

The background of the slide features a large, faint, circular seal of the U.S. Department of Education. The seal contains the text "DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION" at the top and "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" at the bottom, separated by two stars. In the center of the seal is a detailed illustration of an acorn with its cap and a small plant growing from it, surrounded by leaves and branches.

U.S. Department of Education

**Consortia Formation and
Characteristics Under the *Carl D.
Perkins Career and Technical
Education Act of 2006***

This page intentionally left blank

Consortia Formation and Characteristics Under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*

Prepared for the
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education

**National Center for Innovation
in Career and Technical Education**

BY

Sandra Staklis

Steve Klein

RTI INTERNATIONAL

DECEMBER 2014

This report was produced under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. ED-VAE-12-C0051 with RTI International. Carolyn Lee served as the contractor's officer representative. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education

Arne Duncan

Secretary

Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education

Johan E. Uvin

Acting Assistant Secretary

December 2014

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, *Consortia Formation and Characteristics Under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*. Washington, D.C., 2014.

This report is available on the Department's website at: <http://cte.ed.gov> and on the National Center for Innovation in Career and Technical Education's website at: <http://ctecenter.ed.gov/index.php/page/our-research>.

Requests for documents in alternative formats such as Braille or large print should be submitted to the Alternate Format Center by calling 202-260-0852 or by contacting the 504 coordinator via email at: om_eeos@ed.gov.

If you have difficulty understanding English, you may request language assistance services for Department information that is available to the public. These language assistance services are available free of charge. If you need more information about interpretation or translation services, please call 1-800-USA-LEARN (1-800-872-5327) (TTY: 1-800-437-0833), or email us at Ed.Language.Assistance@ed.gov. Or write to U.S. Department of Education, Information Resource Center, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202.

Content Contact: Carolyn Lee at Carolyn.Lee@ed.gov



CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Tables	iv
Acknowledgments.....	v
Abbreviations	vii
Executive Summary.....	ix
Scale of Consortia Formation.....	x
Approaches to Consortia Formation.....	xii
Introduction	1
Background	3
Methodology and Data Sources	5
National Assessment of Career and Technical Education	5
State Five-Year Plans and Consolidated Annual Report Narratives.....	6
Interviews with State CTE Staff.....	6
Study Limitations.....	6
<i>Perkins IV Title I Consortia Financing and Organization</i>	9
Subgrant Allocations to Local Providers	9
Consortia Formation: Secondary.....	11
Postsecondary Consortia.....	18
The Organization of <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> Consortia	21
Category 1—Cross-Level Consortia.....	22
Category 2—Near-Universal Consortia.....	25
Category 3—Majority Consortia	26
Category 4—Limited Consortia	27
Other Approaches to Promoting Collaboration.....	29
Conclusion.....	33
Bibliography	35



LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1: Number and percentage of <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> secondary subgrantees, average grade eight to 12 enrollments, and total number and percentage of grade eight to 12 students enrolled overall, by consortia membership status: Program year 2009–10.....	11
Table 2: Total number of secondary subgrantees, number of secondary consortia, number and percentage of secondary subgrantees participating in consortia, and percentage of state secondary funds distributed through consortia in states with reporting secondary <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> consortia: Program year 2009–10.....	12
Table 3: Number and percentage of secondary <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> subgrantees by location and percentage of students receiving and eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, by consortia membership status: Program year 2009–10	14
Table 4: Amount and percentage of <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> secondary subgrantee allocations, by location and consortia membership status: Program year 2009–10	15
Table 5: <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> grants awarded in states reporting 10 or more consortia, by consortia size range, and by average, median, minimum and maximum award amounts: Program year 2009–10	16
Table 6: Number of secondary <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> subgrantees participating in consortia, the number and percentage of participating subgrantees with allocations of \$15,000 or more, and the number and percentage of consortia members in rural areas, by states with 10 or more consortia: Program year 2009–10.....	17
Table 7: Number and percentage of postsecondary consortia members, number of postsecondary consortia, consortia size range, and average and median consortia grant amounts, by states reporting postsecondary <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> consortia grants: Program year 2009–10.....	19
Table 8: Number and percentage of postsecondary consortia members with allocations above the minimum threshold (\$50,000) and amount and percentage of postsecondary <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> funds directed to those consortia, by state: Program year 2009–10	20
Table 9: Types of <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> consortia that include secondary subgrantees, by state.....	21



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the preparation of this report, Dr. Patrick Ainsworth and Dr. Ivan Charner provided valuable feedback on earlier drafts.



This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS

AMTEC	Automotive Manufacturing Technical Education Collaborative
ATE	National Science Foundation’s Advanced Technological Education
CAR	Consolidated Annual Report
CCD	Common Core of Data
CTE	career and technical education
Department	U.S. Department of Education
EFE	Education for Employment Regional System
ESEA	<i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965</i> , as amended
ESU	education service unit
FY	federal fiscal year
IHE	institution of higher education
IPEDS	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
LEA	local educational agency
NACTE	National Assessment of Career and Technical Education
<i>Perkins II</i>	<i>Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990</i> , as amended
<i>Perkins III</i>	<i>Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998</i>
<i>Perkins IV</i>	<i>Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006</i>
POS	programs of study
PY	program year
state plan	five-year state plan
WIA	<i>Workforce Investment Act of 1998</i>

This page intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (*Perkins IV*) sets a minimum allocation requirement that secondary and postsecondary career and technical education (CTE) subgrantees must achieve to receive federal financing. An eligible recipient with an allocation below the funding threshold may obtain a state waiver in some instances that qualifies it to participate as a stand-alone subgrantee, or an eligible recipient may enter into a consortium with other subgrantees.¹ A consortium's funds must be used for purposes and programs that are mutually beneficial to all of its members; *Perkins IV* prohibits the reallocation of funds for uses benefiting only one member.²

Congress authorized the consortia provision to enable small or rural applicants to access federal funds sufficient to support quality CTE programming.³ Consortia are more prevalent at the secondary level than at the postsecondary level, in part due to the smaller size of secondary subgrantees, the need for a local educational agency (LEA) and either an area CTE school or an educational service agency to fund such an entity that serves the LEA⁴, and the comparatively larger number of secondary entities applying for funding. Consortia formation also tends to be level-specific. With the exception of two states that require or encourage secondary and postsecondary representation, they are composed exclusively of either secondary or postsecondary subgrantees.

This formation of consortia comprised exclusively of secondary or postsecondary subgrantees may be a function of the *Perkins IV* statutory scheme. Grant allocation formulas⁵ are contained within different sections of *Perkins IV* and offer no explicit options

¹ "Funding threshold" or "minimum funding threshold" in this report means the minimum allocation requirement of \$15,000 for secondary subgrantees, referenced in Sec. 131(c) of *Perkins IV*; and the minimum grant amount for postsecondary subgrantees of \$50,000, referenced in Sec. 132(c) of *Perkins IV*. See Sec. 131(c) and Sec. 132(a)(4) of *Perkins IV*, respectively.

² See Sec. 131(f)(2) and Sec. 132(c)(3) of *Perkins IV*.

³ The provision also provides the option for subgrantees located in rural or sparsely populated areas, and public charter schools that demonstrate an inability to enter a consortium, to apply for waivers. See Sec. 132(a)(4).

⁴ See Sec. 131(e) of *Perkins IV*.

⁵ See Sec. 131(a)(1) and Sec. 132(a)(2) of *Perkins IV*.



for distributing combined funding. States must allocate the majority⁶ of funds based on the student populations served by the subgrantees, which may contribute to a perception that funds are intended only for those enrolling within a given educational level.

Educators and policy makers are increasingly recognizing that programs connecting CTE secondary and postsecondary education benefit students (Adelman 2006; Hughes, Rodriguez, Edwards, and Belfield 2012; Ng, Wolf-Wendel, and Lombardi 2012), with some states and federal policy proposals encouraging this collaboration. Notably, the U.S. Department of Education's *Investing in America's Future: A Blueprint for Transforming Career and Technical Education* proposes distributing future federal CTE funding to consortia that include both educational levels (U.S. Department of Education 2012). The intended outcome is to strengthen the connections between secondary and postsecondary recipients of federal CTE grants by breaking down funding silos that could inhibit collaboration.

This report describes the prevalence of *Title I* consortia under *Perkins IV*, examines the characteristics of these entities, and explores whether and how they promote collaboration between and across secondary and postsecondary educational levels. The data and analysis findings included in this report draw on data collected for the National Assessment of Career and Technical Education (NACTE), information contained within states' *Perkins IV* five-year state plans (state plans), and interviews with state CTE directors. The examples of consortia organization and operations illustrated in the text should not be generalized to all of the states and consortia included in the analytical categories presented.

SCALE OF CONSORTIA FORMATION

The analysis of consortia formation revealed the following information about the prevalence of consortia nationwide and the configuration and financing of these entities within states.

- *Consortia were more prevalent at the secondary than the postsecondary level*—At the secondary level, nearly three-fifths (59 percent) or 5,570 of the 9,385 subgrantees that received funding in program year (PY) 2009–10 participated in *Perkins IV* as consortia members (table 1). Nationwide, 32 states provided funds to at least one secondary consortium (table 2), compared to just 10 states that

⁶ A state is not required to use the formulas in *Perkins IV* to distribute its *Title I* funds that it reserves (not more than 10 percent of the funds for local subgrantees), pursuant to Sec. 112(a) and (c) of *Perkins IV*, nor is a state required to use the formula if it distributes less than 15 percent of its *Title I* funds for either secondary or postsecondary programs, pursuant to Sec. 133(a) of *Perkins IV*, if the state uses a competitive or alternative basis to distribute funds more equitably to programs serving the areas of greatest economic need.

reported funding postsecondary consortia (table 7).⁷ At the postsecondary level, the 191 consortia members accounted for roughly 16 percent of the 1,197 postsecondary *Perkins IV* subgrantees in that year (Klein et al. 2014).

- *On average, secondary consortia members enrolled fewer students than stand-alone subgrantees*—For grades eight to 12, consortia members enrolled an average of 708 students, compared with an average of 3,110 students in stand-alone subgrantees (table 1). The difference in enrollments between the two groups suggests that the consortia provision, in accordance with legislative intent, is largely applied to small secondary subgrantees with allocations below the minimum allocation requirement.
- *Secondary consortia members are concentrated in rural areas*—Rural secondary subgrantees tend to be located in areas with smaller populations than suburban and urban subgrantees, which affects their ability to achieve the minimum allocation requirement. Rural secondary subgrantees accounted for just over one-half (55 percent) of 9,385 *Perkins IV* subgrantees, but nearly two-thirds (66 percent) of 5,570 consortia members in PY 2009–10 (table 3).
- *Secondary consortia members enrolled proportionately fewer students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches*—Some 40 percent of the 9,460,800 students who attended subgrantees in consortia were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, compared with 51 percent of the 30,865,600 students enrolled in stand-alone subgrantees (table 3).⁸
- *Not all consortia members had allocations below the minimum allocation requirement*—In all of the states with 10 or more consortia, consortia included a mix of secondary subgrantees with grants under and over the minimum allocation requirement (table 6).
- *Consortia received 22 percent of Perkins Title I grants allocated to the secondary level*—In PY 2009–10, consortia grants accounted for about 22 percent of the total reported *Perkins IV* subgrantee allocations at the secondary level (or about \$129 million of the \$580 million allocated to secondary subgrantees) (table 4). Rural subgrantees accounted for 29 percent of the \$129 million that was allocated to consortia members, but 17 percent of the \$450 million allocated to subgrantees that were not consortia members.

⁷ The data reported and analyzed in this report include secondary data collected for the NACTE study for 49 states and the District of Columbia. Data for Delaware and postsecondary consortia allocation data for Indiana and New York were not submitted.

⁸ Percentages represent the number of students at any grade level attending school districts in the areas of the subgrantees who were eligible for a free and reduced-price lunch.

APPROACHES TO CONSORTIA FORMATION

The composition, operation, and financing of consortia vary across and within states. Some states have few locally-directed consortia that operate with minimal state guidance, whereas in other states all or nearly all *Perkins IV* subgrantees are consortia members, state participation and consortia follow state guidance requirements. States with *Perkins* consortia fall into one of four categories:

- *Category 1: Cross-Level Consortia*—Two states, or 4 percent of the 49 states included in this study, either require (Minnesota) or encourage (Oregon) consortia to include both secondary and postsecondary subgrantees. Consortia members collaborate on the development and implementation of joint local plans that detail how funds will be used to support and improve CTE programs offered at both the secondary and postsecondary educational levels.
- *Category 2: Near-Universal Consortia*—Five states, or 10 percent of the states in this study, allocate virtually all secondary grant funds to regional consortia comprised of secondary subgrantees. These include Indiana, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, which require consortia engagement for all secondary subgrantees, and Illinois and Michigan, which fund consortia for all but two large urban districts located in the Chicago area⁹ and Detroit, respectively.
- *Category 3: Majority Consortia*—Consortia in 13 states, which comprise roughly 27 percent of the states in this study, accounted for at least 59 percent but not more than 94 percent of their states' secondary subgrantees in PY 2009–10 (table 2). Consortia in these states are composed exclusively of either secondary or postsecondary subgrantees.
- *Category 4: Limited Consortia*—Twelve states, or roughly 24 percent of the states included in this study, had secondary consortia that engaged 1 to 40 percent of secondary subgrantees (table 2).

While consortia formation itself will not guarantee connections among members, engaging secondary and postsecondary CTE subgrant recipients in joint planning assures that some communication will take place across educational levels. Input from state directors suggests that when states provide opportunities for secondary and postsecondary consortia members to meet, it also enables them to connect with other stakeholders, such as representatives from business and industry. State directors also noted that these opportunities particularly

⁹ The “Chicago area” for the purpose of this report refers to the J. Sterling Morton High School District and the Chicago Public Schools.

benefit rural and small secondary subgrantees with limited staff and remote locations that can impede connections with employers.

Encouraging and supporting collaboration among CTE providers and stakeholders need not occur through the formation of consortia alone. Although study activities focused on consortia formed to allocate federal funds under *Title I* of *Perkins IV*, states and stakeholder organizations have also developed other networks that encourage collaboration in CTE. These include systems for cooperation between and among educational levels that are organized through regional CTE service providers, community college-directed efforts for adult learners, and employer-led initiatives to connect CTE with industry needs. In contrast to the consortia discussed in this report, these arrangements reflect the varied ways that CTE is organized across states, rather than the *Perkins IV* requirements.

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

In its publication *Investing in America's Future: A Blueprint for Transforming Career and Technical Education*, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) called for distributing *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)* funds to consortia composed of both local educational agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary institutions (U.S. Department of Education 2012). Consortium would, at a minimum, include LEAs (with at least one that serves high concentrations of students from low-income families) and postsecondary institutions that offer two-year degrees. The proposal is intended to (1) strengthen connections between secondary and postsecondary recipients of federal career and technical education (CTE) grants, in part, by breaking down funding silos that could inhibit collaboration across educational levels; (2) facilitate student transitions from one level/system to another; and (3) help secondary students prepare for postsecondary education and careers.

Perkins IV mandates generally that states distribute no less than 85 percent of their *Title I* (basic) grant funds to subgrantees providing organized CTE activities¹⁰ at the secondary and postsecondary educational levels.¹¹ To receive a distribution, a subgrantee must exceed a minimum funding threshold¹² of \$15,000 at the secondary level or \$50,000 at the postsecondary level.¹³ States calculate allocations using statutorily required formulas¹⁴ that account for the number and characteristics of youths residing within a secondary subgrantee's service boundaries or, for postsecondary subgrantees, the number of federal educational financial aid recipients enrolled. An applicant for *Perkins IV* funds with an estimated subgrant amount below the minimum funding thresholds may be eligible for a

¹⁰ See Sec. 3(5) of *Perkins IV*.

¹¹ States and outlying areas with small grants are an exception to the requirement that a state distribute 85 percent to the local level because they may use up to \$250,000 for state administration under Sec. 112(a)(3) of *Perkins IV*.

¹² "Funding thresholds" or "minimum funding thresholds" in this report means the minimum allocation requirement for secondary subgrantees in Sec. 131(c) of *Perkins IV* and the minimum grant amount for postsecondary subgrantees in Sec. 132(c) of *Perkins IV*.

¹³ See Secs. 131(c) and 132(c) of *Perkins IV*.

¹⁴ A state is not required to use the formula in *Perkins IV* to distribute its *Title I* funds that it reserves (not more than 10 percent of the funds for local subgrantees), pursuant to Sec. 112(a) and (c) of *Perkins IV*, or if it distributes less than 15 percent of its *Title I* funds for either secondary or postsecondary programs, pursuant to Sec. 133(a) of *Perkins IV*, if it uses a competitive or alternative basis to distribute funds more equitably to programs serving the areas of greatest economic need.

state waiver¹⁵ to operate as a stand-alone subgrantee, or to enter into a consortium with one or more other subgrantees, in order to achieve the funding thresholds.¹⁶

Consortia must direct *Perkins IV* funds to activities that mutually benefit all members. *Perkins IV* specifically prohibits using funds to benefit a single member or granting the funds back to consortia members for their individual use.¹⁷ Consortia also are subject to the same required and permissible uses of funds, as well as expectations for reporting, as individual subgrantees.¹⁸

This report describes the prevalence of *Title I* consortia under *Perkins IV*, examines the characteristics of these organizations, and explores whether and how consortia promote partnerships among participating members at the secondary and postsecondary levels. It aims to inform *Perkins IV* reauthorization discussions and, in particular, the design of federal policies governing consortia formation in CTE. Lessons learned from an examination of state practices may also help inform federal efforts to promote the development of statewide career pathway systems that align CTE with other educational and social service programs.¹⁹ These approaches emphasize building partnerships and coordinating funds and programmatic offerings across providers to facilitate students' seamless transitions between educational levels, and from both levels into the workforce.

¹⁵ A state must grant a waiver of the secondary threshold to an LEA in a rural, sparsely populated area, or to a public charter school operating a secondary CTE program if such an entity demonstrates, pursuant to Sec. 131(c)(2) of *Perkins IV*, that it is unable to enter into a consortium for purposes of providing CTE activities under *Title I* of *Perkins IV*. Further, a state may grant a waiver under Sec. 132(a)(4) of *Perkins IV* for an eligible postsecondary entity located in a rural, sparsely populated area.

¹⁶ See Secs. 131(f) and 132(a)(3) of *Perkins IV*.

¹⁷ See Secs. 133(f)(2) and 132(a)(3)(B) of *Perkins IV*.

¹⁸ See generally Secs. 113(a)(4)(ii), 134, and 135 of *Perkins IV*.

¹⁹ Career pathways have been described and defined by the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in their April 4, 2012, joint Dear Colleague letter, found at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/ten-attachment.pdf>.

BACKGROUND

Federal policies governing the formation of consortia were introduced in the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990*, as amended (*Perkins II*), which fundamentally changed how CTE funds were distributed. Beginning with *Perkins II*, states generally were required to allocate 75 percent of their *Title I* funds predicated on the number of persons residing in a secondary subgrantee's boundaries or enrolling in a postsecondary subgrantee. The remaining funds were earmarked for the support of special populations and state administrative uses. At the secondary level, states generally had to distribute funds based on the number of youths residing in school districts served by LEAs, with 70 percent conditioned on the number of people living in poverty, 20 percent on the number of individuals with disabilities, and 10 percent on the total number enrolled. Postsecondary funds were to be allocated based on the number of Pell Grant recipients and recipients of assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs enrolled in CTE programs, the formula that is still used today.

Congress made minor adjustments to the basic grant distribution formula in its 1998 (*Perkins III*)²⁰ and 2006 (*Perkins IV*) reauthorizations. Today, under *Perkins IV*, states generally must distribute at least 85 percent of their *Title I* grant funds to secondary and postsecondary subgrantees. At the secondary level, *Perkins IV Title I* grants are distributed based on the number of youths, ages 5–17, residing within an LEA's service area, with 30 percent of the funds allocated based on the total number of persons and the remaining 70 percent based on the number of people living in poverty.²¹ As mentioned above, postsecondary funds are allocated based on the number of Pell Grant recipients and recipients of assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs enrolled in CTE programs meeting the requirements of *Perkins IV*.²² States determine how much of their funding is distributed to secondary, versus postsecondary, recipients.²³

Perkins II set a minimum allocation requirement of at least \$15,000 for secondary subgrantees and required those with allocations below that amount to enter consortia.²⁴ To accommodate small or rural secondary subgrantees, *Perkins II* allowed states to waive the minimum allocation requirement for those subgrantees in sparsely populated areas that could

²⁰ *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (Perkins III)*.

²¹ See Sec. 131(a) of *Perkins IV*.

²² See Sec. 132(a) of *Perkins IV*.

²³ See Sec. 122(c)(6) of *Perkins IV*.

²⁴ See Secs. 231(b)(1) and 232(c)(1), respectively, of *Perkins II*.

demonstrate that they could not enter into a consortium for providing services under the statute.²⁵ In 1993, Congress amended *Perkins II* to authorize consortia of postsecondary institutions with allocations below a required minimum allocation of \$50,000, and also limited the eligibility of such consortia to those providing services to all members and conducting programs of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective.²⁶

Perkins II was also noteworthy for launching the demonstration grant program,²⁷ Tech Prep. Tech Prep required states to offer programs that link the last two years of secondary schooling with at least two years of postsecondary education, with course work leading to the award of a two-year certificate or an associate's degree. The program included the requirement that states award grants to consortia made up of secondary and postsecondary subgrantees cooperating to design and sequence course offerings. Congress expanded support for the program in *Perkins III*, which incorporated Tech Prep as a separate title under which states received grants and awarded subgrants to eligible consortia. *Perkins IV* enhanced states' programmatic flexibility by giving them the option of consolidating all or a portion of their Tech Prep funds into their basic grant. A total of 26 states chose to fully merge their funding as of fiscal year (FY) 2010, with an additional state opting for a partial consolidation.²⁸

Beginning in FY 2011, Congress eliminated new appropriations for *Title II of Perkins IV* (Tech Prep Education). Although there is no longer separate funding under *Perkins IV* to support Tech Prep programs, states may use *Perkins IV Title I* funds, as well as nonfederal funds, to continue the work of their Tech Prep consortia to promote programs of study (POS) development. The POS requirement introduced in *Perkins IV* introduced a requirement, much like Tech Prep, intended to encourage secondary and postsecondary CTE program collaboration, mandating that each subgrantee offer at least one POS that links secondary and postsecondary CTE coursework.²⁹ In February 2010, the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education³⁰ released a nonregulatory guidance framework that described 10 recommended POS components.³¹ Since the development of POS requires secondary and postsecondary CTE programs to work together, consortia that include

²⁵ See Sec. 231(b)(2) of *Perkins II*.

²⁶ See Sec. 232(a)(2) of *Perkins II*.

²⁷ See Sec. 341 of *Perkins II*.

²⁸ The federal fiscal year begins on Oct. 1 and ends on Sept. 30 of the following calendar year. Years are referenced using the second calendar year. For example, FY 2010 encompasses the 12-month period between Oct. 1, 2009, and Sept. 30, 2010.

²⁹ See Sec. 135(b)(2) of *Perkins IV*.

³⁰ On Jan. 18, 2014, the name of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) was changed to the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE).

³¹ The nonregulatory guidance may be found at <http://cte.ed.gov/nationalinitiatives/rposdesignframework.cfm>.



subgrantees from both levels might provide a model for how states can develop similar arrangements.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

This report draws on data collected from a national study of CTE; states' *Perkins IV* five-year state plans (state plans) and narratives describing their intended uses of federal *Perkins IV* funds; and interviews with state CTE staff to assess the scope of consortia formation among states and the operational characteristics of these entities. The analysis focuses primarily on the participation of secondary subgrantees, given that relatively fewer postsecondary subgrantees used consortia to administer CTE programs for *Perkins IV*.

National Assessment of Career and Technical Education

This report uses fiscal allocation data collected for the National Assessment of Career and Technical Education (NACTE) to examine the extent of funding for consortia within each state in program year (PY) 2009–10.³² These data, provided by 49 states and the District of Columbia, include the dollar amounts allocated to each secondary and postsecondary subgrantee and an indication of whether each subgrantee was a member of a consortium.³³

NACTE fiscal data were matched with PY 2009–10 school- and district-level data from the Common Core of Data (CCD). The CCD data include information on subgrantees' grade eight to 12 enrollments, locations (urban, suburban, town, and rural), and student poverty levels, as measured by the number of students enrolled who were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

The PY 2009–10 data are the most recent *Perkins* allocation data that are currently available. To assess whether the number of consortia might have changed over time, the research team contacted state agency staff in the 22 states with 10 or more secondary consortia. These state staff reported few changes in the composition or number of consortia since the beginning of *Perkins IV*, noting that once formed, individual consortia tend to persist with the same members. State staff also confirmed that the numbers of consortia in existence in

³² The NACTE final report also includes analyses of *Perkins* consortia and other allocation issues. See U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service (2014), *National Assessment of Career and Technical Education: Final Report to Congress*. Washington, DC.

³³ Delaware did not submit allocation data in response to the NACTE data request. In addition, complete information on consortia membership was not available for all states. Information on territories and outlying areas is not included in this report. These areas include American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Republic of Palau, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.



PY 2013–14 were a close, if not exact, match to those from PY 2009–10. Differences typically involved the addition (or loss) of one or two consortia members.

State Five-Year Plans and Consolidated Annual Report Narratives

In PY 2008–09, each state submitted a five-year plan describing how it intended to meet the requirements of *Perkins IV*. Each plan included detailed information on state agency staffs' anticipated uses of *Perkins IV* state administrative and leadership funds, and how basic grant funds would be allocated to subgrantees. Plans also provided valuable information on the organization of consortia and guided the research team's follow-up consultations with state staff to update information contained within their plans.

In addition to the state plans and their updates, states are required to submit a narrative section as part of their Consolidated Annual Report (CAR). This narrative describes states' progress toward achieving the targets and goals identified in their plans. In some instances, these narratives provide updates or details on consortia activities that were not included in the original five-year state plan submissions. As with the NACTE fiscal data, the information included in these plans and narratives were three or more years old at the time of this study. State plan information dates back to PY 2008–09 and state narratives to PY 2009–10, the most recent available at the time of this writing.

Interviews with State CTE Staff

The research team conducted interviews with state CTE staff in 19 of the 22 states that reported 10 or more consortia in PY 2009–10. These interviews were conducted by the state CTE director, via telephone, in July and August of 2013, and additional state agency staff joined the calls, if needed, to address specific questions. Each interview took 30 to 60 minutes, with questions individually tailored to each state. No formal protocols were used.

Study Limitations

This study provides an overview of the prevalence of consortia in states, and offers examples of their organization and operations in states supporting ten or more consortia. The examples provided in the text are meant to be illustrative, but should not be generalized to all states or consortia in the categories described. In addition, the available information on the organization of *Perkins IV Title I* consortia is limited. As a result, this report relied on data drawn from states' required reports for *Perkins IV* and other state documentation in which consortia information was often incomplete. State directors provided supplementary interviews that, as with most self-reported interviews, could not be independently verified.



The quantitative data in this report are from PY 2009–10. Although feedback from the state directors contacted for this report indicated that consortia numbers have remained relatively constant over time, the same may not be true for all states. In addition, consortia membership information in the NACTE fiscal data was incomplete for some states. For example, consortia in Minnesota comprise both secondary and postsecondary subgrantees; however, the state reported consortia membership separately for each educational level. Other states indicated whether postsecondary subgrantees were consortia members in their data submissions, but did not provide data on the other institutions with which they partnered. These variations prevented the analysis of data on consortia sizes, median, and average grant amounts in four states.³⁴ Where appropriate, the report notes any data that reflect these variations.

³⁴ Analysis of consortia data for Minnesota and Oregon are limited to either secondary or postsecondary subgrantees. Data on postsecondary subgrantees were missing for Indiana and New York.

This page intentionally left blank

PERKINS IV TITLE I CONSORTIA FINANCING AND ORGANIZATION

The number of secondary and postsecondary subgrantees eligible for funding below the minimum funding thresholds in *Perkins IV* varied across states due to several factors. These included the size of the federal-to-state grant; the amount of *Perkins IV Title I* funds directed to the secondary and postsecondary educational levels; the number, size, and geographic distribution of subgrantees; and the characteristics of students residing within a secondary subgrantee's boundaries or enrolling in a postsecondary subgrantee's CTE program. Consequently, states vary significantly in the number of waivers granted, the number of consortia operating within states, and the proportion of *Perkins IV* subgrantees that are consortia members. The following section provides a summary of state financing and organization of consortia in PY 2009–10.

SUBGRANT ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL PROVIDERS

Perkins IV Title I allotments to states are based on a statutory formula that accounts for each state's share of the national population and its per capita income, relative to the national average.³⁵ Once a state receives its *Perkins IV Title I* funds, the state may make percentages of its allotment available to administer the *Perkins IV Title I* grant (not more than 5 percent

³⁵ The Department allocates funds to states, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, through a formula based on state per-capita income and population in three age cohorts (15–19, 20–24, and 25–65), pursuant to Sec. 111 of *Perkins IV*. This formula provides for a minimum state allocation of at least 0.5 percent of the total amount, and a “hold-harmless” provision in the formula ensures that no state's share of the appropriation is less than its share of the FY 1998 appropriation. A special provision limits the increase a state with an initial allocation of the 0.5 percent minimum may receive, resulting in a number of states that receive an allocation of less than 0.5 percent of the total. If appropriations result in the amount of funds for allocation to states exceeding the amount of funds allocated to states from the FY 2006 appropriation, up to one-third of the additional funds is to be allotted to states with FY 2006 grant awards that were less than the minimum 0.5 percent grant amount, and the remainder is to flow to the other states.

or \$250,000, whichever is greater³⁶) and to support state leadership activities (not more than 10 percent).³⁷

Funds earmarked for local subgrants are split between the secondary and postsecondary educational levels. States determine how to divide these funds between these two levels, and direct a majority of the funds to the secondary program level. In PY 2009–10, states allocated an average of 64 percent of *Perkins IV Title I* subgrant funds to secondary CTE programs, although this average masks considerable variation among states (Klein et al. 2014). For example, Ohio allocated 88 percent of subgrant funds to the secondary level, while California allocated just 38 percent of such funding to the secondary level.

States have two routes for responding to secondary and postsecondary applicants for *Perkins IV* funds that fall short of the \$15,000 and \$50,000 minimum funding thresholds, respectively. One is for the state to grant a waiver. States are required to grant waivers to secondary subgrantees located in rural, sparsely populated areas that are unable to enter into a consortium to provide activities under *Perkins IV*.³⁸ A state may also grant waivers to postsecondary subgrantees located in rural, sparsely populated areas.³⁹

These waiver provisions are designed to enable these smaller subgrantees that lack potential consortia partners to participate in *Perkins IV*. Montana, for example, issued waivers to all of its small rural schools that had allocations below the minimum allocation requirement (152 in PY 2008–09). The remaining 134 waivers reported in that year were spread across 21 states, and all but four issued waivers to 10 or fewer of their local secondary subgrantees (U.S. Department of Education 2014).

A second route is for subgrantees to form consortia. In PY 2009–10, 32 states had at least one secondary consortium (table 2) and 22 of these states had 10 or more (table 5). In contrast, just 10 states had consortia at the postsecondary level (table 7). Although *Perkins IV* does not preclude both secondary and postsecondary grantees from entering into a single consortium, in all but two states membership consisted exclusively of either secondary or postsecondary institutions.

³⁶ For some states, this could reduce the 85 percent that states are required to distribute to local subgrantees, which is discussed elsewhere in the report.

³⁷ See Sec. 112(a) of *Perkins IV*. The reserve funds are part of the funds that a state distributes to the local subgrantees, even though a state would not use the formulas in sections 131 and 132. See the reserve funding provision in Sec. 112(c) of *Perkins IV*.

³⁸ Sec. 131(c)(2) of *Perkins IV*. Similarly, a state also must grant a waiver to a secondary public charter school that demonstrates an inability to enter into a consortium for purposes of providing activities under *Perkins IV*.

³⁹ Sec. 132(a)(4) of *Perkins IV*.

Consortia Formation: Secondary

A total of 9,385 secondary subgrantees participated in *Perkins IV* in PY 2009–10, and nearly three-fifths (59 percent) participated as a member of a consortium (table 1).⁴⁰

Table 1: Number and percentage of *Perkins IV* Title I secondary subgrantees, average grade eight to 12 enrollments, and total number and percentage of grade eight to 12 students enrolled overall, by consortia membership status: Program year 2009–10

Consortia membership status	Total secondary subgrantees		Average grade eight–12 subgrantee enrollment*	Total number of grade eight–12 students enrolled*	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
All PY 2009–10 <i>Perkins IV</i> Title I secondary subgrantees	9,385	100	1,665	15,293,214	100
Not in consortia	3,815	41	3,110	11,545,370	75
Consortia members	5,570	59	708	3,747,844	25

* Calculations are based on the 2009–10 Common Core of Data.

NOTE: *Perkins IV* means the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*. PY means program year.

SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009; Common Core of Data Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v.2a), retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubschuniv.asp>.

Consortia members enrolled an average of 708 students in grades eight to 12, compared with an average of 3,110 students in independent subgrantees. Due to their relatively smaller size, consortia members enrolled just about one-quarter (25 percent) of the total grade eight to 12 students served by *Perkins IV* Title I fund recipients in PY 2009–10.

The number of secondary consortia in a state varied widely. Five states reported just one consortium (New Jersey, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Washington) and five states reported more than 50 consortia each (Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Texas) (table 2).

⁴⁰ Data are based on 49 states and the District of Columbia.

Table 2: Total number of secondary subgrantees, number of secondary consortia, number and percentage of secondary subgrantees participating in consortia, and percentage of state secondary funds distributed through consortia in states reporting secondary Perkins IV Title I consortia: Program year 2009–10

State	Total number of Perkins IV Title I secondary subgrantees	Total number of consortia	Secondary subgrantees participating in consortia		Percentage of state secondary Perkins IV Title I funds distributed through consortia
			Number	Percent	
Alabama	134	2	6	4	2
Arkansas	243	16	179	74	41
California	429	20	102	24	5
Colorado	157	14	108	69	13
Connecticut	116	6	28	24	5
Idaho	110	18	69	63	21
Illinois	485	52	483	100	65
Indiana	291	48	291	100	100
Iowa	361	49	327	91	49
Kansas	276	18	191	69	27
Kentucky	174	5	12	7	1
Massachusetts	81	2	11	14	3
Michigan	524	24	523	100	78
Minnesota	337	26	337	100	100
Mississippi	150	20	57	38	36
Missouri	449	60	418	93	67
Nebraska	254	15	233	92	34
New Hampshire	28	17	28	100	100
New Jersey	267	1	2	1	0
New Mexico	48	4	19	40	5
North Dakota	161	26	151	94	54
Oklahoma	427	59	311	73	26
Oregon	160	15	142	89	52
Pennsylvania	497	72	462	93	65
Rhode Island	38	10	38	100	100
South Dakota	156	21	140	90	51
Tennessee	136	1	25	18	9
Texas	939	52	554	59	7
Utah	38	1	2	5	0
Virginia	131	1	2	2	2
Washington	247	1	2	1	0
Wisconsin	365	30	317	87	40
Total	8209	706	5570	68	33

NOTE: States not listed did not report data on Perkins IV Title I secondary consortia in PY 2009–10. Perkins IV means the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006. The unrounded percentages of secondary subgrantees in consortia in Illinois and Michigan are 99.6 and 99.8 percent, respectively. Each state has large stand-alone districts (Chicago area [J. Sterling Morton High School District and the Chicago Public Schools] and Detroit, respectively) that account for the discrepancy between the percentage of secondary subgrantees in consortia and the percentage of state secondary Perkins IV Title I funds distributed through consortia.

SOURCE: Klein, Steven, Amanda Richards Sheil, Robin White, Sandra Staklis, Corinne Alfeld, Caitlin Rose Dailey, Ivan Charner, and Anne Poliakoff. 2014. *Evaluation of the Implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006: Finance, Accountability, and Programs of Study*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009.



Consortia accounted for 10 percent or less of subgrantees in Alabama, Kentucky, New Jersey, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. In contrast, six states—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island—formed consortia that included all or nearly all eligible subgrantees. These states organized their consortia by regions either to match the state’s approach to CTE programming or to overlap with other state workforce training regions. For example, Michigan allocates its secondary *Perkins IV* funds to consortia aligned with its *Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA)* funding system. Consortia and the state’s workforce development regions have the same secondary members.

In 12 states, less than 10 percent of basic grant funds supported consortia in PY 2009–10. These states also had relatively low numbers of consortia compared to the numbers of secondary subgrantees receiving *Perkins IV Title I* grants. For example, Kentucky reported that its five consortia accounted for 1 percent of all state secondary *Perkins IV Title I* funds distributed, with just 12 of 174 secondary subgrantees (7 percent) participating as consortia members. Nine additional states distributed 50 percent or less of their basic grant funding through consortia, with eight of these states reporting the majority of subgrantees (between 63–92 percent) as consortia members.

The secondary *Perkins IV Title I* allocation formula bases 30 percent of fund distributions on the number of youth aged 5–17 and 70 percent on the number of youth aged 5–17 from families with low-income residing within an LEA’s boundaries. LEAs in rural areas tend to have smaller populations and therefore might be expected to require lower grant allocations and be subject to the consortia provision unless the state waives this requirement. Analysis of state data from PY 2009–10 confirms that rural secondary subgrantees were more likely to be consortia members than those in other areas. While rural subgrantees accounted for just over one-half (55 percent of 9,385) of all *Perkins IV* subgrantees in PY 2009–10, nearly two-thirds (66 percent of 5,570) of consortia members were in rural areas (table 3). Urban and suburban/town subgrantees accounted for lower proportions of consortia members; for example, while urban subgrantees accounted for 7 percent of all subgrantees, they accounted for less than half that proportion (3 percent) of consortia members.

Consortia members also were, on average, somewhat less likely to enroll students eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch. Some 40 percent of students in school districts with membership in a consortium were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, compared with 51 percent of students attending stand-alone subgrantee schools (table 3). This difference indicates that subgrantees within consortia served students from higher-income families relative to other secondary subgrantees participating in *Perkins IV*.

The data show that subgrantees in urban and suburban/town areas serve relatively larger numbers of students and disadvantaged populations, and that these subgrantees are more

likely to meet the minimum funding requirement. Rural-area subgrantees, in contrast, tend to serve relatively smaller, less economically disadvantaged populations and also participate in consortia at a higher rate.

Table 3: Number and percentage of secondary Perkins IV Title I subgrantees by location and percentage of students receiving and eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, by consortia membership status: Program year 2009–10

Consortia membership status	Subgrantee location								Total enrolled	Percent enrolled eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch*
	Total		Urban		Suburban/town		Rural			
	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent		
All PY 2009–10 <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> secondary subgrantees	9,385	100	644	7	3,572	38	5,141	55	40,326,400	48
Not in consortia	3,815	100	479	13	1,833	48	1,491	39	30,865,600	51
Consortia members	5,570	100	165	3	1,739	31	3,650	66	9,460,800	40

* Includes all students enrolling in the district.

NOTE: *Perkins IV* means the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*. PY means program year.
SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009; Common Core of Data Local Educational Agency (School District) Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v. 2a) and Public Elementary/ Secondary School Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v.2a), retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubagency.asp>.

In PY 2009–10, about 20 percent of all funds were allocated to secondary subgrantees in rural areas (table 4). While rural subgrantees received 17 percent of funds distributed among subgrantees not in consortia, they accounted for 29 percent of funds distributed to subgrantees in consortia. The largest proportion of funds (49 percent) directed to consortia members went to subgrantees in suburban areas, while urban subgrantees accounted for 22 percent.

Table 4: Amount and percentage of Perkins IV Title I secondary subgrantee allocations, by location and consortia membership status: Program year 2009–10

Consortia membership status	Percent of funds directed to subgrantees in and out of consortia	Percentage of Perkins IV Title I funds allocated by secondary subgrantee location						Total	
		Urban		Suburban/town		Rural		Amount	Per-cent
		Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent		
All PY 2009–10 Perkins IV Title I secondary subgrantees	100	\$216,150,400	37	\$249,532,700	43	\$113,874,300	20	\$579,557,400	100
Not in consortia	78	187,743,600	42	186,128,800	41	76,473,500	17	450,345,800	100
Consortia members	22	28,406,800	22	63,403,900	49	37,400,900	29	129,211,600	100

NOTE: Perkins IV means the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006. PY means program year.
SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009; Common Core of Data Local Educational Agency (School District) Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v. 2a) and Public Elementary/ Secondary School Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v.2a), retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubagency.asp>.

States with 10 or More Consortia

Consortia sizes varied widely among the 22 states that reported 10 or more consortia in PY 2009–10 (table 5). Those consortia with relatively smaller memberships had between two and five subgrantees, and the largest had around 50 subgrantees (e.g., Kansas with 53 and Minnesota with 47).

Average consortia grant amounts ranged from \$38,900 in South Dakota to \$679,800 in Michigan. Median grant amounts similarly ranged from \$31,400 in Iowa to \$499,500 in Michigan. The average consortia grant amount was twice the median consortia grant amount or more in California and Mississippi. The large differences in these numbers underscore the range of grant amounts in these states, where a small proportion of recipients receive proportionately large grants. In California, for example, the smallest consortia allocation was just above the minimum allocation requirement (\$15,500), and the largest was more than 40 times that amount (\$736,500).

Table 5: Perkins IV Title I grants awarded in states reporting 10 or more consortia, by consortia size range, and by average, median, minimum and maximum award amounts: Program year 2009–10

State	Consortia size range (number of members)	Average consortia grant amount*	Median consortia grant amount*	Consortia grant amounts*	
				Minimum	Maximum
Arkansas	4–23	\$218,700	\$144,800	\$49,700	\$623,100
California	2–6	101,800	48,000	15,500	736,500
Colorado	2–19	50,900	46,200	28,100	116,800
Idaho	2–9	43,800	31,600	15,900	160,000
Illinois	2–25	303,300	210,200	41,600	1,078,300
Indiana	2–12	418,900	319,200	51,900	1,186,900
Iowa	2–31	51,500	31,400	15,500	259,800
Kansas	2–53	69,500	37,000	17,400	362,000
Michigan	5–41	679,800	499,500	95,800	2,283,600
Minnesota	2–47	240,200	173,200	37,000	571,300
Mississippi	2–8	110,600	44,700	21,100	989,000
Missouri	2–16	187,400	145,900	18,200	999,000
Nebraska	5–35	79,700	70,100	25,100	161,600
New Hampshire	2–3	250,700	191,300	28,400	772,300
North Dakota	3–13	46,900	39,200	20,900	198,700
Oklahoma	2–16	44,700	38,400	16,200	144,000
Oregon	2–23	201,700	170,822	40,500	624,400
Pennsylvania	2–15	255,800	198,800	35,200	1,003,800
Rhode Island	3–6	397,200	272,500	104,200	1,247,800
South Dakota	2–18	38,900	32,500	15,400	75,200
Texas	2–36	85,700	49,600	19,500	372,100
Wisconsin	2–38	134,300	95,300	31,400	387,900

* The consortia grant amount is the sum of the consortia members' Perkins IV grants.

NOTE: Perkins IV means the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006. Three states reported consortia that included only one secondary provider. Illinois, for example, requires all Perkins IV subgrantees to join consortia except for the state's two largest school districts, which are regarded as single-member consortia in the state's reporting system. In Oregon and Minnesota, consortia with one secondary member include one or more postsecondary members, and those listed as single-member consortia in other states may have received a waiver. Single-member consortia are included in the overall number of consortia in the state, but not in the minimum and maximum membership and allocation data.

SOURCE: Klein, Steven, Amanda Richards Sheil, Robin White, Sandra Staklis, Corinne Alfeld, Caitlin Rose Dailey, Ivan Charner, and Anne Poliakoff. 2014 *Evaluation of the Implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006: Finance, Accountability, and Programs of Study*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009.

Not all consortia members had grants below the minimum allocation requirement. Consortia members in all of the states included subgrantees with grants over and under the threshold amount. In Idaho, for example, one-fifth (20 percent) of consortia members had allocations above the minimum allocation requirement (table 6).

Table 6: Number of secondary Perkins IV Title I subgrantees participating in consortia, the number and percentage of participating subgrantees with allocations of \$15,000 or more, and the number and percentage of consortia members in rural areas, by states with 10 or more consortia: Program year 2009–10

State	Number of secondary subgrantees participating in consortia	Consortia members with Perkins IV Title I allocations of \$15,000 or more		Consortia members in rural areas	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Arkansas	179	84	47	140	78
California	102	29	28	36	35
Colorado	108	12	11	87	81
Idaho	69	14	20	53	77
Illinois	483	198	41	230	48
Indiana	291	219	75	142	49
Iowa	327	34	10	255	78
Kansas	191	10	5	152	80
Michigan	523	306	59	260	50
Minnesota	337	77	23	225	67
Mississippi	57	46	81	34	60
Missouri	418	203	49	297	71
Nebraska	233	6	3	206	88
New Hampshire	28	28	100	8	29
North Dakota	151	12	8	137	91
Oklahoma	311	33	11	275	88
Oregon	142	60	42	74	52
Pennsylvania	462	389	84	161	35
Rhode Island	38	33	87	11	29
South Dakota	140	12	9	125	89
Texas	554	53	10	470	85
Wisconsin	317	68	21	212	67

NOTE: Perkins IV means the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009; Common Core of Data Local Educational Agency (School District) Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v. 2a), retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubagency.asp>.

Depending on the state, subgrantees receiving grants above the minimum funding thresholds may join consortia to meet a state requirement, to access services available to consortia, or to assist nearby subgrantees with allocations below the minimum allocation requirement. States contacted by the research team reported that consortia members typically come from the same geographic area, with smaller subgrantees forming consortia with their larger neighbors. As one CTE state director explained, secondary subgrantees that had surpassed the funding threshold have “helped out” those with allocations below the minimum that were unable to find a nearby partner that also received less than the threshold

amount. In addition, larger subgrantees typically bring more resources to the table, such as administrators who can help others meet the reporting requirements.

Postsecondary Consortia

Postsecondary subgrantees include public or nonprofit private institutions of higher education (IHEs) that offer CTE courses that lead to technical skill proficiency and an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or a degree. In some states, postsecondary *Perkins IV* funds also support other eligible institutions. These include LEAs and area CTE centers providing postsecondary education, postsecondary educational institutions controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or operated by or on behalf of any Indian tribe that is eligible to contract with the Secretary of Interior for the administration of programs under the *Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act or the Act of April 16, 1934*,⁴¹ or an educational service agency. In PY 2009–10, states reported a total of 1,197 postsecondary *Perkins IV* subgrantees, of which 252 (about 21 percent) were among the other types of eligible institutions just described (U.S. Department of Education 2014).⁴²

On average, states allocated just under two-thirds of *Perkins IV* subgrant funds to the secondary level (64 percent in PY 2009–10) and the remaining 36 percent of funds to the postsecondary level (Klein et al. 2014). In contrast to the 32 states with secondary consortia, 10 states reported the existence of consortia at the postsecondary level in PY 2009–10. Consortia consequently accounted for a smaller proportion of postsecondary than secondary *Perkins IV* subgrantees overall. In PY 2009–10, states reported consortia membership for roughly 16 percent of 1,197 postsecondary subgrantees, versus 59 percent at the secondary level.

Within the 10 states that reported detailed consortia membership information, the percentage of postsecondary subgrantees in consortia varied from 15 percent in Connecticut and New Jersey to 100 percent in Minnesota (table 7). Oklahoma and Pennsylvania reported the largest number of postsecondary consortia members (43 and 50, respectively) and Connecticut and Nebraska the fewest, with two each.

Five states had postsecondary consortia (Minnesota, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania) that accounted for more than one half of the state's postsecondary grantees. The remaining states, with the exception of Oregon that has combined secondary and

⁴¹ See Sec. 3(13)(D) of *Perkins IV*.

⁴² Study findings are based on the 10 states that reported complete fiscal allocation data for postsecondary consortia members. Indiana and New York did not provide information on the number of consortia formed or the membership composition of their consortia; consequently, information presented in this section may underestimate consortia formation at the postsecondary level.

postsecondary consortia, formed relatively small numbers of consortia composed of relatively few members. For example, both Connecticut and Nebraska reported forming just one postsecondary consortium, each composed of two members. Average consortia grant amounts ranged from a low of \$56,000 in Connecticut to nearly \$375,000 in Minnesota.

Table 7: Number and percentage of postsecondary consortia members, number of postsecondary consortia, consortia size range, and average and median consortia grant amounts, by states reporting postsecondary Perkins IV Title I consortia grants: Program year 2009–10

State	Number of consortia members	Percentage of postsecondary subgrantees in consortia	Number of consortia	Consortia size range (number of members)	Average consortia grant amount ^a	Median consortia grant amount ^a
Arkansas	6	22	2	2–4	\$148,000	—
Connecticut	2	15	1	2	56,000	—
Massachusetts	8	32	1	8	61,000	—
Minnesota ^b	30	100	26	1–3	374,600	319,500
Missouri	36	78	8	2–8	296,900	157,600
Nebraska	2	29	1	2	265,800	—
New Jersey	6	15	3	2	64,700	69,600
Oklahoma	43	93	13	2–5	128,200	117,000
Oregon ^c	8	47	8	1–2	267,400	228,600
Pennsylvania	50	67	15	2–6	239,300	96,700

— Not available.

^a The consortia grant amount is the sum of the consortia members' Perkins IV grants.

^b Postsecondary Perkins IV subgrantees in Minnesota are required to join a consortium that includes at least one secondary and one postsecondary member. As a result, 23 of the consortia listed here for Minnesota have just one postsecondary member.

^c Oregon did not provide membership data on postsecondary subgrantees in consortia with secondary subgrantees. The consortia listed here are postsecondary only.

NOTE: Perkins IV means the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006. Indiana and New York reported 22 and 6 postsecondary consortia members, respectively, in PY 2009–10 but did not provide information on the number of consortia formed or the membership composition of their consortia. In addition, Connecticut reported a postsecondary consortium with 1 member that is not included in this table.

SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Postsecondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009.

As was the case for secondary consortia, not all postsecondary consortia members had allocations below the \$50,000 minimum grant award needed to qualify as a stand-alone subgrantee. Of the 10 states reporting postsecondary consortia in PY 2009–10, seven had at least one subgrantee with a grant allocation above the \$50,000 minimum funding amount (table 8). Nearly all consortia members in Minnesota (97 percent) had allocations above the minimum grant award, in part due to state policies that require all Perkins IV subgrantees to form consortia. Accordingly, all of the state's postsecondary Perkins IV funds were directed to consortia.

Generally, states in which no or just one consortia member's allocations exceeded the minimum grant amount directed relatively small amounts of Perkins IV funds to consortia.



For example, just 2 percent of *Perkins IV* funds were directed to consortia in New Jersey, which reported no postsecondary subgrantees with allocations above the \$50,000 minimum threshold participating in consortia.

Table 8: Number and percentage of postsecondary consortia members with allocations above the minimum threshold (\$50,000) and amount and percentage of postsecondary *Perkins IV Title I* funds directed to those consortia, by state: Program year 2009–10

State	Postsecondary consortia members with allocations above the minimum		Postsecondary <i>Perkins IV Title I</i> funds directed to consortia	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Arkansas	1	17	\$296,100	9
Connecticut	0	0	111,800	6
Massachusetts	0	0	61,100	1
Minnesota	29	97	9,738,500	100
Missouri	4	11	2,375,000	42
Nebraska	1	50	265,800	9
New Jersey	0	0	194,200	2
Oklahoma	7	16	1,811,300	92
Oregon	7	88	5,336,100	32
Pennsylvania	14	29	3,589,300	30

NOTE: *Perkins IV* means the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*.

SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009; Common Core of Data Local Educational Agency (School District) Universe Survey Data 2009–10 (v. 2a); Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Institutional Characteristics Data 2009–10.

THE ORGANIZATION OF PERKINS IV TITLE I CONSORTIA

States with *Perkins IV Title I* secondary consortia can be classified into four categories based on the organization or proportion of consortia among their secondary subgrantees. The first category consists of two states with cross-level consortia that use consortia to actively promote collaboration among secondary and postsecondary grant recipients (table 9). These states expect or require secondary and postsecondary subgrantees to engage in joint planning and budgeting.


Table 9: Types of Perkins IV Title I consortia that include secondary subgrantees, by state

Cross-level consortia	Near-universal consortia	Majority consortia	Limited consortia
Include secondary and postsecondary subgrantees.	Include more than 99 percent of secondary subgrantees.	Include between 59 and 94 percent of secondary subgrantees.	Include between 1 and 40 percent of secondary subgrantees.
Minnesota (100%)	Illinois (99.6%)	Arkansas (74%)	Alabama (4%)
Oregon (89%)	Indiana (100%)	Colorado (69%)	California (24%)
	Michigan (99.8%)	Idaho (63%)	Connecticut (24%)
	New Hampshire (100%)	Iowa (91%)	Kentucky (7%)
	Rhode Island (100%)	Kansas (69%)	Massachusetts (14%)
		Missouri (93%)	Mississippi (38%)
		Nebraska (92%)	New Jersey (1%)
		North Dakota (94%)	New Mexico (40%)
		Oklahoma (73%)	Tennessee (18%)
		Pennsylvania (59%)	Utah (5%)
		South Dakota (90%)	Virginia (2%)
		Texas (59%)	Washington (1%)
		Wisconsin (87%)	

* Although not all secondary subgrantees in Oregon are consortia members, the state’s consortia system provides support to nonconsortia members and includes all postsecondary institutions.

NOTE: This schema is based on state consortia formation among secondary subgrantees, with the exception of Minnesota and Oregon, which include both secondary and postsecondary subgrantees within consortia. This reflects the predominance of consortia formation at the local level. *Perkins IV* means the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*.

SOURCE: National Assessment of Career and Technical Education (NACTE) Secondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009; NACTE Postsecondary State Director Survey Fiscal Data, 2009.




The other three categories reflect the prevalence of consortia within states. The near-universal consortia category includes five states in which consortia account for 99 percent or more of secondary subgrantees. In the 13 majority consortia states, consortia account for more than one half but less than 99 percent of secondary subgrantees, or between 59 and 94 percent. The final category, limited consortia states, includes 12 states in which consortia account for a relatively smaller proportion of secondary subgrantees (from one to 40 percent). This section presents a description of approaches to forming consortia at the secondary educational level, including examples of consortia arrangements of states in each of the categories.

CATEGORY 1—CROSS-LEVEL CONSORTIA

Two states, Minnesota and Oregon, use *Perkins IV* consortia to promote a comprehensive, system-wide approach to CTE programming (table 9). These states either require (Minnesota) or encourage (Oregon) consortia that include both secondary and postsecondary subgrantees. Members collaborate to develop and implement a joint plan that details how funds allocated to the consortium will be used to provide services and programs that are mutually beneficial to all members of the consortium, both within and across the secondary and postsecondary educational levels.

Minnesota's approach toward consortia formation includes a number of requirements and features not found in other states. To be eligible to receive a basic grant, each *Perkins IV* subgrantee must enter into one of 26 consortia that consist of at least one secondary and one two-year college partner. This requirement was instituted to address a perceived statewide need for greater secondary–postsecondary collaboration that emerged during public listening sessions held in preparation for *Perkins IV*. The state also opted to consolidate its Tech Prep (*Perkins IV Title II*) funding into its basic grant early in *Perkins IV*, under the assumption that the new state consortia structure would address the goals of Tech Prep programs.

Minnesota allows secondary and postsecondary subgrantees to choose their own members when forming consortia, although it encourages them to consider several factors in identifying partners, including the POS to be offered, the postsecondary matriculation patterns of high school graduates, and geographic proximity. Nearby charter schools with state-approved CTE programs also must be invited to join the consortia. No subgrantee may be a member of more than one consortium, and the state reserves the right to approve final consortia membership and structure. Although not required, the state also encourages consortia to work with their local *WLA*-funded workforce centers and adult education providers, which may include secondary subgrantees and community organizations.



Cooperation with these entities is common but the level of participation varies; in some consortia, these organizations serve as full-fledged members, while in others they serve in an advisory role.

Two consortia members—one from each educational level—serve as fiscal agents in Minnesota. Consortia members jointly develop a consortium plan and are encouraged to use funds for both secondary and postsecondary purposes, irrespective of the fund’s origins. State staff report, however, that funds generally support activities within the educational level that generated them (i.e., secondary funds to secondary subgrantees and postsecondary funds to postsecondary subgrantees) out of state concerns regarding the “supplement not supplant” provision of the Act.⁴³ In earlier *Perkins* statutes, postsecondary subgrantees typically supported CTE career counseling services with nonfederal funds, whereas secondary subgrantees used federal funds for some of these activities. When statewide consortia were implemented in *Perkins IV*, some consortia dedicated federal funds to joint career counseling activities; this raised a concern among state-level CTE staff that new funding directed to postsecondary subgrantees for this purpose might be regarded as supplanting previous state financing.

The state requires consortia plans to address five state-established goals that correspond to required and permissible activities defined in *Perkins IV*: POS; special populations; community, education and industry partnerships; inter-consortium relationships; and sustaining the consortium. As long as their grant applications include activities in these areas, consortia set their own priorities, and as a result, consortia activities vary by region. For example, consortia in the metropolitan areas tend to focus on secondary-to-postsecondary credit transfer agreements and student support services, whereas consortia in the state’s rural southwest region are more likely to devote funds to professional development and career guidance. The state also asks consortia to direct 20 percent of its funds to activities that will build and strengthen operations to ensure sufficient attention on consortia management and function.

Consortia membership in Oregon is not required but strongly encouraged, and 89 percent of secondary and nearly half of postsecondary *Perkins IV* subgrantees (47 percent) are consortia members. The secondary subgrantees that are not members consist of larger districts located in or near metropolitan areas. In PY 2009–10, seven of the state’s 15 consortia included at least one secondary and one postsecondary subgrantee, and each consortium maintained an advisory committee of local business and industry. All eligible grant recipients falling short of the minimum funding thresholds participate in consortia; none received a waiver. Oregon consolidated its Tech Prep funds at the start of *Perkins IV* in the belief that there was

⁴³ See Sec. 311(a) of *Perkins IV*.

overlap, and at times duplication, in the development of POS and Tech Prep (Oregon Department of Education and Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development 2008).

Secondary and postsecondary consortia members combined their *Perkins IV* allocations and developed a joint plan governing their use. State staff noted an increase in consortia membership over *Perkins IV* and speculated that this growth reflects a belief that consortia could accomplish more with limited funds through economies of scale. Staff also suggested that providers at both educational levels recognize that expectations concerning collaboration are likely to grow over time. Oregon requires secondary and postsecondary institutions to work together to implement POS and requires that all *Perkins IV* funds be directed toward these programs; some POS work does, however, across consortia, depending on program offerings. In addition to basic grant funds, the state distributes reserve funds to consortia for special projects. For example, the state has earmarked its PY 2014–15 reserve grant funds for secondary and postsecondary subgrantees to develop career pathways for students in grades 9–14.⁴⁴ Individual grant recipients are also allowed to participate but must work with a consortium if they wish to join in the reserve fund-sponsored activities.

A regional coordinator hired by the fiscal agent leads each consortium in Oregon. These positions are supported in part with federal CTE funds. Coordinators play an active role in convening members and facilitating joint CTE planning and activities. They also assume a critical role in engaging all parties and facilitating planning efforts so that regional investments benefit students at all sites. State guidelines limit the number of votes on the boards to one per represented agency to ensure that postsecondary participants or larger subgrantees do not have greater decision-making authority simply because their “contribution” to a consortium’s pooled funds is larger. Because the coordinator is not viewed as affiliated with any one agency, consortia benefit from having a neutral third party who helps broker agreements among members.

Coordinators generally convene monthly consortia meetings and begin the annual budgeting process by reviewing data from the previous year to identify priorities shared by all or most consortia members. Oregon provides broad guidelines for programmatic goals that each subgrantee is expected to meet. Once state and joint priorities are budgeted, the remaining funds are made available to address specific local needs. Regional coordinators work closely with state administrators to share state priorities and expectations with the consortia and to ensure that consortia execute their plans in accordance with their approved goals.

⁴⁴ See the state’s Perkins Reserve Grant Application & Annual Report, located at: <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=4112>.

Coordinators communicate with one another on a regular basis and therefore serve as conduits for sharing best practices and strategies for addressing programmatic challenges.


CATEGORY 2—NEAR-UNIVERSAL CONSORTIA

Generally, consortia formation tends to be more prevalent at the secondary level, due to the large numbers of small, rural subgrantees that fail to achieve the minimum allocation requirement. Near-universal consortia are made up entirely of secondary subgrantees, and exist in five states. As distinct from other categories in the report, consortia in those states account for all, or nearly all, of the secondary subgrantees, and membership corresponds to organizational units within the states' systems for providing CTE and other educational services. New Hampshire, for example, transferred subgrantee funds to the state's regional CTE center, which provides services.⁴⁵ The other states that have regional consortia to allocate *Perkins IV* funds are Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Rhode Island (table 9).

Illinois and Indiana are examples of states in this category. In Illinois, all secondary subgrantees must join consortia regardless of whether they meet the \$15,000 minimum allocation requirement. The only exceptions are two large urban school districts: J. Sterling Morton High School District and the Chicago Public Schools. Consortia overlap with the state's Education for Employment Regional System (EFE), which was established by the Illinois State Board of Education and Illinois Legislature in the mid-1980s specifically to address federal statutory requirements. The EFEs have from two to 25 subgrantee members, and memberships have generally been stable since the inception of the EFE. However, now that Tech Prep is no longer maintained as a separate system, the state plans to consolidate EFEs to better align secondary and postsecondary providers in support of POS development. Illinois plans to decrease its 50-plus consortia to either 35 (to correspond to regional education offices) or 39 (to correspond with community college districts).

Consortia members in Illinois manage their planning and budgeting based on regional needs and priorities. Each consortium forms a governing board that includes superintendents from participating districts and, in some cases, one or more postsecondary partners. Boards are responsible for developing *Perkins IV* plans and determining how federal funds are to be spent. All secondary consortia must establish formal relationships with their local community colleges via the consortium's advisory council, and the state encourages consortia and community colleges to form joint councils that serve both educational levels (Illinois State Board of Education 2008). Advisory councils may include representatives from local industry and businesses and parents. Community colleges also engage with consortia to develop articulation agreements for dual credit and to offer joint professional development

⁴⁵ See Sec. 131(e) of *Perkins IV*.



opportunities. In addition to providing technical assistance and professional development to member districts, EFE staff in Illinois work to enhance programmatic consistency within regions and to encourage partnerships with local community colleges. The system also maintains a regional directors' leadership council, which meets monthly to share information.


Three-quarters of Indiana's 291 secondary subgrantees have allocations above the minimum allocation requirement needed to participate in *Perkins IV*, including a large number of rural secondary districts. To ensure that all secondary students have equal access to CTE activities and programs, the state requires that all secondary subgrantees participate in consortia called CTE districts.

All postsecondary *Perkins IV* participants in Indiana were large enough to meet the minimum grant requirement of \$50,000, and the state opted to have them receive funding directly. Although postsecondary eligible grant recipients in Indiana do not receive funds through a secondary consortium, they collaborate with the secondary CTE districts on advisory committees to implement POS. The state plan details guidelines for the compositions and roles of advisory committees in ensuring the quality of local CTE programs (Indiana Department of Workforce Development 2008). These advisory committees meet a minimum of twice yearly, and play substantial roles in ensuring that local CTE efforts, *Perkins IV* and otherwise, are vertically aligned across the secondary and postsecondary education levels and responsive to workforce needs. One-half of advisory committee members are required to be local business and industry representatives. In addition to postsecondary administrators and faculty, other members include CTE and academic faculty, parents, and counselors.

CATEGORY 3—MAJORITY CONSORTIA

Thirteen states reported consortia that included the majority of secondary subgrantees in the state. These states—Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin—typically had large numbers of small or rural subgrantees, with 59 to 94 percent of secondary subgrantees being consortia members (table 9).

For example, less than 5 percent of Nebraska's secondary subgrantees meet the minimum allocation requirement independently (table 6). As a result, the state's 15 consortia include nearly all of the state's secondary subgrantees, with stand-alone subgrantees consisting of relatively large school districts in metropolitan areas. Secondary consortia in Nebraska are organized around educational service units (ESUs), which are stand-alone agencies that



provide a range of educational coordinating services. These units also typically serve as fiscal agents. Although secondary grantees have the option to organize consortia in accordance with community college service areas, and to have the college serve as the fiscal agent, all but one consortium opted to work with their ESU. State staff shared that this preference may reflect the longstanding role of ESUs in coordinating funds and providing services for secondary subgrantees as part of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended, and other programs.

In contrast to the nearly universal consortia participation at the secondary level, all but two of Nebraska's postsecondary *Perkins IV* participants were stand-alone subgrantees in PY 2009–10. Although not consortia members, the state's community colleges interface with consortia as members of their advisory boards. Secondary and postsecondary providers work together in support of the state's dual-credit programs though POS development to date has been largely state led. Under *Perkins IV*, Nebraska established Partnerships for Innovation, a statewide consortium led by representatives from both its secondary and postsecondary institutions, with the explicit purpose of building a better statewide system of CTE through coordinated curricula at both levels.⁴⁶ All local *Perkins IV* subgrantees are required to contribute 8 percent of their federal funds to support the consortium's work, which focuses on aligning secondary–postsecondary curricula, developing statewide articulation agreements, and expanding dual-credit CTE opportunities.

North Dakota reported that 94 percent of its secondary subgrantees were members of consortia in PY 2009–10. However, just 54 percent of the state's secondary *Perkins IV* funds were allocated to these consortia (table 2). The difference is primarily due to the geographic makeup of the state. Larger school districts that qualified for an individual grant collected a relatively high percentage of the available funding; secondary subgrantees unable to achieve the minimum allocation requirement were either given a waiver or organized into consortia.

CATEGORY 4—LIMITED CONSORTIA

In 12 states, secondary consortia engaged a relatively small proportion of secondary subgrantees (40 percent or less) in PY 2009–10. These states include Alabama, California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Washington (table 9). Consortia in these states had only secondary members. Typically, consortia members select their own partners based on geographic proximity and access to a fiscal agent to administer funds. This is in contrast to some states in categories 1, 2, and 3, which require or recommend that consortia reflect existing

⁴⁶ For more information, see <http://partnershipsforinnovation.org/about-pfi/>.


administrative arrangements, or that members choose a particular type of fiscal agent, such as a postsecondary subgrantee.

Utah uses both waivers and consortia to fund eligible grant recipients unable to achieve the minimum allocation requirement. The state does not require consortia membership for *Perkins IV* participation and reported just one consortium in PY 2009–10. When *Perkins IV* was first enacted, the state had 16 secondary subgrantees with allocations less than the \$15,000 minimum allocation requirement (Utah State Office of Education 2008). The state issued consortia waivers to three small LEAs that were unable to enter consortia due to their locations in rural, sparsely populated areas. Two additional LEAs in this group, located roughly 75 miles apart, participated in *Perkins IV* as a single consortium. The state determined that the CTE programs in the remaining 11 secondary subgrantees were not of sufficient scope and size to justify funding and excluded them from participation. Instead, the state opted to provide excluded LEAs with state funds equivalent to their *Perkins IV* allocations for purchasing new or upgrading existing CTE equipment.

In contrast, all secondary subgrantees in Texas with funding needs below the minimum allocation requirement join consortia. The state reported 52 consortia in PY 2009–10, with members accounting for 59 percent of the state's *Perkins IV* subgrantees, but just 7 percent of the total secondary funds distributed (table 2). According to state staff, most consortia members are small rural LEAs or charter schools, although some subgrantees with grants above the minimum allocation requirement also join to access the administrative services of the fiscal agent. These eligible recipients accounted for 10 percent of all consortia members in PY 2009–10 (table 6). An LEA or regional educational service center typically served as the fiscal agent, but consortia could also “hire” a postsecondary subgrantee to serve as the fiscal agent by providing them with 5 percent of the consortium's funds. Members of each consortium jointly determine how consortium activities and funding priorities that benefit all members will be determined and report the results of their negotiations to the state in their *Perkins IV* grant application (Texas Education Agency 2008). The state did not issue any waivers and also does not have any postsecondary subgrantees with allocations below the minimum grant amount.

Consortia can thus provide economies of scale for grant administration to benefit small subgrantees, particularly those with limited administrative funds. To reinforce this point, a CTE director in a state in which postsecondary institutions serve as the fiscal agents for secondary consortia reported that the administrative support provided by these larger institutions was an inducement for secondary subgrantees to join consortia.

While consortia within these states may meet *Perkins IV* requirements and effectively fulfill the programmatic and administrative needs of their members, a relatively low proportion of



federal funds are allocated to these entities. Moreover, although consortia members within these states may benefit from the opportunity and encouragement to collaborate with other subgrantees, any practices or activities associated with their collaboration are confined to a small proportion of the states' eligible recipients. This is not to suggest that secondary–postsecondary cooperation is limited to consortia members, but rather that secondary–postsecondary cooperation or other stakeholder engagement in CTE occurs through other organizational arrangements and/or on an individual or regional basis for the majority of subgrantees in these states.

OTHER APPROACHES TO PROMOTING COLLABORATION

Perkins IV consortia are not the only avenue for encouraging and supporting collaboration among CTE providers and stakeholders. Other states and organizations have developed networks that encourage collaborative planning in CTE education and training. These networks do not stem from a single set of legislative guidelines and may not be associated with *Perkins IV*, but instead reflect the varied ways that CTE is organized across states.

California is among the states with limited *Perkins IV* consortia, but it supports cooperation between secondary and postsecondary subgrantees and stakeholders through other systems, including the California Community College Association for Occupational Education.⁴⁷ This association organizes the state's 112 community colleges into 10 regional consortia that conduct both regional and subregional planning, marketing, and engagement with business and industry partners (California Department of Education 2008). Regional consortia are supported by state and *Perkins IV* state leadership funds. According to the California state director of CTE, secondary participation in the regional consortia has been limited but is anticipated to increase in the future.

California also recently appropriated funds to support adult education under Assembly Bill 86 (AB 86).⁴⁸ Beginning in PY 2015–16, the California Community College Chancellor's Office will allocate funds to AB 86 Adult Education consortia for the purpose of developing and implementing regional plans for adult education. The consortia must include at least one community college district and one k–12 school district within the boundaries of the

⁴⁷ California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, accessed Oct. 25, 2013, from <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/WorkforceandEconDev/CareerEducationPractices/PerkinsIV/PerkinsIVTitleIPartB/RegionalConsortia.aspx>.

⁴⁸ AB 86: Collaborating to Better Serve the Educational Needs of Adults, accessed Oct. 30, 2014, from <http://ab86.cccco.edu>.

community college district, and engage other partners, such as correctional facilities and community-based organizations.

In other states, *Perkins IV* subgrantees are expected to contribute a share of their funds to support coordinated planning. For example, Idaho directs its *Perkins IV* reserve funds to the state's six technical colleges to support the state's Advanced Learning Partnerships, and *Perkins IV* subgrantees are required to provide 5 percent of their basic grant allocation to their regional partnership (Idaho State Division of Professional-Technical Education 2008).⁴⁹ The partnerships originally developed in conjunction with Tech Prep to coordinate articulation agreements and include representatives from the technical college, school districts, and business and industry in each region. In addition to coordinating articulation agreements, the partnerships support linkages between secondary and postsecondary CTE programs, improve academic integration, facilitate student transitions to bachelor's degree programs, and develop local and statewide articulation agreements.

Florida maintains a system for CTE cooperation across educational levels based on the relationships that developed between secondary and postsecondary subgrantees under Tech Prep. When Florida consolidated *Title I* and *Title II* funds early in *Perkins IV*, the Department of Education changed the state's Tech Prep consortia to the Florida Career Pathways Network through which members work together to implement POS and other CTE initiatives (Florida Department of Education 2008).⁵⁰ Members are required to allocate a minimum of 1.5 percent of their *Perkins IV* funds to support consortia activities. Membership in Career Pathways Consortia is voluntary, but the state encourages participation by providing members with additional funds drawn from the state's *Perkins IV* reserve fund. These funds are distributed in proportion to subgrantees' *Perkins IV Title I* grant allocations and must be used for joint POS development activities.

In PY 2011–12, Ohio reorganized the state's 23 Tech Prep consortia into six Ohio College Tech Prep Regional Centers supported by state revenues.⁵¹ The centers connect the state's 91 k–12 career and technical education planning districts, 23 community colleges, and 14 universities, and are led by a fiscal agent (usually a postsecondary institution) that hires a chief administrator for the center. The chief administrator connects members to develop CTE programs that span secondary and postsecondary education and that include contextual learning environments, nonduplicative coursework, links to industry, and opportunities for

⁴⁹ Idaho Professional-Technical Education Tech Prep: Tech Prep Regions, accessed Oct. 30, 2014 from http://www.pte.idaho.gov/Tech_Prep/Tech_Prep_Regions.html.

⁵⁰ Florida Career Pathways Network: Welcome to FCPN, accessed Oct. 30, 2014 from <http://www.ftpn.org/>.

⁵¹ Ohio College Tech Prep: About, accessed April, 16, 2014 from <http://www.techprepohio.com/about/about.asp>.

high school students to earn college credits. To develop such opportunities, the chief administrators have focused on developing articulation agreements among center members.

Since Ohio's centers were created, the number of multilateral articulation agreements (i.e., involving three or more institutions) has grown. The state-level director of the program also reported that the larger groupings have lessened the competition among postsecondary institutions for programs and students. He attributed the change to the chief administrators' effectiveness in encouraging cooperation by sharing information and convening meetings among center members. According to the director, the centers' chief administrators are seen as valuable sources of best practices and program development ideas. Ohio is concurrently developing statewide articulation agreements in CTE, which may someday obviate the centers' role in program development, but for now the state is pursuing both statewide and regional approaches.

Some education organizations cross state lines and form national and multistate collaborations in support of specific fields or industries. For example, the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program promotes the education of technicians for high-technology fields.⁵² The program emphasizes partnerships between academic institutions and employers to improve the education of science and engineering technicians at the high school and undergraduate levels. Among ATE's goals is the development of career pathways leading from secondary to two-year colleges, and from two-year to four-year colleges. For example, ATE supports the Automotive Manufacturing Technical Education Collaborative's (AMTEC) National Center for Excellence in Automotive Manufacturing, which connects community and technical colleges and industry partners.⁵³ AMTEC members develop certification assessments and curricula and share best practices and program models.

Industry organizations also support networks that connect educators with businesses and employers. The National Institute of Standards and Technology, an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, supports the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortia (AMTech) Program.⁵⁴ Established in 2013, AMTech offers competitive grants to support industry-led research efforts to promote advanced manufacturing. Grant awards are directed to consortia that include advanced manufacturing companies (small and large), universities, and government agencies.

⁵² Advanced Technological Education (ATE), accessed Jan. 25, 2014, from http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5464.

⁵³ Automotive Manufacturing Technical Education Collaborative: About AMTEC, accessed Oct. 30, 2014, from <http://www.autoworkforce.org>.

⁵⁴ Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortia (AMTech) Program, accessed April 16, 2014, from <http://www.nist.gov/amo/>.



These multistate consortia connect industry and postsecondary institutions, and are examples of organizational networks with aims different from the *Perkins IV* consortia's focus on secondary and postsecondary CTE programs. Although this report focuses on consortia in support of secondary and postsecondary CTE programs, other CTE program stakeholders might form consortia with different or more specific aims, such as research or assessments.

CONCLUSION

Congress authorized the consortia provisions in the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990*, as amended (*Perkins II*), to enable the participation of small or rural eligible recipients. States' consortia address their unique geographic and programmatic needs, and their numbers, sizes, organizations, and roles vary widely.

Consortia are more prevalent at the secondary than the postsecondary level, in part because secondary subgrantees are more likely than postsecondary subgrantees to be small in size. Consortia membership also tends to be level-specific. With the exception of two states that require or encourage both secondary and postsecondary representation, members of a given consortium are made up exclusively of either secondary or postsecondary subgrantees.

The formation of separate consortia for secondary and postsecondary subgrantees may be related to several factors. *Perkins IV* provides separate allocation formulas for allocating funds to each level, based on the populations that each serves, and offers no explicit options for distributing combined funds.⁵⁵ In addition, allocations to eligible recipients are also typically calculated by state staff employed in separate secondary and postsecondary agencies and, with the exception of states like Florida, these agencies are housed in different locations.

The Department's proposal for *Perkins IV's* reauthorization recommends that future funding targets consortia that include secondary and postsecondary subgrantees and partnering agencies and organizations. This review of state practices suggests that two states—Minnesota and Oregon—have consortia that either match or come close to these proposals. Minnesota's consortia include all of the state's *Perkins IV* subgrantees and are required to include subgrantees from both educational levels. Some of the states included in this report also provide examples of state guidance and leadership for consortia that shape their organizations and support state goals for CTE. The guidance includes other approaches to encourage collaboration, such as allocating funds on a regional basis to support shared planning and to manage and provide services. Further research is needed to understand how these different approaches to consortia and collaboration affect state and local practices and the educational programs that are provided to CTE students at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

⁵⁵ See Secs. 131(a) and 132(a) of *Perkins IV*.

This page intentionally left blank

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelman, Clifford. 2006. *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion from High School through College*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Alabama Department of Education—Career and Technical Education. 2008. *Alabama 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Accessed Oct. 30, 2014, from <http://cte.ed.gov/stategrants/stateprofiles.cfm?a=sp&s=AL>.
- Arkansas Department of Workforce Education. 2008. *Arkansas Five-Year Plan for the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/AR5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Association for Career and Technical Education. 2006. *Perkins Act of 2006: The Official Guide*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- California Department of Education. 2008. *2008–2012 California State Plan for Career Technical Education: A Guide to High Quality Programs*. Retrieved Sept. 25, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/CA5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. 2008. *Colorado 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/stategrants/stateprofiles.cfm?a=sp&s=CO>.
- Connecticut State Department of Education. 2008. *Connecticut 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/CT5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Florida Department of Education. 2008. *Florida State Plan for Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*. Retrieved Sept. 25, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/FL5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Government Accountability Office. 2009. *Career and Technical Education: States Have Broad Flexibility in Implementing Perkins IV* (GAO-09-683). Retrieved Oct. 10, 2013, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09683.pdf>.
-

- 
- Hughes, Katherine L., Olga Rodriguez, Linsey Edwards, and Clive Belfield. 2012. *Broadening the Benefits of Dual Enrollment: Reaching Underachieving and Underrepresented Students with Career-Focused Programs*. Insight. San Francisco: The James Irvine Foundation. Retrieved Jan. 20, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED533756.pdf>.
- Idaho State Division of Professional-Technical Education. 2008. *Idaho 2008 Five-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Sept. 10, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/ID5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Illinois State Board of Education. 2008. *Illinois 2008 Five-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Sept. 10, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/IL5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Indiana Department of Workforce Development. 2008. *Indiana State Plan: FY 2009–13 (July 1, 2008–June 30, 2013)*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/IN5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Iowa State Board of Education. 2008. *Iowa Perkins IV Five-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/IA5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Kansas Board of Regents. 2008. *Kansas State Plan for Career and Technical Education 2008–2013*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/KS5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Kentucky Office of Career and Technical Education. 2008. *Kentucky 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/KT5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Klein, Steven, Amanda Richards Sheil, Robin White, Sandra Staklis, Corinne Alfeld, Caitlin Rose Dailey, Ivan Charner, and Anne Poliakoff. 2014. *Evaluation of the Implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006: Finance, Accountability, and Programs of Study*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. 2008. *Massachusetts 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/MA5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Michigan Department of Education. 2008. *Michigan State Plan for Career and Technical Education 2008–2013*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/MI5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
-

- Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System and Minnesota Department of Education. 2009. *Carl D. Perkins Act of 2006—Consolidated Annual Report State of Minnesota, Fiscal Year 2009 (July 1, 2008–June 30, 2009)*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from http://cte.ed.gov/Docs/CARNarrative/MN_narrative_2008-2009.pdf.
- Mississippi Department of Education. 2008. *State Plan for Vocational and Technical Education*. 2008. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/MS5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. 2008. *Missouri 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/MO5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Nebraska Department of Education. 2008. *Nebraska State Plan for Career Technical Education*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/NE5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- New Hampshire Department of Education. 2008. *New Hampshire Five-Year Plan, Career and Technical Education Carl D. Perkins Act of 2006*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from http://www.education.nh.gov/career/career/five_year_plan.htm.
- New Jersey State Department of Education. 2008. *New Jersey 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/NJ5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- New Mexico Public Education Department, Career and Technical Education and Workforce Education Bureau. 2008. *New Mexico 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/NM5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Ng, Jennifer, Lisa Wolf-Wendel, and Karen Lombardi. 2012. Pathways From Middle School to College: Examining the Impact of an Urban, Precollege Preparation Program. *Education and Urban Society*, doi 0013124512470161.
- North Dakota Department of Career and Technical Education. 2008. *North Dakota 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/ND5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
- Oklahoma State Board of Career and Technology Education. 2008. *FY 2009–13 State Plan for the Expenditure of Funds Received Under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/OK5YearStatePlan.pdf>.
-

Oregon Department of Education and Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development. 2008. *Oregon State Plan for Career and Technical Education 2008–2013*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/OR5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. 2008. *Five Year State Plan Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/PA5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. 2008. *Rhode Island 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/stategrants/stateprofiles.cfm?a=sp&s=RI>.

Shumer, Rob, and Cynthia Digby. April 2011. *Six Stories About Six States: Programs of Study*. Louisville, KY: National Research Center for Career and Technical Education.

South Dakota Office of Career and Technical Education. 2008. *South Dakota Perkins IV Five-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/SD5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Tennessee Department of Education. 2008. *Tennessee 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/TN5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Texas Education Agency. 2008. *Texas State Plan for Career and Technical Education 2008–2013*. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/TX5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. 2014. *National Assessment of Career and Technical Education: Final Report to Congress*. Washington, DC. Retrieved Sept. 18, 2014, from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/sectech/nacte/career-technical-education/final-report.pdf>.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education. 2010. *Career and Technical Programs of Study: A Design Framework*. Washington, DC. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/nationalinitiatives/rposdesignframework.cfm>.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education. 2012. *Investing in America's Future: A Blueprint for Transforming Career and Technical Education*. Washington, DC. Retrieved Nov. 15, 2013, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/cte/transforming-career-technical-education.pdf>.

Utah State Office of Education. 2008. *Utah Five-Year State Plan: FY 2009–13*. Retrieved Oct. 20, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/UT5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Virginia Board of Education. 2008. *Virginia 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/VA5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board. 2008. *Washington 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/WA5YearStatePlan.pdf>.

Wisconsin Technical College System Board. 2008. *Wisconsin 2008 5-Year State Plan*. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2013, from <http://cte.ed.gov/docs/stateplan/WI5YearStatePlan.pdf>.



The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

www.ed.gov