

# Evaluating the Governor's Career-Technical Education Proposal

---

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S OFFICE

Presented To:  
Senate Education Committee

February 1, 2006





## The Governor's Career-Technical Proposal

---

- Provides \$1 billion in the 2006 bond and \$2.4 billion over the ten years. The funds will be distributed by OPSC on a competitive grant basis.
- Funds can be used for new construction, reconfiguration, or equipment (with ten-year useful life).
- Requires 50/50 local match and the match can be paid over time.
- No eligibility restrictions linked to unhoused pupils or age of building.
- No hardship provisions.
- Application criteria and priorities.
  - Preference for comprehensive high schools.
  - Applications will be scored based on the following factors: cost per pupil; number of pupils; fiscal participation by industry partners; commitment to accountability for outcomes and participation; relevance to local industry needs and economic development; and coordination with feeder schools, other high schools, and community colleges.



## Facility Funding Needs to Support Program Goals

---



**Facility and equipment funding decisions need to be made in a broader career technical policy and financing discussion.**

- ***California Department of Education (CDE) Study Calls for Multifaceted Approach.*** Conclusion of “A Statewide Needs Assessment Study of California’s Career-Technical Education Programs” states “Addressing the equipment and facility needs of Career-Technical Education (CTE) programs will clearly require a thoughtful and multifaceted approach to funding that takes into account such issues as staffing, long-range planning, delivery systems, and instructional needs.”
- ***CDE Study Suggests Need to Integrate Facility and Program Discussion.*** It is not really possible to consider equipment needs separately from other expenses like funds for instructional materials, course supplies, and professional development.



## **LAO Report—Improving High School: A Strategic Approach Highlights Needed Reforms to Career-Technical Education**

---

- Payoffs to Current High School CTE Are Low.
  - Dropouts: no effect.
  - Employment: small short-run gains.
  - Academics: No impact.
  - College: No Impact.
  - Earnings: Little impact from individual courses; significant gains from completing vocational sequences.
- Recommendations to Improve CTE:
  - Coordination to develop comprehensive sequences (two-year, four-year, and academic/career tech mixes that include community colleges as a vocational education resource to K-12).
  - Redefine mission of ROC/Ps.
  - Equalize ROC/P resources across regions.
  - Improve career path counseling.
  - Integrate CTE outcomes into accountability system.



## Concerns With the Governor's Proposal

---



### **Facilities decisions must follow basic policy decisions about CTE.**

- The administration has not provided data to justify its \$1 billion proposal in large part because it has not defined its policy objectives.
- Applications scored based on accountability for outcomes, but the state has not defined what outcomes it wants in this area.
- What is the role for high schools? Unclear rationale for prioritizing comprehensive high schools.
- What is the role of ROC/Ps? ROC/Ps are often run by counties or joint powers. Not clear how ROC/Ps will provide matches.
- What is the role of community colleges? How does the state use these funds to create linkages between segments?
- While cost of projects may vary, should the Legislature consider boundaries on the funding rates?