providing access to all students
   - ensuring high-quality programs for all students
   - expanding and strengthening career technical student organizations
   - restructuring program approval criteria
   - expanding career-focused and business-linked programs such as Project Lead the Way (pre-engineering curriculum), Cisco networking, Oracle, etc.)
   - expanding program initiatives into middle schools
   - implementing virtual career technical education courses
   - emphasizing growth in new and emerging occupations or growing occupations in the state
   - creating flexible associate degrees

8. Funding for career technical education—
   - increasing levels of funding
   - changing the way secondary vocational education is state funded

9. Technology through such strategies as—
   - virtual technology for instruction, virtual learning network
   - web-based grants
   - *"fully technologically literate faculty"*

10. Addressing issues of teacher and administrator education and quality, including teacher shortage and loss of teacher education programs and improving teacher quality through such strategies as—

- alternative delivery methods, including use of technology and online coursework
- externships for teachers with business and industry
- mentorship program as part of teacher prep (in lieu of student teaching)
- professional development activities, both quantity and quality, up to industry levels.
- state-level professional development institutes for all educators promoting integration of academic and technical skill attainment
- leadership training

A director in a large state said "*I intend to provide professional development activities for administrators and teachers to include more leadership training so that they can be more effective in influencing decision makers.*"

11. Quality initiatives such as—
    - Baldrige Criteria, ISO for state and local career technical education systems
    - streamlining procedures and processes for local districts including salary and equipment reimbursements
    - "*redefining how we do our work*"

12. Improving the image of career technical education through—
    - marketing the "new" vision for career technical education
    - changing the image—"*I would like to see secondary and post-secondary technical education held within the same esteem as traditional, purely academic pursuits.*"
    - creating an image of career technical education that attracts all students into career majors

> *I would like for my legacy to be that students graduated from career technical programs that allowed them to choose their career/employment/life destination and provided the vehicle to get there. (State Director)*

A director from a large state said his major goal is—

to transform high schools from the old factory model—where kids sit in rows, go through the grades, the teacher dumps in the information, we discard the defective units/students, where sports dictate the master schedules, and we measure success through the Carnegie unit to a system that prepares all students with the academic and career base to function as self-sufficient and productive adults. I sincerely believe that we need to have dramatic restructuring, and believe the keys to causing change are to hold schools accountable, promote reform strategies based on data and research, and breaking the many large school districts down into manageable smaller learning communities.

Other directors described their change agendas:

I would like the field to recognize the value of career education and I would like old "vocies" to move on to the bigger picture. In our state, I would like to renovate existing facilities and programs to embrace new and emerging fields and meet the workforce development demands.

As we push the concept of career technical education as an integral part of the overall education system for all students, the expectation is that we will provide leadership beyond our centers to all schools for such things as career exploration/development, work-based learning, and instituting career academies in high schools as well as career and technical centers.

Since {state} does not have a formal and separate adult vocational and job training system, this is an area that we are being asked to get involved with.

Some directors responded directly to the question of what they would like their legacy to be:

I would like for my legacy to be that students in {state} schools graduated from career technical programs that allowed them to choose their career/employment/life destination and provided the vehicle to get there. Would like for {state} to have respected career technical programs with the rigor, validity, and respect that should be associated with learning at the level that makes our economy grow and our citizens prosper.

I would hope my legacy would be that the {state} system is recognized as a world leader in career and technology education.

I really have not ever given any thought to a legacy. I just try to make sure our program decisions are motivated by what's right for the kids and not just the same old stuff.

I would want as my legacy to have counselors stop telling students that they can prepare for college or for work. The two are not mutually exclusive because every student will go to work someday.

Challenge: to be leaders of a movement rather than seeing their jobs as administering a chunk of money—to become advocates for change. (Rob Muller)

Making vocational-technical education a real option for {state} youth, all youth and making a competency based transcript a reality.

To advance career and technical education to meet student and employer needs in an environment of "second priority" with fewer resources.

I also hope to be remembered for assisting in the enhancement of area vocational technical centers to become a major contributor to the workforce education of the state.

Increase numbers and buildings at all tech institutes and upgrade programs in latest technology for training students in high tech/wage programs.

To be remembered as someone who helped make high schools more functional and who is remembered as having contributed nationally to the continued evolution of career technical education.

One director had a pragmatic response to the question of the change agenda. She said, *"survive intact."*

What Should Be the Future Directions for Career Technical Education Leadership?

Although the following role descriptors as "desired future" are arguable in that they may be true of leadership and management in earlier and present times, current state directors and those interviewed support these goals and actions for additional priority and new emphasis.

1. Leading Change

The primary role of state directors should be to lead change. Muller challenges state directors to *"be leaders of a movement rather than seeing their jobs as administering a chunk of money—to become advocates for change."* Bottoms says state directors must be competent in leading change from a state perspective, including how to use state policy and state funding to effect that change.

Brand says: *"The leader is responsible for setting strategic priorities, for understanding when a system/program needs to change, and in what direction those changes should be made."*

One source described the need to adopt the norm of risk-taking rather than caution in a bureaucracy. Based on the interviews of past and current state directors, there was a clear trend toward less regulatory work based on a set of pre-existing rules and regulations. Rather, state directors are required to develop and implement policies based on limited information in times of uncertainty. Many see their role as creating innovative solutions.

A new type of leader is needed, someone who can work both in the areas of academic and vocational education. The academic standards-based movement is not going away, it will just get stronger, and vocational education at the high school level has yet to find a way to be a part of it. (Jack Jennings)

2. Being an Instructional Leader

The instructional leader role was not evident in conversations with past state directors. One current director when asked to describe how the state director role has changed in the past 5-10 years said that he was an administrative manager and that now he is an administrative manager and an instructional leader. Hull argues that state leadership is key to raising the bar on performance and achievement in career technical education at the local level.

Jennings says:

> *A new type of leader is needed, someone who can work both in the areas of academic and vocational education. The academic standards-based movement is not going away, it will just get stronger, and vocational education at the high school level has yet to find a way to be a part of it.*

At the state level, Brand believes that leaders must help school districts change *"and they must act as a motivator, supporter, example for them."*

Bottoms is concerned that as a field we are unwilling to look at quality. State directors, in his view,

> *must have a deep understanding and commitment to quality in teaching and learning—how to organize instruction, what constitutes good curriculum, instruction, assessment; how to collect and use data, professional development based on adult learning principles.*

A leader should cross functional lines and work outside his/her agency/program to build bridges and partnerships with others, and spend as much time outside the system as inside the system. (Betsy Brand)

Hoachlander agrees:

> *Ideally, state directors should understand the most promising strategies in specific concrete ways for realizing the basic aims and purposes of vo ed. If integration needs to be pursued to realize the vision, directors need to know and be able to change curriculum and instructional practice and programmatic frameworks. State leaders must bridge the broad general aims of vo ed and very specific ways of getting there.*

Several sources noted the importance of state directors being knowledgeable of and advocates for research-based practices.

3. Managing Multiple Priorities

On any given day a state director may respond to a call from the governor's office, demand for instant information to a board member; and a complex report due the next day to their superior—in a format that requires computer programming and analysis. This is all wedged into an already planned schedule—a breakfast department meeting, a conference call with the governor's Workforce Investment Board's committee on industry standards; a performance review for a staff member—and after a luncheon meeting with a trade association leader, a call from an unhappy parent over a student organization competition, and a drive to a distant part of the state for an evening presentation to an advisory committee and all-boards dinner. Prioritizing "first things first" is an essential skill.

4. Managing In a Political Environment

One director stated the challenge this way: *Today's state director must spend a great deal of effort educating policy makers and 'heading off' misdirected political 'fixes' of education."* Another said, *"Directors need a knack for working with politicians."* Hull said, *"Strong state career technical education leadership appears to remain only in those states where there is a firmly established link between the career technical education director and the state educational authority and decision-makers on funding."*

5. Competent in Different Worlds

State directors must be competent in the world of education and school improvement and in the world of workforce development. The language, people, and laws often represent diverse cultures. State directors often bridge that divide, bringing together those two spheres.

6. Doing More with Less

The level of funding for state administration has been reduced significantly over time. Yet demands and expectations have grown exponentially. The ability to prioritize and leverage limited resources for the career technical education enterprise is essential.

7. Attention to the Macro and the Micro

State directors need to focus on the "big picture." Yet, state directors sign the federal reports that go to Washington attesting that funds are spent properly, that the core indicators of performance are met. They hire staff and oversee budgets—in some cases nearly a billion dollars. What should a state system of career technical education be and do? What is the change agenda? What is needed to move that agenda?

We can no longer do our own thing and let someone else figure out how it fits with the rest of the educational and workforce development systems. (State Director)

8. Working Collaboratively

State directors must be astute at fostering relationships and working with different partners. The value of networking is increasingly important. Directors will work on cross-functional teams in their departments and institutions. They will need to break down silos. Brand said, "A *leader should cross functional lines and work outside his/her agency/program to build bridges and partnerships with others, and spend as much time outside the system as inside the system.*"

9. Advocating for Career Technical Education

Although this role is clearly one that has been true historically, it rates mention in the emerging roles because of the changing context in which one advocates. As one director said,

> *We can no longer do our own thing and let someone else figure out how it fits with the rest of the educational and workforce development systems....The biggest problem I see in some states is not antagonism, it is that we simply get ignored.*

A major contribution of state directors is advocacy for career technical education, says Ryan. "*They make the case in statehouses and in Congress.*"

10. Promoting Accountability

With Perkins III and the Workforce Investment Act, the stakes for federal accountability are higher. Bottoms calls for career technical education to become a part of high stakes accountability systems in states. Directors need to work with policymakers to make that happen. Directors need to "energize" the system to understand the need for accountability and for making decisions based upon data.

11. Coping with Information Overload

Given that state directors work in the different worlds of education and workforce development, the amount of information crossing their desk is voluminous. Most directors when they meet at national conferences are connected by e-mail, fax and phone to their offices. Further, directors are increasingly expected to make data-driven decisions. They should be more than technologically literate. They must actively promote and support innovative applications of technology in their work.

What Is the Role of State Directors in a National Agenda for Career Technical Education?

State directors play a vital role in shaping and implementing the national agenda for career technical education. They have done so through the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium (NASDCTEC). The association's mission is to provide leadership for career technical education's role in economic development, educational improvement, and workforce development for the 21st Century.

Most recently, NASDCTEC (2001) published *Career and Technical Education: An Essential Component to the Total Educational System*; this vision paper outlines a set of principles that describe the system and its capacity. NASDCTEC is leading a national career clusters initiative, funded by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, that will serve as an effective tool for systemic reform.

NASDCTEC develops legislative and policy recommendations at the federal level that support a strong state role and expanded support for career technical education. To accomplish its mission, NASDCTEC builds alliances with partners such as the Association for Career and Technical Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, as well as myriad other education, business/industry, labor, governmental, and policy organizations.

As noted earlier, USDE staff view state directors as being more proactive at the national level than in earlier years. They believe that current state directors have a greater understanding of national issues and are serving on national panels and commissions.

Part II: Developing Leaders for Career Technical Education

Part II is organized in four sections. The first section addresses knowledge, skills and dispositions needed for career technical education leaders. The second part identifies criteria for leadership programs and delivery strategies. Leadership program models are described in the third section. The final section synthesizes recommendations for developing state leaders.

According to the Institute for Educational Leadership report (2001a), the development of trained leaders for state government deserves a much higher place on state agendas (and in their budgets) than is now the case.

Leadership training programs focused on developing school leaders have increased, some based on sound theory; others, questionable. Evaluations of leadership development activities reveal that some of the attributes (characteristics, knowledge, and skills) common to successful leaders can be significantly influenced by a reasonable amount of planned education or training (Moss & Liang, 1990). A meta-analysis of studies on leadership development using control groups by Yukl (1981) found that the training "*can be quite effective for improving managerial skills, altering leadership behavior, and strengthening managerial motivation.*"

The development of trained leaders for state government deserves a much higher place on state agendas (and in their budgets) than is now the case. (IEL)

Although state-level career technical education leaders are usually considered "*senior administrators,*" it may be useful to think of leadership skills being developed throughout one's career. One stage prepares for the next through a continuum or progression of skill development. Ideally, leadership training opportunities will be provided to young professionals as well as experienced ones. Most studies have found that experiences occurring early in one's career were among the key influencers in leadership development (Lambrecht et al., 1997). Graduate students are a potential source of leaders for the profession.

Preparation of Career Technical Education Leaders: Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

This section highlights standards for educational administrators and a set of leadership attributes developed through research at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE). It also includes findings from other sources that should inform what one needs to know as a state leader or the content for a leadership development program.

Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium Standards

More than half of the states have adopted or adapted new standards for school administrators based on the Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium, a collaboration of states and professional organizations. The ISLLC guidelines were written in 1996 as a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers to strengthen the licensing process for school leaders and the accreditation process for the institutions that train them. The standards specify that a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by—

- Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the local community;
- Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
- Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
- Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
- Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
- Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Murphy (2001) says that considerable attention is being given to linking ISLLC standards with the redesign of educational administration and leadership development programs. ISLLC standards are also being adopted in a number of states for certification and licensure of educational administrators.

Leadership Attributes

A construct referenced in the literature on leadership for career technical education leaders is the "Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI)." The genesis for this work was an NCRVE project to provide leadership development services for vocational educators (Moss et al., 1991). Given a lack of consensus on a definition of "leadership" or what constituted "leadership development," the researchers identified broad tasks and conceptualized 37 leader attributes for leaders in vocational education.

Although all attributes are strongly related to perceived leadership effectiveness, the following six attributes were identified as particularly useful in predicting perceived effectiveness (Moss & Liang, 1990): (1) motivating others; (2) team building; (3) adaptable, open, flexible; (4) gathering and managing information; (5) willing to accept responsibility; and (6) insightful.

Houston's (2001) comments on changes needed in preparation of superintendents stress collaboration and communication:

Most of the coursework now required for licensure focuses on the old role. It prepares people for centralized, command-and-control managerial tasks. It doesn't teach the collaborative skills needed in today's more complex and connected environment. Superintendents must be great communicators. They must be outstanding facilitators. They have to know how to take the pulse of the public and how to sell their ideas. Persuasion is the ultimate tool for a superintendent of education. (p. 432)

Skills needed by state directors: leading change and collaborating

Given the complex nature of change and the rapidity of change needed to transform career technical education programs, a model of transformational leadership is advocated. Transformational leadership has been described as "*the process of perceiving when change is needed and influencing the group by such noncoercive means as persuasion and example in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement.*" (Moss & Liang, 1990, p. 5)

State Director Recommendations

State directors identified the following knowledge and skills as essential in a leadership development program:

1. Basic understanding of career and technical education and what is required to be an instructional leader

2. Understanding of the larger workforce development systems in the country and how to connect career technical education programs to that system

3. Understanding of political systems, the political environment, state and national political agendas, and how to work within that environment to effect change. A director from a large state, emphasizing the political role of state directors, said "*Knowing how to function effectively among competing interests, shaping a vision, collaborating across boundaries, and maintaining huge fiscal systems are the new skills we need.*"

   Brand says that directors need to learn "*really good communication skills to influence the debate or discussion.*"

4. Administrative and leadership roles—managing people, budgets, resources; organizational development; planning, managing, evaluating programs; using data and technology

Two specific skill sets were mentioned most frequently: (1) leading change and (2) collaborating—partnering, developing networks of private and public supporters in the education, workforce development, and economic development communities and. One director said, "*Directors as a whole must become the visible and accepted leaders to establish partnerships with business and industry.*"

Brand says, "*People need to get out of the box, be exposed to thinking in other similar and very dissimilar programs and areas.*" She adds:

> You have to get leaders comfortable with taking risks and pushing people to do the same. But you also have to reward and recognize those leaders that do take risks and make sure the bureaucracy is not going to come back and bite them.

A response that captured the sentiments of many was that state directors *"need to know how to accomplish things in tough times as well as good times."* Leaders are tested in the tough times.

Another director when asked what it takes to be a state director said, *"able to work long, hard hours."*

> *I attempt to balance the demands from my state, the knowledge and ideas gleaned from other states, and the federal government expectations into a mix that comprises "my job."*

Directors agreed that they were captains of a very large enterprise. One director stated what is **not** important: *"Knowing how to micro-manage local vocational education programs is simply not important."*

Preparation of Career Technical Education Leaders: Criteria, Delivery, and Strategies

Olson (2000) says that the university-based programs that traditionally have prepared administrators have not responded adequately. She quotes Michael D. Usdan, president of the Institute for Educational Leadership: *"There is widespread unhappiness and disillusionment with the lack of relevance of most administrator-training programs."*

A number of leadership development programs are in place, but usually not in a systematic or coordinated effort. These include such arrangements as graduate degree programs, classes, leadership academies or institutes, workshops, organization-sponsored programs, fellowships, and seminars.

In a follow-up study of vocational education doctoral graduates in 1983, 1987, and 1990, Stitt-Gohdes (1993) concluded that *"University Council of Vocational Education (UCVE) institutions appear to be beginning to make curricular changes to develop leadership qualities in their graduates. A strong commitment by the UCVE to develop tomorrow's leaders today would benefit all who are touched by vocational education"* (p. 102).

Preparation programs for the next generation of leaders must involve a constant dance between doing the work and thinking about it (Houston, 2001). Houston affirms the importance of the practicum and practice phases, calling for preparation of educational leaders to be reflective—writing journals, mentoring, and teaching.

Finch et al. (1992) argue that to prepare individuals for the further development of their talents and to prepare for the long term, we must create a leadership develop-

ment program that is truly comprehensive. Finch and Gregson (1990) outline four phases for leadership development programs:

1. **Foundation Phase**—emphasis is placed on the development of knowledge (recall of leadership concepts and phenomena) and comprehension (a broad understanding of leadership). Resources typically associated with this phase are textbooks, lectures, discussions.

2. **Bridging Phase**—serves to narrow the gap between foundational studies and field experiences. May take place in the classroom, during a practicum, or some combination. Focus is on practice and application of effective leadership behaviors in "safe" settings. Strategies include simulations, case studies and self-assessments that enable individuals to identify their strengths and shortcomings in order to design personal improvement programs. [Bennis (1989) says that each of us has the capacity to become leaders, that the process of becoming a leader is much the same as the process of becoming an integrated human being.]

3. **Practicum Phase**—develops leadership further through structured and monitored experiences in actual educational settings. Strategies include field assignments, interning, externing, and shadowing.

4. **Practice Phase**—provides opportunities for the individual to grow while being employed in a leadership role. Strategies include access to a professional network, participation in conferences, publications, and access to leadership programs.

Joe Murphy, President of the Ohio Principals Leadership Academy, recommends the staff development standards from the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) as the basis for leadership development programs. He says the NSDC standards anchor the Ohio Academy.

A study by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (Lambrecht et al., 1997) explored the importance of on-the-job experiences as a means of complementing and supplementing leadership development provided in formal education programs. Research conducted in business settings has shown that the timing and type of on-the-job experiences (e.g., use of mentors, cross-organizational experience opportunities) are relevant in the study of on-the-job leadership development.

Lambrecht et al. (1997) studied chief vocational administrators who scored highest on two assessments—the Leader Attributes Inventory and the Leader Effectiveness Index. The five most frequently recommended types of experience for future leaders were (1) mentoring, counseling and advocate support; (2) formal training programs on-the-job; (3) internships; (4) various special assignments (while on the job); and (5) simulations/case studies (p. 45).

It was determined from the study that all on-the-job experiences are not perceived to be equal in their potential for developing leadership qualities. Two characteristics of effective on-the-job learning were identified:

1. Individuals are placed in a variety of challenging situations with problems to solve and choices to be made under conditions of risk. These situations motivate individuals to learn, provide opportunities to gain new ideas and knowledge and to practice skills and apply knowledge, and encourage new insights through reflection on prior actions.

2. Individuals gain their experiences in a supportive environment with supervisors who provide positive role models and constructive support and mentors who provide counsel. (p. 49)

> *The most important kinds of outcomes from on-the-job experiences for both men and women appear to be growth in personal and interpersonal leadership skills (listening, speaking, writing), sensitivity to and respect for others, team building skills, appropriate use of leadership styles, self-confidence, networking, planning, organizing, and decision making. In addition, it was reported that on-the-job experiences further developed administrative/management knowledge and skills specific to the context, as well as broadened one's perspective about the organization.* (p. 50)

Nearly all leadership programs include some phase of case study or problem-based study. Bridges (1992) describes problem-based learning as a strategy used in the "Prospective Principals' Program" at Stanford University that was pioneered by medical educators. Problem-based learning organizes knowledge around administrative problems rather than the disciplines using role-relevant problems. Bridges cites extensive research from medical education that indicates that problem-based learning produces better outcomes than traditional programs.

A variation of case studies is a case story approach in which participants learn through writing and telling about their own experiences as practitioners. A study of how educational administrators used this approach in university and inservice leadership academies suggests that this approach requires administrators to integrate theory and practice (Maslin-Ostrowski & Ackerman, 1997).

State directors responded to the question of what should be done to prepare state leaders in terms of both content and process as well as history and experiences. A majority believes that state directors should "*come up through the ranks*" so that they understand teaching and local administration. Others suggested industry experience as well. One director who did not come from career and technical education said that he thinks his "*political experience, business experience, and broad educational policy experiences help me to think more out of the box.*"

Another said,

> *The best preparation I had was to be involved with the High Schools That Work network. The exchange of ideas and best practices was the best inservice possible.*

Directors said management experience is also important.

Active recruitment of outstanding career technical educators with leadership potential must be a priority. More than half of women in vocational education leadership positions in Murphy's (1990) study stated that acceptance as leaders was difficult to obtain, especially from men in the traditional male-oriented vocational disciplines. Those currently in senior administrative positions should identify and nurture potential leaders.

Leadership Development Programs

This section highlights three leadership development programs that could inform the development of state leaders for career technical education.

Danforth Foundation. The Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals, begun in 1987, has developed better understandings of what is required to improve the preparation of educational administrators, particularly school principals (Milstein, 1993). The Danforth report says that time allocated to practice seems to distinguish between programs that teach about leadership and those that bring about behavioral modifications. Critical elements of the Danforth Foundation program are in Appendix C.

Ohio Career-Technical Education Leadership Institute. One of the long-standing leadership development programs specific to career technical education is the Ohio Career-Technical Education Leadership Institute (OCTELI). The premise for OCTELI as set forth in the plan is as follows:

> *We need career technical education leaders who know where career technical education came from, how it got here, where it is, and where it must go. Leaders who have a vision of the future, are knowledgeable of trends and the operational and policy context, and who, above all, have the commitment and courage to lead and make a difference.*
>
> *The Ohio Career-Technical Education Leadership Institute recognizes the need and provides the means to develop* ***the next generation of leaders.***
>
> *The plan provides a means of concurrently preparing individuals for state and local administrative roles with synergism and cost benefits.* (Ohio Department of Education, 2001)

A program description for OCTELI is in Appendix D.

National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education (NDCCTE). The National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education is sponsoring a National Leadership Institute to prepare future secondary and postsecondary career and technical educators for leadership positions at the institutional, state, and national levels. A description of the NDCCTE Institute is in Appendix E.

Study of other education-related leadership institutes might inform the process for developing state leaders for career technical education. The Harvard Institute for School Leadership is a two-week residential program that provides useful insights and strategies about school change. Murphy (1990) identified two "lighthouse" programs for preparation of principals: the North Carolina Principal's Executive Program and the Ohio Principals Leadership Academy. The University of Texas program for community college presidents was also recommended.

Recommendations for Developing State Leaders for Career Technical Education

Based on the suggestions of state directors and others interviewed and the literature on career technical education leadership, the following recommendations are proposed for developing state leaders for career technical education.

Who

- The National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium should take a lead role to develop a coalition of the different organizations, institutions, and agencies that could inform policy and practice for developing leaders for career technical education. The organizations should agree on mutual expectations for aspiring and practicing leaders and an action plan with clearly delineated responsibilities. Some directors requested a repeat of the Wallace-Reader's Digest sponsored leadership institutes for state directors.

- Request a greater investment by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), including an orientation for new directors. State adult directors have a national working group in which OVAE has invested to meet the needs of state adult directors.

- At the state level, create coalitions to include universities, state departments of education, workforce boards, local education agencies, and postsecondary institutions.

- Create a network of higher education institutions to collaborate in developing career technical education leadership programs at both the preservice and inservice levels.

What

- Develop content or curriculum for a leadership program from the work and emerging roles of state directors. One director said:

  State leaders are thrown into administrative positions without having established a thorough understanding for or appreciation of what it is the enterprise should accom-

plish. They become "reactive," allowing the pressure of the immediate situation to form defacto long-term strategy and direction.

- Incorporate the foundation, bridging, practicum and practice phases when developing a comprehensive leadership development program. Note that these may not be linear, but that participants may engage in one or more phases simultaneously.

- Allocate sufficient time for internship and mentoring experiences. Provide internship experiences in other states and in the U.S. Department of Education. As one director said, *"it's important to spend time out of your system."* Establish criteria for quality in internship and mentoring experiences.

- Ensure that on-the-job training experiences provide challenging situations with problems to solve and choices to make under conditions of risk. Provide for reflections on those experiences.

- Structure a cohort system for leadership development with a continuous system for networking.

- Consider establishment of an Emeritus State Director program, based on established criteria, to nurture and mentor new state directors.

How

- Identify potential leaders as early in their careers as possible. (It should be noted that career technical student organizations serve more than 1.5 million students and, with the emphasis on providing leadership experiences to students, should be considered a source for developing leaders in career technical education.)

- Develop criteria for selection of potential candidates that includes evidence of potential for success in educational leadership and administration.

- Be intentional in seeking out candidates who represent diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

- Incorporate a leadership component in graduate career technical education programs.

- Encourage states to develop leadership academies for career technical education and/or incorporate a component for career technical education leadership in state leadership academies for principals and superintendents.

- Require all partners who benefit to share in the costs of leadership development.

- Ensure that there is adequate time to explore issues and processes in depth and to provide time for reflective experiences.

Resources

- Develop a technical line of assistance model (based on School-to-Work model) for states to access to develop state-level leaders
- Develop and advocate for state and federal legislation to support leadership development for career technical education.
- Seek corporate sponsorship of a leadership program for state directors and senior leaders.
- This program would have definite expectations of participants and specific outcomes. It would match "mentees" with experienced and respected "mentors' from states of similar size and demographics. Corporate sponsorships would help ensure participation from states who may not be able to afford to pay for participant expenses.

The reduced state setaside in Perkins II and III has seriously "clipped the wings" of state career technical education leaders. This has limited their ability to provide leadership in curriculum, teacher quality, and recruitment, and to promote achievement of the objectives of the federal legislation. (Dan Hull)

Summary and Recommendations

The paper begins with concern for the quality and quantity of educational leaders, including state leaders for career technical education. Sources include a literature review; survey responses from directors of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and territories; and interviews with a purposeful cross-section of persons considered opinion leaders in career technical education, persons representing key policy organizations, trade associations, business leaders, professional organizations, policymakers, university faculty, educators, and leadership development program providers.

Part I addresses the status of state leadership for career technical education, including a profile of state directors, the value of state leadership, how it has changed, the change agenda in states, future directions, and the role of state directors in shaping and implementing a national agenda for career technical education.

The evidence from Part I suggests support for the thesis that where there are strong career technical education programs, there is strong state leadership. However, state leadership has suffered from serious cuts in funding and dramatically reduced staffing levels. Another contributing factor to lessened state leadership is the higher rate of turnover of state directors.

By channeling additional funding to local sites, the 1990 Perkins Act overlooks the vital role of state governments in supporting vocational education reform. (NAVE)

Hull expressed the view of many when he said:

> *The reduced state setaside in Perkins II and III has seriously "clipped the wings" of state career technical education leaders. This has limited their ability to provide leadership in curriculum, teacher quality, and recruitment, and to promote achievement of the objectives of the federal legislation...As the power and authority of state career technical education leadership has eroded, there has also been similar erosion at the local level.*

The final report to Congress from the National Assessment of Vocational Education (USDE 1994) supports this view: *"By channeling additional funding to local sites, the 1990 Perkins Act overlooks the vital role of state governments in supporting vocational education reform."* The panel recommended that the next Perkins Act should capture a new federal role in vocational education by *"once again emphasizing the* ***state role*** *(bold added) in vocational education reform."*

Brand says of the impact of positive state leadership:

> *A leader who can break out of the silos and talk about and design a system/programs that meet the needs of kids (in terms of success and transition to college/work) can make all kinds of great things happen.*

Leadership matters.

Everyone agreed that leadership matters. Leaders of national career technical education reform movements stated unequivocally that state leadership is the key to successful implementation. The NAVE report said, *"States hold the key to achieving vocational education reform at a pace and scale sufficient to affect national workforce quality."*

When directors were asked how their role has changed, the dominant theme was that of politicization of education. Many directors experienced changes in governance structures, mergers of agencies, and new players, particularly workforce boards. Although some had reduced roles in the organizational hierarchy, others assumed broader roles, including responsibility for high school education and merged higher education systems. Another theme was increased collaboration with partners from business and industry, workforce development, secondary and postsecondary systems, academic and technical education, and economic development.

The change agendas of the directors of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories are remarkably consistent. Those agendas reflect and support the vision statement of the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education and the policy direction of the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education. That is, career technical education is an essential component of the total educational system, offering career-oriented benefits for all students. Career technical education is a critical and integral component of the workforce development system, providing the essential foundations for a thriving economy. Most directors referenced policy and research from the National Centers for Career and Technical Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, as well as models of best practice such as High Schools That Work and career academies as a basis for their change agendas.

Priorities for change agendas were integration of career technical education in the total mission of education, building strong workforce, economic development, and education partnerships; integration of academic and technical education, business industry certifications, accountability, secondary-postsecondary articulation, expansion of career technical education, and increasing funding.

The dominant theme for the desired future direction for career technical education state leaders is leading change. Two strands emerged in the data analysis of this theme: (1) leading change in the system of career technical education—positioning it in state education reform initiatives and in state workforce development systems and (2) being an instructional leader with a deep commitment to quality in teaching and learning, an understanding of promising strategies, and most important, the ability to make it happen in schools. Leaders need the ability to advocate and motivate for change as well as the skills to design and implement strategies for improving the quality of teaching and learning.

Making change happen also requires political savvy and the willingness to take risks in a bureaucracy. *"Only strong leadership at the state level can bridge the gap between national*

policymakers/administrators and local practitioners to energize change and drive needed reform," according to Hull.

Part II identifies a set of knowledge and skills needed for career technical education leaders and recommended criteria for leadership development programs and delivery strategies. The data from the literature, surveys, and interviews supported the need for a leadership development program that includes a foundation of a structured curriculum phase; a bridging phase including strategies such as simulations, case studies, self-assessments; a practicum through structured and monitored experiences in actual settings; and a practice phase with the opportunity to grow while employed in a leadership role. These phases are not necessarily progressive; they may occur simultaneously and cyclically.

The leadership models make a strong case for structuring a cohort system with a continuous system of networking. Part II concluded with a set of recommendations for developing state leaders for career technical education, including a convening role for the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium.

Future role for career technical education leaders: Leading change and being an instructional leader

Major recommendations are—

1. To communicate the "value added" of state leadership for career technical education

2. To advocate with state and federal policymakers to provide resources for state-level leadership and leadership development

3. To encourage state policymakers and agency heads to assess the authority levels of state directors to ensure that they can convene business, education, and workforce and economic development entities, make decisions, speak on behalf of career technical education and impact state policy

4. To communicate the consensus among state directors on the vision and mission for career technical education

5. For the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education to convene related organizations, including the National Centers for Career and Technical Education and the American Association of Community Colleges, to address the need for developing state leaders for career technical education

6. For leadership development programs to build a curriculum based on mission and future directions, particularly leading change, becoming an instructional leader and advocacy in a political system

7. For leadership development programs to provide a continuum of experiences, including formal classroom instruction, bridging or simulation and case study activities; internships; and on-the-job support and mentorships

8. For leadership development programs to include a cohort system design with structured networking throughout the program

One of the tenets of Stephen Covey's leadership theory (Covey, Merrill & Merrill, 1994) is to begin with the end in mind. What is the final test of leaders? The answer is that leaders leave behind them those with the will and ability to carry on. Leaders who are clear about mission and who possess the skills to make it happen are the best hope for the future of career technical and adult education. Strong state leadership is a cornerstone for the success of the enterprise of career technical education.

Strong state leadership is a cornerstone for the success of the enterprise of career technical education.

References

Barkley, S. (2001). *Leadership matters: Building leadership capacity*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boesel, D. & McFarland, L. (1994). *National assessment of vocational education final report to Congress*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Office of Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 371 191)

Bridges. E. M. (1992). *Problem-based learning for administrators*. Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 617)

Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998. Public Law 105-332. Washington, DC: U.S. Congress.

Council of Chief State School Officers (2001). *State action for education leadership project: State policy & practice compendium*. Washington, DC: CSSO.

Covey, S. R., Merrill, A. R. & Merrill, R. R. (1994). *First things first*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Finch, C. & Gregson, J. (1990). *Resources for leadership development: Concepts, criteria, and examples*. Paper presented for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education conference on Preparing Leaders in Vocational Education, Las Vegas, NV, April 25-28, 1990.

Finch, C., Gregson, J. & Reneau, C. (1992). *Vocational education leadership development resources: Selection and application*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349 471)

Grubb, N. et al. (1999). *Toward order from chaos: State efforts to reform workforce development systems*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 427 172)

Houston, P. (2001, February). Superintendents for the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling. *Phi Delta Kappan* 82(6), 428-433.

Institute for Educational Leadership (2001a). *Leadership for student learning: Recognizing the state's role in public education. Report of the Task Force on State Leadership.* Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Institute for Educational Leadership (2001b). *Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership. Report of the Task Force on School District Leadership.* Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Lambrecht, J., Hopkins, C., Moss, J., Finch, C., Crane, E., & Bruce, C. (1997). *Importance of on-the-job experiences in developing leadership capabilities.* Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 413 462)

Lusi, S. F. (1997). *The role of state departments of education in complex school reform.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Maslin-Ostrowski, P. & Ackerman, R. (1997). *A case for stories: Toward further understanding of situated knowledge and practice.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago IL, March 24-28, 1997. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408 265)

Milstein, M. M. (1993). *Changing the way we prepare educational leaders: The Danforth experience.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Moss, J., Johansen, B. & Preskill, H. (1991). Developing the leader attributes inventory: An odyssey. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education,* 28(2), 7-22.

Moss, J. & Liang, T. (1990). *Leadership, leadership development and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.* Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325 645)

Murphy, J. (2001). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for school leaders *AASA Professor,* 24(2), 2-8.

Murphy, L. (1990, Spring). Women in vocational education leadership positions: Their backgrounds and experience. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education,* 6(2), 23-34.

National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education (2001). *Career and technical education: An essential component of the total educational system.* Washington, DC: NASDCTE.

National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education (2001). *Leadership Institute program brochure.*

Ohio Department of Education (2001). *Improving the mentoring process in the Ohio Career-Technical Education Leadership Institute.* Unpublished.

Olson, L. (2000). Policy focus converges on leadership. *Education Week,* January 12, 2000.

Olson, L. (2001). Grant program aims to nurture school leaders. *Education Week,* January 10, 2001, pp. 1, 17.

Peters, R. (1987). *A case study of three states identified as having a high-quality state vocational education system.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Peterson, J. (2001). Presentation to National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education, Washington DC, May 1, 2001,

Schultz, T. (1997). *Hearings on Vocational and Technical Education.* Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives. June 5, 1997, 105-39.

Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Southern Illinois University (1975). *EPDA Leadership Development Program. Final report.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 117 356)

Stitt-Gohdes, W. (1993). A follow-up study of 1983, 1987, and 1990 vocational education doctoral graduates of University Council for Vocational Education Colleges/Universities. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 18*(4), 81-103.

Unger, P. V. (1988). A follow-up on EPDA Fellows. *Vocational Education Journal,* 63 (8), 26-28.

United States Department of Education (1994). *National Assessment of Vocational Education: Interim report to Congress.* Washington, DC: USDE, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Office of Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 369 929)

Wirth, A. G. (1972). *Education in the technological society: The vocational-liberal studies controversy in the early twentieth century.* Scranton, PA: Intext Educational Publishers.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A
Interview Sources

The following persons were interviewed and/or responded by e-mail.

Piers Bateman, President, CCI Publishing, CORD, Waco, TX

Irmgard Berry, Education Program Specialist, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Richard Blais, Executive Director, Project Lead the Way, Clifton Park, NY

Barbara Border, Director, Education Leadership Consultants, Phoenix, AZ

Gene Bottoms, Senior Vice President, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA

Betsy Brand, Co-Director, American Youth Policy Forum, former Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Charles Buzzell, Former Executive Director, American Vocational Association and Assistant Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Milo, ME

Ron Castaldi, Director, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Charlotte Coomer, Assistant Director, Career Pathways, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, OH

Joseph Crowley, Director, Chariho Career and Technical Center, Wood River Junction, RI

Jim Dick, CEO, Career Communications, Inc., Overland Park, KS

Carmen Gonzalez, Assistant Secretary, Technological Education, Department of Education, San Juan, Puerto Rico

Don Gray, President and CEO, Automotive Youth Excellence Systems, Troy, MI

James Gregson, Division Director, Adult, Counselor, Technology Education, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID

Gisela Harkin, Career Development Program Officer, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Susan Henson, Director, Technical Assistance, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA

Ric Hernandez, Chief, Program Improvement Branch, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Scott Hess, Education Program Specialist, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Barbara Hinton, Professor and Department Head, Department of Vocational and Adult Education, College of Education and Health Professions, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR

Gary Hoachlander, President, MPR Associates, Inc., Berkeley, CA

Dan Hull, President and CEO, CORD, Waco, TX

Jack Jennings, Director, Center on Education Policy, Former General Counsel for the Education and Labor Committee, United States House of Representatives, Washington, DC

Frank Lanford, Director, Hamilton Career Center, Seneca, SC

Timothy Lawrence, Executive Director, SkillsUSA-VICA, Leesburg, VA

Christopher Lyons, Education Program Specialist, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Maria Martin, Technological Education, Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Ron McCage, Executive Director, V-TECS, Atlanta, GA

Floyd McKinney, Director, National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education, Columbus, OH

Peter McWalters, Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, Providence RI

Laura Messenger, Education Program Specialist, Program Improvement Branch, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

W.R. Miller, Assistant Vice President for Development, Auburn University, AL

Robert Muller, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Joseph Murphy, President, Ohio Principals Leadership Academy, Columbus, OH

Barbara Orwig, President/Publisher, Career Communications, Inc., Overland Park, KS

Ray Ryan, President and CEO, National Occupational Competency Testing Institute, Big Rapids, MI

Vickie Schray, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC

Byrl Shoemaker, former State Director, Division of Vocational and Adult Education, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, OH

Cathy Stasz, Senior Behavioral Scientist, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA

Lawrence Zane, Professor Emeritus, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI

Appendix B
Survey–State Directors

1. Name

2. State

3. Who employs you?

4. Do you have direct responsibility (other than flowing Perkins funds) for
   Secondary education?
   Postsecondary—community colleges?
   Postsecondary—adult education?

5. How many years have you been a state director?

6. How many years was your predecessor a state director?

7. What were your major jobs before becoming a state director?

8. How has the state director role changed in your state in the past five to ten years?

9. How would you describe your "change" agenda—i.e., what you would like to accomplish as state director? What do you want as your legacy as state director?

10. What recommendations do you have for preparing state leaders for career technical education?

Appendix C

Critical Elements for Danforth Foundation Program

(Milstein, 1993)

1. Program champions to guide a leadership development process—individuals who are firm believers, effective organizers, with the commitment and energy to implement change.

2. Partnerships within the university, central office personnel, and site-based administrators to achieve a common understanding of purposes and processes.

3. Purposeful selection of candidates with high potential. The report notes that education can learn from other professionals, such as medicine, and law, which understand the importance of controlling entrance to the field. They also promote identification of racial and ethnic minority candidates.

   Traditional criteria rated candidates on academic potential. The report notes that these criteria may not be helpful in establishing their potential as leaders. Rather, leaders are measured by their sense of purpose, ability to get others engaged with them as they translate purposes, manage the enterprise, and intervene when require to keep the system on target. These qualities may be best measured by past leadership behaviors, ability to communicate an educational platform, and response in leadership situations.

4. Flexible delivery of the "academic" content based on principles of adult learning—interactive learning, tapping instructional talent of educational administrators in the field, flexible time blocks, alternative locations.

5. Internships that require sufficient time-on-task in challenging situations. The foundation encourages multiple field experiences and cross-district internships. Mentor and field supervisor roles should be clarified with sufficient site visits. Results must be meaningfully evaluated. Opportunities for reflection time and scheduled time to share reflection.

6. Organization and structure for cohort development, considered to be one of the mainstays of the Danforth leadership development programs. Cohort development promotes support systems and networking among members of the student group and encourages long-term support systems. The cohort approach provides a model of how schools can be transformed into adult learning communities.

7. Risk capital must be obtained. All partners who benefit should expect to share the resource burden.

8. Leadership development programs should be institutionalized.

Appendix D
Ohio Career-Technical Education Leadership Institute (OCTELD

The specific goals of OCTELI are to:

1. Ensure an *adequate number* of high quality leaders with a commitment to the profession.
2. Ensure *continuity* of administrative leadership
3. Ensure high-level administrator *performance, cost efficiency and compliance* with relevant standards and regulations in program operations.
4. Contribute "*intellectual capital*" to the state career technical education programs.
5. Prepare career technical education "*statesmen*" who are both competent and comfortable in a variety of settings and jurisdictions.
6. Provide the state office of career technical education with a *quick response network* that will rapidly mobilize talent, provide useful inputs, and marshal political support on key issues.
7. Provide a *policy advisory network* to the office of career technical education by serving as a "sounding board" for policy options and program initiatives in the formative stages.

The 12-month institute features four basic components: (1) 10 monthly weekend seminars; (2) the development of an Individual Strategic plan (3) mentoring to achieve the necessary competencies desired through the Individual Strategic Plan; and (4) network development among the Fellows.

Participants are also expected to attend the Association for Career and Technical Association (ACTE) National Policy Seminar in Washington, the Conference for Career-Technical and Adult Education in Ohio, and the ACTE Convention. Each institute session involves outside consultants who focus on fundamental concepts and issues that will ensure insight into the dimensions of the operation, maintenance, and redesign of career-focused career technical education programs. Each session focuses on policy and the future to provide the breadth and depth necessary to understand how current trends and issues influence program and policy. Participants are expected to read at least six books. OCTELI Fellows rate the mentorship component highly, noting the opportunities for networking opportunities and learning from an experienced leader in the field were invaluable.

(Ohio Department of Education, 2001)

Appendix E
National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education Leadership Institute

Participants in the Leadership Institute will engage in activities enabling them to be effective leaders, to understand change processes, to influence policy development at local, state, and federal levels, and to lead reform efforts. Participants in the Leadership Institute will be known as National Career and Technical Education Scholars.

The Leadership Institute Scholars will—

1. Develop an Individual Leadership Development Plan
2. Participate in four national meetings
3. Engage in scheduled biweekly meetings via distance technology
4. Complete assigned readings
5. Engage in discussions with current leaders
6. Engage in approved mentorship experience
7. Engage in an approved internship
8. Participate in evaluation efforts of The National Institute.

As a result of participating in the National Leadership Institute, the scholars will—

1. Develop an understanding of the role of a leader and how to exercise the responsibilities inherent in that role
2. Improve their understanding of and ability to lead reform/change processes
3. Develop/improve ability to influence policymaking at the local, state, and national levels
4. Develop skills in interpreting and using research findings and evaluation information to improve programs and develop new initiatives
5. Increase knowledge of the legislative process and learn how to impact that process
6. Develop an understanding regarding the political and financial challenges of planning and implementing programs

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

CE082797

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: State Leadership for Career-Technical Education: Role and Nature of State Leadership; Developing Leaders	
Author(s): Joanna Kister	
Corporate Source: National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium	Publication Date: 2001

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Joanna Kister	Printed Name/Position/Title: Joanna Kister
Organization/Address: 444 N. Capitol St. NW - Suite 830 Washington DC 20001	Telephone: 614-451-1306 FAX: 614-488-9505
	E-Mail Address: jkister@pager.llc.com Date: 2-11-02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Cheryl Grossman
Processing Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: