

# **Tech Prep/School-to-Work Partnerships: More Trends and Challenges**

**MDS-1078**

**Debra D. Bragg  
Paula A. Puckett  
William Reger IV  
Helen Sue Thomas  
Joan Ortman**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC)

**Carolyn Dornsife**

University of California at Berkeley

**National Center for Research in Vocational Education  
Graduate School of Education  
University of California at Berkeley  
2030 Addison Street, Suite 500  
Berkeley, CA 94720-1674**

Supported by  
The Office of Vocational and Adult Education  
U.S. Department of Education

**December 1997**

---

## FUNDING INFORMATION

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Project Title:</b>                                    | National Center for Research in Vocational Education   |
| <b>Grant Number:</b>                                     | V051A30003-97A/V051A30004-97A  |
| <b>Act under which Funds Administered:</b>               | Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act<br>P.L. 98-524  |
| <b>Source of Grant:</b>                                  | Office of Vocational and Adult Education<br>U.S. Department of Education<br>Washington, DC 20202   |
| <b>Grantee:</b>  | The Regents of the University of California<br>c/o National Center for Research in Vocational Education<br>2030 Addison Street, Suite 500<br>Berkeley, CA 94720  |
| <b>Director:</b>   | David Stern  |
| <b>Percent of Total Grant Financed by Federal Money:</b> | 100%   |
| <b>Dollar Amount of Federal Funds for Grant:</b>         | \$4,500,000  |
| <b>Disclaimer:</b>                                       | This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy. |
| <b>Discrimination:</b>                                   | Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be  |

subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

- [ACKNOWLEDGMENTS](#)
- [EXECUTIVE SUMMARY](#)
- [INTRODUCTION](#)
  - [The Initial Tech Prep Implementation Survey in 1993](#)
- [THE PURPOSE FOR THE STUDY](#)
  - [The 1995 Follow-Up Survey](#)
  - [The Field Studies](#)
- [DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS](#)
  - [Characteristics of Tech Prep Consortia and Coordinators](#)
  - [Goals, Elements and Curriculum Reform](#)
  - [Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep](#)
  - [Barriers to Tech Prep Implementation](#)
  - [Local Coordinator Recommendations for Federal and State Policy](#)
- [REFERENCES](#)
- [APPENDIX A: AGGREGATED RESPONSES TO 1993 TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY](#)
- [APPENDIX B: MODIFICATIONS TO THE TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY](#)
- [APPENDIX C: AGGREGATED RESPONSES TO 1995 TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY](#)
- [APPENDIX D: SITE PROFILES](#)

---

---

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As we reflect on the past several years of work that produced this report, we realize that we have many to thank. First, we express our sincere appreciation to the growing community of professionals who actively implement Tech Prep on a day-to-day basis. For our study, this group was ably represented by the nearly 350 Tech Prep coordinators whose thoughtful and candid responses made our follow-up survey a worthwhile endeavor. We are particularly indebted to five Tech Prep coordinators who hosted our field visits, answered a myriad of tedious questions, and shared incredible amounts of their time and talents. To Bonnie Bensonhaver, Debra Mills, Roger Johnson, Jim Schoelkopf, and Carole Swineheart, we share our deepest gratitude. At the national and state levels, we share our thanks for the continuous support we have received from the U.S. Department of Education Tech Prep Team and the state Tech Prep coordinators. Our study is richer in depth and quality because of the wisdom these national and state leaders contributed to our research.

At the NCRVE-University of Illinois site we thank our colleagues who contributed all along the way, particularly Mildred Griggs for her sagacious advice and James Layton for his expert computer skills. We also thank our researcher-friends in Texas, Carrie Brown, and Florida, Frank Hammons, who helped us understand the intricacies of Tech Prep implementation in their states and elsewhere. Finally, we thank our families and friends. Without their unconditional love and support, this research would not have been possible.

Debra D. Bragg  
Paula A. Puckett  
William Reger IV  
Helen Sue Thomas  
Joan Ortman  
Carolyn Dornsife

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A few years ago, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) published the results of our national study of Tech Prep implementation in the United States (Bragg, Layton, & Hammons, 1994). That report indicated that Tech Prep--a relatively new federal initiative designed to improve education by linking vocational subjects with rigorous academics and articulating the secondary and postsecondary levels--had produced a number of *promising trends* but *lingering challenges* were evident. In 1993 and 1995, we surveyed local consortia to determine how Tech Prep implementation had changed and/or progressed over time. What we found was encouraging, but issues emerged. Between 1993 and 1995, the Tech Prep concept had spread to more schools and involved

more students, but the extent to which it had produced changes in student outcomes was unclear. In 1996 and 1997, we conducted in-depth field studies in five Tech Prep consortia located in different regions of the United States to learn more about how various approaches to Tech Prep and School-To-Work (STW)--career-oriented programs supported by the federal School-To-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) designed to assist youth to transition from school to careers--were advancing together. Through interviews and observations, these field studies gave us insights into various facets of Tech Prep implementation, furthering knowledge about changes that are being attempted but also accomplished.

Throughout all of our research, our overall objectives have remained consistent. They are:

- to document the characteristics of local Tech Prep consortia and consortium coordinators
- to describe the goals, elements, and outcomes of local Tech Prep initiatives
- to determine the stage of implementation of local Tech Prep initiatives and selected components operating within those initiatives
- to assess the barriers impacting local Tech Prep implementation
- to identify recommendations that local coordinators perceive to be needed in state and federal policy

Presented here are the methodologies and major findings of the 1995 survey and the five field studies. Throughout, comparisons are made to the 1993 survey and related literature on Tech Prep, School-To-Work (STW), educational reform, and the like. Policy recommendations made by the local Tech Prep coordinators surveyed are reported at the conclusion of the report along with our own concluding remarks concerning the future of Tech Prep implementation in the United States.

## **More Promising Trends and Lingering Challenges**

Reviewing the information we and others have collected since passage of the Tech Prep Education Act, it is evident that a great deal has been learned about Tech Prep implementation in the United States in a relatively short period of time. Still, with all that is known, important questions remain. When one scratches below the surface, what do we know about Tech Prep? What stands out as *promising* trends? Some of the most important trends are:

- Tech Prep continues to expand across the nation, reaching well over half of the comprehensive high schools and the vast majority of community colleges in the United States.
- As Tech Prep implementation progresses, a wider net is cast in terms of membership in local Tech Prep consortia, especially among businesses, community-based organizations, and postsecondary education, although involvement by 4-year colleges and universities remains problematic.

- A more diversified approach to public finance of Tech Prep is evident, including more state and local funding; however, federal funds continue to dominate the financial resource base for local Tech Prep implementation.
- Support for Tech Prep remains strong among stakeholder groups that are key to its implementation and sustainability. These groups are vocational faculty, state agency personnel, local secondary and two-year college administrators, business/industry representatives, and students. Much less support was felt from 4-year higher-education institutions toward greater acceptance of or involvement in Tech Prep.
- Most local coordinators support the notion of using Tech Prep as a foundation for School-To-Work (STW), and there are signs that collaboration is occurring. Evidence of the marriage of Tech Prep and STW includes the increasing number of coordinators thinking about Tech Prep in terms of "all students," the expansion of business/education partnerships, and the provision for more work-based learning opportunities for more students.

Whereas these results are promising, *lingering challenges* remain:

- A lack of clarity and consensus is evident surrounding the fundamental purpose of Tech Prep, reinforcing concerns about how Tech Prep will fit with or contribute to related educational restructuring endeavors, including the STW programs targeted for all students.
- Many local coordinators have devoted the majority of their time the past several years to Tech Prep but less and less of their salaries is paid by grants earmarked for it. Where an organization designates Tech Prep as an administrative priority, this trend may be fine. However, where an administrator's time and attention is routinely diverted to other tasks, Tech Prep is likely to suffer.
- Curriculum reform has extended into some aspects of postsecondary education (mostly community colleges), but Tech Prep continues to be primarily a secondary reform, potentially weakening student outcomes.
- With few exceptions, barriers thought to be the most serious in 1993 continued to be troublesome two years later. In fact, many concerns had heightened, not diminished, including issues surrounding joint planning time, secondary and postsecondary (two-year but also four-year) articulation, and instructor preparation to integrate academic and vocational subject matter.

Six *recommendations* were offered by local Tech Prep coordinators that deserve the attention of practitioners and policy makers at all levels.

1. Continue a distinct funding stream for Tech Prep to protect and nurture fledgling but also maturing Tech Prep initiatives.
2. Strengthen federal and state leadership for Tech Prep to ensure clear guidelines are provided to local leaders.
3. Clarify the uneasy relationship between Tech Prep and STW by encouraging logical relationships between Tech Prep and STW policies at the federal and state levels.

4. Broaden the concept of Tech Prep by adopting the view that Tech Prep should serve *all students*, avoiding targeting of the neglected majority.
  5. Increase the *active involvement* of key stakeholder groups such as academic faculty, postsecondary faculty, counselors, and business/industry by finding rewards and incentives to encourage the participation of these groups.
  6. Heighten awareness about Tech Prep. If the idea of Tech Prep has merit, as many believe that it does, it should become much more widely recognized and understood.
- 

## INTRODUCTION

Tech Prep is intended to integrate vocational subjects with rigorous academics and articulate secondary and postsecondary education. The intended result of this new combination of general and vocational education is an approach to education that is more relevant to and supportive of students' career goals[1]. Recognizing the potential of this relatively new federal initiative, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) published the results of our study of Tech Prep implementation in the United States (Bragg, Layton, & Hammons, 1994). In 1994 we reported many hopeful trends with respect to Tech Prep implementation but some serious concerns were raised by local officials as well. Many of these early findings were corroborated by results of other national evaluations conducted in accordance with the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) by Boesel, Rahn, & Deich (1994) and by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (Silverberg & Hershey, 1995; Silverberg, 1996a). We therefore concluded that Tech Prep was stimulating a number of *promising trends* but *lingering challenges* remained.

At the time we conducted our initial survey during the summer of 1993, only a couple of years had passed since federal support was made available for Tech Prep[2]. Whereas some Tech Prep initiatives had started prior to passage of the Tech Prep Education Act, Title III E of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, most were initiated in the 1990s once federal funds became available. Consequently, much of what we reported in 1994 represented progress associated with very early planning, development, and some initial implementation of new Tech Prep initiatives throughout the country.

To introduce our current research, it is important to summarize the major conclusions from our 1994 report, first noting several positive developments associated with Tech Prep at that time. These *promising trends* include the following:

- As many as 50% of the nation's high schools were participants in some form or fashion in Tech Prep implementation in a local consortium, indicating dramatic growth in Tech Prep activity at the secondary education level from 1991 (pre-Perkins II) to

1993 (post-Perkins II).

- Broad-based representation was evident in most local Tech Prep consortia, and this phenomenon was thought to be highly useful in implementing local programs. During the 1992-93 academic year, on average, a local Tech Prep consortium consisted of twelve high schools, two postsecondary schools, and ten private-sector business and industry firms. Some consortia, although not the majority, also involved labor organizations and public community-based organizations.
- A diverse set of student outcomes was given high priority for Tech Prep participants or graduates. The areas of academic skill attainment, employability skill attainment, and matriculation from high school to college were viewed as particularly important outcomes for Tech Prep students.
- A high level of support was perceived for Tech Prep by numerous stakeholder groups, particularly state agency personnel, vocational faculty, local two-year postsecondary administrators, business/industry representatives, local secondary administrators, students, and secondary school board members. One group was viewed as having only a "fair" level of support: four-year college/university personnel.
- Professional development of secondary and postsecondary personnel was conducted by nearly all consortia (which is not surprising since it is an "essential element" of the federal Tech Prep law.) Still, it was encouraging to see that 90 percent of local consortia reported offering *joint* in-service training for secondary and postsecondary teachers. In a typical consortium, about one-half of the secondary and postsecondary vocational faculty, counselors, and administrators had participated in at least one Tech Prep in-service activity. Academic faculty were less likely to participate than vocational faculty, and postsecondary personnel were less likely to participate than their secondary counterparts.
- The hallmark of Tech Prep--formal articulation agreements--were well established in vocational courses in most consortia. Articulation agreements at the program level or in academic areas were much less evident, however. Other key elements of Tech Prep showed encouraging signs of development, including the integration of academic and vocational education (primarily utilizing applied academics) and the implementation of career clusters and career awareness activities, and the beginnings of work-based learning experiences for selected students.

In 1994, we also reported findings considered more disconcerting. We referred to these results as *lingering challenges* and they are summarized below:

- Most local coordinators worked on Tech Prep part-time or as only one facet of their regular jobs, indicating limited resources were dedicated to overseeing Tech Prep implementation and administration. Other resource constraints were evident and manifested in a widespread perception of lacking staff, time, and money for Tech Prep, particularly for collaborative planning that could lead to significant curriculum changes.
- The purpose of Tech Prep lacked clarity as evidenced by the broad and conflicting goals supplied by respondents. Utilizing 1993 survey findings, we tried to determine whether respondents thought Tech Prep was for *all students*, a subset of students

known as the *neglected majority*, or for still another group? Whereas the respondents indicated that equal access for all students was a priority[3], nearly a majority reported dedicating resources to the middle two quartiles of students in academic ability, as envisioned by Parnell (1985) in his book *The Neglected Majority*. Apparently, Parnell's persuasive argument resonates with Tech Prep consortia throughout the nation. However, it is noteworthy that some consortia have adopted different perspectives toward the appropriate student population(s) for Tech Prep. Some have directed Tech Prep to all students; others have targeted it to either higher-achieving or lower-achieving students. Much of this variation is due to local circumstances, of course, but such findings raise questions about how Tech Prep fits with other systemic educational reforms, especially those intended for *all students* such as the reforms brought about by the School-To-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA)[4].

- Few consortia were engaged in complex or far-reaching curriculum reform at either the secondary or postsecondary levels, as evidenced by the lack of reported involvement in advanced-skills courses, career academies or interdisciplinary courses. About two-thirds of respondents planned to implement work-based learning, but only one-third had done so. On an encouraging note, the level of implementation of work-based learning was higher for consortia funded in 1991 than in 1992, showing that consortia with more time and resources were more likely to implement work-based learning. Furthermore, minimal levels of curriculum reform were reported at the postsecondary level, except for formal articulation agreements associated with vocational courses.
- The most serious barriers to the implementation of Tech Prep were those most deeply rooted in long-standing educational policy and practice--the continuation of tracking; the indelible structure of the school day; and teachers' beliefs that 'theory' is for the college-bound and 'practice' is for the rest. These fundamental concerns are evident in respondents' perceptions of the barriers to Tech Prep implementation, especially the lack of time for joint planning by academic and vocational; issues with coordinating secondary and postsecondary programs; the failure of four-year colleges and universities to award college credit for applied academics or other Tech Prep courses; a poor image of vocational education reflecting unfavorably on Tech Prep; and a lack of staff, time, and money. Indeed, these barriers are so deeply ingrained in the fabric and structure of American education, particularly K-12 education, that they seem almost impenetrable. With limited resources, one wonders what level of impact an initiative such as Tech Prep can be expected to have on educational systems.

## **The Initial Tech Prep Implementation Survey in 1993**

The survey research we conducted in 1993 examined the goals, policies, practices, and obstacles local consortia were encountering in implementing Tech Prep. The data were supplied by local Tech Prep consortium coordinators (and occasionally by their designees). Consequently, the information obtained by the survey was reflective of the knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs of this group. The primary goal of our survey research in 1993 was to describe how Tech Prep policy was implemented by local consortia, including examining the ways in which varying contexts (e.g., settings, funding) interact with Tech Prep development.

The five major research questions for the study were:

1. What are the characteristics of Tech Prep local consortia and their coordinators?
2. What are the goals, elements, and outcomes of local Tech Prep initiatives?
3. At what stage of implementation are local Tech Prep initiatives and the selected components operating within these initiatives?
4. What barriers are perceived to impact local Tech Prep implementation?
5. What do local coordinators perceive to be the needed changes in federal and state policy?

Our earlier report synthesized the federal legislation on Tech Prep, reviewed extant literature pertaining to its implementation, and provided descriptive findings associated with the study's five research questions[5]. Since our report on local implementation was one of the first to be published on this concern[6], it was *not* filled with complex statistical results, but written in a concise and straightforward manner for an audience composed largely of education practitioners. Policy makers at all levels of government were another important audience for the report.

### **The 1993 Survey Methods**

Our initial survey involved a sample of the nation's total 1993 population of 855 local Tech Prep consortia. Sample selection occurred on a state-by-state basis, ensuring that all the states had at least one local consortium represented in the total sample[7]. In total, 473 local consortia were surveyed, representing 55 percent of all local Tech Prep consortia in the nation as of June 1, 1993. Of the 473 consortia, 397 provided usable questionnaires that were included in the final data analysis, yielding a response rate of 84 percent.

The mail questionnaire used for our initial study was a sixteen-page booklet of closed- and open-ended items organized into five parts: a) Tech Prep goals and outcomes, b) the stage of implementation of Tech Prep, c) barriers to Tech Prep implementation, d) Tech Prep consortium characteristics, and e) Tech Prep coordinator background. To establish content validity, the instrument was reviewed by a national panel of Tech Prep experts. Then, during the Spring of 1993, it was pilot tested with a small sample of state and local Tech Prep coordinators in California, Illinois, Maine, New York, Texas, and Virginia. Reliability estimates for subscales in the questionnaire ranged from .82 to .94, suggesting a high level of reliability.

During the summer of 1993, we administered the mail questionnaire in four waves, based on procedures developed by Dillman (1978). In wave one, the questionnaires were mailed to the total sample of 473 local consortium coordinators who were asked to return it by June 30, 1993. In wave two, a postcard was mailed to all coordinators reminding them to return the instrument by June 30, 1993. In wave three, at approximately one week prior to June 30, another postcard was mailed to all coordinators who had not yet responded. Also at this time, state coordinators were notified of their state's overall response rate and asked to encourage 100 percent participation

in their states. In wave four in early July, all non-respondents were mailed a replacement questionnaire and asked to complete it by July 25, 1993. Throughout the month of August, telephone follow-up was conducted and surveys were accepted. On September 1, 1993 data collection phase was concluded.

Data analysis consisted of computing simple descriptive statistics followed by inferential statistics such as the Pearson Product-Moment correlation and factor analysis. Open-ended items were analyzed using an inductive content analysis procedure described by Guba and Lincoln (1985). Appendix A presents aggregated responses to each item on the 1993 survey, along with a response rate for each item.

---

## **THE PURPOSE FOR THE STUDY**

Following the 1993 survey, we continued studying Tech Prep implementation, expanding our study to include quantitative and qualitative research methods. In 1995, we conducted a follow-up survey of the same group of consortia sampled in 1993 to determine how these local Tech Prep consortia had changed and/or progressed. In 1996 and 1997, we conducted in-depth field studies involving five local Tech Prep consortia located in different regions of the United States. This aspect of the research provided more detailed understanding of how Tech Prep implementation was advancing at the local level. To ensure readers have a clear understanding of the research methods used, we first present the procedures pertaining to our follow-up survey, then we review the qualitative, field study methodologies.

### **The 1995 Follow-Up Survey**

First, in 1995, we conducted a follow-up survey with the same sample of local Tech Prep consortia that responded to our initial survey in 1993. Of the total group of 397 consortia responding in 1993, 339 responded again in 1995, yielding an 85 percent response rate. Nearly 60 percent of the 1995 respondents were the same people who completed our survey in 1993. This high response rate ensured that similar information was provided in 1993 and 1995, helping us better understand how implementation had progressed over that two-year time period. Table 1 shows the survey population, sample, and response rate by state for both surveys.

**Table 1**  
**Survey Population, Sample and Response Rate by State for 1993 and 1995**

---

| <b>State</b>  | <b>State Consortia as of June 1993</b> | <b>Consortia Surveyed in 1993</b> | <b>Number/Percent Responding in 1993 &amp; Re-surveyed in 1995</b> | <b>Number/Percent Responding in 1995</b> |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Alabama       | 32                                     | 16                                | 12 (75%)   | 10 (83%)                                 |
| Alaska        | 3                                      | 3                                 | 2 (67%)  | 1 (50%)                                  |
| Arizona       | 14                                     | 7                                 | 6 (86%)  | 4 (67%)                                  |
| Arkansas      | 13                                     | 7                                 | 7 (100%)   | 4 (57%)                                  |
| California    | 70                                     | 35                                | 30 (86%)   | 27 (90%)                                 |
| Colorado      | 20                                     | 10                                | 7 (70%)  | 4 (67%)                                  |
| Connecticut   | 14                                     | 7                                 | 4 (57%)  | 4 (100%)                                 |
| DC            | 1                                      | 1                                 | 1 (100%)   | 1 (100%)                                 |
| Delaware      | 1                                      | 1                                 | 1 (100%)   | 1 (100%)                                 |
| Florida       | 17                                     | 9                                 | 7 (77%)  | 6 (86%)                                  |
| Georgia       | 58                                     | 29                                | 24 (83%)   | 22 (92%)                                 |
| Hawaii        | 1                                      | 1                                 | 1 (100%)   | 1 (100%)                                 |
| Idaho         | 6                                      | 6                                 | 4 (66%)  | 4 (100%)                                 |
| Illinois      | 40                                     | 20                                | 20 (100%)  | 16 (80%)                                 |
| Indiana       | 18                                     | 9                                 | 7 (83%)  | 7 (100%)                                 |
| Iowa          | 6                                      | 6                                 | 5 (83%)  | 3 (60%)                                  |
| Kansas        | 6                                      | 6                                 | 4 (66%)  | 4 (100%)                                 |
| Kentucky      | 44                                     | 22                                | 16 (73%)   | 12 (75%)                                 |
| Louisiana     | 13                                     | 7                                 | 7 (100%)   | 5 (71%)                                  |
| Maine         | 6                                      | 6                                 | 6 (100%)   | 5 (83%)                                  |
| Maryland      | 16                                     | 8                                 | 8 (100%)   | 6 (75%)                                  |
| Massachusetts | 11                                     | 6                                 | 5 (83%)  | 4 (80%)                                  |
| Michigan      | 39                                     | 20                                | 17 (85%)   | 15 (88%)                                 |

|                |    |    |           |           |
|----------------|----|----|-----------|-----------|
| Minnesota      | 24 | 12 | 9 (75%)   | 9 (100%)  |
| Mississippi    | 14 | 7  | 7 (100%)  | 7 (100%)  |
| Missouri       | 12 | 6  | 5 (83%)   | 5 (100%)  |
| Montana        | 4  | 4  | 3 (75%)   | 3 (100%)  |
| Nebraska       | 6  | 6  | 6 (100%)  | 6 (100%)  |
| Nevada         | 3  | 3  | 3 (100%)  | 3 (100%)  |
| N. Hampshire   | 4  | 4  | 3 (75%)   | 2 (67%)   |
| New Jersey     | 21 | 11 | 9 (82%)   | 7 (78%)   |
| New Mexico     | 13 | 7  | 7 (100%)  | 6 (86%)   |
| New York       | 28 | 14 | 11 (79%)  | 11 (100%) |
| North Carolina | 47 | 23 | 23 (100%) | 23 (100%) |
| North Dakota   | 1  | 1  | 1 (100%)  | 1 (100%)  |
| Ohio           | 13 | 7  | 7 (100%)  | 7 (100%)  |
| Oklahoma       | 10 | 10 | 8 (80%)   | 5 (63%)   |
| Oregon         | 20 | 11 | 9 (82%)   | 7 (78%)   |
| Pennsylvania   | 22 | 11 | 11 (100%) | 10 (91%)  |
| Rhode Island   | 1  | 1  | 1 (100%)  | 1 (100%)  |
| South Carolina | 16 | 8  | 7 (88%)   | 5 (71%)   |
| South Dakota   | 4  | 4  | 4 (100%)  | 3 (75%)   |
| Tennessee      | 15 | 8  | 6 (75%)   | 5 (83%)   |
| Texas          | 25 | 14 | 11 (79%)  | 11 (100%) |
| Utah           | 11 | 6  | 4 (67%)   | 2 (50%)   |
| Vermont        | 9  | 9  | 6 (67%)   | 4 (67%)   |

|             |     |     |           |           |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----------|
| Virginia    | 34  | 17  | 13 (76%)  | 11 (85%)  |
| Washington  | 18  | 9   | 8 (89%)   | 7 (88%)   |
| W. Virginia | 11  | 6   | 5 (83%)   | 4 (80%)   |
| Wisconsin   | 16  | 8   | 6 (75%)   | 5 (83%)   |
| Wyoming     | 4   | 4   | 3 (75%)   | 3 (100%)  |
| TOTAL       | 855 | 473 | 397 (84%) | 339 (85%) |

The mail questionnaire used for the 1995 follow-up survey was very similar to the initial instrument, although some changes were made. One important reason for modifications was to take into account changes that might have occurred in Tech Prep because of the introduction of the federal School-To-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) of 1994. With the infusion of new funding to stimulate systemic reform in school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities, we hypothesized that Tech Prep programs may have changed to incorporate STWOA components. Other changes were made simply to update and improve the newer version of the questionnaire. For a listing of specific changes made to the 1993 survey to create the 1995 follow-up survey instrument, see Appendix B.

Administration of the follow-up survey in 1995 followed the exact same protocol as for the 1993 survey. Again, the first copy of the survey was mailed in June 1995 with three waves following it to maximize response rate. In September 1995, the follow-up survey was concluded. Appendix C contains aggregated responses and response rates for each item in the 1995 survey.

## **The Field Studies**

In 1996 and 1997, we employed individual and cross-comparative case study methods to conduct field work in one purposively selected Tech Prep consortium in Florida, Illinois, Ohio, Oregon, and Texas. The data collection took place beginning early in the 1996-1997 academic year and continued into the summer of 1997. The sample of five states included was selected purposively based on expert opinion, document review, and in-depth investigation of the Tech Prep and STW policies and practices in all 50 states[8]. A panel of experts was used to review and verify the selection procedure. The five selected states (and sites within) are geographically distributed throughout the United States, and they are all actively engaged in Tech Prep and STW implementation, although they are at different stages of implementation of key components of both Tech Prep and STW (e.g., integrated curriculum, career guidance, work-based learning).

Within each of the five states, we selected one local Tech Prep consortium for more in-depth field study. The process of site selection

was conducted in a careful, purposive manner. First, we conducted meetings (in person and by telephone) with knowledgeable representatives (or key informants). These meetings were designed to provide us with greater understanding of how Tech Prep and STWOA policies and practices were being conceptualized and implemented. We then reviewed Tech Prep and STW-related plans and documents (e.g., agendas, board minutes, brochures, newsletters, grant applications, end-of-year reports) to ensure that we had a clear and comprehensive understanding of what was being attempted in each state. We then sought nominations from Tech Prep experts within and outside of each state, asking for sites where local consortia were thought to demonstrate Tech Prep and STW goals and directives established by the state. We wanted sites where serious attention was paid to Tech Prep and STW, but not necessarily sites that were not facing challenges. We wanted to study sites that were still learning and advancing. We also asked nominators to recommend sites where they knew program evaluation and student outcomes assessment was being done in a serious and thoughtful manner. This criterion was *extremely* important because it ensured our accessibility to baseline information on student outcomes.

Finally, when one or more sites were identified in each of the five states, we interviewed (in person or by telephone) the identified local Tech Prep coordinators regarding their approach to curriculum, use of program evaluation/student outcomes assessment, engagement with STW initiatives, and interest in participating in our study. Our final selection of the five sites was made based on the aforementioned criteria as well as an attempt to identify distinctly different local approaches to Tech Prep curriculum, ranging from the use of the traditional Tech Prep Associate Degree (TPAD) in one site, to the use of dual credits/advanced placement in a second site, to implementation of youth apprenticeships in third site, and to attempts at whole-school reform in the two remaining sites.

The five sites selected for the study were geographically distributed throughout the country, and they ranged in size and composition. Two sites were rural/small town, two were urban/large metropolitan, and one was suburban<sup>[9]</sup>. Appendix D provides a brief description of each of the five field sites but a brief synopsis of the each site follows:

- **The East Central Illinois Education-To-Careers Partnership** is headquartered at the Danville Area Community College in Danville, IL. The consortium is located in a rural region of East Central Illinois serving twelve high schools, a regional vocational school, and the community college. The Tech Prep initiative is directed at grades 9-14. Over 70 business and labor partners are involved, several of which offer youth apprenticeships to Tech Prep students. Although not all of this consortium's Tech Prep programs offer youth apprenticeships, many do. Tech Prep/youth apprenticeships are available in the areas of manufacturing, accounting, banking, health occupations, and food service. The consortium sponsors a Tech Prep Student Leadership organization that prepares students to be ambassadors for Tech Prep. The program provides special training in leadership, communications, and team building. In addition, peer mentoring is encouraged where a community college student is paired with high school student. Since 1993, this consortium has been recognized as a demonstration site for the state of Illinois for Tech Prep and Education-to-Careers (the terminology used in Illinois for School-To-Work.)
- **The Miami Valley Tech Prep Consortium** is headquartered at Sinclair Community College in Dayton, OH. This consortium

is located in an urban area, but the large geographic region served is suburban and rural as well. Besides the community college, eight vocational education planning districts (involving 64 comprehensive high schools) are part of the consortium. Over 100 businesses (manufacturers, automotive dealers, hospitals) are engaged as well. This consortium is noted for its dedicated use of advanced-skills curriculum where students progress to higher levels of competence in academic and technical subjects at both the secondary and postsecondary levels (without the provision of dual credits). It is unique in that the consortium awards scholarships to most students who matriculate from the secondary to postsecondary level in a 2+2 curriculum sequence (grades 11-14). The University of Dayton participates in the consortium, offering students the opportunity to complete the final two years of college with a baccalaureate degree. This consortium has received state and national recognition, most notably the 1996 Parnell Tech Prep Award of the American Association of Community Colleges<sup>[10]</sup>.

- **The Golden Crescent Tech Prep/School-To-Work Partnership** is headquartered at Victoria College in Victoria, TX. Like many of the partnerships in Texas, the region served by the Golden Crescent Partnership is expansive and primarily rural. It involves nearly 40 high schools or independent school districts (ISDs) directly, and another 20 high schools or ISDs that are outside its region. Since passage of STWOA, this consortium has developed a governance structure and supporting policies to fully combine Tech Prep and STW. Utilizing the curriculum structure required by the state of Texas, the Partnership has defined seven Tech Prep pathways that are approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. These Tech Prep pathways are offered in such areas as electronics/instrumentation advanced technology, associate degree nursing, and microcomputer technology. Dual credit is a key feature of articulation agreements worked out between the area secondary schools and Victoria College; over twenty high-school vocational-technical courses provide college credit.
- **The Hillsborough School District/Community College Tech Prep Consortium** is located in a large and growing metropolitan area in central Florida. Thus far, twenty-six different programs of study have been articulated between Hillsborough Community College and the fifteen comprehensive high schools, one technical high school, one alternative high school, and several adult vocational centers that feed students into the college. At the secondary level, the School District of Hillsborough County has designated several courses of study that involve Tech Prep, including the *Tech Prep* course of study requiring students take appropriate community/postsecondary preparatory courses, plus applied technical courses; the *College/Tech Prep* course of study where students meet College Prep and Tech Prep requirements; and the *Florida Academic Scholars/Tech Prep* course of study where students take specific academic course requirements along with Tech Prep to qualify for college scholarships. In 1997, this consortium received national acclaim when it won the Parnell Tech Prep Award from the American Association of Community Colleges.
- **The Mt. Hood Regional Tech Prep Consortium** is headquartered at Mt. Hood Community College in Gresham, OR. Located in a suburb of Portland, OR, this consortium serves eight high schools that feed into Mt. Hood Community College. The consortium has a history with Tech Prep that predates the federal Tech Prep Education Act, contributing to its selection as a national demonstration site for Tech Prep for the U.S. Department of Education and a Parnell Tech Prep Award winner for the American Association of Community Colleges in the early 1990s. Currently, several high schools engaged in the consortium

are involved in whole-school reform to meet the requirements of the STWO Act. Noteworthy among these is Reynolds High School, where the high school learning environment has been re-organized around four houses or families, named after the great mountains that surround the community--Mt. Adams, Mt. Hood, Mt. St. Helens, and Mt. Jefferson. Goals of the house organization include to personalize student learning experiences, to assist students in achieving academic and career goals, to support students in making successful transitions, to assist students in meeting Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) standards, and to integrate instruction that connects learning to real world application (Reynolds High School, 1997).

Two field visits were conducted with each site during the 1996-97 academic year. During our initial site visit conducted in the fall of 1996, in-depth personal interviews were conducted with secondary school and community college personnel (administrators, teachers, counselors), employers, and other key informants. Care was taken to identify persons highly involved with and supportive of Tech Prep and STW as well as those more peripheral and/or skeptical. Whereas the personal interviews were relatively informal and unstructured, they displayed a close relationship to the three major research themes that provided the over-riding focus for the field studies. These themes (posed as questions) were:

- **How is Tech Prep conceptualized?** What are the distinguishing features (goals, elements, key components) of Tech Prep? How have these components evolved over time? How does Tech Prep relate to School-To-Work Opportunities (STW) and other educational reforms? What barriers or obstacles influence implementation of Tech Prep, STW or other educational reforms?
- **How is Tech Prep curriculum structured?** Where does Tech Prep fit with respect to college prep, general education, vocational education, or other existing options (tracks)? For the various options, but particularly for Tech Prep and STW, what are the predominant characteristics, goals, and aspirations of students served?
- **How are the experiences and outcomes of students participating in Tech Prep and/or STW assessed?** Drawing upon local evaluative information, what is known about the patterns of experiences and outcomes of students who participate in Tech Prep and/or STW?

In the spring or summer of 1997, another round of in-depth interviews was conducted, this time with a small cross-section of students (approximately 30 per site) ensuring gender, racial and ethnic diversity. The majority of these students had matriculated (or had intention to do so) from high school to community college in a sequence of courses and experiences associated with Tech Prep/STW. A few interviews were conducted with students who had not participated in Tech Prep/STW to provide comparative data. The interview questions explored students' preparedness for the transition from high school to college and their satisfaction with the school/collegiate experience, progress toward completing a credential, perceptions of the relationships between school/college and work, and perceptions of outcomes attained or anticipated. The student interviews occurred individually or in small groups, lasting from 30 to 60 minutes. Also, students completed a brief questionnaire to provide additional information about their STW transition

experiences.

In terms of data analysis, the field data were analyzed to unveil either unique or pervasive themes and patterns pertaining to the research objectives, first within sites and then across sites. Preliminary data analysis was first completed for each site, revealing five unique case studies. Subsequent data analysis focused on cross-site comparisons to identify important similarities and differences in results across the sites (Merriam, 1988). Cross-site comparisons are highlighted in this report.

---

## **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

In this section, we reveal major findings and conclusions from the 1995 follow-up survey and compare those results to our earlier 1993 report. We also discuss how the survey findings relate to the field studies conducted during the 1996-97 academic year in the five selected sites of Danville, IL; Dayton, OH; Victoria, TX; Tampa, FL; and Gresham, OR. Together, the national survey findings as well as the field studies help to describe how Tech Prep implementation is progressing in the United States. The information collected for the field sites is particularly useful in showing how Tech Prep has developed in recent years, once the federal STWOA legislation took effect.

These findings are organized according to the five major research questions that organized our initial report on *Tech Prep Implementation in the United States*. First, the findings related to Tech Prep consortia and coordinators are discussed. Then, we present the goals, elements, and foci of curriculum reform. Third, we describe the level of implementation of various key components of Tech Prep. Fourth, the barriers to local Tech Prep implementation are discussed. Finally, we present recommended changes to federal and state policy provided by the local Tech Prep coordinators.

### **Characteristics of Tech Prep Consortia and Coordinators**

This section presents findings related to the composition of consortia and funding for Tech Prep implementation. Coordinator characteristics are also presented to portray the characteristics of individuals who guide local Tech Prep efforts. Results from our field studies are presented to supplement the survey findings.

#### **Organizational Composition of Local Consortia**

In both the 1993 and the 1995 surveys, respondents were asked to estimate the number of organizations involved in a local Tech Prep consortium based on the following categories: secondary schools, two-year postsecondary schools, four-year postsecondary schools, private-sector business and industrial firms, labor organizations, public community-based organizations, student leadership organizations, and other. In 1995, respondents were also asked to indicate the number of organizations in each category that were actively participating (defined in the survey as organizations that had students enrolled, actively involved in, and benefiting from a Tech Prep core curriculum.) Results show the number of organizations involved in a Tech Prep consortium increased in all categories (e.g., schools, colleges, businesses) from 1993 to 1995, although most of the changes were not dramatic (see Table 2). The largest increases were registered in the category of secondary schools where the mean increased from 12 to 14 from 1993 to 1995 and in business and industry where the average went from 23 to 27. Similar increases were noted in our five field sites. In these, new partnerships were formed with schools and businesses, partly in an effort to expand the scope and impact of Tech Prep but also to better accommodate expectations associated with the STWOA legislation (e.g., 50 percent membership representation by the private sector on governing boards.)

**Table 2**  
**Organizations Participating in Local Tech Prep Consortia in 1993 and 1995**

| Organizations                              | Total Number in Consortium<br>(1992-1993) |       |        |       | Total Number in Consortium<br>(1994-1995) |       |        |       | Number Actively Participating<br>in Tech Prep (1994-1995) |       |        |       |
|--|---|-------|--------|-------|---|-------|--------|-------|---|-------|--------|-------|
|  | No. & Percent<br>of Total<br>Sample       | Mean  | Median | SD    | No. & Percent<br>of Total<br>Sample       | Mean  | Median | SD    | No. & Percent<br>of Total<br>Sample                       | Mean  | Median | SD    |
| Secondary Schools                          | 364<br>(92%)                              | 11.60 | 8.00   | 11.15 | 325<br>(96%)                              | 14.28 | 11.00  | 12.77 | 317<br>(94%)  | 11.22 | 8.00   | 9.60  |
| Two-Year<br>Postsecondary<br>Schools       | 349<br>(88%)                              | 1.78  | 1.71   | 1.71  | 327<br>(96%)                              | 1.79  | 1.00   | 1.73  | 313<br>(92%)  | 1.81  | 1.00   | 2.16  |
| Four-Year<br>Postsecondary<br>Schools      | 152<br>(38%)                              | 1.64  | 1.00   | 1.19  | 171<br>(50%)                              | 1.99  | 1.00   | 2.13  | 117<br>(35%)  | 1.62  | 1.00   | 2.05  |
| Private-Sector<br>Business<br>and Industry | 287<br>(72%)                              | 22.78 | 10.00  | 45.24 | 223<br>(66%)                              | 26.91 | 15.00  | 49.03 | 241<br>(71%)  | 17.67 | 10.00  | 21.30 |

|  |              |      |      |      |              |      |      |      |              |      |      |      |
|--|--------------|------|------|------|--------------|------|------|------|--------------|------|------|------|
| Labor Organizations                      | 91<br>(23%)  | 2.31 | 1.00 | 2.54 | 100<br>(29%) | 2.52 | 1.50 | 3.53 | 98<br>(29%)  | 1.66 | 1.00 | 1.01 |
| Public Community-<br>Based Organizations | 164<br>(45%) | 5.00 | 3.00 | 6.20 | 130<br>(38%) | 5.75 | 3.00 | 8.56 | 132<br>(39%) | 4.02 | 2.00 | 5.64 |
| Student Leadership<br>Organizations      | 83<br>(21%)  | 4.36 | 2.00 | 4.62 | 80<br>(24%)  | 6.36 | 4.00 | 9.78 | 73<br>(22%)  | 3.73 | 3.00 | 3.87 |

Looking at the 1995 results only, we see a difference in the *involvement* of various organizations as compared to *active participation*. In all categories except one--two-year postsecondary schools (where students can matriculate to institutions other than the one in their district/region in order to participate in Tech Prep), fewer institutions were thought to be actively participating than merely involved. This finding is consistent with a conclusion drawn by Silverberg (1996a) that "All Tech-Prep member districts--and their schools--do not participate in Tech-Prep to the same degree. . . . 'Membership' in a consortium reflects varying approaches to and levels of involvement in Tech-Prep implementation as well as different stages of development" (p. 13).

Based on estimates of the number of secondary and two-year postsecondary organizations reported in the 1993 survey, our previous NCRVE report indicated that well over three-fourths of the nation's two-year postsecondary schools had some level of involvement with a Tech Prep consortium, and approximately one-half of the nation's secondary schools were involved in some manner. Similar estimates were reported by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. for the national Tech-Prep evaluation [11]. Silverberg (1996a) estimated that, in 1993, 51 percent of all secondary districts had some level of involvement in Tech Prep. By 1995, her estimate had increased to 63 percent, based on data collected during the 1992-93 academic year. Our 1995 survey show a continual increase in involvement by secondary schools (increasing by three schools per consortium over the two years between 1993 and 1995), but the number of postsecondary schools leveled off over that period due to the fact that a large proportion were already involved in 1993.

### **Funding for Local Tech Prep Initiatives**

Two-thirds of local consortia initiated planning and implementation for Tech Prep during the first two years federal Tech Prep funds became available for the 1991-92 and 1992-93 academic years. Respondents reported that 34 percent of the Tech Prep programs were started during the 1991-92 academic year; 33 percent began in the 1992-93 school year. Only 12 percent reported beginning Tech Prep initiatives as early as 1990-91. In prior years there were minimal numbers (less than 1 percent per year) reporting the initiation of Tech Prep. In the more recent academic years of 1993-94 and 1994-95, 11 percent and 7 percent of the respondents reported the onset of Tech Prep programs.

Not surprisingly, the years when beginning Tech Prep programs correspond closely to the years when federal Tech Prep monies became available. Forty percent of the respondents reported that funds were first received during the 1991-92 academic year, while another 42 percent first received funds in 1992-93. During 1993-94, 14 percent of respondents related that Tech Prep federal funds were first made available to them (indicating a few consortia were included in our original sample in 1993 that did not receive federal funding.)

In 1993, nearly all respondents reported receiving federal funding for Tech Prep through the Perkins Title III E Act; however, a few indicated federal funding was no longer available to them. For those who did receive federal funding for Tech Prep, the average grant amount increased from \$97,343 in 1992-93 to \$117,274 in 1994-95 (see Table 3)[\[12\]](#). Most federal grants in 1994-95 were around \$100,000, which represented a fairly substantial increase over the typical federal Tech Prep grant in 1992-93. Compared to other sources, federal grants far overshadowed other funding sources. However, many local consortia had created a more diversified funding base for Tech Prep in 1995 than in 1993.

**Table 3**  
**Average Funds to Local Consortia by Source for 1993 and 1995**

| Source of Funds   | 1993                          |          |          |          |         |           | 1995                          |           |         |         |          |           |
|---|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|
|   | No. & Percent of Total Sample | Mean     | SD       | Median   | Min.    | Max.      | No. & Percent of Total Sample | Mean      | SD      | Median  | Min.     | Max.      |
| Tech Prep Grant Funds (Perkins Title III E)                               | 373 (94%)                     | \$97,343 | \$85,619 | \$70,800 | \$7,500 | \$625,000 | 289 (85%)                     | \$117,274 | 100,446 | \$10100 | \$10,000 | \$984,400 |
| Federal Grant Funds other than Perkins Title III E Tech Prep <sup>a</sup> | 101 (25%)                     | 62,221   | 82,026   | 30,784   | 2,000   | 500,000   | 78 (23%)                      | 84,255    | 150,613 | 30,000  | 1,000    | 1,000,000 |
| State Funds <sup>a</sup>  | --                            | --       | --       | --       | --      | --        | 73 (22%)                      | 76,181    | 197,316 | 30,000  | 2,000    | 1,500,000 |
| Local Funds   | 145 (37%)                     | 45,572   | 66,649   | 25,000   | 1,400   | 475,000   | 88 (26%)                      | 67,955    | 125,450 | 24,000  | 600      | 800,000   |

|                                    |              |         |         |        |       |         |               |         |         |         |       |           |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|-----------|
| Private-Sector Business & Industry | 42<br>(11%)  | 9,228   | 11,858  | 5,000  | 500   | 45,000  | 39<br>(11.5%) | 22,534  | 56,353  | 5,000   | 200   | 300,000   |
| Private Foundations <sup>b</sup>   | --           | --      | --      | --     | --    | --      | 10<br>(3%)    | 27,650  | 29,339  | 17,500  | 2,500 | 100,000   |
| Other                              | 18<br>(5%)   | 29,744  | 40,145  | 10,000 | 500   | 140,000 | 16<br>(5%)    | 73,697  | 93,752  | 39,985  | 1,000 | 300,000   |
| Total                              | 383<br>(96%) | 130,987 | 116,358 | 96,000 | 7,000 | 700,000 | 309<br>(91%)  | 180,990 | 215,559 | 120,000 | 7,000 | 1,625,000 |

Notes: <sup>a</sup>In the 1993 survey, this category was defined as "state or federal grant funds other than Perkins Title III E Tech Prep funds," so a separate category for "state funds" was not provided and comparable data is not available.

<sup>b</sup>In the 1993 survey, the category of "private foundations" was not provided, so comparable data is not available.

Approximately one-fourth of the respondents received funds from other federal government sources to support Tech Prep for the 1994-95 academic year (about the same percentage as in 1992-93); however, the average amount of funding from other federal sources had increased by more than one-third. Also in 1995, about one-fourth of the respondents reported financial support from state and local sources. Local funds received in the 1994-95 school year have increased by about 50 percent, on average, than in 1992-93. In either time period, far fewer respondents reported receiving private dollars to support Tech Prep activities than public funds. However, when private funds were reported, a noteworthy increase in was evident. The average level of private funding rose from approximately \$9,000 to \$22,000. But, again, these contributions are far less than the average level of funding from federal, state, or local sources.

**Funding of the Field Sites.** Observations in our five field sites show how funding has shifted from the time initial Tech Prep grants were awarded to local consortia, usually in 1991 or 1992, to the present. As the years passed, several of our field sites were recognized as demonstration sites, meaning they had additional federal or state funds (beyond planning or implementation) to disseminate "best practices" to other consortia. For example, in addition to its base grant, the East Central Illinois Education-To-Careers (ETC) Partnership received numerous demonstration grants to encourage the development and sharing of good ideas with other schools in the state. This consortium also received special funds to extend Tech Prep into the workplace through the development of a Tech Prep/youth apprenticeship model. To sustain newly forming collaborations, the East Central ETC Partnership acquired business/industry support far exceeding the average level of private-sector funding reported by our 1995 survey respondents. Businesses in the Danville area, a region hard-hit with unemployment and corporate downsizing during the 1980s and early 1990s,

contribute generously of personnel and facilities to assist various facets of the local Tech Prep initiative.

Other consortia, such as the Miami Valley Tech Prep Consortium and the Mt. Hood Regional Tech Prep Consortium, received federal grants that dovetail with Tech Prep, providing added momentum to curriculum restructuring. With respect to the Miami Valley Consortium, the National Science Foundation (NSF) awarded Sinclair Community College a 5-year, \$5 million grant to establish the National Center for Excellence for Advanced Manufacturing Education (AME), an national curriculum initiative designed to recreate the infrastructure of technological education. The local coordinator and other Tech Prep leaders work closely with staff of the AME Center on curriculum reform in the manufacturing and related areas. At the Mt. Hood Consortium, a USDE-funded demonstration project, known locally as "Blueprint for Success," plays an integral role in curriculum redesign for Tech Prep in the region. A unique contribution of the Blueprint project is that it "aligns educational standards with industry skill standards [and] aligns a common core of academic standards to industry skill standards and higher education" (Mt. Hood Regional Tech Prep Consortium, 1996, p. 1). In the cases of Miami Valley and Mt. Hood, additional grants have unique but related purposes with respect to Tech Prep. In both locations, additional federal funds have provided necessary resources to develop innovative curriculum that probably could not have happened otherwise. Local officials are quick to point out how they have gained efficiencies and momentum by integrating related curriculum efforts.

In addition to federal funds, all the field sites were awarded STWOA planning and/or implementation funds to strengthen the relationship between Tech Prep and STW. Even though Tech Prep funds dwarfed the limited amount of STWOA dollars received at the local level, having the combined resources provided an incentive to connect the two initiatives, particularly in rural areas where resources (both money and people) are often scarce. In several cases, particularly rural areas, minimal alterations of the Tech Prep administrative structure resulted in a local STW governing board and other partnerships. Where this occurs, Tech Prep and STW and the many stakeholders who support these initiatives, are nearly indistinguishable.

**Local Expenditures.** Finally, regarding funding, our 1995 survey asked where Tech Prep funds were spent. Respondents indicated most of the funds were used in the same five areas in 1993 and 1995: program administration, staff development, curriculum development, equipment purchases, and curriculum materials. Of these five areas, our most recent findings show a slight decrease in funds spent on equipment and a small increase in the monies spent on curriculum development and materials purchases. In 1993 and 1995, the same percentage of funds were spent on promotion and marketing. Funds for evaluation and assessment increased only slightly from 1993 to 1995, and the amount of monies reported for the "other" category tripled, but still accounted for a minimal amount of total funding (see Figure 1). The distribution of funds was fairly indicative of spending by our five field sites, although two sites reported a higher proportion of funds going for program administration, and one of these and another site showed a substantially larger appropriation for professional development. Also, although the funding for evaluation was not ostensibly larger for our field sites than the general population of consortia nationally, the monies devoted to evaluation seemed to be used in more valuable ways to

document program and student outcomes.

### Level of Support from Interest Groups

In the 1995 survey, respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the level of support of several key interest groups. Vocational faculty topped the list of interest groups thought to offer the greatest support to the implementation of Tech Prep. Other interest groups seen as having a good to excellent level of support, based on a rating scale of 3.0 to 4.0 on a 5-point scale, were state agency personnel, local two-year postsecondary administrators, business/industry representatives, local secondary administrators, and students (see Table 4).

**Figure 1**

**Table 4  
Level of Support for Tech Prep from Interest Groups as Perceived by Local Coordinators in 1993 and 1995**

| Interest Group                              | Level of Support (1992-1993) |       |       |           |      |      |     | Level of Support (1994-1995) |       |       |           |       |      |     |
|---|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|------|------|-----|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|------|-----|
|   | Poor                         | Fair  | Good  | Excellent | NA   | Mean | SD  | Poor                         | Fair  | Good  | Excellent | NA    | Mean | SD  |
| Vocational faculty                          | 1.3%                         | 8.9%  | 38.5% | 51.1%     | 0.3% | 3.40 | .70 | 0.9%                         | 6.5%  | 40.1% | 52.2%     | 0.3%  | 3.44 | .66 |
| State agency personnel                      | 2.5%                         | 9.2%  | 30.3% | 53.7%     | 4.3% | 3.41 | .77 | 3.9%                         | 10.7% | 32.6% | 49.9%     | 3.0%  | 3.32 | .83 |
| Local two-year postsecondary administrators | 1.5%                         | 11.4% | 36.2% | 50.4%     | 0.5% | 3.36 | .74 | 2.7%                         | 14.0% | 39.6% | 42.9%     | 0.9%  | 3.24 | .79 |
| Business/industry representatives           | 2.3%                         | 10.2% | 37.6% | 47.2%     | 2.8% | 3.33 | .76 | 2.7%                         | 13.7% | 44.8% | 37.3%     | 1.5%  | 3.19 | .77 |
| Local secondary administrators              | 2.5%                         | 17.0% | 41.3% | 39.2%     | 0.0% | 3.17 | .80 | 3.0%                         | 17.2% | 50.0% | 29.3%     | 0.6%  | 3.06 | .76 |
| Students                                    | 2.0%                         | 14.6% | 48.3% | 25.3%     | 9.7% | 3.07 | .73 | 1.2%                         | 16.9% | 55.5% | 22.8%     | 3.6%  | 3.04 | .68 |
| Secondary faculty <sup>a</sup>              | --                           | --    | --    | --        | --   | --   | --  | 1.2%                         | 18.7% | 63.5% | 16.3%     | 0.3%  | 2.95 | .63 |
| Secondary school board members              | 3.6%                         | 20.6% | 39.1% | 31.2%     | 5.6% | 3.04 | .84 | 5.6%                         | 22.3% | 38.9% | 20.8%     | 12.5% | 2.85 | .86 |

|   |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| Counselors                              | 5.3%  | 26.1% | 43.0% | 25.1% | 0.5%  | 2.88 | .85  | 5.1%  | 30.1% | 45.2% | 18.8% | 0.9% | 2.78 | .81  |
| Parents                                 | 2.3%  | 20.4% | 48.5% | 19.1% | 9.8%  | 2.93 | .73  | 4.7%  | 29.7% | 44.2% | 15.4% | 5.9% | 2.75 | .79  |
| Postsecondary faculty <sup>a</sup>      | --    | --    | --    | --    | --    | --   | --   | 5.4%  | 32.7% | 44.9% | 16.4% | 0.6% | 2.73 | .80  |
| Academic faculty                        | 4.3%  | 30.5% | 43.7% | 21.1% | 0.5%  | 2.82 | .81  | 3.8%  | 35.1% | 49.0% | 11.2% | 0.6% | 2.68 | .72  |
| Labor union representatives             | 7.5%  | 13.7% | 13.2% | 11.9% | 53.6% | 2.64 | 1.04 | 9.0%  | 15.6% | 16.2% | 12.6% | 0.6% | 2.64 | 1.08 |
| College trustee                         | 9.3%  | 14.5% | 24.3% | 20.2% | 31.8% | 2.81 | 1.01 | 12.2% | 15.2% | 26.0% | 12.5% | 0.9% | 2.63 | 1.07 |
| Four-year college/ university personnel | 20.2% | 25.6% | 23.0% | 6.9%  | 24.3% | 2.22 | .94  | 20.8% | 29.8% | 18.2% | 8.3%  | 0.3% | 2.20 | .98  |

Note: <sup>a</sup>The categories of "secondary faculty" and "postsecondary faculty" were not included in the 1993 survey.

Other interest groups identified as being fair to good (2.0 to 3.0) in their support for Tech Prep were secondary faculty, secondary school board members, counselors, parents, postsecondary faculty, academic faculty, labor union representatives, and college trustees. While the mean level of support provided by four-year college/university personnel was within the fair to good range, there was a fairly large gap between the perceived level of support provided by the college trustees and the four-year college/university personnel. This finding corresponds closely to findings from the 1993 study. Little change has occurred in the support shown for Tech Prep by four-year colleges and universities, according to local coordinators.

**Stakeholder Support of the Field Sites.** Having the support of many different stakeholder groups was important to our field sites as well. Many of the same groups reported by the survey respondents to be supportive of Tech Prep were thought to be supportive by the five field-site coordinators. Personal interviews with representatives of groups such as vocational faculty, secondary and postsecondary administrators, business/industry representatives, and students suggested supportive attitudes toward Tech Prep. More skepticism was expressed by academic faculty, counselors, and parents. Generally, the more active the stakeholder groups were in implementation as planners, teachers, mentors and the like, the more supportive they were of Tech Prep. Of course, it is difficult to know how this relationship came about. Did positive attitudes toward Tech Prep encourage some individuals and groups to get involved or did greater involvement lead to more positive attitudes? In reality, both of these scenarios are likely to occur. Tech Prep coordinators emphasize that "forced participation" fails to produce positive results, so involvement needs to be encouraged, not mandated.

## Local Tech Prep Coordinator Profile

Tech Prep coordinators were working at their respective jobs for longer periods than was evident in 1993, which is understandable since Tech Prep has been in existence for more time (see Table 5). The percentage of coordinators who had been employed for three years or longer jumped from 14 percent in 1993 to 44 percent in 1995. Though some changes were evident in the funding sources for the Tech Prep coordinator position, the greatest change was seen in the number of positions that were *not* funded, but considered part of another regular job (usually an administrator position).

**Table 5**  
**Coordinator Work Experiences with Tech Prep in 1993 and 1995**

| Tech Prep Work Experiences                                      | 1992-1993 Percent<br>n=397 | 1994-1995 Percent<br>n=339 |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Number of Months a Tech Prep Coordinator</i>                 |                            |                            |
| 1-6   | 6.0%                       | 6.7%                       |
| 7-12  | 20.4                       | 1.0                        |
| 13-18   | 18.9                       | 7.5                        |
| 19-24   | 22.2                       | 6.2                        |
| 25-30   | 15.6                       | 7.4                        |
| 31-36   | 2.5                        | 17.6                       |
| 36+   | 14.4                       | 44.1                       |
| <i>Organization Employing Immediate Supervision<sup>a</sup></i> |                            |                            |
| Two-year postsecondary college                                  | 52.9                       | 54.7                       |
| Secondary school  | 32.7                       | 14.6                       |
| Other   | 17.6                       | 9.8                        |
| Four-year postsecondary college                                 | 2.8                        | 4.0                        |
| Business and industry   | 1.3                        | 1.5                        |
| Local school district <sup>b</sup>                              | --                         | 21.3                       |
| State or regional office of education <sup>b</sup>              | --                         | 4.9                        |
| <i>Position Funded as</i>                                       |                            |                            |

|  |      |      |
|--|------|------|
| Full-time                                | 37.0 | 35.4 |
| Part-time                                | 38.0 | 24.5 |
| Not funded (part of regular job)         | 20.8 | 32.0 |
| Other                                    | 4.2  | 8.1  |
| <i>Hours Per Week Spent on Tech Prep</i> |      |      |
| 1-20                                     | 44.3 | 42.0 |
| 21-40                                    | 32.5 | 36.6 |
| 41 or more                               | 23.2 | 21.2 |

Notes: <sup>a</sup>Percentages do not add to 100% since multiple responses were permitted.

<sup>b</sup>The categories of "local school district" and "state or regional office of education" were not included in the 1993 survey.

In 1993, 21 percent of the coordinator positions were *not* funded, whereas in 1995, 32 percent had no funding, suggesting that at least some coordinator positions that received part-time funding in 1993 shifted to no funding by 1995. Interestingly enough, results show little change in the number of hours devoted to Tech Prep. In 1995, similarly to 1993, the majority of local coordinators reported spending over 20 hours per week on Tech Prep activities. The commitment to funding Tech Prep administration without external funding would appear to call for greater support from local entities. Whereas the average level of local funding increased fairly dramatically from 1993 to 1995 (see Table 3 above); only about one-quarter of the 1995 respondents indicated receiving *any* local funds, suggesting large disparities across the nation. This finding raises the question of how the cost of local administration is being paid when neither grant funds or local funds are utilized. Are Tech Prep coordinators contributing their personal time, over and above other duties? How long can Tech Prep coordinators be expected to make such commitments? How long can Tech Prep be sustained under these conditions?

Similarly to findings for 1993, two-year colleges were the largest employers of Tech Prep coordinators, with approximately 55 percent of reporting their immediate supervisor to be in that type of organization. The other predominant organization employing Tech Prep coordinators was local school districts. Similarly to our 1993 results, few coordinators were employed by four-year colleges, businesses, state or regional offices of education, or secondary schools (refer again to Table 5). Evident in this strategy is the awarding of responsibility and/or authority for administration to organizations that can provide a centralizing and coordinating function. Although difficult to measure, this aspect of Tech Prep implementation is important because of its contribution to more consistent quality and efficiency across schools and colleges.

Respondents were again asked in 1995 to indicate their previous professional work experience. Those who had prior administrative experience increased slightly from 53 to 56 percent from 1993 to 1995 (see Table 6). A slight increase was also documented in prior experience in business/industry employment from 28 to 31 percent. The percentage of coordinators previously engaged in vocational teaching, university teaching/research or guidance/counseling fell slightly, with the drop in past vocational teaching being more pronounced.

**Table 6**  
**Tech Prep Coordinator Work and Educational Background in 1993 and 1995**

| Background   | 1992-1993 Percent<br>n=397 | 1994-1995 Percent<br>n=339 |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Previous Professional Work Experience<sup>a</sup></i>                     |                            |                            |
| Educational administration   | 53.1%                      | 56.2%                      |
| Vocational teaching  | 47.4%                      | 39.8%                      |
| Academic teaching  | 33.5%                      | 32.5%                      |
| Business/industry employment   | 28.5%                      | 31.3%                      |
| University teaching/research   | 16.1%                      | 13.1%                      |
| Guidance/counseling  | 14.6%                      | 10.9%                      |
| Other  | 13.4%                      | 8.5%                       |
| <i>Highest Educational Degree Obtained<sup>d</sup></i>                       |                            |                            |
| Advanced certificate or master's plus additional graduate study <sup>b</sup> | --                         | 33.9%                      |
| Master's degree  | 63.5%                      | 32.7%                      |
| Doctoral degree  | 20.2%                      | 16.2%                      |
| Bachelor's degree  | 11.3%                      | 14.1%                      |
| Associate's degree   | 2.8%                       | 0.9%                       |
| Other  | 2.3%                       | 2.1%                       |

Notes: <sup>a</sup>Percentages do not add to 100% since multiple responses were permitted.

<sup>b</sup>The categories of "advanced certificate or master's plus additional graduate study" was not provided in the 1993 survey.

As a group, local coordinators were highly educated, with the majority having earned a master's degree or higher. In fact, the survey was changed between 1993 and 1995 to include a category on "advanced certificate or master's plus additional graduate study" to accommodate respondents who had given this information in 1993. By including the new category, we learned that approximately one-third of the respondents had an advanced certificate or master's course work and beyond. Sixteen percent had obtained a doctoral degree. The percentage of respondents with a bachelor's degree increased from 11 percent in 1993 to 14 percent in 1995 (refer again to Table 6).

**Coordinators of the Field Sites.** In all cases, the coordinators responsible for Tech Prep in our field sites were well educated, highly competent, politically connected (networked), and astutely savvy. In nearly all cases, the individuals held the position of Tech Prep coordinator since the time federal funds for Tech Prep flowed to their region in 1991 or 1992. The coordinators confessed that their understanding of the many dimensions of Tech Prep had grown enormously over these relatively short years. At first, they were relatively unaware of matters such as how to approach school restructuring, where to develop education and business partnerships, and why it is important to nurture STW transition. Only later, after having five or more years of experience, did they feel more confident in their ability to guide their local initiatives. In fact, most were highly sought-after speakers on critical issues pertaining to Tech Prep/STW implementation for state and national professional organizations such as the National Tech Prep Network (NTPN), the American Vocational Association (AVA) and the American Association of Community College (AACC).

Contributing to their success as local Tech Prep coordinators, all had a variety of work experiences within education and elsewhere. In fact, having a varied work history was thought to contribute to mastering the complex and multiple-faceted dimensions of the Tech Prep coordinator job. Although not a criterion for selection for our field study, all sites administered Tech Prep grant(s) from the community college, therefore acting as fiscal agents for the local Tech Prep initiatives. Knowing this, it is interesting that three of the five Tech Prep coordinators in our study were hired by the community colleges because of their recent high school teaching experience. The sincere commitment these individuals, along with their colleges, showed for improving secondary education seemed to be an asset to the overall Tech Prep initiative, according to the community colleges employing them. A fourth Tech Prep coordinator had recent community college teaching experience, but most of her current work with Tech Prep was done at the secondary level. While this coordinator maintained an office at the community college, she rarely used it, dedicating most of her time to working with the secondary district offices where policies affecting K-12 education were carried out. The one remaining coordinator spent the first part of his career in the military, more recently moving to public education. His recent experience in the military service is evident in his personal philosophy about education and his approach to management. Holding a staunch conviction to the need to make education more effective, this coordinator is committed to integrating regional Tech Prep and STW activities. For him, the challenge is to bring improved quality and efficiency to all of education by developing a coordinated Tech Prep/STW system for the region.

## Goals, Elements and Curriculum Reform

This section presents findings related to the goals and elements of Tech Prep as well as progress on curriculum reform. Included in this section are the primary goals and elements specified for Tech Prep, the vocational program areas involved, the student groups targeted, and the activities being addressed by curriculum reform at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. Survey respondents wrote brief narratives regarding how their consortium differentiates between Tech Prep and vocational education, enhancing our understanding of how Tech Prep fits with other curricular options or tracks. Similar questions were asked of various stakeholder groups involved in our field studies.

### Primary Goal for Tech Prep

The 1993 survey asked respondents to write a brief statement about the primary goal of their consortium's Tech Prep initiative. A range of responses were received, and the statements were organized into five distinct categories. The five goals, gleaned from a content analysis of the respondents' 1993 narratives, were to:

- *Articulate secondary and postsecondary education*--increase student matriculation into postsecondary education by formally articulating secondary and postsecondary education
- *Enhance workforce preparation*--prepare individuals for an increasingly competitive and technological workplace with education that combines academics, technologies, and career preparation
- *Give students multiple options beyond high school*--provide educational preparation that leads to multiple options beyond high school, including employment, two-year college, four-year college, or military service
- *Reach the neglected majority*--create educational opportunities to ensure the neglected majority receives better career and academic preparation by eliminating the general track
- *Reform the secondary school curriculum*--institute systemic reform to change teaching and learning processes and institutionalize Tech Prep at the secondary level

In 1993, the most prominent goal for Tech Prep was enhancing the workforce through educational programs involving technology and career preparation, according to 36 percent of those surveyed. In 1995, this goal remained predominant, although less so than in 1993[13] (see Figure 2). In 1995, 29 percent of the respondents chose the goal to enhance workforce preparation as their top goal for Tech Prep. The next three goals--to reach the neglected majority, give students multiple options beyond high school, and articulate secondary and postsecondary education--were identified by 18 to 20 percent, a small increase over 1993 in each category. Finally, in 1993, 17 percent of the respondents indicated their Tech Prep initiative was directed at reforming secondary school curriculum; however, in 1995, the percentage of respondents who selected this option was 12 percent, suggesting less emphasis on secondary

school reform relative to the other goals.

**Figure 2**

Examining these rankings, Table 7 indicates that respondents' views on the goals for Tech Prep were highly disparate. Whereas the goal of enhancing workforce preparation was top for about one-third of the respondents, this goal ranked last or next to last for another one-quarter. About one-fifth of the respondents indicated the goal of reaching the neglected majority was ranked 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th; the distribution of responses could not have been spread more equally. Except for the goal of reforming the secondary school curriculum, ranked at the bottom or next to bottom by the majority, the four goals of workforce preparation, serving the neglected majority, articulating curriculum, and providing students with multiple options were viable for a fairly large proportion of respondents, suggesting Tech Prep was not intended to meet only one goal, but many. As local circumstances and needs vary, so do the goals of Tech Prep. So, if Tech Prep can be viewed primarily as an approach to addressing workforce needs by engaging students who have been neglected by traditional high-school curriculum. Accepting this perspective, it is logical and reasonable to pursue multiple goals for Tech Prep.

**Table 7**  
**Rank Ordering of Goals for Tech Prep in 1995**

| Goal  | Percent Ranked 1st | Percent Ranked 2nd | Percent Ranked 3rd | Percent Ranked 4th | Percent Ranked 5th |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Articulate secondary and postsecondary education  | 18                 | 13                 | 20                 | 25                 | 24                 |
| Enhance workforce preparation                     | 30%                | 23%                | 23%                | 15%                | 10%                |
| Give students multiple options beyond high school | 19                 | 31                 | 22                 | 19                 | 10                 |
| Reach the neglected majority                      | 20                 | 19                 | 20                 | 20                 | 20                 |
| Reform the secondary school curriculum            | 12                 | 15                 | 16                 | 22                 | 36                 |

**Goals of the Field Sites.** Our field study revealed just how complex the task of goal setting can be to local Tech Prep consortia. In many respects, all five of the aforementioned goals are evident in the five sites we studied. All seek to use Tech Prep to prepare a more highly skilled technical workforce, and all do so by improving relationships between secondary and postsecondary education, by serving secondary students seem to be short-changed by existing curricula, and by increasing options for students in school-based and

work-based learning experience. Where substantial differences exist among each site, the level of emphasis on particular goals within the sites seems to shift and grow as Tech Prep evolves. For example, some local consortia build Tech Prep around articulation agreements. Once these agreements are hammered out, priorities shift to another goal, such as articulation with four-year colleges and universities. In other consortia, articulation was not the first priority. Instead, the consortia start with curriculum re-design at the high-school level, preferring to make secondary curricular changes before developing articulation agreements. For these sites, Tech Prep goals are not stagnant, but dynamic and dependent upon many factors, not the least is the stage of implementation.

### Elements of Tech Prep

The 1995 respondents were asked to respond to the same list of fourteen elements presented in 1993, plus an additional element: local program evaluation of Tech Prep. Similarly to 1993, results indicate that thirteen of the fourteen elements are formally stated as a foci of Tech Prep by the vast majority of respondents in 1995 (see Table 8). Six elements presented in the 1993 survey were identified by over 90 percent of the respondents as being "formally stated in writing as a foci for Tech Prep implementation." These include articulation agreements, integrated academic and vocational curriculum, career guidance, collaboration between education and employers, and equal access for special populations. Over 80 percent of the respondents said an element of Tech Prep was joint in-service for teachers, marketing, and training for counselors. Over 60 percent indicated elements such as preparatory services, new teaching methods, work-based learning, and alternative assessment. Only in the case of job placement did less than 50 percent of the 1993 respondents fail to respond affirmatively.

**Table 8**  
**Elements Formally Stated as Foci of Tech Prep Initiative in 1993 and 1995**

| Element  | Percent<br>1992-<br>1993 | Percent<br>1994-<br>1995 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Formal articulation agreements to create 2+2 program-area course sequences between secondary and postsecondary schools | 96.4%                    | 97.4%                    |
| Integrated academic and vocational curriculum  | 95.6                     | 92.6                     |
| Career guidance, including career awareness and exploration  | 93.6                     | 94.7                     |
| Collaboration between educators and employers  | 92.5                     | 89.6                     |
| Equal access to the full range of Tech Prep for special populations  | 91.9                     | 87.8                     |
| Common core curriculum in math, science, and communications (including applied academics) and technologies             | 91.9                     | 91.4                     |

|  |      |      |
|--|------|------|
| leading to an associate degree, certificate, or apprenticeship in a career field                           |      |      |
| Joint inservice training for teachers from the entire consortium   | 89.9 | 81.3 |
| Marketing of Tech Prep programs  | 87.0 | 88.7 |
| Training programs for counselors   | 82.5 | 73.1 |
| Preparatory services for all participants in Tech Prep   | 78.5 | 73.4 |
| New teaching methods such as cooperative learning appropriate for varied student needs and learning styles | 71.9 | 72.3 |
| Work-based learning experiences (e.g., youth apprenticeships, cooperative education, school academies)     | 67.7 | 77.5 |
| Alternative learner assessment (e.g., performance assessment, portfolios)                                  | 60.5 | 60.4 |
| Employment assistance and job placement services   | 46.8 | 46.2 |
| Local program evaluation of Tech Prep <sup>a</sup>   | --   | 77.6 |

Note: <sup>a</sup>The category of "local program evaluation of Tech Prep" was not included in the 1993 survey.

In 1995, only minor deviations were noted in the areas of joint in-service for teachers and training for counselors, with 1995 respondents indicating that less attention was being paid to these areas than in 1993. In contrast, more respondents indicated work-based learning to be formally stated foci of Tech Prep in 1995 than in the previous survey, possibly showing compliance with the STWOA law. Work-based learning was identified by over 77 percent of the 1995 respondents as a foci of Tech Prep, up from 68 percent in 1993. With respect to our new item on "local program evaluation of Tech Prep," about three-fourths of the respondents identified this area as a formally stated foci of Tech Prep, although, as later results show, actual implementation of evaluation was much less common.

**Elements as Foci of Field Sites.** The breadth of elements specified for Tech Prep is immense. In reviewing the list of elements provided in Table 8, one gets the sense that Tech Prep has taken on a much broader scope than Parnell (1985) imagined in his book *The Neglected Majority*, where the notion of Tech Prep was first introduced on the national scene. Yet, as our local field sites aptly point out, if Tech Prep is going to have an impact, if it is going to be sustainable over time, it must not be isolated from other systemic reforms, particularly those occurring at the secondary level. To advocate new Tech Prep programs that do *not* mesh with other systemic reforms will likely perpetuate the separateness vocational education has experienced from mainstream curricula throughout much of its modern history. Indeed, grappling with the issue of targeting Tech Prep to the neglected majority versus all students is not a peripheral concern but a central one. Aligning Tech Prep with a philosophy of serving all students, as our five field sites have done, demonstrates that the visibility and credibility of Tech Prep can be strengthened, producing valuable advancements in implementation

activities. More limited definitions seem destined to replicate the past, yielding far less powerful results.

### **Target Student Groups for Tech Prep**

In both surveys, we asked respondents to indicate the primary target group of students for their local Tech Prep initiative. In 1993, we concluded,

consortia were directing their efforts to students in the middle quartiles of academic ability, and especially to students in the second quartile (i.e., 50th-75th). Students in the two extreme quartiles were much less likely to be identified as target groups for Tech Prep. . . . [Therefore] it seems apparent that many local Tech Prep coordinators have adopted the perspective that Tech Prep can fill the gap in high school curriculum for the 'neglected majority'. (Bragg, Layton & Hammons, 1994, p. 48)

In 1995, 39 percent of respondents indicated they were directing Tech-Prep efforts to the 25th-75th percentile--the 'middle majority', and 20 percent indicated the 50th-75th percentile group. Together, these two responses accounted for 59 percent of all 1995 responses compared to 73 percent in 1993, suggesting the practice of targeting of Tech Prep to the neglected majority had weakened. In 1995 we saw a noticeable increase in the proportion of respondents who viewed Tech Prep as for "all students," rising from 11 percent to 16 percent. Little change was registered in other categories (see Figure 3 and 4 below).

#### **Figure 3**

#### **Figure 4**

Anticipating this finding, we added a question to our 1995 survey asking respondents to identify elements of their definition of a Tech Prep student. By checking yes or no, respondents could indicate whether their consortium's official definition of a Tech Prep student included any one of fourteen statements (gleaned primarily from state and local policy statements). To interpret the results, first note that 42 percent of the respondents denied that a formal written definition exists for a Tech Prep student and 66 percent answered negatively to the statement that "a formal written admission process is used to admit Tech Prep students" (see Table 9). These responses suggest that the ambiguity we saw in definitions of the target population in our earlier survey (as well as NAVE and national Tech Prep evaluation studies) are largely unresolved.

**Table 9**  
**Definitions of the Tech Prep Student in 1995**

| Element  | Percent |
|--|---------|
| Any student who chooses to participate in Tech Prep can do so.   | 92.4    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who chooses a program of study designated as Tech Prep.   | 80.2    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who has an individualized plan showing Tech Prep is his/her designated program of study.  | 66.8    |
| A Tech Prep student must create a formal plan to complete a sequence of courses in a core curriculum of math, science, communications, and workplace skills that logically leads to an associate degree. | 63.3    |
| A formal written definition exists for a Tech Prep student.  | 58.3    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who is required to enroll in vocational-technical courses that are formally articulated to the postsecondary level.   | 56.1    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who is academically capable but unmotivated by the traditional academic curriculum.   | 49.5    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who is required to take applied academics courses such as applied math, Principles of Technology, or applied communications.  | 47.6    |
| A Tech Prep student must maintain academic progress on grade level in the core curriculum.   | 47.3    |
| A formal written admission process is used to admit Tech Prep students.  | 34.3    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who actually participates in a work-based learning experience such as co-op or apprenticeship.  | 30.7    |
| All students are considered Tech Prep students.  | 21.1    |
| A Tech Prep student is someone who is identified as being at risk of dropping out or of school failure.  | 12.0    |
| At entry into Tech Prep, a student must meet a specific grade point average.   | 10.4    |

Addressing this concern head-on, a 1996 statement on Tech Prep by the U.S. Department of Education identified the definition and target population for Tech Prep as its #1 issue. This report addressed concerns brought about by targeting Tech Prep to a subset of students when the goals are applicable to all students. In the *Tech Prep Concept Paper*, Harkin, Beaulieu, Brooks, and Cossaro (1996) concluded "Tech Prep is a curricular and instructional strategy for *all* students" [*emphasis added*], (p. 4). They support this conclusion with the following rationale:

In a broader sense, the purpose of Tech Prep education is to prepare an academically and technically competent workforce. This workforce must be prepared to adapt to rapid technological changes in the competitive workforce and to pursue lifelong learning. How then is Tech Prep different from other educational strategies? Let us take a look at its unique features:

1. a planned, non-duplicative sequence of study in a technical field leading to an associate degree or certificate
2. an articulated secondary and postsecondary career pathway tied to the evolving workplace
3. an applied/integrated academic and technical/occupational curriculum
4. a rigorous set of high academic and occupational skills standards for students. (Harkin, Beaulieu, Brooks, & Cossaro, 1996, p. 4-5)

Considering the milieu of concerns surrounding defining the target student population for Tech Prep, it is noteworthy that the top statement, chosen by nearly all respondents, was "any student who chooses to participate in Tech Prep can do so," demonstrating a firm appreciation for access. At the same time, the results do not support the conclusion that all students are Tech Prep students since only a few respondents gave an affirmative response to the statement that "all students are considered Tech Prep students," which closely approximates earlier findings showing 16 percent of respondents selected the 0-100th percentile of students as the target group for Tech Prep. Of course, it is one thing to construct a definition of Tech Prep that includes all students and quite another to deliver programs so that all students benefit. Although limited evaluation exists of STW, this observation probably applies to other models and approaches to STW too, such as cooperative education (co-op), youth apprenticeships, and career academies. Saying STW is for "all" appeals to our egalitarian values, but adopting that appealing rhetoric does not necessarily translate into action. To accomplish STW for all requires enormous change, far beyond our present circumstances.

When a definition is offered for the Tech Prep student, what are the elements of that definition? Results show the definition of a Tech Prep student is much more closely tied to participation in a particular curriculum, course, or program than it is to student characteristics. For example, 80 percent of respondents indicated a Tech Prep student is "someone who chooses a program of study designated as Tech Prep," 66 percent said a Tech Prep student is "someone who has an individualized plan," and another 63 percent said "a Tech Prep student must create a formal plan." In their written comments, several respondents identified counseling as an important element of Tech Prep because it allows schools to expose all students to the opportunity to enroll in Tech Prep; thus Tech Prep is considered a mainstream system or an option for all students within a total delivery system. In effect, students become Tech Prep students through their participation rather than because of their characteristics or any selection mechanism. This conclusion is consistent with earlier findings showing that "any student who chooses to participate in Tech Prep can do so."

Nearly half of the respondents indicated there are other elements of curriculum that can be added to help define the Tech Prep student. These include enrollment in vocational-technical courses formally articulated to the postsecondary level, applied academics courses

and work-based learning. Apparently, for some, educating students for a lifetime in the workforce is central to providing a well-rounded education. These results suggest, as the Tech Prep process becomes better defined, so does the definition of the Tech Prep student. Some consortia considered their primary target students as those who are enrolled in vocational classes, but most expressed a different view. The others suggested the more inclusive the Tech Prep approach, the better the chances of countering the isolationism characteristic of some vocational programs. These consortia refuse to label or track students under the banner of Tech Prep, preferring to consider all students participants in a comprehensive education system.

Ultimately, these results suggest that, in practice, Tech Prep is rarely targeted at particular student groups, especially the top or bottom academic-ability quartiles. Only 12 percent of the respondents indicated that a Tech Prep student is someone who is at risk of dropping out or school failure (suggesting lower academic ability) and only 10 percent indicated a student must meet a specific grade point average to enter Tech Prep (approximating higher academic ability).

Nearly half of the respondents did report that a Tech Prep student must maintain academic progress on grade level in the core curriculum, but this is quite different from requiring a particular entry-level grade point average (GPA) for access into the program. In these sites, a wide population of students--sometimes all students--are encouraged to enroll rather than targeting only a few. Once engaged, all students are expected to perform at prescribed academic and occupational performance levels, specified by educators and sometimes other stakeholders, such as employers. The established performance levels are often well beyond what the typical student (sometimes labeled the "general education" student) is attaining, particularly in the math, science and technical course sequences. In so doing, students are better prepared to matriculate to college, often receiving articulated credit in the process.

### **Vocational Program Areas for Tech Prep**

When students enroll in Tech Prep, what is the focus of their involvement in vocational-technical areas? Over one-half of the 1995 respondents indicated that Tech Prep involved one or more of four vocational-education program areas (see Figure 5). Business and Office was a focus of most Tech Prep initiatives in 1993 and almost all in 1995, followed by Trade and Industrial education that is reported by approximately two-thirds of respondents. In 1993, Industrial Technology Education was the next most prominent vocational area as it was reported to be part of about two-thirds of the consortia as well. A fourth vocational area, appearing in slightly over one-half of the 1993 consortia, was Health Occupations. This percentage increased by 1995 to two-thirds, approximating the same level of activity as trade and industrial and industrial technology education. While less than one-third of the 1993 consortia reported involving any of the remaining vocational program areas such as agriculture, marketing/distributive education, or various areas of consumer and family studies, nearly one-half indicated agriculture and marketing/ distributive to be part of Tech-Prep curriculum reform by 1995.

## Figure 5

**Vocational Areas in the Field Sites.** The concentration of Tech Prep programs in such areas as business and office, health occupations, trade and industrial, and technology education was evident in our field sites as well. Vocational program such as business management, nursing, automotive technology, or electronics are likely foci because they have a logical extension to the postsecondary level, and they have a meaningful connection to academic subjects, making academic and vocational integration a valuable activity. Since a requirement of Tech Prep is to articulate programs from the secondary to the postsecondary level, some secondary vocational education programs do not fit the Tech Prep model well because there is no obvious parallel curriculum at the collegiate level. Several representatives of our local field sites talked about the challenges in realigning secondary and postsecondary vocational curriculum; in some cases, new vocational programs were built from scratch at either the secondary or postsecondary level to ensure a core sequence of courses for grades 9-14. Clearly, such immense changes take time and resources. They also require skillful leadership as changes of this scope rarely occur without conflict or stress. Fundamentally, reorganization of this scale requires that local policy makers and practitioners take a close look at what Tech Prep means and how it is similar to or different from vocational education and other aspects of the secondary curriculum.

### How Tech Prep Differs From Vocational Education

Five major components distinguish Tech Prep from vocational education, according to our survey respondents. The most important components are applied academics, articulation, workplace experiences, career clusters or pathways, and the notion that tech prep is a strategy that benefits all students. These components are not universal or even readily applicable to all respondents. Nevertheless, the terms used to define Tech Prep reflect a fair amount of consistency.

**Applied Academics.** An important foundation of Tech Prep is its academic component. One hundred and forty-nine respondents in forty-two states identified academics as a central part of their definition of Tech Prep. Principally, academics in Tech Prep are considered to be integrated with vocational courses, usually meaning a combination of academic and technical subject matter. Sixty-three consortia included the element of applied academics in their definitions of Tech Prep, using terms such as "cluster," "sequence," "integration," "direct link," or "pathway," in which applied academics are a key element. Eighteen consortia described applied academics in superlative terms: "Tech prep includes *more* academic course work in programs of study." Or the academic element of the program is described as "rigorous" or as the "foundation" of the Tech Prep course of study. One coordinator identified applied academics as the principle characteristic of Tech Prep reform, saying "Tech Prep is a change to applied academics." Other respondents said that applied academics "supported" technical programs or "complemented" them.

Though Tech Prep appears to be based on the idea that academics are closely linked to technical education, relatively few consortia defined academics in term of specific standards. Only twelve consortia pointed out that Tech Prep was differentiated from vocational education because of its "high level" or "increased academics." Fewer identified a specific grade point level (GPA) as a measurement of academic performance that could be used to define "high level" academics and therefore Tech Prep which is consistent with our previous discussion regarding definitions for Tech Prep students. In fact, twenty-eight consortia differentiated Tech Prep from vocational education with *minimum* standards in core academic courses in mathematics, English, communications or science. Also, not all consortia consider these subjects equally important; Mathematics was named more often than science, English or communications.

As a final comment on raising academic standards, only four consortia identified Tech Prep students as those students required to take a specific number of courses or years in academic subjects. A few consortia stipulated that these courses were internally oriented toward students with "applied" interests or, in other words "related courses" with a contextual format (Bolt & Swartz, 1997), while other consortia identified mathematics, English or communications and science courses as part of a broader set of course work, avoiding stipulating that these are applied courses by nature. Only one consortium identified the academic core of math, science and communications as "designed to make postsecondary study a possibility for all students."

**Articulation.** Close behind applied academics is the notion that secondary and postsecondary schools create continuous Tech Prep programs to support the completion of higher degrees or further education, almost as though this component was so obvious and little specific comments were necessary. Some consortia emphasized that the academic core of the secondary program is articulated directly to the postsecondary level (i.e., to the associate degree, a certificate in a specific field, or apprenticeship.) A few consortia defined articulation as a formal agreement between institutions, in which standards of accomplishment are governed by "skill content/curriculum review" by faculty and business representatives, or in which other academic standards are agreed upon, thereby determining who can articulate. This approach to Tech-Prep articulation was evident at two of our field sites: the Golden Crescent Tech Prep/School-To-Work Partnership and Mt. Hood Regional Tech Prep Consortium. Although not prevalent, a few respondents indicated that articulation is pursued by the student as opposed to the institution itself.

**Work-based learning.** Although not the majority, some respondents emphasized workplace (or work-based) learning experience as a core component of Tech Prep. For a growing number of respondents, work-based learning made an important contribution to Tech Prep and its applied academics course work, providing "practical application of learned skills in a workplace setting." In at least a few consortia, work-based learning was limited to "honors students" or "special populations" and the student body at large was not informed about workplace learning opportunities. However, this was not appear to be the norm. More often, consortia were grappling with operationalizing the idea of work-based learning for all students. Only one consortium specifically noted that adult apprenticeships were a part of Tech Prep and an alternative to the associate degree.

Some consortia associated Tech Prep with internships or youth apprenticeships offered in conjunction with local business and industry. In fact, this view was evident in the East Central ETC Partnership (one of our field sites) that has incorporated the youth apprenticeship model into nearly all aspects of Tech Prep. Consortia like the East Central Partnership are moving toward providing work experiences for a sizable proportion if not all students. In this consortium, youth apprenticeships and other forms of work-based learning are a core component of Tech Prep, following state guidelines established when Tech Prep grants were first awarded in 1991. As such, Tech Prep are indistinguishable from STW and, because Tech Prep has become an recognized and accepted term in the community, the new terminology of STW has not been emphasized in an attempt to avoid the perception that Tech Prep was being replaced quickly by yet another program. Although their approaches were different, all of our five field sites held somewhat similar views toward the relationship between Tech Prep and STW.

**Career Clusters or Pathways.** Some consortia considered career development or education to be part of Tech Prep, and the predominant terminology used to describe this component was "career path" or "career cluster." Career paths or pathways were typically career or technical in nature and combined with stronger academic components. Tech Prep was sometimes characterized by the planning of career pathways (apparently consistent with the STWOA legislation. Tech Prep students were said to follow a career path to work or past study. One consortium identified Tech Prep as a secondary technology curriculum (among others) that could be followed by students. Tech Prep students could identify a vocational program within career clusters that would eventually lead to an associate degree. Of course, in at least some of these cases, career clusters represented more of an administrative than curricular feature since existing vocational programs appeared to be unchanged.

On the other hand, many respondents considered career clusters broader in scope than vocational education as evidenced by the following statement: "Tech Prep is aimed at a career cluster and requires post-secondary training." Career clusters in engineering, health and human services, and business were common. One consortium considered career clusters and pathways to be the solution to the division between vocational and academic tracks; in this view, "all students are `career bound.'"[14] Furthermore, some consortia considered career guidance or counseling part of Tech Prep. For these consortia, Tech Prep includes career guidance that extends throughout the student's career, including career and academic assessment. Guidance counselors play a critical role in these Tech Prep initiatives, from junior high school through at least the community-college level.

**No differentiation.** Twenty-seven consortia specifically stated that they do not differentiate between Tech Prep and vocational education; however, these responses fall into several categories. Some claim to have no Tech Prep program in place that is distinctive from other vocational programs. These consortia state either that clear policies have not been laid down to define a distinct Tech Prep program or that there are efforts being made to make the distinction, but they are incomplete. Some consortia make no distinction because they have incorporated either the term or some elements of Tech Prep into all existing vocational programs. Here, the term "Tech Prep" is applied with no mention of reforms to change the stigma of vocational education. Most often, however, distinction is

not made because elements of Tech Prep are incorporated into existing vocational programs still not considered Tech Prep at the local levels. In other words, the old vocational system continues to dominate and overwhelm early changes associated with newer Tech Prep. These consortia commonly adopt such facets of Tech Prep as articulation and applied academic courses, but deeper changes are not reported. While these consortia may not consider Tech Prep to be a part of or distinct from vocational education generally, it has informed the local practice of vocational education. Of course, such subtleties are nearly impossible to apprehend using survey research.

In contrast to some local Tech Prep coordinators who were surveyed, none of the coordinators in our field sites considered Tech Prep and vocational education synonymous with one another. Rather, they viewed Tech Prep as a more contemporary approach to help restructure all of education, partly by updating vocational education or replacing it altogether. At the least, each of the five field-site coordinators recognized the need to align vocational education with more current thinking, particularly with respect to their personal beliefs about how secondary education ought to work.

Further, all of our five field sites viewed Tech Prep as having a close relationship with STW, although most did not see Tech Prep and STW as synonymous. Interestingly, where the line between Tech Prep and STW seemed to us to be the most blurred was in the rural settings, where the limited size of schools, teaching staffs, employers, and student populations compelled nearly everyone to think carefully about how one reform, Tech Prep, should relate to the next reform, STW. In our two rural sites, the local Tech Prep coordinator became the STW coordinator, making a fairly smooth transition into this position. Few distinctions were made between Tech Prep and STW, as evidenced by how often a wide range of local personnel interchanged the terms. Referring to the Golden Crescent Partnership, Carrie Brown, state evaluator of Tech Prep in Texas explained,

This partnership appears to have fully integrated Tech Prep and STW, as well as related state and local education reform initiatives. This is reflected in the consortium's name, mission statement, goals, by-laws, governance structure, print materials, [and] activities. . . . [T]here is no problem with the definitions of Tech Prep and STW locally. . . . The timing is perfect for STW (with regard to increased emphasis on workplace experiences and earlier work experiences, the ability to expend funds to lower grade levels, and a formal change in board composition to meet federal requirements), and the initiatives are stated to be complementary. (Brown, Field Notes, 1996, p. 6)

Directing her comments to the complimentary nature of Tech Prep and STW in Texas, and specifically the Golden Crescent Partnership, Brown added,

Although most people interviewed overwhelmingly stated that their approach to Tech Prep and STW is no different ("they are the same thing," "they are identical," etc.), some distinguishing characteristics were evident. They are: a) the focus of Tech Prep is

secondary to postsecondary articulation, and in STW, the emphasis is from school to college to the workplace; b) board composition is different; and c) STW focuses on earlier workplace experiences.

What seems apparent from Brown's comments is that there are features (or priorities) that distinguish Tech Prep and STW; however, many of these are complimentary, even transparent to local practitioners and other stakeholders. In fact, the closer one gets to the classroom, the foggier the distinctions get; the farther away from the classroom (especially the state and federal levels), the wider the gap.

Distinctions between Tech Prep and STW were more evident in the suburban and urban settings we studied. There, different people led the two initiatives and their relationships were not as clearly formulated, although, in most cases, we still saw cooperative arrangements being forged. These arrangements varied, however. In one site, Tech Prep was designated as the school-based side of the STW equation while the work-based side was to be carried out by new staff dedicating itself to securing more workplace learning arrangements for students. Of all our sites, this conceptualization was most problematic because of the separation of the two most critical aspects of STW (school-based and work-based learning) at the administrative level. A tension if not outright competition was evident between the two "camps" responsible for the school-based and work-based components. In yet another site, Tech Prep was viewed as a premier approach to STW for more academically-talented students, incorporating both school-based and work-based components. In this site, other approaches such as cooperative learning (co-op) were encouraged for the rest of the student population, creating the potential for a two-tier approach to STW. Still, in all of our field sites, STW was perceived as the umbrella for several STW models and approaches, with Tech Prep being one of the most central.

## **Curriculum Reform and Tech Prep**

Survey respondents were asked to respond to a list of twelve potential curriculum reform options that could have been implemented at the secondary or postsecondary level. These options focused on several avenues of reform, such as articulation, applied academics, career academies, block scheduling, and work-based learning. At both the secondary and postsecondary levels, the proportion of consortia implementing almost any one of these reforms was thought to have increased from 1993 to 1995 (see Table 10). At the secondary level, increases were evident in the areas of career clusters, block scheduling, advanced-skills curriculum, and work-based learning. At the postsecondary level, noteworthy increases were reported in the areas of supplementing existing vocational courses with academics or vice versa, adding advanced-skills courses, and providing work-based learning. The only areas where no change or a decline was reported was in career academies at both the secondary and postsecondary levels and in block scheduling courses at the postsecondary level.

In 1993, the major thrust of Tech Prep curriculum reform took place at the secondary level. In 1995, secondary curriculum reform

activities continued to surpass those reported for postsecondary schools, with the exception of a few activities. One of these was articulation of vocational and academic program sequences between secondary and postsecondary schools--a process that requires that both levels be involved. Another area was work-based learning, an approach to learning that has taken place in many postsecondary schools in the form of cooperative education and professional-clinical experiences for many years (Bragg, Trinkle, & Hamm, 1995; Bragg & Hamm, 1996; U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1995). An additional area was the addition of advanced-skills curriculum, a strategy that has a direct impact on postsecondary curriculum because of the necessity to develop new courses at the upper level when standards are raised in preceding courses (Parnell, 1985).

**Table 10**  
**Tech Prep Curriculum Reform at the Secondary and Postsecondary Levels in 1993 and 1995**

|   | 1992-1993              |                            | 1994-1995              |                            |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
|   | Secondary<br>(Percent) | Postsecondary<br>(Percent) | Secondary<br>(Percent) | Postsecondary<br>(Percent) |
| Tech Prep Curriculum Reform Efforts   |                        |                            |                        |                            |
| Articulate vocational program sequences between secondary and postsecondary levels.     | 89.5%                  | 88.1%                      | 94.2%                  | 93.4%                      |
| Add applied academics (commercially or locally developed) to existing curriculum.       | 86.4                   | 37.7                       | 88.8                   | 41.3                       |
| Supplement existing vocational courses with academics.                                  | 76.5                   | 42.7                       | 81.3                   | 53.2                       |
| Replace existing curriculum with applied academics (commercially or locally developed). | 77.9                   | 29.9                       | 80.4                   | 40.1                       |
| Supplement existing academic courses with vocational courses.                           | 72.1                   | 34.3                       | 80.4                   | 49.0                       |
| Articulate academic program sequences between secondary and postsecondary levels.       | 69.6                   | 69.2                       | 75.2                   | 77.2                       |
| Organize occupational/career clusters.  | 68.9                   | 51.6                       | 79.7                   | 58.6                       |
| Sequence and block scheduling courses.  | 56.5                   | 32.0                       | 71.2                   | 32.1                       |
| Provide work-based learning.  | 46.2                   | 39.8                       | 66.6                   | 64.1                       |
| Add advanced-skills courses to the existing curriculum.                                 | 40.6                   | 35.3                       | 51.4                   | 53.2                       |
| Provide career academies.   | 39.9                   | 23.3                       | 39.9                   | 20.3                       |

|                                    |      |      |      |      |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Provide interdisciplinary courses. | 37.4 | 22.3 | 48.3 | 29.0 |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|

**Curriculum Reform in the Field Sites.** Many of these reforms were represented in our five field sites. For example, in the Miami Valley Tech Prep Consortium, noted for its dedicated use of advanced-skills curriculum, students progress to higher levels of competence in academic and technical subjects at both the secondary and postsecondary levels *without* the provision of dual credits. The Consortium awards scholarships to most students who matriculate from the secondary to postsecondary level in a 2+2 curriculum sequence (grades 11-14). The University of Dayton, a private school, participates in the consortium, offering students the opportunity to complete their final two years of college with a baccalaureate degree (creating the 2+2+2 approach). In contrast, the Tech Prep initiative located in the East Central Education-To-Careers (ETC) Partnership is directed at grades 9-14, creating a 4+2 pattern. Over 70 business and labor partners are involved, several of whom sponsor youth apprenticeships for Tech Prep students. Tech Prep/youth apprenticeships are available in the areas of manufacturing, accounting, banking, health occupations, and food service. With the support of local employers, all apprenticeships require a postsecondary component consisting of two years of study for the associate degree at Danville Area Community College (DACC). After graduating from DACC, most, if not all, of the apprenticeships require that students go to work full-time as a way to compensate the businesses for their human-resource investment. A two-year minimum of full-time work is prescribed, after which students can continue their education at four-year colleges, if they so choose. Concurrent college enrollment and full-time work is possible, often with support for tuition from local employers; however, the remote location of the East Central ETC Partnership provides few options for four-year college in the area, so many students foresee having to move out of the area to continue their pursuit of a baccalaureate degree.

A third consortium, the Golden Crescent Tech Prep/School-To-Work Partnership, develops its own version of Tech Prep but also adheres to the curriculum required by the state of Texas. At Golden Crescent, seven Tech Prep pathways are approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. These pathways are offered in such areas as electronics/instrumentation advanced technology, associate degree nursing, and microcomputer technology. Dual credit is a key feature of articulation agreements worked out between the almost 40 high schools and intermediate school districts and the local community college, Victoria College; over twenty high-school vocational-technical courses provide college credit. Similarly to this Texas consortium, the Mt. Hood Regional Tech Prep Consortium, has offered articulation agreements as the backbone of its Tech Prep initiative for many years. To date, thirteen professional/technical areas are offered by Mt. Hood College that are articulated with feeder high schools. More recently, several high schools in the consortium have become involved in whole-school reform. Noteworthy among these is the Reynolds High School, which is attempting to change the learning environment by re-organizing around four houses or families. The goals of each house is to assist students in achieving academic and career goals, to support students in making successful transitions, to assist students in meeting Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) standards, and to integrate instruction that connects learning to real world application. Due to the relative infancy of the whole-school reform taking place at Reynolds, some of the relationships between the academic curriculum and Tech Prep or STW are not fully developed. Vocational education is a part of the Tech Prep/STW initiative, but other

elements of the curriculum are less clear, largely because the

Taking a very different tact but also focusing on secondary school reform, our fifth field site, the Hillsborough School District/Community College Tech Prep Consortium, has specified courses of study that students select during counselor/student conferences. The School District of Hillsborough County has indicated that several courses of study have a Tech Prep focus, including the *Tech Prep* course of study where students take appropriate community college preparatory courses, plus applied technical courses; the *College/Tech Prep* course of study where students meet College Prep and Tech Prep requirements; and the *Florida Academic Scholars/Tech Prep* course of study where students take specific academic course requirements along with Tech Prep to qualify for the Florida Gold Seal Scholarship. The later two courses of study are designed specifically to attract college-bound students while the general Tech Prep pathway attracts a sizable proportion of special needs students. According to local officials, having the distinctive courses of study was an important for this consortium because historically vocational education has been populated primarily by special needs students. To differentiate Tech Prep from vocational education and reinforce its emphasis on academic standards, the *College/Tech Prep* and even more importantly the *Florida Academic Scholars/Tech Prep* options were seen as vital to the success of the local Tech Prep initiative.

## Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep

This section presents findings related to the overall stage of implementation of selected components of Tech Prep, as reported by the local coordinators surveyed.

### Stage of Implementation of Selected Components

Based on the federal Tech Prep legislation, an extensive literature review, and findings from previous research on Tech Prep implementation, 36 components of Tech Prep were listed in the survey. Six of these components were new to the survey and they were added because they were thought to be representative of activities that Tech Prep consortia might engage in when implementing STW activities[15]. Shown in Table 11, the range of mean ratings for the stage of implementation of all 36 of the components in 1993 was between 2.0 and 4.0, indicating ratings from the planning to the initial implementation stage. Mean ratings for 1995 were higher, ranging from 2.5 to 4.6[16].

**Table 11**  
**Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep Components in 1993 and 1995**

|  | 1992-1993 | 1994-1995 |
|--|-----------|-----------|
|--|-----------|-----------|

| Tech Prep Components   | Not Beg un % | Pla n % | Develop ment % | Initial Implement ation % | Advanced Implement ation % | N A | Mea n <sup>b</sup> | SD   | Not Beg un % | Pla n % | Develop ment % | Initial Implement ation % | Advanced Implement ation % | N A | Mea n <sup>b</sup> | S D |
|--|--------------|---------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----|--------------------|------|--------------|---------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|
| Formal signed articulation agreement(s) between secondary and postsecondary schools              | 3.3          | 15.8    | 20.6           | 39.9                      | 18.3                       | 2.0 | 4.0                | 1.12 | 0.0          | 1.8     | 7.4            | 18.6                      | 71.7                       | 0.6 | 4.6                | 0.7 |
| Consortium building (including recruiting schools, colleges, employers, and other organizations) | .8           | 7.1     | 10.4           | 43.8                      | 37.2                       | .8  | 4.1                | .91  | 1.5          | 1.8     | 4.7            | 25.7                      | 65.4                       | 0.9 | 4.5                | 0.8 |
| Formal governing/advisory board <sup>a</sup>   | --           | --      | --             | --                        | --                         | --  | --                 | --   | 4.1          | 3.8     | 7.4            | 21.0                      | 62.1                       | 1.5 | 4.4                | 1.1 |
| Equal access for all students  | 7.9          | 20.6    | 30.2           | 27.4                      | 13.5                       | .5  | 3.7                | 1.2  | 0.6          | 5.6     | 7.4            | 32.3                      | 53.7                       | 0.3 | 4.3                | 0.9 |
| Applied academics courses such as Principles of  | --           | --      | --             | ---                       | --                         | --  | --                 | --   | 2.7          | 2.9     | 8.6            | 33.0                      | 51.3                       | 1.5 | 4.3                | 0.9 |

|  |     |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |      |     |     |     |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Technology <sup>a</sup>  |     |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |      |     |     |     |
| Team building to facilitate Tech Prep planning and implementation                                    | 3.8 | 13.3 | 25.8 | 39.5 | 17.1 | .5  | 3.8 | .96 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 11.3 | 40.7 | 44.2 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 0.9 |
| Site-based planning and decisionmaking for Tech Prep   | 4.1 | 19.2 | 21.5 | 39.5 | 15.2 | .5  | 3.6 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 12.5 | 34.4 | 46.3 | 1.5 | 4.2 | 0.9 |
| Joint inservice of secondary and postsecondary personnel (e.g., faculty, counselors, administrators) | 1.5 | 9.9  | 18.7 | 46.1 | 23.3 | .5  | 3.8 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 5.9 | 10.0 | 33.3 | 45.4 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 1.1 |
| Development of 2+2 core academic and technical curriculum  | 4.1 | 8.6  | 16.2 | 44.6 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 5.9 | 16.6 | 34.1 | 40.9 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| Career awareness and exploration   | 2.5 | 15.9 | 20.8 | 38.5 | 21.8 | .5  | 3.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 6.2 | 20.1 | 42.9 | 29.6 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 0.9 |

|   |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |      |     |     |     |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| for students in Tech Prep   |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |      |     |     |     |
| Long-range and/or strategic planning for Tech Prep  | 18.0 | 18.5 | 20.6 | 29.7 | 11.7 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 20.4 | 29.8 | 39.8 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 1.1 |
| Guidance and counseling services  | 22.1 | 23.2 | 21.1 | 23.9 | 7.9  | 1.8 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 7.2 | 19.5 | 37.2 | 34.2 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| Integration of academic and vocational secondary curriculum   | 4.0  | 8.3  | 12.4 | 31.6 | 42.7 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 8.3 | 16.8 | 41.3 | 30.7 | 0.9 | 3.9 | 1.0 |
| Inservice training of counselors in recruitment, placement, and retention of students for Tech Prep | 5.6  | 19.5 | 29.1 | 30.9 | 14.4 | .5  | 3.4 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 5.6 | 17.5 | 40.8 | 31.7 | 0.6 | 3.9 | 1.0 |
| Marketing and promotions  | 17.3 | 26.0 | 22.1 | 23.2 | 9.4  | 2.0 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 7.8 | 22.1 | 35.8 | 33.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 1.0 |
| Formal partnerships with business and industry  | 13.3 | 24   | 24.8 | 25.8 | 9.5  | 2.6 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 8.3 | 21.9 | 34.3 | 31.7 | 0.3 | 3.8 | 1.1 |
| Use of new  | 19.1 | 25.  | 23.3 | 21.2 | 7.8  | 3.  | 3.2 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 8.3 | 21.0 | 42.0 | 24.6 | 1.  | 3.8 | 1.  |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| instructional strategies (including cooperative learning approaches) |      | 3    |      |      |      | 4   |     |     |     |      |      |      |      | 5   |     | 0   |
| Collaboration between academic and vocational educators              | 15.3 | 15.5 | 20.1 | 27.5 | 18.6 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 8.3  | 20.4 | 46.2 | 22.8 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 0.9 |
| Individualized student training and/or career plans <sup>a</sup>     | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --  | 4.2 | 10.1 | 22.3 | 34.4 | 27.3 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 1.1 |
| Preparatory services for all participants                            | 17.9 | 26.2 | 22.6 | 23.1 | 7.7  | 2.6 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 5.1 | 13.8 | 21.0 | 28.4 | 27.5 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 1.2 |
| Strategies to address the needs of special populations               | 7.1  | 22.7 | 25.5 | 31.1 | 12.1 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 13.4 | 24.9 | 30.3 | 26.1 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 1.1 |
| Evaluation of Tech Prep programs                                     | 37.9 | 29.5 | 15.3 | 8.1  | 2.5  | 6.6 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 4.7 | 13.3 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 25.4 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 1.1 |
| Workplace professional development                                   | 7.3  | 21.8 | 24.8 | 29.9 | 15.9 | .3  | 3.0 | 1.3 | 7.7 | 14.2 | 20.7 | 32.5 | 23.1 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 1.2 |

|   |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| experiences for teachers and counselors                               |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |
| Labor market analysis to inform curriculum development                | 4.3  | 17.7 | 31.6 | 34.9 | 10.6 | .8  | 3.2 | 1.3 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 21.1 | 28.2 | 26.1 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| Work-based learning for students (e.g., internships, apprenticeships) | 7.1  | 24.0 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 13.4 | .5  | 2.6 | 1.3 | 5.6  | 18.3 | 24.5 | 35.7 | 15.0 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.1 |
| Performance standards and measures for Tech Prep <sup>a</sup>         | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --  | 7.1  | 16.6 | 30.3 | 24.0 | 20.2 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 1.2 |
| Alternative assessments (e.g., portfolios, performance assessment)    | 6.3  | 16.2 | 23.7 | 32.8 | 20.5 | .5  | 2.8 | 1.2 | 6.8  | 18.0 | 22.8 | 35.2 | 14.5 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 1.1 |
| Use of outcomes-based education for Tech Prep                         | 20.3 | 27.3 | 23.5 | 19.5 | 7.1  | 2.3 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 13.8 | 11.1 | 19.8 | 28.8 | 18.0 | 8.4 | 3.3 | 1.4 |
| Development   | 3.3  | 17.  | 18.0 | 32.4 | 28.9 | .3  | 2.7 | 1.2 | 13.1 | 14.  | 23.5 | 27.7 | 19.9 | 1.  | 3.3 | 1.  |

|  |      |          |      |      |      |         |     |     |      |          |      |      |      |         |     |         |
|--|------|----------|------|------|------|---------|-----|-----|------|----------|------|------|------|---------|-----|---------|
| of advanced-<br>skills<br>technical<br>curriculum  |      | 2        |      |      |      |         |     |     |      | 0        |      |      |      | 8       |     | 3       |
| Joint planning<br>time for<br>academic and<br>vocational<br>teachers                                     | 32.0 | 22.<br>0 | 13.6 | 14.8 | 12.8 | 4.<br>9 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 14.5 | 14.<br>2 | 27.4 | 26.0 | 14.2 | 3.<br>8 | 3.1 | 1.<br>3 |
| Integration of<br>academic and<br>vocational<br>postsecondary<br>curriculum                              | 5.8  | 22.<br>2 | 27.3 | 31.8 | 12.6 | 0.<br>3 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 17.5 | 13.<br>0 | 25.1 | 24.9 | 14.8 | 4.<br>7 | 3.0 | 1.<br>3 |
| Formal<br>assessment<br>and<br>certification<br>of skills based<br>on industry<br>standards <sup>a</sup> | --   | --       | --   | --   | --   | --      | --  | --  | 19.3 | 21.<br>7 | 22.6 | 22.3 | 12.2 | 2.<br>1 | 2.9 | 1.<br>3 |
| Incorporation<br>of "all aspects<br>of the<br>industry" <sup>a</sup>                                     | --   | --       | --   | --   | --   | --      | --  | --  | 17.4 | 22.<br>5 | 22.5 | 22.2 | 9.3  | 6.<br>3 | 2.8 | 1.<br>3 |
| Job placement<br>services for<br>students/grad<br>uates  | 7.8  | 24.<br>3 | 26.9 | 25.8 | 14.0 | 1.<br>3 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 24.9 | 16.<br>6 | 22.6 | 18.4 | 13.9 | 3.<br>6 | 2.8 | 1.<br>4 |
| Apprenticeshi<br>ps spanning   | 39.4 | 24.<br>9 | 16.0 | 11.7 | 3.8  | 4.<br>1 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 27.3 | 18.<br>1 | 16.9 | 22.6 | 8.0  | 7.<br>1 | 2.6 | 1.<br>3 |

|   |      |      |      |      |     |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |
|---|------|------|------|------|-----|----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| secondary and postsecondary education   |      |      |      |      |     |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |
| Computer monitoring (tracking) of student progress through Tech Prep programs | 13.6 | 24.5 | 28.5 | 23.0 | 9.8 | .5 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 27.0 | 22.6 | 24.3 | 14.8 | 8.3 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.3 |

Notes: <sup>a</sup>Categories were not included in the 1993 survey.

<sup>b</sup>Mean scores presented in this table are calculated without the "NA" value.

A total of twelve components were given mean ratings of 4.0 or higher in 1995, placing them between the initial and advanced implementation stages, compared to only two components rated at this level in 1993. Of these components, 1995 respondents said their consortia were farthest along with formal signed articulation agreements, giving it a mean rating of 4.6. This component was rated at the advanced implementation stage by 72 percent of the 1995 respondents compared to only 18 percent of the 1993 respondents. The other component above 4.0 in both 1993 and 1995 was consortium building. The percentage of respondents who rated this component at the advanced implementation stage was 65 percent in 1995 but only 37 percent in 1993. Other components rated above 4.0 in 1995 were formal governing/advisory boards, equal access for all students, applied academics course offerings such as team building, site-based planning, joint in-service of secondary and postsecondary personnel, development of 2+2 core curriculum, career awareness and exploration, long-range and/or strategic planning, and guidance and counseling.

Nineteen components had mean ratings between 3.0 and 3.9, indicating a majority of the thirty-six components were considered to be between the development and initial implementation stage in 1995 (two or more years into Tech Prep implementation for most respondents). Interestingly enough, these nineteen components ranged from integration of academic and vocational education at the *secondary* level (3.9) to integration of academic and vocational courses at the *postsecondary* level (3.0). Several other components at this same level of implementation were associated with professional development, an "essential element" of Tech Prep according to the federal law. These components were in-service for counselors, workplace professional development for teachers and counselors, and joint planning time. Other components at this stage centered around curriculum issues such as the use of new instructional strategies, advanced-skills curriculum development, individualized student training and/or career plans, and outcomes-based

curriculum. Still others were associated with evaluation and assessment, including evaluation of Tech Prep programs, labor market analysis, performance standards and measures, and alternative assessments. Eight of these components received a rating below 3.0 in 1993.

Five components were rated between 2.0 and 2.9, indicating their level of implementation to be between planning and development. Components at this stage were formal assessment of Tech Prep students, incorporation of "all aspects of industry," job placement services, apprenticeships spanning from secondary to postsecondary and finally, computer monitoring or "tracking" of Tech Prep student's progress. The first two of these components were not rated in 1993 because they represent new activities associated with STW systems, but the latter three components were rated in 1993 and these were given even lower ratings at that time.

Within the five field sites there seemed to be a heavy emphasis on organizing and administering Tech Prep initially and now Tech Prep combined with STW. These activities could be considered "consortium building" or "site-based planning." The local coordinators involved in the field studies were engaged in a great deal of coordination activity, ensuring that information was circulated properly and key organizations and persons were informed and "on board." After these concerns were cared for, activities such as professional in-service, curriculum development, instruction, guidance/counseling and other core functions were carried out, explaining why these activities were still rated at the development to initial implementation stage after two or more years of funding.

Our field-site findings reinforce the fact that Tech Prep implementation efforts are fully logical or linear. Momentum in implementing a new initiative such as Tech Prep moves rapidly at times and more slowly at others. From year to year (or even more quickly), implementation can shift from one aspect of the academic curriculum to another (math to science); one part of the vocational curriculum to another (business to health); from one level of education to another (freshman to senior); from one student population to another (middle to all); and so forth. Even relatively dramatic shifting of priorities can occur to accommodate local needs, indicating a certain level of "agility" is advantageous to Tech-Prep implementation.

Many factors contribute to changes in direction such as the ebb and flow of the academic calendar, turnover of key local leadership (especially high-school principals), coordination (or lack thereof) with related reforms, changing local economic and social conditions, stability of resources over time, changes in state and federal priorities, and expressed demands of particular stakeholder groups. Some of these factors are predictable, others are not. Yet, recognizing how these kinds of factors affect implementation is essential if practitioners are to create real change and policy makers at all levels are to encourage and support it. To expect significant change with respect to Tech Prep or STW in a short time period of on a set timetable is simply not realistic.

On the other hand, there are some predominant patterns in the way Tech Prep implementation has occurred, largely due to the limited prescription provided by the Tech Prep Education Act since few states enforced additional requirements (Layton & Bragg, 1992).

Most consortia used initial funding to build an administrative structure and hire a coordinator. This individual took responsibility for creating a sort of "virtual" organizational structure called a consortium made up of the leadership of local secondary schools, a community college, businesses, labor, and sometimes other groups. Articulation agreements and all they entail (e.g., curriculum or course review and realignment) were typically the next step to formulating the core sequence of the Tech Prep curriculum. Unfortunately, these agreements usually applied to the vocational curriculum and much less often to the academic.

On the academic side, consortia sought help in the form of off-the-shelf applied academics curriculum to initiative activity around the integration of academic and vocational education--almost completely at the secondary level. Later, they may have provided small incentives for teachers to develop their own applied academics courses or other forms of integration at either the secondary or postsecondary levels. When this was done, leadership for Tech Prep may have been decentralized to some degree with monies oriented to a school-based coordinator to oversee special projects funded by Tech Prep, seemingly lessening the need for a full-time coordinator for the "virtual" organization, the consortium. When this occurred, the evolution of Tech Prep often became less predictable. Depending upon the local (school) context and needs, priorities may have been directed to career guidance and counseling, education/business partnerships and work-based learning for students, elementary or middle-school career exploration, and so forth. If STW was underway within a state, these priorities took on greater priority.

## **Barriers to Tech Prep Implementation**

Barriers to the implementation of Tech Prep were also a focus of this study.[\[17\]](#) To the list of 47 barriers presented in the 1993 survey we added 22 new barriers, many of which represented more recent concerns associated with Tech Prep, STW, or other reforms. Altogether, the list of barriers was wide ranging, covering obstacles linked to attitudes, resources, expertise, policy, and practices. Overall, the vast majority of barriers had minor or moderate levels of impact on Tech Prep implementation (see Table 12). However, eight of the 69 barriers had a mean score of 4.0 or higher, representing a slightly larger number of barriers rated at this level of importance than in 1993. About half of the 69 barriers were considered to be minor barriers, and another 22 were considered very minor.

The barrier of too little time designated for joint planning by academic and vocational or secondary and postsecondary faculty was perceived to be the most serious by respondents as indicated by a mean score of 4.50 on the six-point scale. This barrier was given a major to very major rating by 55 percent of the respondents, showing very similar results to our 1993 survey. The fact that the barrier had not diminished suggests that faculty, upon whom a large share of the responsibility for the actual implementation of Tech Prep often rests, still do not work together to accomplish the planning and development work necessary for Tech Prep. However, the fact that the barrier remains may suggest deeper issues, such as difficulties involved in realigning school calendars or, a situation that is far more disconcerting, the possibility that these faculty groups make a deliberate choice not to collaborate.

**Table 12**  
**Barriers to Local Tech Prep Implementation in 1993 and 1995**

|   | Level of Impact in 1992-1993 |            |       |          |       |            |      |      | Level of Impact in 1994-1995 |            |       |          |       |            |      |      |
|---|------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|-------|------------|------|------|------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|-------|------------|------|------|
|   | None                         | Very Minor | Minor | Moderate | Major | Very Major | Mean | SD   | None                         | Very Minor | Minor | Moderate | Major | Very Major | Mean | SD   |
| Little time for joint planning by ac. and voc. or sec. and postsec. faculty | 2.8                          | 6.4        | 17.6  | 28.8     | 28.6  | 15.8       | 4.20 | 1.25 | .6                           | 4.7        | 11.9  | 27.0     | 37.7  | 18.1       | 4.50 | 1.10 |
| Tight budgets at the local level  | --                           | --         | --    | --       | --    | --         | --   | --   | 3.6                          | 7.1        | 12.7  | 20.7     | 31.1  | 24.9       | 4.43 | 1.36 |
| Lack of staff, time, and money dedicated to Tech Prep                       | 2.5                          | 7.3        | 18.9  | 34.8     | 27.0  | 9.3        | 4.05 | 1.16 | 1.2                          | 5.4        | 16.4  | 36.3     | 28.6  | 12.2       | 4.22 | 1.10 |
| Tight budgets at the state level  | --                           | --         | --    | --       | --    | --         | --   | --   | 1.5                          | 5.9        | 25.2  | 24.3     | 28.5  | 14.5       | 4.16 | 1.21 |
| Pressure for quick success and student head counts                          | 16.0                         | 12.2       | 16.5  | 25.7     | 17.3  | 12.2       | 3.53 | 1.59 | 5.9                          | 9.5        | 16.9  | 26.0     | 24.0  | 17.8       | 4.05 | 1.42 |
| Lack of recent work experience among school personnel                       | --                           | --         | --    | --       | --    | --         | --   | --   | 3.3                          | 8.9        | 19.8  | 26.3     | 30.2  | 11.5       | 4.05 | 1.26 |
| Belief that Tech Prep is a "fad" that will go away                          | 4.3                          | 10.6       | 21.5  | 33.2     | 21.0  | 9.4        | 3.84 | 1.26 | 1.8                          | 8.0        | 22.5  | 29.3     | 28.7  | 9.8        | 4.04 | 1.17 |
| Negative attitude   | 2.5                          | 9.2        | 24.7  | 40.2     | 17.6  | 5.9        | 3.79 | 1.10 | 2.1                          | 5.3        | 20.8  | 40.1     | 26.1  | 5.6        | 3.99 | 1.04 |

|   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| toward Tech Prep  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Difficulty in dealing with educational bureaucracies                                    | 4.3  | 9.5  | 23.3 | 34.5 | 17.6 | 10.7 | 3.84 | 1.26 | 1.2 | 10.1 | 23.7 | 30.6 | 22.6 | 11.9 | 3.98 | 1.20 |
| Failure of educators to see the need to change  | 3.8  | 13.4 | 25.8 | 32.2 | 19.2 | 5.6  | 3.66 | 1.20 | 1.5 | 8.0  | 20.2 | 39.8 | 24.0 | 6.5  | 3.96 | 1.07 |
| Lack of general awareness about Tech Prep   | 1.5  | 6.6  | 18.9 | 38.1 | 27.0 | 7.8  | 4.06 | 1.08 | 1.5 | 6.5  | 22.8 | 39.6 | 24.0 | 5.6  | 3.95 | 1.04 |
| Lack of funds for curriculum reform   | 9.6  | 13.9 | 20.5 | 27.8 | 18.7 | 9.4  | 3.60 | 1.63 | 2.7 | 11.0 | 23.1 | 28.8 | 23.1 | 11.3 | 3.92 | 1.26 |
| Inability of young people to make early career decisions                                | 8.0  | 18.9 | 21.2 | 30.2 | 17.3 | 4.4  | 3.43 | 1.31 | 3.8 | 13.0 | 23.1 | 28.4 | 22.5 | 9.2  | 3.80 | 1.28 |
| Lack of knowledge and skills among ed. personnel in how to implement educational change | 3.6  | 10.5 | 23.7 | 37.2 | 19.9 | 5.1  | 3.75 | 1.15 | 2.7 | 10.9 | 23.4 | 38.2 | 17.5 | 7.4  | 3.79 | 1.15 |
| Lack of counselor interest in or involvement with Tech Prep                             | 10.3 | 16.4 | 19.7 | 27.9 | 17.4 | 8.2  | 3.51 | 1.43 | 4.7 | 14.7 | 21.2 | 28.9 | 20.6 | 9.7  | 3.75 | 1.32 |
| Increased paperwork to  | 3.6  | 15.8 | 29.8 | 33.6 | 13.2 | 4.1  | 3.49 | 1.14 | 5.6 | 15.6 | 25.4 | 28.0 | 16.8 | 8.6  | 3.60 | 1.32 |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| support Tech Prep  |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Lack of collaboration between ac. and voc. educators                 | 3.6  | 15.8 | 29.8 | 33.6 | 13.2 | 4.1 | 3.49 | 1.14 | 2.9  | 14.7 | 27.1 | 34.8 | 16.5 | 3.8  | 3.58 | 1.13 |
| The stigma of "tracking" is associated with Tech Prep                | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --   | --   | 8.6  | 18.6 | 20.6 | 22.7 | 19.2 | 10.3 | 3.56 | 1.46 |
| Difficulty maintaining momentum over the long term                   | 16.4 | 16.9 | 27.9 | 21.5 | 13.1 | 4.1 | 3.10 | 1.39 | 5.9  | 15.7 | 24.0 | 33.8 | 16.6 | 3.9  | 3.51 | 1.22 |
| Lack of clear federal level policy for Tech Prep                     | 14.0 | 21.1 | 26.4 | 20.3 | 11.9 | 6.3 | 3.14 | 1.42 | 9.2  | 18.5 | 25.9 | 21.4 | 16.7 | 8.3  | 3.42 | 1.41 |
| Lack of developed competencies for the academic areas                | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --   | --   | 8.3  | 16.1 | 27.1 | 29.2 | 15.5 | 3.9  | 3.39 | 1.26 |
| Limits on using Tech Prep funds below grade 11                       | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --   | --   | 16.9 | 18.3 | 18.0 | 16.9 | 17.5 | 12.4 | 3.37 | 1.64 |
| Limits on using Tech Prep funds for equipment or materials purchases | 11.5 | 18.4 | 21.0 | 22.8 | 17.4 | 9.0 | 3.43 | 1.48 | 9.8  | 21.4 | 25.2 | 19.3 | 16.0 | 8.3  | 3.35 | 1.43 |
| Lack of authority of local personnel                                 | 12.7 | 19.8 | 25.4 | 22.3 | 12.2 | 7.6 | 3.24 | 1.43 | 8.8  | 23.9 | 23.0 | 18.9 | 18.3 | 7.1  | 3.35 | 1.42 |

|   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| to make changes   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Resistance from postsec. schools to introduce Tech Prep       | 9.0  | 18.8 | 27.8 | 23.3 | 15.5 | 5.7  | 3.34 | 1.34 | 9.0  | 18.8 | 27.8 | 23.3 | 15.5 | 5.7  | 3.34 | 1.34 |
| Lack of evaluation mechanisms to inform implementation        | 10.6 | 17.9 | 26.9 | 27.5 | 13.7 | 3.4  | 3.26 | 1.29 | 9.0  | 19.8 | 25.4 | 25.1 | 17.4 | 3.3  | 3.32 | 1.30 |
| Looking at Tech Prep as voc. ed. by another name              | 4.1  | 11.5 | 24.9 | 33.6 | 19.8 | 6.1  | 3.72 | 1.20 | 4.2  | 8.7  | 25.3 | 28.0 | 13.1 | 5.1  | 3.31 | 1.31 |
| Funding for Tech Prep limited to vocational education sources | 20.3 | 15.2 | 17.5 | 22.8 | 14.5 | 9.6  | 3.25 | 1.61 | 17.1 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 20.7 | 16.9 | 9.8  | 3.31 | 1.59 |
| Turf battles between secondary and postsecondary educators    | 9.8  | 20.2 | 33.3 | 22.7 | 9.8  | 4.0  | 3.15 | 1.25 | 9.5  | 19.0 | 25.3 | 28.0 | 13.1 | 5.1  | 3.31 | 1.31 |
| Lack of parental support for Tech Prep                        | 16.3 | 20.7 | 29.0 | 23.1 | 8.8  | 2.1  | 2.94 | 1.28 | 9.7  | 16.2 | 28.9 | 27.1 | 14.2 | 3.8  | 3.31 | 1.28 |
| Lack of clear state-level policy for Tech Prep                | 12.1 | 21.2 | 18.7 | 22.5 | 14.6 | 10.9 | 3.39 | 1.53 | 15.2 | 21.1 | 22   | 14.3 | 15.8 | 11.6 | 3.29 | 1.60 |
| Lack of student interest in Tech Prep                         | 15.5 | 23.8 | 30.3 | 22.5 | 6.2  | 1.6  | 2.85 | 1.21 | 4.2  | 17.8 | 36.2 | 32.0 | 9.5  | .3   | 3.25 | 1.00 |
| Lack of a clear   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | 15.7 | 21.9 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 13.3 | 8.9  | 3.20 | 1.53 |

|   |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| definition of the Tech Prep student   |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Lack of interest and support from upper-level administration                            | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --   | --   | 12.4 | 21.5 | 24.8 | 23.6 | 12.7 | 5.0  | 3.17 | 1.37 |
| Resistance from secondary schools to introduce Tech Prep into the curriculum            | 9.7  | 20.2 | 27.6 | 30.4 | 9.9  | 2.3 | 3.18 | 1.21 | 9.5  | 18.2 | 33.9 | 26.5 | 10.7 | 1.2  | 3.14 | 1.16 |
| Lack of jobs in the region for Tech Prep graduates                                      | 13.7 | 17.3 | 20.1 | 25.2 | 14.2 | 9.4 | 3.37 | 1.50 | 15.8 | 21.1 | 26.2 | 17.3 | 10.1 | 9.5  | 3.13 | 1.50 |
| Resistance from sec. school administrators to Tech Prep                                 | 15.7 | 23.6 | 26.9 | 23.1 | 8.4  | 2.3 | 2.92 | 1.28 | 10.4 | 21.4 | 32.0 | 27.0 | 5.9  | 3.3  | 3.06 | 1.19 |
| Focus on applied academics rather than other academic and vocational integration models | --   | --   | --   | ---  | --   | --  | --   | --   | 12.8 | 24.3 | 27.9 | 22.0 | 8.3  | 4.7  | 3.03 | 1.31 |
| Conflict between Tech Prep and School-to-Work   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --   | --   | 24.5 | 20.6 | 16.4 | 15.2 | 12.8 | 10.4 | 3.02 | 1.67 |
| Difficulty reaching consensus on reform strategies                                      | 12.3 | 27.2 | 29.3 | 20.6 | 8.7  | 1.8 | 2.92 | 1.22 | 8.6  | 23.8 | 34.5 | 25.0 | 6.5  | 1.5  | 3.01 | 1.11 |

|   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Turnover of local or state leaders involved in Tech Prep  | 25.5 | 28.1 | 21.2 | 12.8 | 7.7  | 4.8  | 2.64 | 1.43 | 17.8 | 23.4 | 22.2 | 18.3 | 13.0 | 5.3  | 3.01 | 1.46 |
| Large distances separating institutions in the consortium | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | 22.7 | 22.7 | 15.6 | 17.4 | 12.4 | 9.1  | 3.01 | 1.62 |
| Lack of clear local-level policy for Tech Prep            | 13.2 | 23.2 | 22.6 | 24.9 | 9.7  | 6.4  | 3.14 | 1.40 | 18.0 | 22.1 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 11.5 | 4.7  | 3.00 | 1.43 |
| Conflict with other educational reform movements          | 22.0 | 26.3 | 24.6 | 17.0 | 6.1  | 4.1  | 2.71 | 1.36 | 15.8 | 25.9 | 22.6 | 19.9 | 10.1 | 5.7  | 2.99 | 1.41 |
| Lack of certificates of mastery                           | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --   | 20.0 | 19.7 | 25.1 | 18.8 | 12.5 | 3.9  | 2.95 | 1.42 |
| Lack of active involvement from business and industry     | 22.6 | 26.4 | 24.4 | 16.8 | 7.6  | 2.3  | 2.67 | 1.32 | 17.7 | 23.6 | 22.4 | 25.7 | 7.4  | 3.2  | 2.91 | 1.33 |
| Failure to employ local Tech Prep coordinator full-time   | 42.2 | 7.2  | 12.3 | 13.8 | 13.3 | 11.3 | 2.83 | 1.85 | 37.2 | 11.7 | 9.9  | 16.5 | 13.8 | 10.8 | 2.90 | 1.81 |
| Lack of support from business and industry                | 24.2 | 28.8 | 29.6 | 13.0 | 3.3  | 1.0  | 2.45 | 1.15 | 12.2 | 31.2 | 27.3 | 21.7 | 5.9  | 1.8  | 2.83 | 1.17 |
| Resistance from academic                                  | 2.3  | 14.5 | 25.4 | 31.7 | 21.3 | 4.8  | 3.70 | 1.16 | 13.4 | 30.0 | 27.3 | 21.1 | 7.1  | 1.2  | 2.82 | 1.18 |

|   |      |      |      |      |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|
| educators to make changes for Tech Prep   |      |      |      |      |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |
| Lack of availability of integrated ac. and voc. curriculum materials                      | 14.5 | 25.7 | 29.3 | 20.9 | 7.9 | 1.8 | 2.87 | 1.23 | 13.6 | 29.1 | 27.3 | 22.8 | 5.3  | 1.8 | 2.82 | 1.18 |
| Limitations in using Tech Prep funds beyond grades 11-14                                  | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 24.7 | 25.3 | 17.9 | 14.6 | 10.7 | 6.8 | 2.81 | 1.55 |
| Lack of credibility of vocational ed. involved with Tech Prep                             | 11.9 | 29.9 | 30.7 | 21.1 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 2.82 | 1.15 | 11.3 | 33.8 | 29.1 | 18.1 | 5.9  | 1.8 | 2.78 | 1.15 |
| Lack of cooperation among institutional partners  | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 17.3 | 30.7 | 25.9 | 13.7 | 8.9  | 3.6 | 2.77 | 1.32 |
| Difficulty in developing formal articulation agreements between sec. and postsec. schools | 22.2 | 26.3 | 21.7 | 22.4 | 5.6 | 1.8 | 2.68 | 1.29 | 23.0 | 26.0 | 22.1 | 18.0 | 8.0  | 2.9 | 2.70 | 1.36 |
| Lack of support from both state sec. and postsec. agencies                                | 17.8 | 23.7 | 28.2 | 17.8 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 2.89 | 1.38 | 19.8 | 31.4 | 24.6 | 13.3 | 6.8  | 4.1 | 2.68 | 1.33 |

|  |      |      |      |      |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Resistance from postsec. school administrators to Tech Prep            | 25.3 | 25.3 | 27.1 | 14.8 | 5.1 | 2.3 | 2.56 | 1.28 | 18.4 | 29.4 | 27.6 | 16.3 | 6.8 | 1.5  | 2.68 | 1.22 |
| Lack of developed competencies for the vo-tech areas                   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 22.4 | 28.0 | 25.1 | 14.2 | 8.8 | 1.5  | 2.63 | 1.29 |
| Failure of two-year postsec. schools to accommodate Tech Prep students | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 22.6 | 28.5 | 26.1 | 16.6 | 4.2 | 2.1  | 2.57 | 1.23 |
| Lack of experts to provide inservice about Tech Prep                   | 22.0 | 21.5 | 27.1 | 18.7 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 2.77 | 1.34 | 25.0 | 26.8 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 4.2 | 2.4  | 2.55 | 1.18 |
| Lack of support from labor organizations                               | 36.7 | 23.8 | 22.1 | 9.1  | 4.4 | 3.9 | 2.32 | 1.37 | 35.3 | 22.1 | 21.5 | 9.6  | 7.4 | 4.2  | 2.44 | 1.44 |
| Lack of cooperation for state professional organizations               | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 29.5 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 9.8  | 5.7 | 2.1  | 2.40 | 1.27 |
| Too much flexibility in local implementation of Tech Prep              | 30.4 | 29.9 | 24.3 | 10.0 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 2.31 | 1.19 | 31.4 | 27.5 | 20.4 | 13.9 | 4.4 | 2.40 | 2.39 | 1.30 |
| Too many schools in the consortium                                     | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 34.0 | 28.1 | 18.3 | 10.7 | 6.2 | 2.7  | 2.34 | 1.34 |
| Use of adv. placement and  | --   | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --   | --   | 30.4 | 35.4 | 18.2 | 10.7 | 3.9 | 1.5  | 2.26 | 1.19 |

|  |      |      |      |     |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|------|
| other articulation that allow students to complete college early |      |      |      |     |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |      |      |
| Lack of cooperation from teachers' unions                        | 47.4 | 20.7 | 17.7 | 8.7 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 2.05 | 1.25 | 44.6 | 15.1 | 24.6 | 10.5 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.19 | 1.31 |
| Pressure from special interest groups to modify Tech Prep        | 42.9 | 27.3 | 17.6 | 6.9 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 2.07 | 1.23 | 38.0 | 29.7 | 18.1 | 8.3  | 3.6 | 2.4 | 2.16 | 1.25 |
| Too much state involvement in day-to-day operations              | --   | --   | --   | --  | --  | --  | --   | --   | 33.2 | 33.8 | 22.0 | 6.5  | 3.9 | 6   | 2.15 | 1.11 |

Respondents to the 1995 survey identified seven additional barriers that were thought to have a moderate impact on Tech Prep implementation as indicated by any barrier with a mean score between 4.0 and 5.0. There were eight barriers at this moderate level in 1995 compared to 1993. The seven barriers were tight *local* budgets; lack of staff, time and money to implement Tech Prep; failure of four-year colleges and universities to award college credit for applied academic or other Tech Prep courses; tight *state* budgets; pressure for quick success; lack of recent workforce experience among school personnel; and the belief that Tech Prep was an educational "fad." Rather than falling in importance, these barrier had risen, suggesting they were even more serious in 1995 than in 1993.

Two of the barriers were an exception because they were not presented in the 1993 survey, so comparable data were unavailable. These were the barriers of tight budgets at the *local* level and lack of recent work experience among school personnel. The fact that 40 percent of the respondents perceived a lack of staff, time and money to implement Tech Prep suggests the importance of resources on influencing change at the local level. Without adequate and stable funds, change becomes much more tenuous.

There is a failure of four-year colleges to award credit for Tech Prep courses according to 50 percent of the respondents, and this situation is perceived as having a major or very major negative impact on Tech Prep implementation. This same barrier ranked high on the 1993 survey as well, suggesting little has changed in more recent years. It seems that this kind of systemic educational policy issue

must be addressed if Tech Prep curriculum is to be linked to four-year college in meaningful ways, as is advocated by the federal Tech Prep Education Act. Numerous reports by NCRVE and others support this concern, but to no avail (Bailey & Merritt, 1996). Results suggest systemic reforms that involve multiple levels acting together in a coordinated fashion are not likely to happen easily or quickly, if at all.

Other barriers close to the moderate level of impact included negative attitudes toward vocational education, difficulty in dealing with educational bureaucracies, failure of educators to see the need to change, and a lack of general awareness about Tech Prep. While most of these barriers had risen in importance between 1993 and 1995, it appears that efforts to create a general awareness for Tech Prep at all levels had helped somewhat in that it was perceived to be a greater barrier in 1993 than in 1995. Other barriers rated between 3.0 and 4.0, indicating a minor to moderate level of impact ranged from looking at Tech Prep as vocational education by another name to a lack of clear local-level policy. Categories of barriers considered to be minor included administrative, students, and professional development concerns.

In many respects Tech Prep and related innovations such as STW ask people to think in very different ways about education. These reforms ask people to stop thinking that, for most students if not all, formal education should stop at high-school graduation; that only a fraction of the high-school population can and should go to college; that this same small student group is the only one that can and should be challenged academically; that academics should be disconnected from career preparation; that good teaching occurs within the confines of schools; that students should be passive recipients in learning; that business and community groups should be excluded from decision making; and on and on. To stop thinking in these kinds of ways is a grandiose change. For most schools, these kinds of alterations are almost unimaginable. To implement them requires a system overhaul of unprecedented scope and scale. Knowing this, is it any wonder local Tech Prep coordinators say barriers exist? Is it surprising that at least some barriers seem higher and even more insurmountable a few years into the implementation process than in the first few years when changes in classrooms had barely begun? No doubt overcoming obstacles in the creation of policies, programs, and practices that support a new system is a great challenge to any educational reformer.

## **Local Coordinator Recommendations for Federal and State Policy**

The recommendations provided by the survey respondents as well as the field sites fell into six categories. Without question, the two most important recommendations pertain to issues surrounding *funding* and *federal and state guidance*, but survey respondents also described the need for increasing the participation of the various stakeholders in Tech Prep, such as the academic faculty, postsecondary institutions, business and industry, guidance counselors and even tech Prep coordinators. Also, many recommended broadening the application of Tech Prep programs to include more students earlier. One of the basic concerns had to do with the relationship between Tech Prep and STWOA. Many consortia wanted to see some kind of combination of effort with Tech Prep as the

dominant or leading program within STW, but a few wanted to maintain a completely separate stance between Tech Prep and STW.

### **Local Recommendation 1: Continue Funding for Tech Prep**

Among those whose recommendations relate to funding, the vast majority called for continued funding and for the opportunity to use their money more flexibly. Most respondents who pointed out the need for continued funding wanted to do so to protect fledgling efforts at Tech Prep implementation. They argued that Tech Prep "is not yet a mature program and needs federal support before states can take over leadership," and they feared that a drop in funding would eventually kill Tech Prep because local and state governments could not afford to support it. Without funding, state and federal policies "become optional guideline suggestions for programs." In the end some feared Tech Prep would receive the most dreaded label of all: *fad*.

Consortia recommending more flexibility in spending were primarily concerned with equipment expenditures. More money was also recommended for the hiring and development of personnel such as a full-time state Tech Prep coordinator and more faculty. Given the emphasis on *continued* funding, surprisingly few consortia recommended that *increased* funds be granted. One recommendation was that Tech Prep "needs federal and state funding increases and support for the next 4-5 years to fully implement this reform movement." Increased funding was considered essential to "program development and expansion" and to "provide the necessary professional [development]."

Several consortia expressed concern for the effect of block grants on Tech Prep. These concerns included determining beforehand what percentage of the block grants would go to existing Tech Prep initiatives and what would go to STWOA-supported ones. The concern was to provide funding "blocked" for Tech Prep so secondary and postsecondary education could still work to institutionalize it.

Showing concern that Tech Prep be accountable for its share of federal funding, a small group of consortia wanted to attach new funding to performance. One respondent proclaimed, "Performance-based funding for public education! This, more than any single reform, would change the way we operate." Another respondent recommended "fund allocation for programs that can demonstrate strong and effective 2+2 commitments" and another said, "Get a firm long-term financial commitment with evaluations that accurately reflect local consortium issues." Apparently, quality does not have to happen top-down. Rather, it can bubble up from the local level if there is a firm commitment to quality and accountability.

### **Local Recommendation 2: Strengthen Federal and State Leadership**

Federal and state leadership is very important to the surveyed consortia. They recommended that government take a more aggressive

role in mandating programs and providing definite guidelines or standards in Tech Prep. Some also recommended that federal and state government provide incentives and recognition for successful Tech Prep initiatives, though these recommendations were very much in the minority. One respondent said, "[National standards] are needed to allow groups using a variety of strategies to assess their programs on students' performance[s]." Respondents' comments suggested they had experienced some confusion in defining Tech Prep programs, an issue discussed in some depth earlier in this paper. One coordinator recommended the "clarification of terms used with Tech Prep." The sense was that consortia had struggled to achieve a relationship among the different shareholders in Tech Prep, but that these struggles could be more successful with increased government support and leadership. One respondent attempted to speak for many in recommending more clarity concerning work-based learning and Tech Prep:

We recommend that the federal and state governments develop and promote incentives for business and industry regarding their working together with schools to implement the work experience component of the Tech Prep program. We recommend that the state do more to help local consortia with the development of work standards and competencies for establishing and implementing the different Tech Prep curricular programs.

Indeed, the federal and state government has contributed to the complex environment in which Tech Prep is being implemented. Sharing this frustration, one respondent said,

Implementers feel assailed by all these new mandates at both the state and local level. Strategies need to be identified which assist implementers to coordinate and integrate these pieces into an articulated whole. Establishment of community wide partnerships with key stakeholders seems to be key. Leadership to help implementers at the local level [to] see the connections between mandates and define strategies to realize them would be very helpful.

### **Local Recommendation 3: Clarify the Uneasy Relationship Between Tech Prep and School-To-Work**

One of the most important concerns for the surveyed consortia is the relationship between Tech Prep and the STW initiatives. Many respondents thought that Tech Prep and STW should be joined into a coherent program, but there were misgivings because of the vagaries of government policy and confusion over the proliferation of seemingly identical but uncoordinated programs. Although not the majority, some consortia made the recommendation that the two programs should remain separate because they feared that Tech Prep would disappear in the maelstrom. Representative of these recommendations were: "[We need a] clear definition separate from School-to-Work"; "clearly separate the goals of Tech Prep from School-to-Work"; "clarity must be made (*sic*) between the terms Tech Prep and School-to-Work." A few respondents discouraged any merger between the two. Although not widespread, the sense of emotion evident in these comments suggest these views should not be discounted. The following statements are representative of this perspective: "[D]o not replace Tech Prep with School-to-Work"; "[S]upport Tech Prep and [do] not move to a new bandwagon such as

School-to-Work"; and "Keep it a separate issue from School-to-Work." Looking back at how STWOA was introduced once Tech Prep was underway, one respondent offered, "Tech Prep should have been expanded to reach all students and encompass School-to-Work, instead of starting another new initiative which is a broader version of Tech Prep." Having reviewed all comments, we suspect this sentiment is probably held widely by the respondents.

#### **Local Recommendation 4: Broaden the Tech Prep Concept**

Consortia recommended that the idea of Tech Prep be expanded in several ways. First, some respondents said that Tech Prep programs should be expanded to include secondary students below tenth grade, suggesting a 2+2 model. "If kids are to make a career choice by the start of 10th grade they need career information and awareness activities long before 10th or 11th grade." Others said, "Require secondary schools to have a career portfolio for all students beginning at middle school level" and "Mandate a comprehensive (K-14) career guidance program." One coordinator suggested that Tech Prep has placed too much emphasis on special populations, resulting in a remedialization of the programs. Therefore, Tech Prep needs to return to its original emphasis on the middle majority."

A prevalent recommendation among the consortia surveyed was to urge an emphasis on "all students," expanding Tech Prep and transforming it ultimately into something more akin to career education for all students. One such recommendation was, "Tech Prep is an occupational-career curriculum open to all students whether or not they may be designated as 'vocational'." Another supporting comment follows: "Tech Prep should be for all students. All students should be career bound and should plan for lifelong learning." The emphasis on "all students" moves Tech Prep into the mainstream and away from strictly vocational education, though it appears that the assumption underlying "all students" does not necessarily include liberal arts. Nevertheless, there are threads (admittedly somewhat obscure) among the recommendations that suggest Tech Prep could move further in that direction: "All education should be occupational as well as liberal arts - it isn't necessary to have either/or situations." "Support for technical/vocational and School-to-Work education for students who appear to be college bound. This is the biggest hurdle we have to overcome everyone's daughter/son is going to Harvard so they don't need occupational preparation right? Wrong. Everyone can benefit from high academic and technical education."

A related consideration behind the attempt to include "all students" is a concern over nomenclature: some consortia wish to avoid labeling students as Tech Prep because their emphasis is on career preparation. "It appears that many are concerned that Tech Prep students be identified. Have we not learned that labeling students is 'death' to a concept --it is not necessary to label students-- curriculum changes that any student can enroll in by choice improves educational opportunities for all." "We need to quit labeling students 'College Prep' or 'Tech Prep'. They are all career bound. A student in the health/human services cluster who plans on becoming a doctor needs the same core curriculum (in high school) and voc[ational] training as one pursuing a career as a lab technician. The curriculum should only change as they go into post-secondary/specialty training." "Drop labeling [and] move to career

pathways with two-year degree as part of choice." For some the notion of all students also refers to all grade levels: "The initiative should create systemic change in K-16 education. Therefore, policy should expand the focus to include all students at all levels."

### **Local Recommendation 5: Increase the Participation of Key Stakeholders**

Many consortia identified a need for increased participation by various stakeholder groups. Of the many, *academic faculty* and *postsecondary institutions* were mentioned repeatedly. Academic faculty are especially crucial given the fundamental academic character of the reform, and many see increased participation among academic faculty as a necessary aspect of stabilizing it. To some, the key to involving academic faculty in Tech Prep is considered to be funding. "In addition, offering funding to academic areas to infuse technical and career components into instruction would be beneficial." Another respondent explained,

The problem is academics, for the most part, haven't caught on because it [Tech Prep] is not required of them and the funding has been through vocational channels. As a result, . . . participation and support varies based on [the] actual interest and emphasis of the administration. In our case the interest, support and participation of the academic side is outstanding. Tech Prep should be a required part of every education system with appropriate funding.

Aside from funding, some consortia also recognized and recommended increased cooperation between academic and vocational faculty. One respondent called for an "Inservice/staff education emphasis for administrators and *academic* faculty, specifically designed to orient toward the reform education movement." Another pointed out a deeper concern surrounding academic and vocational faculty involvement: "The biggest challenge will be to get academic and vocational to do joint planning."

Interestingly enough, three consortia in California clearly expressed the need for increased participation by academic faculty. Comments of two of these coordinators follow:

[The] University of California acceptance of Tech Prep courses would establish credibility of applied academics with traditional academic faculty. . . . All academic and vocational faculty should be required to participate in the integration of academic and vocational curriculum.

Secondary and post-secondary faculty and administrative cooperation has been sluggish. Little motivation for them, slow progress for us. This could have been facilitated at the state level, and saved much time and effort, i.e. California Department of Education could have attached some secondary funding to cooperation or at least have given high schools strong encouragement to participate.

Coordinators also want to see *business and industry* take a more active role in Tech Prep development. Business and industry organizations are recognized as important stakeholders in Tech Prep, and recommendations for increasing their involvement are made

by several consortia. One respondent recommended "a stronger commitment from the private sector related to hiring and promoting employees with certificates." At least one consortium suggested that the government could have a hand in encouraging this stronger commitment: "We recommend that the federal and state governments develop and promote incentives for business and industry regarding their working together with schools to implement the work experience component of the Tech Prep program." One incentive could be to "offer tax incentives and other breaks (workers compensation) to businesses who provide work-based learning opportunities."

Bringing the *guidance counselors* into a more active role in Tech Prep is one way to increase the impact of Tech Prep as an educational reform, according to respondents. One suggested the need to "Mandate a comprehensive (K-14) career guidance program [that is] focus[ed] on [the] program not the position of the counselor (a counselor is a proactive player in the overall program). Advisor/adviser a must, but provide staff development for training." Another said, "Federal policy should mandate high school counselors to require students to make career choices. Most counselors are the slowest individuals to change old habits of doing business." Even though counselor inservice is an "essential element" of the Tech Prep law, respondents indicated more is necessary. Several comments documented by the survey are: "One weakness is motivation and acceleration of our guidance counselors into the Tech Prep program. More training for these people would help." "More emphasis needs to be placed on educational planning and counselor function" and "Aim at principals and guidance counselors and help people learn how to change systems."

Developing some kind of nationally-based support system for *Tech Prep coordinators* is also an important part of expanding Tech Prep reforms to include a broader group. One respondent offered, "Most importantly this state needs a pro-active and involved Tech Prep coordinator to solidify and unify Tech Prep efforts." Other respondents emphasized that improving the Tech Prep coordinator position requires training, funding, and government leadership. "It has taken me three years of involvement in Tech Prep and one year of coordinating a Tech Prep project to learn what could have been taught in a workshop dedicated to training Tech Prep participants." Another said, "[The] secondary system should be required to hire a full time Tech Prep coordinator, of course funds should be provided to local system for that purpose." "A coordinator is a must. Part of the grant should include funding for a full-time Tech-Prep coordinator." "State guidelines allow for only one coordinating position per county - this currently presents serious constraints on the level that does not received the funding, i.e. secondary and post-secondary."

### **Local Recommendation 6: Heighten Awareness About Tech Prep**

Some consortia determined that some kind of national marketing objective or "national awareness program" be agreed upon and pursued with respect to Tech Prep. "Educators need to sell best practices and especially bring parents and counselors on board." A few consortia suggested that Tech Prep should be marketed differently from vocational education so as to not mix Tech Prep with the image of a vocational program. Marketing initiatives should "promote data showing positive impact, if available, and/or publish

positive testimonials." Others wanted to see some kind of statewide or national development of recruitment tools. "Too much re-creating the wheel - articles for newspapers, etc. - [we need] more vehicles for sharing."

Part of the reason for marketing Tech Prep to the general public is again to avoid the impression that Tech Prep is a "fad" that will soon be gone from the educational scene, as well as to emphasize that Tech Prep is an educational reform that affects all segments of the population. One coordinator thought it important to "work on internal marketing within [an] educational hierarchy so that Tech Prep is viewed as a high quality program rather than 'another vocational program'." A particular concern to some was the need to demonstrate to "superintendents and school board members that Tech Prep/School-to-Work is not just another initiative that will come and go," and to "state and national (Congress) politicians [who] need correct info[rmation] on how and why a program was set up.... [It] needs to be sold to national educational organizations and unions which teachers belong to." Some considered the marketing of Tech Prep a government responsibility: "[The] state and feds need to promote Tech Prep much more through marketing and grass roots information elements."

---

## REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges. (1997). *Request for proposals: 1998 Tech Prep awards*. Washington, DC: author.

Badway, N., & Grubb, W. N. (1997). *Curriculum integration and multiple domains of career preparation: A sourcebook for reshaping the community college*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Bailey, T., & Merritt, D. (1996). *School-to-work for the college bound*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Boesel, D., Rahn, M., & Deich, (1994, July). *Final report to Congress, Volume III, Program improvement: Education reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Bolt, L., & Swartz, N. (1997, Spring). Contextual curriculum: Getting more meaning from education. In E. Farmer & Cassy Key (Eds.), *School-to-work systems: The role of community college preparing students and facilitating transitions* (pp. 81-88). *New Directions for Community Colleges, 97*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Bragg, D., Layton, J., & Hammons, F. (1994, September). *Tech prep implementation in the United States: Promising trends and lingering challenges*. (MDS-714). Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Bragg, D., Hamm, R., & Trinkle, K. (1995, February). *Work-based learning in two-year colleges in the United States*. (MDS-721). Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Bragg, D., & Hamm, R. (1996, April). *Linking college and work: Exemplary policies and practices of two-year college work-based learning programs*. (MDS-795). Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Bragg, D. (1997, January). *Educator, student and employer priorities for Tech Prep outcomes*. (MDS-790). Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Dillman, D. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Grubb, N., Badway, N., Bell, D., Kraskouskas, E. (1996). *Community college innovations in workforce preparation: Curriculum integration and Tech-Prep*. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College, National Council for Occupational Education, and National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Harkin, G., Beaulieu, M., Brooks, N., & Cossaro, K. (1996). *Tech Prep concept paper*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational Technical Education.

Hershey, A., Silverberg, M., & Owens, T. (1995). *The diverse forms of Tech Prep: Implementation approaches in ten local consortia*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Hershey, A., Owens, T., & Silverberg, M. (1996). *Promising practices in Tech Prep: Local solutions to common problems*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Hull, D., & Parnell, D. (Eds.) (1991). *Tech Prep associate degree: A win/win experience*. Waco, TX: Center for Occupational Research and Development.

Illinois Task Force on Integration. (1997, October). *Academic and occupational integration at the community college*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Community College Board.

Law, D. (1994). *Tech Prep education: A total quality approach*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co., Inc.

Mt. Hood Regional Tech Prep Consortium. (1996, November). *Blueprint for Success: Strengthening School-to-Work in Oregon and the Nation*. A presentation at the Work Now and in the Future 13 Conference in Portland, OR.

Parnell, D. (1985). *The neglected majority*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Reynolds High School. (1997). *1997-1998 program of studies: Reynolds High School*. Troutdale, OR: author.

Silverberg, M., & Hershey, A. (1995). *The emergence of Tech Prep at the state and local levels*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Silverberg, M. (1996). *The continuing development of local Tech-Prep initiatives*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. (1995, September). *Learning to work: Making transition from school to work*. (OTA-HER-637). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Walleri, D. (1994). *Assessment of 2+2 in the Mt. Hood regional consortium: Summary of preliminary findings and proposal for additional research*. Gresham, OR: Mt. Hood Community College.

---

# **APPENDIX A**

## **AGGREGATED RESPONSES TO 1993 TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY**

**Survey Instructions for Tech Prep Coordinators**

Since passage of the federal Tech Prep legislation, local consortia have been forming across the United States. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) is conducting research to better understand how Tech Prep is progressing nationwide and to identify barriers that need to be overcome in future implementation efforts. Your consortia has been randomly selected from all local consortia throughout the country to be part of this survey. We need your assistance to determine how Tech Prep is being implemented at your site.

You may be assured complete confidentiality regarding your responses to this questionnaire. An identification number appears on the questionnaire for mailing purposes only. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire and your responses will only be reported in aggregate form.

The survey has five parts and it is essential that you provide responses to the questions in all the parts of the questionnaire. The five parts are:

- 1. Part I: Tech Prep Goals & Outcomes**
- 2. Part II: The Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep**
- 3. Part III: Barriers to Tech Prep Implementation**
- 4. Part IV: Tech Prep Consortium Characteristics**
- 5. Part V: Tech Prep Coordinator Background**

Most questions require you circle responses. A few questions require you print a short answer. Typing is not necessary. Respondents in the pilot of this survey reported completion time ranged between forty-five minutes and one hour.

If any problems or questions arise as you complete the survey, please refer them immediately to:

Debra Bragg (217) 333-0807 or (217) 244-4260 Fax: (217) 244-5632

James Layton (217) 333-0807 or (217) 244-3537 Fax: (217) 244-5632

Once you have completed the questionnaire, please mail it to us as quickly as possible; no later than June 30, 1993. The enclosed pre-

addressed envelope is included for your convenience. Should you use other cover, please send your survey to:

Dr. Debra Bragg  
 NCRVE Site, University of Illinois  
 344 Education Building  
 1310 South Sixth Street  
 Champaign, IL 61820

## **PART I: TECH PREP GOALS and OUTCOMES**

Q- Which of the following components of Tech Prep is formally stated in writing in a mission statement, proposal, policy, plan, 1. marketing brochure, or other official document(s) as the focus of your consortium's Tech Prep initiative?

| <b>Tech Prep Component</b>  | <b>YES</b> | <b>NO</b> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| 1. Common core curriculum in math, science, and communications (including applied academics) and technologies leading to an associate degree, certificate, or apprenticeship in a career field ( <i>n=393</i> ) | 91.9%      | 8.1%      |
| 2. New teaching methods such as cooperative learning appropriate for varied student needs and learning styles ( <i>n=385</i> )  | 71.9%      | 28.1%     |
| 3. Integrated academic and vocational curriculum ( <i>n=390</i> )   | 95.6%      | 4.4%      |
| 4. Alternative learner assessment (e.g., performance assessment, portfolios) ( <i>n=185</i> )   | 60.5%      | 39.5%     |
| 5. Career guidance including career awareness and exploration ( <i>n=393</i> )  | 93.6%      | 6.4%      |
| 6. Formal articulation agreements to create 2+2 program-area course sequences between secondary and postsecondary schools ( <i>n=391</i> )  | 96.4%      | 3.6%      |
| 7. Work-based learning experiences (e.g., youth apprenticeships, cooperative education, school academies) ( <i>n=384</i> )  | 67.7%      | 32.3%     |
| 8. Employment assistance & job placement services ( <i>n=380</i> )  | 46.8%      | 53.2%     |
| 9. Equal access to the full range of Tech Prep for special populations ( <i>n=393</i> )   | 91.9%      | 8.1%      |
| 10. Preparatory services for all participants in Tech Prep ( <i>n=377</i> )   | 78.5%      | 21.5%     |
| 11. Joint in-service training for teachers from the entire consortium ( <i>n=388</i> )  | 89.9%      | 10.1%     |
| 12. Training programs for counselors designed to enable them to recruit students and ensure they complete programs and obtain employment ( <i>n=388</i> )   | 82.5%      | 17.5%     |

|  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| 13. Collaboration between educators and employers to enhance education ( <i>n=385</i> )  | 92.5% | 7.5%  |
| 14. Marketing of Tech Prep programs ( <i>n=386</i> )   | 87.0% | 13.0% |
| 15. Other responses: Internships, work experience, mentorships; program evaluation; curriculum articulation, alignment, applied academics, common core, integration; adult bridge programs; career development, pathways, centers. ( <i>n=45</i> ) |       |       |

**Note:** Due to the omission of response categories for item 4, the findings for this category are likely to under represent actual activity. Therefore, readers are urged to interpret and report statistics related to alternative learner assessment cautiously.

Q-2. There are many reasons to implement Tech Prep. Briefly state the one primary goal of your Tech Prep initiative.

- 36% Workforce, technology, and career preparation
- 17% Reform secondary education
- 16% Reach student groups
- 13% Continue to postsecondary education
- 13% Options beyond high school
- 5% Other goals

Q- During the 1992-93 academic year, which of the following types of committees or teams operated (e.g., held meetings, developed policy) in your Tech Prep consortium? (*Circle all that apply.*) (*n=397*)

| <b>Committee or Team Type</b>          | <b>YES</b> | <b>NO</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 1. Executive committee/Governing board | 77.6%      | 22.4%     |
| 2. Advisory committee                  | 74.8%      | 25.2%     |
| 3. Planning                            | 72.3%      | 27.7%     |
| 4. Curriculum                          | 86.4%      | 13.6%     |
| 5. Evaluation                          | 36.8%      | 63.2%     |
| 6. Promotion/marketing                 | 60.7%      | 39.3%     |
| 7. Staff development                   | 68.3%      | 31.7%     |
| 8. Counseling/guidance                 | 63.5%      | 36.5%     |
| 9. Business/industry collaboration     | 70.0%      | 30.0%     |

|   |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|
| 10. Implementation  | 45.1% | 54.9% |
| 11. Other responses: Steering committee, leadership, administration, applied academics, special populations/needs, maintenance, career awareness/guidance, integration, school to work. | 11.3% | 88.7% |

Q- Did your consortium have site-based committees or teams at participating secondary and postsecondary school in the consortium during the 1992-93 academic year? *(Circle one response.) (n=395)*

- 43.5% YES, at some schools
- 27.3% YES, at all schools
- 18.2% NO, but plans call for site-based committees/teams in the future
- 6.8% NO, and there are no plans for site-based committees/teams in the future
- 4.1% Other

Q- Which of the following class rank percentiles best describes the primary target group(s) of students for your Tech Prep initiative? *(Circle all that apply.) (n=389)*

- 45.5% 25th-75th
- 23.0% 50th-75th
- 10.5% All percentiles
- 5.9% 25th-50th
- 5.6% 25th-100th
- 1.8% 50-100th
- 3.8% 0-75th
- 1.5% Other
- 1.0% 75th-100th
- 0.8% 0-25th

Q- During the 1992-93 academic year, which vocational education program areas were part of the Tech Prep curriculum reform efforts? *(Circle all that apply.) (n=397)*

| Vocational Program Areas | YES | NO |
|--------------------------|-----|----|
|--------------------------|-----|----|

|                                     |       |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 1. Agriculture                      | 27.7% | 72.3% |
| 2. Business and Office              | 79.3% | 20.7% |
| 3. Health Occupations               | 50.6% | 49.4% |
| 4. Marketing/distributive education | 31.5% | 68.5% |
| 5. Occupational Home Economics      | 22.7% | 77.3% |
| 6. Consumer and Homemaking          | 13.6% | 86.4% |
| 7. Trade & Industrial               | 61.0% | 39.0% |
| 8. Industrial Technology Education  | 57.9% | 42.1% |
| 9. Other                            | 16.1% | 83.9% |

Q- During the 1992-93 academic year, which of the following represent(s) the focus of Tech Prep curriculum reform efforts that occurred in your consortium at the secondary and postsecondary levels? (Circle all that apply.)

| Curriculum Reform Effort  | At the <u>secondary</u> level during '92-93? |       | At the <u>postsecondary</u> level during '92-93? |       |
|---|--|-------|--|-------|
|   | Yes  | No    | Yes  | No    |
| Supplement existing vocational-technical courses with academic content ( <i>n=368/305</i> )   | 76.1%  | 23.9% | 42.6%  | 57.4% |
| Supplement existing academic courses with vocational-technical content ( <i>n=369/297</i> )   | 72.1%  | 27.9% | 34.3%  | 65.7% |
| Add applied academic courses (commercially- or locally-developed) to the existing curriculum ( <i>n=381/305</i> )                                       | 86.4%  | 13.6% | 37.7%  | 62.3% |
| Replace parts of the existing curriculum with applied academic courses (commercially- or locally-developed) ( <i>n=375/298</i> )                        | 77.9%  | 22.1% | 29.9%  | 70.1% |
| Coordinate academic and vocational-technical courses by sequencing and reinforcing related content, often through block scheduling ( <i>n=368/300</i> ) | 56.5%  | 43.5% | 32.0%  | 68.0% |
| Provide interdisciplinary courses combining vocational-technical and academic content (e.g., History of Work) ( <i>n=364/301</i> )                      | 37.4%  | 62.6% | 22.3%  | 77.7% |

|  |       |       |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Organize academic and vocational-technical courses around occupational/ career clusters<br>( <i>n=373/310</i> )  | 68.9% | 31.1% | 51.6% | 48.4% |
| Provide academies combining courses from vocational-technical areas and math, science, communications, and other academic areas ( <i>n=363/296</i> )   | 39.9% | 60.1% | 23.3% | 76.7% |
| Articulate academic program-area course sequences between the secondary and postsecondary levels ( <i>n=368/331</i> )  | 69.6% | 30.4% | 69.2% | 30.8% |
| Articulate vocational-technical program-area course sequences between the secondary and postsecondary levels ( <i>n=382/335</i> )  | 89.5% | 10.5% | 88.1% | 11.9% |
| Add advanced-skills courses to the existing curriculum ( <i>n=355/306</i> )  | 40.6% | 59.4% | 35.3% | 64.7% |
| Provide work-based learning outside the formal structure of schools as a significant portion of student learning (e.g., internship, apprenticeship) ( <i>n=366/309</i> )   | 46.2% | 53.8% | 39.8% | 60.2% |
| Other responses: Transitional courses at postsecondary level, core curriculum/competencies, add/incorporate SCANS, develop TQM component; infuse career skills in state-mandated curricula, enhance student assessment Career Awareness; youth apprenticeship, work experience; language remediation assistance; align secondary curriculum; improve technical associate degree; DACUM.<br>( <i>n=32</i> ) |       |       |       |       |

Q- Which educational reforms were implemented in any participating secondary or postsecondary schools in your Tech Prep consortium during the 1992-93 academic year? (*Circle all that apply.*)

|  | YES   | NO    |
|--|-------|-------|
| 1. America 2000 initiative   | 39.3% | 60.7% |
| 2. Secondary school reforms (e.g., Coalition of Essential Schools, Effective Schools)  | 42.6% | 57.4% |
| 3. Postsecondary/higher education reforms (e.g., multicultural, general education reform)  | 28.0% | 72.0% |
| 4. School-to-work transition reforms (e.g., youth apprenticeship, school academies)  | 38.3% | 61.7% |
| 5. Total Quality Management (TQM) (e.g., quality improvement, employee involvement)  | 41.6% | 58.4% |
| 6. Other responses: Integration, SCANS, SREB, Beacon School initiative, outcomes-based education, cooperative learning, State reform initiatives, competency-based education, Quality schools, cooperative work experience, site-based management. | 15.6% | 84.4% |

Q- Tech Prep could impact secondary and postsecondary students in many different ways. Review the following list of student outcomes and indicate the level of priority that your Tech Prep consortium gives to each outcome. (Circle 9 only if the outcome is Not Applicable (NA) to your Tech Prep initiative.)

| Student Outcome   | Level of Priority<br>(Circle the one best response) |       |          |       |           |      |
|---|---|-------|----------|-------|-----------|------|
|   | Very Low  | Low   | Moderate | High  | Very High | NA   |
| Improved knowledge and skills in English/communications (n=392)         | 0.0%  | 1.0%  | 8.9%     | 35.7% | 53.8%     | 0.5% |
| Increased interpersonal skills (e.g., team & leadership skills) (n=392) | 0.0%  | 1.8%  | 15.8%    | 39.0% | 42.6%     | 0.8% |
| Increased problem solving, thinking, and reasoning skills (n=393)       | 0.0%  | 1.3%  | 2.8%     | 33.3% | 61.8%     | 0.8% |
| Improved knowledge and skills in math (n=394)                           | 0.3%  | 0.3%  | 5.1%     | 30.2% | 63.7%     | 0.5% |
| Improved knowledge and skills in science (n=393)                        | 0.5%  | 1.3%  | 9.7%     | 36.4% | 51.7%     | 0.5% |
| Increased knowledge and skills in vocational-technical areas (n=393)    | 0.3%  | 0.8%  | 7.9%     | 37.7% | 52.9%     | 0.5% |
| Increased self esteem (n=394)   | 0.5%  | 2.0%  | 24.1%    | 39.6% | 32.5%     | 1.3% |
| Increased motivation for learning (n=392)                               | 0.0%  | 0.8%  | 11.2%    | 39.3% | 48.0%     | 0.8% |
| Improved employability skills and work readiness (n=394)                | 0.3%  | 1.0%  | 4.1%     | 33.2% | 60.9%     | 0.5% |
| Increased awareness of and interest in technical careers (n=392)        | 0.5%  | 0.8%  | 6.4%     | 38.8% | 53.3%     | 0.3% |
| Increased secondary school completion rate (n=392)                      | 0.5%  | 2.0%  | 15.1%    | 33.2% | 47.7%     | 1.5% |
| Increased matriculation from secondary to postsecondary levels (n=393)  | 0.3%  | 0.5%  | 7.6%     | 35.4% | 55.5%     | 0.8% |
| Increased postsecondary school completion rate (n=394)                  | 1.0%  | 2.8%  | 18.8%    | 37.1% | 36.5%     | 3.8% |
| Increased matriculation from two-year to four-year college (n=390)      | 2.6%  | 14.4% | 39.5%    | 25.4% | 11.5%     | 6.7% |
| Increased job placement rate (n=392)                                    | 0.8%  | 4.3%  | 21.7%    | 39.0% | 30.6%     | 3.6% |
| Increased employability in high-wage jobs (n=392)                       | 0.5%  | 2.3%  | 20.4%    | 40.1% | 32.9%     | 3.8% |
| Increased satisfaction of students/graduates with jobs (n=392)          | 0.8%  | 4.1%  | 21.4%    | 37.5% | 32.7%     | 3.6% |

Q- Thinking about your overall experience with Tech Prep implementation thus far, how would you describe support for Tech Prep

10. from the following interest groups? (Circle 9 only if the interest group is Not Applicable (NA) to your Tech Prep initiative.)

| Interest Group                                      | Level of Support<br>(Circle the one best response) |       |       |           |       |
|---|--|-------|-------|-----------|-------|
|   | Poor   | Fair  | Good  | Excellent | NA    |
| Academic faculty (n=394)                            | 4.3%   | 30.5% | 43.7% | 21.1%     | 0.5%  |
| Vocational faculty (n=395)                          | 1.3%   | 8.9%  | 38.5% | 51.1%     | 0.3%  |
| Counselors (n=395)                                  | 5.3%   | 26.1% | 43.0% | 25.1%     | 0.5%  |
| Local secondary administrators (n=395)              | 2.5%   | 17.0% | 41.3% | 39.2%     | 0.0%  |
| Local two-year postsecondary administrators (n=395) | 1.5%   | 11.4% | 36.2% | 50.4%     | 0.5%  |
| Business/industry representatives (n=394)           | 2.3%   | 10.2% | 37.6% | 47.2%     | 2.8%  |
| Labor union representatives (n=386)                 | 7.5%   | 13.7% | 13.2% | 11.9%     | 53.6% |
| State agency personnel (n=393)                      | 2.5%   | 9.2%  | 30.3% | 53.7%     | 4.3%  |
| Four-year college/university personnel (n=391)      | 20.2%  | 25.6% | 23.0% | 6.9%      | 24.3% |
| Secondary school board members (n=393)              | 3.6%   | 20.6% | 39.1% | 31.2%     | 5.6%  |
| College trustees (n=387)                            | 9.3%   | 14.5% | 24.3% | 20.2%     | 31.8% |
| Students (n=391)                                    | 2.0%   | 14.6% | 48.3% | 25.3%     | 9.7%  |
| Parents (n=388)                                     | 2.3%   | 20.4% | 48.5% | 19.1%     | 9.8%  |

## PART II: THE STAGE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF TECH PREP

- Q- This question focuses on the stage of implementation of components of your Tech Prep initiative. For each component, indicate
11. the stage of implementation of the most typical organization(s) in your local consortium. The stages of implementation are:
- 1 Not Begun: This stage indicates the component has not been addressed.
  - 2 Planning: This stage includes goal setting, staff orientation, the formation of committees and teams, and the development of plans for a component.
  - 3 Development: This stage involves such activities as reviewing, designing, creating, and field testing a component.
  - 4 Initial implementation: This stage occurs when plans and products of the developmental stage begin to be carried out for a

component.

**5 Advanced implementation:** This stage occurs when a component is routinely carried out, regularly reviewed and evaluated, and institutionalized so that it continues even if current leaders are no longer responsible for Tech Prep.

**9 Not Addressed (NA):** This category indicates that your consortium does not intend to include the component in its Tech Prep initiative.

| <b>Tech Prep Component</b>   | <b>Stage of Implementation</b><br><i>(Circle the one best response)</i> |       |         |                   |                    |      |
|--|---|-------|---------|-------------------|--------------------|------|
|  | Not Begun   | Plan  | Develop | Initial Implement | Advanced Implement | NA   |
| Consortium building (including recruiting schools, colleges, employers, and other organizations) ( <i>n=395</i> )      | 0.8%  | 7.1%  | 10.4%   | 43.8%             | 37.2%              | 0.8% |
| Site-based planning and decision making for Tech Prep ( <i>n=393</i> )   | 3.3%  | 15.8% | 20.6%   | 39.9%             | 18.3%              | 2.0% |
| Team building to facilitate Tech Prep planning and implementation ( <i>n=395</i> )                                     | 1.5%  | 9.9%  | 18.7%   | 46.1%             | 23.3%              | 0.5% |
| Long-range and/or strategic planning for Tech Prep ( <i>n=392</i> )  | 3.8%  | 13.3% | 25.8%   | 39.5%             | 17.1%              | 0.5% |
| Formal partnerships with business and industry ( <i>n=394</i> )  | 7.9%  | 20.6% | 30.2%   | 27.4%             | 13.5%              | 0.5% |
| Joint in-service of secondary and postsecondary personnel (e.g., faculty, counselors, administrators) ( <i>n=395</i> ) | 4.1%  | 8.6%  | 16.2%   | 44.6%             | 26.6%              | 0.0% |
| In-service training of counselors in recruitment, placement, and retention of students for Tech Prep ( <i>n=395</i> )  | 4.1%  | 19.2% | 21.5%   | 39.5%             | 15.2%              | 0.5% |
| Work place professional development experiences for teachers and counselors ( <i>n=394</i> )                           | 18.0%   | 18.5% | 20.6%   | 29.7%             | 11.7%              | 1.5% |
| Joint planning time for academic and vocational teachers ( <i>n=393</i> )  | 17.3%   | 26.0% | 22.1%   | 23.2%             | 9.4%               | 2.0% |
| Collaboration between academic and vocational educators ( <i>n=395</i> )   | 5.6%  | 19.5% | 29.1%   | 30.9%             | 14.4%              | 0.5% |
| Formal signed articulation agreement(s) between secondary and postsecondary schools ( <i>n=396</i> )                   | 4.0%  | 8.3%  | 12.4%   | 31.6%             | 42.7%              | 1.0% |
| Labor market analysis to inform curriculum development ( <i>n=393</i> )  | 15.3%   | 15.5% | 20.1%   | 27.5%             | 18.6%              | 3.1% |
| Development of 2+2 core academic and technical curriculum ( <i>n=395</i> )   | 2.5%  | 15.9% | 20.8%   | 38.5%             | 21.8%              | 0.5% |

|  |       |       |       |       |       |      |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Development of <u>advanced-skills</u> technical curriculum ( <i>n=393</i> )                      | 22.1% | 23.2% | 21.1% | 23.9% | 7.9%  | 1.8% |
| Integration of academic and vocational <u>secondary</u> curriculum ( <i>n=395</i> )              | 4.3%  | 17.7% | 31.6% | 34.9% | 10.6% | 0.8% |
| Integration of academic and vocational <u>postsecondary</u> curriculum ( <i>n=387</i> )          | 19.1% | 25.3% | 23.3% | 21.2% | 7.8%  | 3.4% |
| Use of outcomes-based education for Tech Prep ( <i>n=391</i> )                                   | 13.3% | 24.0% | 24.8% | 25.8% | 9.5%  | 2.6% |
| Use of new instructional strategies (including cooperative learning approaches) ( <i>n=396</i> ) | 7.1%  | 22.7% | 25.5% | 31.1% | 12.1% | 1.5% |
| Alternative assessments (e.g., portfolios, performance assessment) ( <i>n=390</i> )              | 17.9% | 26.2% | 22.6% | 23.1% | 7.7%  | 2.6% |
| Career awareness and exploration for students in Tech Prep ( <i>n=395</i> )                      | 7.3%  | 21.8% | 24.8% | 29.9% | 15.9% | 0.3% |
| Work-based learning for students (e.g., internships, apprenticeships) ( <i>n=395</i> )           | 20.3% | 27.3% | 23.5% | 19.5% | 7.1%  | 2.3% |
| Apprenticeships spanning secondary and postsecondary education ( <i>n=393</i> )                  | 37.9% | 29.5% | 15.3% | 8.1%  | 2.5%  | 6.6% |
| Job placement services for students/graduates ( <i>n=391</i> )                                   | 32.0% | 22.0% | 13.6% | 14.8% | 12.8% | 4.9% |
| Marketing and promotions ( <i>n=396</i> )  | 6.3%  | 16.2% | 23.7% | 32.8% | 20.5% | 0.5% |
| Guidance and counseling services ( <i>n=396</i> )  | 5.8%  | 22.2% | 27.3% | 31.8% | 12.6% | 0.3% |
| Equal access for all students ( <i>n=397</i> )   | 3.3%  | 17.2% | 18.0% | 32.4% | 28.9% | 0.3% |
| Strategies to address the needs of special populations ( <i>n=396</i> )                          | 7.1%  | 24.0% | 27.5% | 27.5% | 13.4% | 0.5% |
| Preparatory services for all participants ( <i>n=387</i> )                                       | 7.8%  | 24.3% | 26.9% | 25.8% | 14.0% | 1.3% |
| Evaluation of Tech Prep programs ( <i>n=396</i> )  | 13.6% | 24.5% | 28.5% | 23.0% | 9.8%  | 0.5% |
| Computer monitoring of student progress through Tech Prep programs ( <i>n=393</i> )              | 39.4% | 24.9% | 16.0% | 11.7% | 3.8%  | 4.1% |

Q- Take a few minutes to review your responses to the previous question (Q-11). Now, to summarize, indicate the stage of implementation that best describes your Tech Prep consortium overall. (Circle the one best response.) (*n=387*)

- 10.6% Planning
- 23.5% Development
- 51.9% Initial Implementation
- 12.9% Advanced Implementation

1.0%

Other

**PART III: BARRIERS TO TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION**

Q- Barriers stand in the way of implementation of any new educational program. This question focuses on identifying barriers to implementation of Tech Prep. For each of the barriers listed below, indicate the level of impact it has had or is having on your consortiums Tech Prep initiative.

| Barrier  | Level of Impact<br><i>(Circle the one best response)</i> |            |       |          |       |            |
|--|--|------------|-------|----------|-------|------------|
|  | None   | Very Minor | Minor | Moderate | Major | Very Major |
| Negative attitude toward vocational education (n=393)  | 2.5%   | 9.2%       | 24.7% | 40.2%    | 17.6% | 5.9%       |
| Lack of staff, time, and money dedicated to Tech Prep (n=396)  | 2.5%   | 7.3%       | 18.9% | 34.8%    | 27.0% | 9.3%       |
| Failure of educators to see the need to change (n=395)   | 3.8%   | 13.4%      | 25.8% | 32.2%    | 19.2% | 5.6%       |
| Turf battles between secondary and postsecondary educators (n=396)   | 9.8%   | 20.2%      | 33.3% | 22.7%    | 9.8%  | 4.0%       |
| Looking at Tech Prep as vocational education by another name (n=393)   | 4.1%   | 11.5%      | 24.9% | 33.6%    | 19.8% | 6.1%       |
| Lack of general awareness about Tech Prep (n=396)  | 1.5%   | 6.6%       | 18.9% | 38.1%    | 27.0% | 7.8%       |
| Belief that Tech Prep is an educational "fad" that will go away (n=395)  | 4.3%   | 10.6%      | 21.5% | 33.2%    | 21.0% | 9.4%       |
| Failure of two-year postsecondary schools to accommodate Tech Prep students (n=387)  | 29.2%  | 31.3%      | 21.4% | 12.7%    | 4.7%  | 0.8%       |
| Failure of four-year colleges and universities to award college credit for applied academic or other Tech Prep courses (n=378) | 10.3%  | 9.3%       | 12.2% | 20.1%    | 25.9% | 22.2%      |
| Difficulty in dealing with educational bureaucracies (n=391)   | 4.3%   | 9.5%       | 23.3% | 34.5%    | 17.6% | 10.7%      |
| Lack of support from business and industry (n=392)   | 24.2%  | 28.8%      | 29.6% | 13.0%    | 3.3%  | 1.0%       |
| Lack of support from labor organizations (n=362)   | 36.7%  | 23.8%      | 22.1% | 9.1%     | 4.4%  | 3.9%       |
| Lack of availability of integrated academic and vocational curriculum materials (n=393)  | 14.5%  | 25.7%      | 29.3% | 20.9%    | 7.9%  | 1.8%       |

|  |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Conflict with other educational reform movements ( <i>n=395</i> )  | 22.0% | 26.3% | 24.6% | 17.0% | 6.1%  | 4.1%  |
| Resistance from secondary school administrators to Tech Prep ( <i>n=394</i> )  | 15.7% | 23.6% | 26.9% | 23.1% | 8.4%  | 2.3%  |
| Resistance from postsecondary school administrators to Tech Prep ( <i>n=393</i> )                                    | 25.3% | 25.3% | 27.1% | 14.8% | 5.1%  | 2.3%  |
| Difficulty reaching consensus among curriculum planners on reform strategies ( <i>n=389</i> )                        | 12.3% | 27.2% | 29.3% | 20.6% | 8.7%  | 1.8%  |
| Lack of funds for curriculum reform ( <i>n=395</i> )   | 9.6%  | 13.9% | 20.5% | 27.8% | 18.7% | 9.4%  |
| Failure to employ local Tech Prep coordinator full time ( <i>n=391</i> )   | 42.2% | 7.2%  | 12.3% | 13.8% | 13.3% | 11.3% |
| Lack of experts to provide in-service about Tech Prep ( <i>n=391</i> )   | 22.0% | 21.5% | 27.1% | 18.7% | 8.2%  | 2.6%  |
| Resistance from ac. ed's to make changes for Tech Prep ( <i>n=394</i> )  | 2.3%  | 14.5% | 25.4% | 31.7% | 21.3% | 4.8%  |
| Resistance from voc. ed's to make changes for Tech Prep ( <i>n=390</i> )   | 9.7%  | 23.6% | 34.6% | 21.3% | 9.0%  | 1.8%  |
| Resistance from secondary schools to introduce Tech Prep into the curriculum ( <i>n=392</i> )                        | 9.7%  | 20.2% | 27.6% | 30.4% | 9.9%  | 2.3%  |
| Resistance from postsec. schools to introduce Tech Prep into the curriculum ( <i>n=390</i> )                         | 15.4% | 20.0% | 26.7% | 26.4% | 8.2%  | 3.3%  |
| Difficulty in developing formal articulation agreements between secondary and postsecondary schools ( <i>n=392</i> ) | 22.2% | 26.3% | 21.7% | 22.4% | 5.6%  | 1.8%  |
| Lack of collaboration between voc. and ac. educators ( <i>n=393</i> )  | 3.6%  | 15.8% | 29.8% | 33.6% | 13.2% | 4.1%  |
| Lack of knowledge and skills among education personnel in how to implement educational change ( <i>n=392</i> )       | 3.6%  | 10.5% | 23.7% | 37.2% | 19.9% | 5.1%  |
| Little time for joint planning by ac. and voc. or sec. and postsec. faculty ( <i>n=392</i> )                         | 2.8%  | 6.4%  | 17.6% | 28.8% | 28.6% | 15.8% |
| Lack of credibility of vocational ed. involved with Tech Prep ( <i>n=394</i> )                                       | 11.9% | 29.9% | 30.7% | 21.1% | 4.1%  | 2.3%  |
| Lack of clear <u>federal</u> level policy for Tech Prep ( <i>n=394</i> )   | 14.0% | 21.1% | 26.4% | 20.3% | 11.9% | 6.3%  |
| Lack of clear <u>state</u> level policy for Tech Prep ( <i>n=396</i> )   | 12.1% | 21.2% | 18.7% | 22.5% | 14.6% | 10.9% |
| Lack of clear <u>local</u> level policy for Tech Prep ( <i>n=393</i> )   | 13.2% | 23.2% | 22.6% | 24.9% | 9.7%  | 6.4%  |
| Lack of support from <u>both</u> state sec. and postsec. agencies( <i>n=393</i> )                                    | 17.8% | 23.7% | 28.2% | 17.8% | 6.6%  | 5.9%  |

|  |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Turnover of state or local leaders involved in Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =392)  | 25.5% | 28.1% | 21.2% | 12.8% | 7.7%  | 4.8%  |
| Too much flexibility in local implementation of Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =391)   | 30.4% | 29.9% | 24.3% | 10.0% | 4.3%  | 1.0%  |
| Funding for Tech Prep limited to vocational ed. sources( <i>n</i> =393)  | 20.3% | 15.2% | 17.5% | 22.8% | 14.5% | 9.6%  |
| Limitations in using Tech Prep funds for equipment or instructional materials purchases ( <i>n</i> =391)   | 11.5% | 18.4% | 21.0% | 22.8% | 17.4% | 9.0%  |
| Limitations in using Tech Prep funds beyond grades 11-14 ( <i>n</i> =398)  | 24.4% | 20.3% | 18.5% | 13.9% | 14.7% | 8.2%  |
| Lack of evaluation mechanisms to inform implementation ( <i>n</i> =386)  | 10.6% | 17.9% | 26.9% | 27.5% | 13.7% | 3.4%  |
| Lack of authority of local personnel to make changes needed to implement Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =394)  | 12.7% | 19.8% | 25.4% | 22.3% | 12.2% | 7.6%  |
| Pressure from special interest groups to modify Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =392)   | 42.9% | 27.3% | 17.6% | 6.9%  | 3.1%  | 2.3%  |
| Lack of active involvement from business and industry ( <i>n</i> =394)   | 22.6% | 26.4% | 24.4% | 16.8% | 7.6%  | 2.3%  |
| Lack of jobs in the region for Tech Prep graduates ( <i>n</i> =393)  | 13.7% | 17.3% | 20.1% | 25.2% | 14.2% | 9.4%  |
| Lack of parental support for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =386)  | 16.3% | 20.7% | 29.0% | 23.1% | 8.8%  | 2.1%  |
| Lack of student interest in Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =386)   | 15.5% | 23.8% | 30.3% | 22.5% | 6.2%  | 1.6%  |
| Inability of young people to make early career decisions ( <i>n</i> =387)  | 8.0%  | 18.9% | 21.2% | 30.2% | 17.3% | 4.4%  |
| Lack of counselor interest in or involvement with Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =390)   | 10.3% | 16.4% | 19.7% | 27.9% | 17.4% | 8.2%  |
| Lack of cooperation from teachers unions ( <i>n</i> =367)  | 47.4% | 20.7% | 17.7% | 8.7%  | 4.4%  | 1.1%  |
| Difficulty maintaining momentum over the long term ( <i>n</i> =390)  | 16.4% | 16.9% | 27.9% | 21.5% | 13.1% | 4.1%  |
| Pressure for quick success and student head counts ( <i>n</i> =393)  | 16.0% | 12.2% | 16.5% | 25.7% | 17.3% | 12.2% |
| Other responses: Size of region & number of schools, consortium too big, widespread geography; lack of integrated concept between Tech Prep and youth apprenticeship, incompatibility with federally-funded apprenticeship in region; lack of funding of grades 8, 9, & 10, local tight budget, crisis of school funding, funds for proper administration and marketing; applied academics rather than true integration, articulation defined as early completion, different approaches of secondary systems, resistance to DACUM, lack of developed competencies for occupational areas; lack of recent work force experience among school personnel; lack of interest & support of upper-level administration; too much State involvement in day-to-day operations; staggering paperwork for Perkins; fiscal agent usurps autonomy; lack of cooperation from state professional organizations; identification that Tech Prep tracks students; lack of support from student services side of postsecondary. ( <i>n</i> =30) |       |       |       |       |       |       |

## PART IV: TECH PREP CONSORTIUM CHARACTERISTICS

Q- Estimate the number of organizations that participated in Tech Prep implementation in your consortium during the 1992-93  
14. year. (Enter 0 (zero) if no such organizations participated.)

| Type of Organization   | Number in Consortium (mean) |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Secondary schools (e.g., comprehensive high schools, area or regional vocational schools, vocational high schools) (n=364)                               | 11.60                       |
| If readily available, estimate the combined student enrollment (head count) of <u>all</u> secondary schools participating in the consortium. (n=241)     | 7800.75                     |
| Two-year postsecondary schools (e.g., community and junior colleges, two-year vocational-technical institutes and proprietary schools) (n=349)           | 1.78                        |
| If readily available, estimate the combined student enrollment (head count) of <u>all</u> postsecondary schools participating in the consortium. (n=212) | 7,104.53                    |
| Four-year postsecondary schools (e.g., public and private four-year colleges and universities) (n=152)   | 1.64                        |
| Private-sector businesses and industrial firms (including private not-for-profit organizations) (n=287)  | 22.78                       |
| Labor organizations (n=91)   | 2.31                        |
| Public community-based organizations (including parent, teacher organizations) (n=164)   | 5.04                        |
| Student leadership organizations (secondary and postsecondary) (n=83)  | 4.36                        |
| Other (specify): (n=22)  | 2.50                        |

Q- For each group of secondary and postsecondary personnel listed below, estimate 1) the total number employed by organizations  
15. in your consortium, 2) the percentage of each group of personnel actively involved in Tech Prep planning, development and implementation activities and 3) the percentage of each group that has participated in Tech Prep in-service.

| Secondary | Total Number | Percent (%) involved | Percent (%) in |
|-----------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|
|-----------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|

| <b>Education Personnel</b>                   | <b>Employed</b>                  | <b>in Tech Prep</b>                          | <b>Tech Prep In-service</b>                    |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Vocational faculty                           | 91.82 (n=293)                    | 53.7 (n=260)                                 | 59.8 (n=262)                                   |
| Academic faculty                             | 504.99 (n=286)                   | 29.9 (n=207)                                 | 42.5 (n=214)                                   |
| Counselors                                   | 31.64 (n=294)                    | 61.4 (n=243)                                 | 67.4 (n=236)                                   |
| Administrators                               | 43.54 (n=288)                    | 56.4 (n=242)                                 | 60.5 (n=238)                                   |
| <b>Postsecondary<br/>Education Personnel</b> | <b>Total Number<br/>Employed</b> | <b>Percent (%) involved<br/>in Tech Prep</b> | <b>Percent (%) in<br/>Tech Prep In-service</b> |
| Vocational faculty                           | 53.77 (n=256)                    | 47.5 (n=216)                                 | 54.5 (n=206)                                   |
| Academic faculty                             | 92.97 (n=254)                    | 31.2 (n=158)                                 | 44.7 (n=160)                                   |
| Counselors                                   | 8.51 (n=255)                     | 56.5 (n=202)                                 | 63.2 (n=185)                                   |
| Administrators                               | 18.38 (n=266)                    | 53.7 (n=230)                                 | 59.2 (n=206)                                   |

**Note:** Due to the high incidence of non response to this question, readers are urged to use caution in interpreting and reporting these statistics.

Q- Describe the most successful Tech Prep in-service activity your consortium has conducted thus far for secondary and  
16. postsecondary and academic and vocational education personnel. *(If additional space is needed, please use the back of this survey.)* Refer to the section of this report on local consortium characteristics for a discussion of these open-ended survey responses.

Q-17. Estimate the total number of people who live in your Tech Prep consortium service area.  
288,114 (mean) TOTAL CONSORTIUM POPULATION

Q-18. In what type of setting(s) do people in your consortium service area reside? *(Circle all that apply.)*

- 39.4% Rural only
- 24.2% All settings
- 10.9% Rural and Suburban
- 23.9% All

|      |                    |
|------|--------------------|
| 9.2% | Suburban only      |
| 7.6% | Urban only         |
| 4.3% | Rural and Urban    |
| 4.3% | Urban and Suburban |

Q- For the 1992-93 academic year, indicate source(s) and amount of grant funds for Tech Prep (NOT counting carry forward funds from previous funding periods or in-kind contributions of goods and services). (Enter 0 (zero) in categories where no such funds were received during 1992-93.)

| Source of funds   | Total of '92-'93 Funds (mean) |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Tech Prep grant funds (Perkins Title III-E Tech Prep funds awarded by states) ( <i>n</i> =373)<br>Year Perkins III-E Tech Prep funds were <u>first</u> received: 1991 ( <i>n</i> =264); 1992 ( <i>n</i> =127) | 97,342.87                     |
| Federal or state grant funds <u>other</u> than Perkins Title III-E Tech Prep funds ( <i>n</i> =101)   | 62,220.58                     |
| Local funds ( <i>n</i> =145)  | 45,572.33                     |
| Private-sector business and industry funds ( <i>n</i> =43)  | 9,228.17                      |
| Other ( <i>n</i> =198)  | 29,744.44                     |
| <b>Total</b> ( <i>n</i> =383)   | 130,987.27                    |

Q- Considering the total 1992-93 Tech Prep funds reported in the previous question (Q-18), estimate the percentage that was allocated to the following activities:

| Tech Prep Activity                        | Percent (%) of '92-'93 Funds |
|---|------------------------------|
| Program administration ( <i>n</i> =383)   | 21.2%                        |
| Curriculum development ( <i>n</i> =383)   | 15.0%                        |
| Staff development ( <i>n</i> =383)        | 21.0%                        |
| Promotions and marketing ( <i>n</i> =383) | 6.1%                         |

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Equipment purchases ( <i>n</i> =383)                                 | 15.4% |
| Curriculum and instructional materials purchases ( <i>n</i> =383)    | 14.3% |
| Program evaluation and student (learner) assessment ( <i>n</i> =383) | 2.3%  |
| Other ( <i>n</i> =382)   | 2.9%  |

## PART V: TECH PREP COORDINATOR BACKGROUND

Q-21. How many months have you been employed as a Tech Prep consortium coordinator? (*n*=397)

|       |                   |
|-------|-------------------|
| 6.0%  | 1-6 months        |
| 20.4% | 7-12 months       |
| 18.9% | 13-18 months      |
| 22.2% | 19-24 months      |
| 15.6% | 25-30 months      |
| 2.5%  | 31-36 months      |
| 14.4% | More than 3 years |

Q-22. How many years have you been employed in an educational setting? (*n*=397)

|       |                  |
|-------|------------------|
| 18.7% | 1-10 years       |
| 25.5% | 11-20 years      |
| 38.8% | 21-30 years      |
| 17.2% | 31 or more years |

Q-23. Your position as Tech-Prep coordinator is funded as a: (*n*=384)

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| 37.0% | Full-time position   |
| 38.0% | Part-time position   |
| 20.8% | Coordinator responsibilities not funded Tech Prep is part of regular job |
| 4.2%  | Other  |

Q-24. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend on Tech Prep activities? ( $n=386$ )

27.89 (*mean*) HOURS PER WEEK

Q-25. In what type of organization is your immediate supervisor employed? (*Circle all that apply.*) ( $n=397$ )

|       |                                 |
|-------|---------------------------------|
| 52.9% | Two-year postsecondary college  |
| 32.7% | Secondary school                |
| 17.6% | Other                           |
| 2.8%  | Four-year postsecondary college |
| 1.3%  | Business and industry           |

Q-26. Which category best describes your previous professional work experience? (*Circle all that apply.*) ( $n=397$ )

|       |                              |
|-------|------------------------------|
| 53.1% | Educational administration   |
| 47.4% | Vocational teaching          |
| 33.5% | Academic teaching            |
| 28.5% | Business/industry employment |
| 16.1% | University teaching/research |
| 14.6% | Guidance/counseling          |
| 13.4% | Other                        |

Q-27. What is the highest educational degree you have obtained? ( $n=389$ )

|       |                   |
|-------|-------------------|
| 0.8%  | Associate Degree  |
| 11.6% | Bachelor's Degree |
| 64.8% | Master's Degree   |
| 20.6% | Doctoral Degree   |
| 2.3%  | Other             |

Q- A goal of this survey is to provide ideas to improve federal and state policies regarding Tech Prep. To address this goal, we

28. invite you to provide one or more recommendations for improving federal and/or state Tech Prep policy. Refer to section of this report on local coordinator recommendations for federal and state policy for a discussion of these open-ended survey responses.

Q- Please provide the following information so that, if necessary, we may follow up with you about information reported in this  
29. survey.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Work Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_

---

## **APPENDIX B**

# **MODIFICATIONS TO THE TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY**

### **Part I**

To Part I of the survey on *Tech Prep Goals and Outcomes*, the following changes were made:

- Question 2 (Q-2) was changed from an open-ended item telling respondents to "briefly state one primary goal of your Tech Prep initiative" to a closed-ended item telling respondents to "rank order the following five reasons [for implementing Tech

Prep] from 1 to 5 with 1 being the highest (top) reason and 5 the lowest (bottom) reason:

- Articulate secondary and postsecondary education
- Enhance workforce preparation
- Give students multiple options beyond high school
- Reach the neglected majority
- Reform secondary school curriculum
- Questions 3 (Q-3) and Question 4 (Q-4) on use of site-based committees or teams were dropped from the 1995 survey.
- In 1995, a new question was added to the survey (Question 5) asking respondents to indicate the formal definition for a Tech Prep student used by their consortia. Fourteen different statements were presented to respondents, along with an "Other" category.
- Question 7 (Q-7) and Question 8 (Q-8) of the 1993 survey on educational reforms and student outcomes were dropped from the 1995 survey.
- A new Question 8 was created for the 1995 survey asking respondents how their consortium differentiates between Tech Prep and vocational education (to attempt to understand how the respondents were thinking about Tech Prep in relation to existing vocational education programs and practices.)

## **Part II**

In Part II of the survey on *Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep* several items were added to better capture various dimensions of the School-To-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) initiatives that were evolving at the time. These items were:

- Applied academics courses such as Principles of Technology
- Formal governing/advisory board
- Individualized student training and/or career plans
- Performance standards and measures for Tech Prep
- Formal assessment and certification of skills based on industry standards
- Incorporation of "all aspects of the industry"

## **Part III**

In Part III of the survey on *Barriers to Tech Prep Implementation* twenty-one items were added to the list of barriers, reflecting the barriers named by respondents in the "other" category of the 1993 survey as well as potential issues associated with implementation of Tech Prep/STWOA initiatives. These barriers were:

- Tight budgets at the *state* level
- Tight budgets at the *local* level
- Funding for Tech Prep is limited to vocational education sources
- Large distances separating institutions in the consortium
- Too many schools in the consortium
- Lack of developed competencies for the academic areas
- Lack of developed competencies for the vocational-technical areas
- Increased paperwork to support Tech Prep
- Conflict between Tech Prep and School-To-Work
- Limits on using Tech Prep funds below grade 11
- Focus on applied academics rather than other academic and vocational integration models
- Too much state involvement in day-to-day operations
- Use of advanced placement and other articulation models that allow students to complete college early
- Lack of recent workforce experience among school personnel
- Lack of interest and support from upper-level administration
- Lack of cooperation from state professional organizations
- Lack of a clear definition of the Tech Prep student
- The stigma of "tracking" is associated with Tech Prep
- Lack of certificates of mastery
- Lack of cooperation among institutional partners

## **Part IV**

In Part IV on *Tech Prep Consortium Characteristics* we asked in Question 11 (Q-11) for respondents to tell us not only how many organizations were involved in their local Tech Prep consortium, but how many were *actively* participating. We added two questions that asked the academic year in which Tech Prep was first implemented in the area (Question 14) and the academic year in which federal Tech Prep funding was first awarded to the consortium (Question 15). In this section, we dropped two questions from the 1993 survey about Tech Prep in-service activities and involvement by secondary and postsecondary personnel.

## **Part V**

In the last section of the survey, Part V on *Tech Prep Coordinator Characteristics*, the questions remained the same, except Question 22 (Q-22) from the 1993 survey asking respondents how many years they had been employed in an educational setting was dropped

from the 1995 survey instrument.

---

# **APPENDIX C**

## **AGGREGATED RESPONSES TO 1995 TECH PREP IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY**

### **About the Study**

We at the University of Illinois site of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) conduct research to better understand how Tech Prep is progressing and to identify barriers that need to be overcome in future implementation efforts. This study follows up on a survey completed by local Tech Prep coordinators in 1993. As such, it will show changes that have occurred in Tech Prep between 1993 and 1995 as well as identify the status of Tech Prep nationwide.

### **Filling Out the Questionnaire**

In 1993 your Tech Prep consortium was randomly selected from all local consortia throughout the nation to be part of a survey regarding Tech Prep implementation. Now, we need your assistance in completing the 1995 follow-up questionnaire or getting it to the person in your consortium who is most knowledgeable about current Tech Prep implementation efforts. Usually this person is the local Tech Prep coordinator (or director), but not always. If you have questions about who should complete the questionnaire or if you have any other questions, contact me by phone, fax, or e-mail at the numbers shown at the bottom of the page.

### **The Questionnaire**

There are five parts to the questionnaire and it is essential that you provide responses to the questions in all the parts. The five parts are:

Part One: Tech Prep Goals & Outcomes

Part Two: The Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep

Part Three: Barriers to Tech Prep Implementation

Part Four: Tech Prep Consortium Characteristics

Part Five: Tech Prep Coordinator Background

Most questions require you to circle responses, but a few require you print a short answer. *Typing is not necessary.* Please be assured that your answers will be completely confidential. An identification number appears on the form for mailing purposes only. Your responses will only be reported in aggregate form.

### Returning the Questionnaire

Once you have completed the questionnaire, please mail it to us within the next three weeks. A postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you use a different envelope, send your survey to the attention of:

Dr. Debra Bragg  
NCRVE Site, University of Illinois  
344 Education Building  
1310 South Sixth Street  
Champaign, IL 61820

### Part One: Tech Prep Reform Goals

This section of the questionnaire focuses on the particular goals and elements of your local Tech Prep initiative during the 1994-95 academic year, which spans approximately August 1994 to June 1995.

1. Which of the following elements of Tech Prep is formally stated in writing in a mission statement, proposal, policy, plan, marketing brochure, or other official document as a focus of your consortiums Tech Prep initiative? (*Circle yes or no on each line.*)

|                          | <b>Stated <u>in writing</u> as a focus of Tech Prep?</b> |           |
|--------------------------|--|-----------|
|                          | <b>Yes</b>   | <b>No</b> |
| <b>Tech Prep Element</b> |  |           |

|   |      |      |
|---|------|------|
| a. Common core curriculum in math, science, and communications (including applied academics) and technologies leading to an associate degree, certificate, or apprenticeship in a career field ( <i>n</i> =337) | 91.4 | 8.6  |
| b. New teaching methods such as cooperative learning appropriate for varied student needs and learning styles ( <i>n</i> =332)  | 72.3 | 27.7 |
| c. Integrated academic and vocational curriculum ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 92.6 | 7.4  |
| d. Alternative learner assessment (e.g., performance assessment, portfolios) ( <i>n</i> =331)   | 60.4 | 39.6 |
| e. Career guidance including career awareness and exploration ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 94.7 | 5.3  |
| f. Formal articulation agreements to create 2+2 program-area course sequences between secondary and postsecondary schools ( <i>n</i> =336)  | 97.6 | 2.4  |
| g. Work-based learning experiences (e.g., youth apprenticeships, cooperative education, school or career academies) ( <i>n</i> =334)  | 77.5 | 22.5 |
| h. Employment assistance & job placement services ( <i>n</i> =331)  | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| i. Equal access to the full range of Tech Prep for special populations ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 87.8 | 12.2 |
| j. Preparatory services for all participants in Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =331)  | 73.4 | 26.6 |
| k. Joint in-service training for teachers from the entire consortium ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 81.3 | 18.8 |
| l. Training programs for counselors designed to enable them to recruit students and ensure they complete programs and obtain employment ( <i>n</i> =334)  | 73.1 | 26.9 |
| m. Collaboration between educators and employers to enhance education ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 89.6 | 10.4 |
| n. Marketing of Tech Prep programs ( <i>n</i> =335)   | 88.7 | 11.3 |
| o. Local program evaluation of Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =335)   | 77.6 | 22.4 |

2. There are many reasons to implement Tech Prep. Considering your local consortiums reasons for implementing Tech Prep, rank order the following five reasons from 1 to 5 with 1 being the highest (top) reason and 5 the lowest (bottom) reason. (Percentage represents the number of respondents who ranked each item as 1.) (*n*=321)

**17.8% Articulate secondary and postsecondary education**

Increase student matriculation into postsecondary education by formally articulating secondary and postsecondary

education.

29.6% **Enhance workforce preparation**

Prepare individuals for an increasingly competitive and technological workplace with education that combines academics, technologies, and career preparation.

19.0% **Give students multiple options beyond high school**

Provide educational preparation that leads to multiple options beyond high school, including employment, two-year college, four-year college, or military service.

20.0% **Reach the neglected majority**

Create educational opportunities to ensure the neglected majority receives better career and academic preparation by eliminating the general track.

11.5% **Reform the secondary school curriculum**

Institute systemic reform to change teaching and learning processes and institutionalize Tech Prep at the secondary level.

3. During the 1994-95 academic year, which vocational education program areas were part of your Tech Prep curriculum reform efforts? (*Circle all that apply.*)

| <b>Vocational Program Areas</b> |   | <b>YES</b> | <b>NO</b> |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|-----------|
| 1                               | Agriculture ( <i>n=338</i> )                      | 39.6       | 60.4      |
| 2                               | Business and Office ( <i>n=338</i> )              | 89.1       | 10.9      |
| 3                               | Health Occupations ( <i>n=338</i> )               | 66.6       | 33.4      |
| 4                               | Marketing/distributive education ( <i>n=338</i> ) | 39.3       | 60.7      |
| 5                               | Occupational Home Economics ( <i>n=338</i> )      | 26.3       | 73.7      |
| 6                               | Consumer and Homemaking ( <i>n=338</i> )          | 21.9       | 78.1      |
| 7                               | Trade & Industrial ( <i>n=338</i> )               | 67.8       | 32.2      |
| 8                               | Industrial Technology Education ( <i>n=338</i> )  | 69.2       | 30.8      |
| 9                               | Other ( <i>specify</i> ): ( <i>n=332</i> )        | 12.7       | 87.3      |

4. Which of the following class rank percentiles best describes the primary target group(s) of students for your Tech Prep initiative?  
*(Circle all that apply.) (n=336)*

- |       |          |
|-------|----------|
| 38.7% | 25-75th  |
| 19.3% | 50-75th  |
| 15.8% | 0-100th  |
| 7.7%  | 25-50th  |
| 7.1%  | 25-100th |
| 0.9%  | Other    |
| 0.3%  | 0-25th   |

5. Some consortia create a formal definition and identify the Tech Prep student. Others do not. Read the following list of statements about how some local consortia define and identify Tech Prep students. Then, indicate whether each statement applies to how Tech Prep students are defined and identified by your own local consortium. *(Circle yes or no on each line. Also, be sure to list other Tech Prep definitions at the bottom of the grid.)*

| <b>Defining and Identifying the Tech Prep Student</b>   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| a. A formal written definition exists for a Tech Prep student in your local consortium <i>(n=336)</i>   | 58.6       | 41.4      |
| b. A formal written admission process is used to admit Tech Prep students <i>(n=335)</i>  | 34.3       | 65.7      |
| c. Any student who chooses to participate in Tech Prep can do so <i>(n=331)</i>   | 92.7       | 7.3       |
| d. A Tech Prep student is someone who chooses a program of study designated as Tech Prep <i>(n=333)</i>   | 80.2       | 19.8      |
| e. At entry into Tech Prep, a student must meet a specific grade point average <i>(n=328)</i>   | 10.4       | 89.6      |
| f. A Tech Prep student is someone who has an individualized plan showing Tech Prep is his/her designated program of study <i>(n=331)</i>  | 66.8       | 33.2      |
| g. A Tech Prep student is someone who is academically capable but unmotivated by the traditional academic curriculum <i>(n=325)</i>   | 49.5       | 50.5      |
| h. A Tech Prep student must create a formal plan to complete a sequence of courses in a core curriculum of math, science, communications, and workplace skills that logically leads to an associate degree <i>(n=335)</i> | 63.3       | 36.7      |
| i. All students are considered Tech Prep students <i>(n=332)</i>  | 21.1       | 78.9      |

|  |      |      |
|--|------|------|
| j. A Tech Prep student must maintain academic progress on grade level in the core curriculum ( <i>n</i> =328)  | 47.3 | 52.7 |
| k. A Tech Prep student is someone who is required to enroll in vocational-technical courses that are formally articulated to the postsecondary level ( <i>n</i> =335)          | 56.1 | 43.9 |
| l. A Tech Prep student is someone who is required to take applied academics courses such as applied math, Principles of Technology, or applied communications ( <i>n</i> =330) | 47.6 | 52.4 |
| m. A Tech Prep student is someone who is identified as being at risk of dropping out or school failure ( <i>n</i> =326)  | 12.0 | 88.0 |
| n. A Tech Prep student is someone who actually participates in a work-based learning experience such as co-op or apprenticeship ( <i>n</i> =330)                               | 30.7 | 69.3 |

6. During the 1994-95 academic year, which of the following represents the focus of Tech Prep curriculum reform efforts that occurred in your consortium at the secondary and postsecondary levels? (Circle the one best response on each line for the secondary and postsecondary levels. Also, be sure to list other curriculum reform efforts in the blanks provided at the bottom of the grid.)

|  | <b>At the secondary level during '94-95?</b> |      | <b>At the postsecondary level during '94-95?</b> |      |
|--|--|------|--|------|
|  | No   | Yes  | No   | Yes  |
| <b>Curriculum Reform Effort</b>  |  |      |  |      |
| a. Supplement existing vocational-technical courses with academic content ( <i>n</i> =326/297)   | 18.7   | 81.3 | 46.8   | 53.2 |
| b. Supplement existing academic courses with vocational-technical content ( <i>n</i> =327/296)   | 19.6   | 80.4 | 51.0   | 49.0 |
| c. Add applied academic courses (commercially- or locally-developed) to the existing curriculum ( <i>n</i> =329/293)                                       | 11.2   | 88.8 | 58.7   | 41.3 |
| d. Replace parts of the existing curriculum with applied academic courses (commercially- or locally-developed) ( <i>n</i> =332/292)                        | 19.6   | 80.4 | 59.9   | 40.1 |
| e. Coordinate academic and vocational-technical courses by sequencing and reinforcing related content, often through block scheduling ( <i>n</i> =330/290) | 28.2   | 71.8 | 67.9   | 32.1 |
| f. Provide interdisciplinary courses combining vocational-technical and academic content (e.g., History of Work) ( <i>n</i> =327/290)                      | 51.7   | 48.3 | 71.0   | 29.0 |

|   |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| g. Organize academic and vocational-technical courses around occupational/career clusters ( <i>n=330/285</i> )  | 19.7 | 80.3 | 41.4 | 58.6 |
| h. Provide academies combining courses from vocational-technical areas and math, science, communications, and other academic areas ( <i>n=326/291</i> )                               | 59.8 | 40.2 | 79.7 | 20.3 |
| i. Articulate academic program-area course sequences between the secondary and postsecondary levels ( <i>n=330/303</i> )  | 24.8 | 75.2 | 22.8 | 77.2 |
| j. Articulate vocational-technical program-area course sequences between the secondary and postsecondary levels ( <i>n=330/304</i> )  | 5.8  | 94.2 | 6.3  | 93.8 |
| k. Add advanced-skills courses to the existing curriculum ( <i>n=327/297</i> )  | 48.0 | 52.0 | 46.8 | 53.2 |
| l. Provide work-based learning outside the formal structure of school or college as a significant portion of student learning (e.g., internship, apprenticeship) ( <i>n=332/301</i> ) | 33.4 | 66.6 | 35.9 | 64.1 |

7. What level of support does your Tech Prep initiative currently receive from the following groups? (Circle one response on each line. Circle 9 only if the group is Not Applicable (NA) or the level of support is unknown.)

| Group   | Level of Support |      |      |           |      |
|---|------------------|------|------|-----------|------|
|   | Poor             | Fair | Good | Excellent | NA   |
| a. Academic faculty ( <i>n=338</i> )                            | 3.8              | 35.2 | 49.1 | 11.2      | 0.6  |
| b. Vocational faculty ( <i>n=337</i> )                          | 0.9              | 6.5  | 40.1 | 52.2      | 0.3  |
| c. Counselors ( <i>n=336</i> )                                  | 5.1              | 30.1 | 45.2 | 18.8      | 0.9  |
| d. Local secondary administrators ( <i>n=338</i> )              | 3.0              | 17.2 | 50.0 | 29.3      | 0.6  |
| e. Local two-year postsecondary administrators ( <i>n=336</i> ) | 2.7              | 14.0 | 39.6 | 42.9      | 0.9  |
| f. Secondary faculty ( <i>n=337</i> )                           | 1.2              | 18.7 | 63.5 | 16.3      | 0.3  |
| g. Postsecondary faculty ( <i>n=336</i> )                       | 5.4              | 32.7 | 44.9 | 16.4      | 0.6  |
| h. Business/industry representatives ( <i>n=335</i> )           | 2.7              | 13.7 | 44.8 | 37.3      | 1.5  |
| i. Labor union representatives ( <i>n=333</i> )                 | 9.0              | 15.6 | 16.2 | 12.6      | 45.9 |
| j. State agency personnel ( <i>n=337</i> )                      | 3.9              | 10.7 | 32.6 | 49.9      | 3.0  |
| k. Four-year college/university personnel ( <i>n=336</i> )      | 20.8             | 29.8 | 18.2 | 8.3       | 22.6 |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| l. Secondary school board members ( <i>n</i> =337) | 5.6  | 22.3 | 38.9 | 20.8 | 12.5 |
| m. College trustees ( <i>n</i> =335)               | 12.2 | 15.2 | 26.0 | 12.5 | 33.1 |
| n. Students ( <i>n</i> =337)                       | 1.2  | 16.9 | 55.5 | 22.8 | 3.6  |
| o. Parents ( <i>n</i> =337)                        | 4.7  | 29.7 | 44.2 | 15.4 | 5.9  |

8. How does your consortium differentiate between Tech Prep and vocational education? (*Provide a brief written response and/or examples in the space below.*) Results from a content analysis of the responses is presented in the Goals, Elements and Curriculum Reform section of the text.

## Part Two: Stage of Implementation of Tech Prep

This section of the survey focuses on the stage of implementation of components of your Tech Prep initiative as of the conclusion of the 1994-95 academic year. For each component, indicate the stage of implementation that is typical for the institutional partners in your local consortium.

The stages of implementation are:

**1 Not Begun:** This stage indicates the component has not been addressed.

**2 Planning:** This stage includes goal setting, staff orientation, the formation of committees and teams, and the development of plans.

**3 Development:** This stage involves such activities as reviewing, designing, creating, and field testing.

**4 Initial implementation:** This stage occurs when plans and products of the developmental stage begin to be carried out.

**5 Advanced implementation:** This stage occurs when a component is routinely carried out, regularly reviewed and evaluated, and institutionalized so that it continues even if current leaders are no longer responsible for Tech Prep.

**9 Not Addressed (NA):** This category indicates that your consortium does not intend to include the component in its Tech Prep initiative.

9. For each of the following Tech Prep components indicate the current stage of implementation. (Circle the one best response on each line. Circle 9 only if the component is not applicable (NA) or unknown.)

| Tech Prep Component   | Stage of Implementation |      |         |                |             |     |
|---|-------------------------|------|---------|----------------|-------------|-----|
|   | Not Begun               | Plan | Develop | Initial Implmt | Adv. Implmt | NA  |
| 1. Consortium building (including recruiting schools, colleges, employers, and other organizations) ( <i>n</i> =338)      | 1.5                     | 1.8  | 4.7     | 25.7           | 65.4        | 0.9 |
| 2. Site-based planning and decision making for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 2.1                     | 3.3  | 12.5    | 34.4           | 46.3        | 1.5 |
| 3. Team building to facilitate Tech Prep planning and implementation ( <i>n</i> =337)                                     | 1.8                     | 1.8  | 11.3    | 40.7           | 44.2        | 0.3 |
| 4. Long-range and/or strategic planning for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =339)  | 2.1                     | 7.7  | 20.4    | 29.8           | 39.8        | 0.3 |
| 5. Formal partnerships with business and industry ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 3.6                     | 8.3  | 21.9    | 34.3           | 31.7        | 0.3 |
| 6. Joint in-service of secondary and postsecondary personnel (e.g., faculty, counselors, administrators) ( <i>n</i> =339) | 4.7                     | 5.9  | 10.0    | 33.3           | 45.4        | 0.6 |
| 7. In-service training of counselors in recruitment, placement, and retention of students for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 3.8                     | 5.6  | 17.5    | 40.8           | 31.7        | 0.6 |
| 8. Work place professional development experiences for teachers and counselors ( <i>n</i> =338)                           | 7.7                     | 14.2 | 20.7    | 32.5           | 23.1        | 1.8 |
| 9. Joint planning time for academic and vocational teachers ( <i>n</i> =339)  | 14.5                    | 14.2 | 27.4    | 26.0           | 14.2        | 3.8 |
| 10. Formal signed articulation agreement(s) between secondary and postsecondary schools ( <i>n</i> =339)                  | 0.0                     | 1.8  | 7.4     | 18.6           | 71.7        | 0.6 |
| 11. Integration of academic and vocational <u>secondary</u> curriculum ( <i>n</i> =339)                                   | 2.1                     | 8.3  | 16.8    | 41.3           | 30.7        | 0.9 |
| 12. Labor market analysis to inform curriculum development ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 11.3                    | 11.6 | 21.1    | 28.2           | 26.1        | 1.8 |
| 13. Development of 2+2 core academic and technical curriculum ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 1.2                     | 5.9  | 16.6    | 34.1           | 40.9        | 1.2 |
| 14. Development of advanced-skills technical curriculum ( <i>n</i> =336)  | 13.1                    | 14.0 | 23.5    | 27.7           | 19.9        | 1.8 |
| 15. Use of outcomes-based education for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =333)  | 13.8                    | 11.1 | 19.8    | 28.8           | 18.0        | 8.4 |
| 16. Integration of academic and vocational <u>postsecondary</u> curriculum ( <i>n</i> =338)                               | 17.5                    | 13.0 | 25.1    | 24.9           | 14.8        | 4.7 |
| 17. Use of new instructional strategies (including cooperative learning approaches) ( <i>n</i> =338)                      | 2.7                     | 8.3  | 21.0    | 42.0           | 24.6        | 1.5 |
| 18. Alternative assessments (e.g., portfolios, performance assessment) ( <i>n</i> =338)                                   | 6.8                     | 18.0 | 22.8    | 35.2           | 14.5        | 2.7 |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |     |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 19. Collaboration between academic and vocational educators ( <i>n=338</i> )                       | 1.8  | 8.3  | 20.4 | 46.2 | 22.8 | 0.6 |
| 20. Career awareness and exploration for students in Tech Prep ( <i>n=338</i> )                    | 0.3  | 6.2  | 20.1 | 42.9 | 29.6 | 0.9 |
| 21. Work-based learning for students (e.g., internships, apprenticeships) ( <i>n=339</i> )         | 5.6  | 18.3 | 24.5 | 35.7 | 15.0 | 0.9 |
| 22. Apprenticeships spanning secondary and postsecondary education ( <i>n=337</i> )                | 27.3 | 18.1 | 16.9 | 22.6 | 8.0  | 7.1 |
| 23. Applied academics courses such as Principles of Technology ( <i>n=339</i> )                    | 2.7  | 2.9  | 8.6  | 33.0 | 51.3 | 1.5 |
| 24. Formal governing/advisory board ( <i>n=338</i> )   | 4.1  | 3.8  | 7.4  | 21.0 | 62.1 | 1.5 |
| 25. Individualized student training and/or career plans ( <i>n=337</i> )                           | 4.2  | 10.1 | 22.3 | 34.4 | 27.3 | 1.8 |
| 26. Guidance and counseling services ( <i>n=333</i> )  | 0.9  | 7.2  | 19.5 | 37.2 | 34.2 | 0.6 |
| 27. Equal access for all students ( <i>n=337</i> )   | 0.6  | 5.6  | 7.4  | 32.3 | 53.7 | 0.3 |
| 28. Performance standards and measures for Tech Prep ( <i>n=337</i> )                              | 7.1  | 16.6 | 30.3 | 24.0 | 20.2 | 1.8 |
| 29. Strategies to address the needs of special populations ( <i>n=337</i> )                        | 4.7  | 13.4 | 24.9 | 30.3 | 26.1 | 0.6 |
| 30. Preparatory services for all participants ( <i>n=334</i> )                                     | 5.1  | 13.8 | 21.0 | 28.4 | 27.5 | 4.2 |
| 31. Evaluation of Tech Prep programs ( <i>n=338</i> )  | 4.7  | 13.3 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 25.4 | 0.3 |
| 32. Marketing and promotions ( <i>n=335</i> )  | 1.2  | 7.8  | 22.1 | 35.8 | 33.1 | 0.0 |
| 33. Formal assessment and certification of skills based on industry standards ( <i>n=337</i> )     | 19.3 | 21.7 | 22.6 | 22.3 | 12.2 | 2.1 |
| 34. Incorporation of all aspects of the industry ( <i>n=334</i> )                                  | 17.4 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.2 | 9.3  | 6.3 |
| 35. Computer monitoring (tracking) of student progress through Tech Prep programs ( <i>n=337</i> ) | 27.0 | 22.6 | 24.3 | 14.8 | 8.3  | 3.0 |

### Part Three: Barriers to Tech Prep Implementation

10. Barriers are inevitable when implementing any educational innovation. For each of the barriers listed below, indicate the level of impact it has on your consortiums Tech Prep initiative. *(Circle the one best response on each line.)*

| Barrier | Level of Impact |            |       |          |       |            |
|---------|-----------------|------------|-------|----------|-------|------------|
|         | None            | Very Minor | Minor | Moderate | Major | Very Major |
|         |                 |            |       |          |       |            |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Negative attitude toward vocational education ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 2.1  | 5.3  | 20.8 | 40.1 | 26.1 | 5.6  |
| 2. Lack of staff, time, and money dedicated to Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =336)  | 1.2  | 5.4  | 16.4 | 36.3 | 28.6 | 12.2 |
| 3. Failure of educators to see the need to change ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 1.5  | 8.0  | 20.2 | 39.8 | 24.0 | 6.5  |
| 4. Turf battles between secondary and postsecondary educators ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 9.5  | 19.0 | 25.3 | 28.0 | 13.1 | 5.1  |
| 5. Looking at Tech Prep as vocational education by another name ( <i>n</i> =334)   | 4.2  | 8.7  | 18.9 | 36.8 | 24.3 | 7.2  |
| 6. Lack of general awareness about Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 1.5  | 6.5  | 22.8 | 39.6 | 24.0 | 5.6  |
| 7. Belief that Tech Prep is an educational "fad" that will go away ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 1.8  | 8.0  | 22.5 | 29.3 | 28.7 | 9.8  |
| 8. Failure of two-year postsecondary schools to accommodate Tech Prep students ( <i>n</i> =337)                                    | 22.6 | 28.5 | 26.1 | 16.6 | 4.2  | 2.1  |
| 9. Failure of four-year colleges and universities to award credit for applied academic or other Tech Prep courses ( <i>n</i> =333) | 8.1  | 9.3  | 12.9 | 18.0 | 28.8 | 22.8 |
| 10. Difficulty in dealing with educational bureaucracies ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 1.2  | 10.1 | 23.7 | 30.6 | 22.6 | 11.9 |
| 11. Tight budgets at the <u>state</u> level ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 1.5  | 5.9  | 25.2 | 24.3 | 28.5 | 14.5 |
| 12. Lack of support from business and industry ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 12.2 | 31.2 | 27.3 | 21.7 | 5.9  | 1.8  |
| 13. Resistance from academic educators to make changes for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 1.2  | 7.7  | 17.5 | 41.7 | 26.0 | 5.9  |
| 14. Lack of support from labor organizations ( <i>n</i> =312)  | 35.3 | 22.1 | 21.5 | 9.6  | 7.4  | 4.2  |
| 15. Lack of availability of integrated academic and vocational curriculum materials ( <i>n</i> =337)                               | 13.6 | 29.1 | 27.3 | 22.8 | 5.3  | 1.8  |
| 16. Conflict with other educational reform movements ( <i>n</i> =336)  | 15.8 | 25.9 | 22.6 | 19.9 | 10.1 | 5.7  |
| 17. Resistance from secondary school administrators ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 10.4 | 21.4 | 32.0 | 27.0 | 5.9  | 3.3  |
| 18. Difficulty reaching consensus among curriculum planners on reform strategies ( <i>n</i> =336)                                  | 8.6  | 23.8 | 34.5 | 25.0 | 6.5  | 1.5  |
| 19. Lack of funds for curriculum reform ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 2.7  | 11.0 | 23.1 | 28.8 | 23.1 | 11.3 |
| 20. Failure to employ local Tech Prep coordinator full time ( <i>n</i> =333)   | 37.2 | 11.7 | 9.9  | 16.5 | 13.8 | 10.8 |
| 21. Lack of experts to provide in-service about Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 25.0 | 26.8 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 4.2  | 2.4  |
| 22. Resistance from vocational educators to make changes for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 13.4 | 30.0 | 27.3 | 21.1 | 7.1  | 1.2  |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 23. Resistance from postsecondary school administrators ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 18.4 | 29.4 | 27.6 | 16.3 | 6.8  | 1.5  |
| 24. Resistance from secondary schools to introduce Tech Prep into the curriculum ( <i>n</i> =336)                                | 9.5  | 18.2 | 33.9 | 26.5 | 10.7 | 1.2  |
| 25. Lack of clear <u>federal</u> policy for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 9.2  | 18.5 | 25.9 | 21.4 | 16.7 | 8.3  |
| 26. Difficulty in developing formal articulation agreements between secondary and postsecondary schools ( <i>n</i> =339)         | 23.0 | 26.0 | 22.1 | 18.0 | 8.0  | 2.9  |
| 27. Lack of collaboration between vocational and academic educators ( <i>n</i> =339)   | 2.9  | 14.7 | 27.1 | 34.8 | 16.5 | 3.8  |
| 28. Lack of knowledge and skills among education personnel in how to implement educational change ( <i>n</i> =338)               | 2.7  | 10.9 | 23.4 | 38.2 | 17.5 | 7.4  |
| 29. Little time designated for joint planning by academic and vocational or secondary and postsecondary faculty ( <i>n</i> =337) | 0.6  | 4.7  | 11.9 | 27.0 | 37.7 | 18.1 |
| 30. Resistance from postsecondary schools to introduce Tech Prep into the curriculum ( <i>n</i> =335)                            | 9.0  | 18.8 | 27.8 | 23.3 | 15.5 | 5.7  |
| 31. Lack of credibility of vocational educators involved with Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 11.3 | 33.8 | 29.1 | 18.1 | 5.9  | 1.8  |
| 32. Lack of clear <u>state</u> policy for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 15.2 | 21.1 | 22.0 | 14.3 | 15.8 | 11.6 |
| 33. Pressure from special interest groups to modify the Tech Prep effort ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 38.0 | 29.7 | 18.1 | 8.3  | 3.6  | 2.4  |
| 34. Lack of support from <u>both</u> state secondary and postsecondary agencies ( <i>n</i> =338)                                 | 19.8 | 31.4 | 24.6 | 13.3 | 6.8  | 4.1  |
| 35. Turnover of state or local leaders involved in Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 17.8 | 23.4 | 22.2 | 18.3 | 13.0 | 5.3  |
| 36. Too much flexibility in local implementation of Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =338)   | 31.4 | 27.5 | 20.4 | 13.9 | 4.4  | 2.4  |
| 37. Funding for Tech Prep is limited to vocational education sources ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 17.2 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 20.7 | 16.9 | 9.8  |
| 38. Limits on using Tech Prep funds for equipment or instructional materials purchases ( <i>n</i> =337)                          | 9.8  | 21.4 | 25.2 | 19.3 | 16.0 | 8.3  |
| 39. Limitations in using Tech Prep funds beyond grades 11-14 ( <i>n</i> =336)  | 24.7 | 25.3 | 17.9 | 14.6 | 10.7 | 6.8  |
| 40. Lack of evaluation mechanisms to inform implementation ( <i>n</i> =334)  | 9.0  | 19.8 | 25.4 | 25.1 | 17.4 | 3.3  |
| 41. Lack of authority of local personnel to make changes needed to implement Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =339)                          | 8.8  | 23.9 | 23.0 | 18.9 | 18.3 | 7.1  |
| 42. Lack of clear <u>local</u> policy for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =339)   | 18.0 | 22.1 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 11.5 | 4.7  |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 43. Lack of active involvement from business and industry ( <i>n</i> =339)   | 17.7 | 23.6 | 22.4 | 25.7 | 7.4  | 3.2  |
| 44. Lack of jobs in the region for Tech Prep graduates ( <i>n</i> =336)  | 15.8 | 21.1 | 26.2 | 17.3 | 10.1 | 9.5  |
| 45. Lack of parental support for Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =339)  | 9.7  | 16.2 | 28.9 | 27.1 | 14.2 | 3.8  |
| 46. Large distances separating institutions in the consortium ( <i>n</i> =339)   | 22.7 | 22.7 | 15.6 | 17.4 | 12.4 | 9.1  |
| 47. Lack of student interest in Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 4.2  | 17.8 | 36.2 | 32.0 | 9.5  | 0.3  |
| 48. Lack of cooperation from teachers unions ( <i>n</i> =325)  | 44.6 | 15.1 | 24.6 | 10.5 | 2.8  | 2.5  |
| 49. Difficulty maintaining momentum over the long term ( <i>n</i> =337)  | 5.9  | 15.7 | 24.0 | 33.8 | 16.6 | 3.9  |
| 50. Too many schools in the consortium ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 34.0 | 28.1 | 18.3 | 10.7 | 6.2  | 2.7  |
| 51. Inability of young people to make early career decisions ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 3.8  | 13.0 | 23.1 | 28.4 | 22.5 | 9.2  |
| 52. Lack of developed competencies for the academic areas ( <i>n</i> =336)   | 8.3  | 16.1 | 27.1 | 29.2 | 15.5 | 3.9  |
| 53. Lack of counselor interest in or involvement with Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =339)   | 4.7  | 14.7 | 21.2 | 28.9 | 20.6 | 9.7  |
| 54. Increased paperwork to support Tech Prep ( <i>n</i> =339)  | 5.6  | 15.6 | 25.4 | 28.0 | 16.8 | 8.6  |
| 55. Pressure for quick success and student head counts ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 5.9  | 9.5  | 16.9 | 26.0 | 24.0 | 17.8 |
| 56. Conflict between Tech Prep and School-To-Work ( <i>n</i> =335)   | 24.5 | 20.6 | 16.4 | 15.2 | 12.8 | 10.4 |
| 57. Limits on using Tech Prep funds below grade 11 ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 16.9 | 18.3 | 18.0 | 16.9 | 17.5 | 12.4 |
| 58. Focus on applied academics rather than other academic and vocational integration models ( <i>n</i> =337)               | 12.8 | 24.3 | 27.9 | 22.0 | 8.3  | 4.7  |
| 59. Tight budgets at the <u>local</u> level ( <i>n</i> =338)   | 3.6  | 7.1  | 12.7 | 20.7 | 31.1 | 24.9 |
| 60. Too much state involvement in day-to-day operations ( <i>n</i> =337)   | 33.2 | 33.8 | 22.0 | 6.5  | 3.9  | 0.6  |
| 61. Use of advanced placement and other articulation models that allow students to complete college early ( <i>n</i> =336) | 30.4 | 35.4 | 18.2 | 10.7 | 3.9  | 1.5  |
| 62. Lack of developed competencies for the vocational-technical areas ( <i>n</i> =339)                                     | 22.4 | 28.0 | 25.1 | 14.2 | 8.8  | 1.5  |
| 63. Lack of recent workforce experience among school personnel ( <i>n</i> =338)  | 3.3  | 8.9  | 19.8 | 26.3 | 30.2 | 11.5 |
| 64. Lack of interest and support from upper-level administration ( <i>n</i> =339)  | 12.4 | 21.5 | 24.8 | 23.6 | 12.7 | 5.0  |
| 65. Lack of cooperation from state professional organizations ( <i>n</i> =338)   | 29.5 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 9.8  | 5.7  | 2.1  |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 66. Lack of a clear definition of the Tech Prep student ( <i>n=338</i> ) | 15.7 | 21.9 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 13.3 | 8.9  |
| 67. The stigma of tracking is associated with Tech Prep ( <i>n=339</i> ) | 8.6  | 18.6 | 20.6 | 22.7 | 19.2 | 10.3 |

#### Part Four: Tech Prep Consortium Characteristics

11. In Column 1 various types of organizations that could be associated with Tech Prep are listed. For each type of organization, estimate in Column 2 the total number that were involved in any way in your local Tech Prep consortium during the 1994-95 academic year. In Column 3, estimate the number that were actively participating, meaning they had students enrolled, actively involved in, and benefiting from a Tech Prep core curriculum during the 1994-95 academic year. (*Enter 0 (zero) in spaces where no such organizations participated.*)

| <b>COLUMN 1</b>  | <b>COLUMN 2</b>                   | <b>COLUMN 3</b>                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Type of Organization</b>  | <b>Total Number in Consortium</b> | <b>Number Actively Participating in Tech Prep</b> |
| a. Secondary schools (e.g., comprehensive high schools, area or regional vocational schools, vocational high schools) ( <i>n=325/318</i> )                     | 14.28                             | 11.22   |
| b. Two-year postsecondary schools (e.g., community and junior colleges, two-year vocational-technical institutes and proprietary schools) ( <i>n=330/327</i> ) | 1.79                              | 1.81  |
| c. Four-year postsecondary schools (e.g., public and private four-year colleges and universities) ( <i>n=323/314</i> )   | 1.98                              | 1.62  |
| d. Private-sector businesses and industrial firms (including private not-for profit organizations) ( <i>n=296/291</i> )  | 26.91                             | 17.66   |
| e. Labor organizations ( <i>n=291/300</i> )  | 2.52                              | 1.66  |
| f. Public community-based organizations (including parent, teacher organizations) ( <i>n=279/294</i> )   | 5.75                              | 4.02  |
| g. Student leadership organizations (secondary and postsecondary) ( <i>n=279/287</i> )   | 6.36                              | 3.72  |

12. Estimate the total number of people who live in your Tech Prep consortium service area. (*n=294*)

260,419 (mean) TOTAL POPULATION

13. In what type of setting do most people in your consortium service area reside? *(Circle the one best response.)*

- |     |                          |
|-----|--------------------------|
| 40% | Rural or small town only |
| 9%  | Suburban only            |
| 8%  | Urban only               |
| 4%  | Rural/Urban              |
| 4%  | Urban/Suburban           |
| 11% | Rural/Suburban           |
| 24% | Rural/Suburban/Urban     |

14. In what academic year (e.g., 1994-95) was Tech Prep first implemented in your area? *(n=318)*

ACADEMIC YEAR TECH PREP BEGAN

- |     |               |
|-----|---------------|
| <1% | Prior to 1990 |
| 12% | 1990-91       |
| 34% | 1991-92       |
| 33% | 1992-93       |
| 11% | 1993-94       |
| 7%  | 1994-95       |

15. In what academic year (e.g., 1994-95) were federal Tech Prep grant funds from the Tech Prep Education Act first awarded to your consortium? *(n=325)*

ACADEMIC YEAR TECH PREP FUNDS STARTED

- |     |               |
|-----|---------------|
| <1% | Prior to 1990 |
| 2%  | 1990-91       |
| 40% | 1991-92       |

|     |         |
|-----|---------|
| 42% | 1992-93 |
| 14% | 1993-94 |
| 1%  | 1994-95 |

16. For the 1994-95 academic year, estimate source(s) and amount of grant funds for Tech Prep (NOT counting carry forward funds from previous funding periods or in-kind contributions of goods and services). (*Please do not leave lines blank. Enter 0 (zero) in categories where no such funds were received during 1994-95.*)

| Source of funds   | Total of '94-'95 Funds (mean) |
|---|-------------------------------|
| a. Federal Tech Prep grant funds (Perkins Title III E Tech Prep Education Act funds) ( <i>n</i> =289)   | 117,274                       |
| b. Federal funds <u>other</u> than Perkins Tech Prep funds (e.g., other Perkins funds, NSF grant funds, U.S. Department of Labor funds) ( <i>n</i> =78) | 84,255                        |
| c. State funds ( <i>n</i> =73)  | 76,181                        |
| d. Local funds ( <i>n</i> =88)  | 67,955                        |
| e. Private-sector business and industry funds ( <i>n</i> =39)   | 22,534                        |
| f. Private foundations ( <i>n</i> =10)  | 27,650                        |
| g. Other ( <i>specify</i> ) ( <i>n</i> =88)   | 73,697                        |
| Total ( <i>n</i> =309)  | 180,090                       |

17. Considering the total 1994-95 Tech Prep funds reported in the previous question, estimate the percentage (not amount) that was allocated to the following activities. (*Enter 0 (zero) in categories where no such funds were allocated during 1994-95.*)

| Tech Prep Activity                         | Percent (%) of '94-'95 Funds |
|--|------------------------------|
| a. Program administration ( <i>n</i> =307) | 22.06                        |
| b. Curriculum development ( <i>n</i> =302) | 16.83                        |

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| c. Staff development ( <i>n=310</i> )                                   | 20.99 |
| d. Promotions and marketing ( <i>n=299</i> )                            | 6.11  |
| e. Equipment purchases ( <i>n=297</i> )                                 | 13.14 |
| f. Curriculum and instructional materials purchases ( <i>n=301</i> )    | 15.01 |
| g. Program evaluation and student (learner) assessment ( <i>n=276</i> ) | 3.57  |
| h. Other ( <i>specify</i> ): ( <i>n=152</i> )                           | 6.06  |
| Total   | 100%  |

### Part Five: Tech Prep Coordinator Characteristics

18. What month and year were you first appointed as a Tech Prep consortium coordinator? (*n=319*)

MONTH & YEAR

|       |       |
|-------|-------|
| 6.7%  | 1-6   |
| 1.0%  | 7-12  |
| 7.5%  | 13-18 |
| 6.2%  | 19-24 |
| 7.4%  | 25-30 |
| 17.6% | 31-36 |
| 44.1% | 36+   |

19. How is your Tech-Prep coordinator position funded? (*n=322*)

- 35.4% It is a full-time position (40+ hours per week) funded with Tech Prep grant funds
- 24.5% It is a part-time position (less than 40 hours per week) funded with Tech Prep grant funds
- 32.0% It is not funded with Tech Prep grant funds but considered part of my regular position
- 8.1% Other

20. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend on Tech Prep activities? (*n=319*)

HOURS PER WEEK

|       |            |
|-------|------------|
| 42.0% | 1-20       |
| 36.6% | 21-40      |
| 21.2% | 40 or more |

21. In what type of organization is your immediate supervisor employed? (*Circle all that apply.*) (*n=329*)

|      |                                       |
|------|---------------------------------------|
| 54.7 | Two-year postsecondary college        |
| 21.3 | Local school district                 |
| 14.6 | Secondary school                      |
| 9.8  | Other                                 |
| 4.9  | State or regional office of education |
| 4.0  | Four-year postsecondary college       |
| 1.5  | Business and industry                 |

22. Which category best describes your previous professional work experience? (*Circle all that apply.*) (*n=329*)

|      |                              |
|------|------------------------------|
| 32.5 | Academic teaching            |
| 39.8 | Vocational teaching          |
| 10.9 | Guidance/counseling          |
| 56.2 | Educational administration   |
| 13.1 | University teaching/research |
| 31.3 | Business/industry employment |
| 8.5  | Other                        |

23. What is the highest educational degree you have obtained? (*Circle one.*) (*n=327*)

|      |                   |
|------|-------------------|
| 0.9  | Associate Degree  |
| 14.1 | Bachelor's Degree |

32.7 Master's Degree

33.9 Advanced Certificate or Masters plus additional graduate study

16.2 Doctoral Degree

2.1 Other

A goal of this survey is to provide ideas to improve federal and state policies regarding Tech Prep. To address this goal, we invite you to provide recommendations for improving Tech Prep policy.

---

---

---

---

Please provide the following information so that, if necessary, we may follow up with you about information reported in this survey.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Work Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_

e-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate the amount of time required to complete this survey: \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank You!**

ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_

---

## APPENDIX D

### SITE PROFILES

**Consortium:** The East Central Illinois Education-To-Careers Partnership

**Director:** Debra Mills  
Danville Area Community College  
2000 East Main Street  
Danville, IL 61832  
217/443-8582*phone*  
217/443-8560*fax*

**Profile:**

The East Central Illinois Education-To-Careers Partnership is headquartered at the Danville Area Community College (DACC) in Danville, IL. The consortium is located in a rural region of East Central Illinois serving twelve high schools, a regional vocational center, and the community college. The Tech Prep initiative is directed at grades 9-14. Over 70 business and labor partners are involved, several of whom sponsor youth apprenticeships for Tech Prep students. Although not all of this consortium's Tech Prep programs offer youth apprenticeships, many do. Tech Prep/youth apprenticeships are available in the areas of manufacturing, accounting, banking, health occupations, and food service.

The consortium sponsors a Tech Prep Student Leadership organization that prepares students to play an ambassador-like for Tech Prep. The Leadership program provides special training in communications and team building. In addition, faculty and peer mentoring are emphasized by this consortium. Faculty mentoring occurs at DACC so that every apprentice receives special attention and guidance from a faculty member; peer mentoring occurs when a community college student apprentice is paired with a high school student. Since 1993, this consortium has been recognized as a demonstration site for the state of Illinois for Tech Prep and

Education-to-Careers (Illinois' terminology for School-To-Work.)

Thus far, the consortium has been selected by the state as a demonstration site for rural Tech Prep, postsecondary Tech Prep, and youth apprenticeships. Besides the program evaluation conducted for local and state purposes, this site has engaged in benchmarking activities involving several nationally-recognized Tech Prep/STWOA sites, including two of the New American High Schools, several U.S. Department of Education demonstration sites, and two of the Parnell Tech Prep Award winners. In 1996, this site was selected to pilot a School-To-Work audit procedure conducted by the Gallop Organization for the Center on Occupational Research and Development (CORD) in Waco, TX.

**Consortium:** Miami Valley Tech Prep Consortium

**Coordinator:** Bonnie Bensonhaver

Sinclair Community College

444 West Third Street, 12-201

Dayton, OH 45402-1460

(937) 449-5146 *phone*

(937) 449-5164 *fax*

**Profile:**

The Miami Valley Tech Prep Consortium is headquartered at Sinclair Community College in Dayton, OH. This consortium is located in an urban area, but the large geographic region served is suburban and rural as well. Besides the community college, eight vocational education planning districts (involving 64 comprehensive high schools) are part of the consortium. Over 100 businesses (manufacturers, automotive dealers, hospitals) are engaged as well.

This consortium is noted for its efforts to coordinate Tech Prep and STWOA through the dedicated use of advanced-skills curriculum where students progress to higher levels of competence in academic and technical subjects at both the secondary and postsecondary levels (without the provision of dual credits). The consortium awards scholarships to most students who matriculate from the secondary to postsecondary level in a 2+2 curriculum sequence (grades 11-14). The University of Dayton participates in the consortium, offering students the opportunity to complete the final two years of college with a baccalaureate degree.

This consortium has received state and national recognition, most notably the 1996 Parnell Tech Prep Award of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Data collection is extensive, due partly to the consortium's selection as one of ten sites

for the national evaluation of Tech Prep conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. The consortium also piloted the School-To-Work audit for the Gallop Organization and CORD. Since 1995, the site has provided data for the Ohio Tech Prep evaluation, one of the most extensive state-level evaluations conducted in the nation (Bragg, 1997). Ohio's evaluation of Tech Prep is conducted by MGT of America, Inc. of Tallahassee, TX.

**Consortium:** Golden Crescent Tech Prep/School-To-Work Partnership

**Director:** Roger Johnson  
2200 E. Red River  
Victoria, TX 77901  
(512) 572-5477 *phone*  
(512) 572-6439 *fax*  
rjohnson@vc.cc.tx.us *e-mail*

**Profile:**

The Golden Crescent Tech Prep/School-To-Work Partnership is headquartered at Victoria College in Victoria, TX. Like many of the partnerships in Texas, the region served by the Golden Crescent Partnership is expansive and primarily rural. It involves nearly forty high schools or independent school districts (ISDs) directly, and another twenty high schools or ISDs outside of its region. Since passage of STWOA, this consortium has developed a governance structure and supporting policies to fully combine Tech Prep and STWOA activities.

Utilizing the curriculum structure required by the state of Texas, the Partnership has defined seven Tech Prep pathways that are approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. These Tech Prep pathways are offered in such areas as electronics/instrumentation advanced technology, associate degree nursing, and microcomputer technology. Dual credit is a key feature of articulation agreements worked out between the area secondary schools and Victoria College; over twenty high-school vocational-technical courses provide college credit. Although not the recipient of national acclaim, the evaluation process conducted by this local consortium is as extensive as any site in this study.

Under the direction of the Partnership's full-time coordinator, Roger Johnson, a database is maintained of all participants in Tech Prep/STWOA since the earliest days of the formation of the local Tech Prep consortium in 1991-92. Much of the data is collected using a "student enrollment/intent form" filled out by students when they enroll in high-school classes and these forms are sent to the Partnership Office on the Victoria College campus. Annual follow-up surveys are conducted with 20% of all Tech Prep high-school

graduates. Besides the student data, information collected by the Partnership addresses administrative and curricular concerns, including documenting the number of state approved pathways and the number of active high school articulated courses available in each participating high school.

**Consortium:** The Hillsborough School District/Community College Tech Prep Consortium

**Coordinator:** Carole Swineheart  
Technical and Career Education Offices or  
Division of Program Services  
5410 N. 20th Street  
Tampa, FL 33610  
(813) 231-1869 *phone*  
(813) 231-1882 *fax*

**Profile:**

The Hillsborough School District/Community College Tech Prep Consortium is located in a large and growing metropolitan area in central Florida. Thus far, twenty-six different programs of study have been articulated between Hillsborough Community College and the fifteen comprehensive high schools, one technical high school, one alternative high school, and several adult vocational centers that feed students into the college. At the secondary level, the School District of Hillsborough County has designated several courses of study that have a Tech Prep focus, including the *Tech Prep* course of study where students take appropriate community college preparatory courses, plus applied technical courses; the *College/Tech Prep* course of study where students meet College Prep and Tech Prep requirements; and the *Florida Academic Scholars/Tech Prep* course of study where students take specific academic course requirements along with Tech Prep to qualify for college scholarships.

In 1997, this consortium received national acclaim when it won the Parnell Tech Prep Award from the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). The consortium's extensive use of evaluation was one reason given for the award. As a participant in Florida's evaluation of Tech Prep and STW, this site has provided leadership statewide in student outcomes assessment. (Like Ohio, Florida is noted for having one of the most extensive evaluation processes in the nation. It is one of only a few states that has combined Tech Prep and STWOA into one assessment process.) Utilizing the expertise of the Hillsborough School District and the Hillsborough Community College, the consortium has been able to track students from the secondary to postsecondary level, often examining academic performance in core subjects such as mathematics and English.

**Consortium:** Mt. Hood Regional Cooperative Consortium

**Coordinator:** Jim Schoelkopf

Work & Educational Opportunities

Mt. Hood Community College

26000 SE Stark Street

Gresham, Oregon 97030

(503) 667-7602 *phone*

(503) 667-7390 *fax*

schoelkj@mhcc.cc.or.us *e-mail*

**Profile:**

The Mt. Hood Regional Cooperative Consortium is headquartered at Mt. Hood Community College in Gresham, OR. Located in a suburb of Portland, OR, this consortium serves seven district high schools as well as Mt. Hood Community College. The consortium has a long history with Tech Prep having started such curricula nine years ago, contributing to its selection as a national demonstration site for Tech Prep for the U.S. Department of Education in the early 1990s. The consortium was also one of the earliest winners of the Parnell Tech Prep Award from AACC. To date, Mt. Hood Community College has articulated thirteen professional/technical areas with its feeder high schools. It serves over 30,000 students each year, one-third of whom are graduating high school seniors from inside the district.

A major secondary school partner, Reynolds High School, consistently matriculates 35% of its graduates to Mt. Hood Community College, and has a particularly strong Tech Prep/School-to-Career initiative in the career pathways of business management systems, industrial and engineering, and natural resource systems. Currently, several high schools in the consortium are involved in whole-school reform. Noteworthy among these is the aforementioned Reynolds High School. Reynolds has moved aggressively to changing the learning environment by re-organizing around four houses or families, named after the mountains that surround the community-- Mt. Adams, Mt. Hood, Mt. St. Helens, and Mt. Jefferson. Goals of the house organization include to assist students in achieving academic and career goals, to support students in making successful transitions, to assist students in meeting Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) standards, and to integrate instruction that connects learning to real world application.

As a U.S. Department of Education Demonstration site for Tech Prep, this consortium contracted with Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) to conduct several program evaluations. Although these evaluations have been useful to the consortium, the chief institutional researcher for Mt. Hood Community College, Dan Walleri, has pointed out that more evaluation is needed. Walleri stated, "an analysis of transcripts is needed to understand and evaluate continuity in the Tech Prep curriculum and identify which courses are proving most difficult once the student continues at the College" (Walleri, 1994, p. 3).

---

[1] For further discussion of various Tech Prep philosophies, purposes, and approaches, see, for example, Parnell (1985); Hull and Parnell (1991); Dornsife (1992); Law (1994); Bragg et al. (1994).

[2] The Carl D. Perkins Applied Technology and Vocational Education Act of 1990, commonly known as Perkins II, included Tech Prep within the special projects section (Title III-E). Federal funds were appropriated to the states to begin local planning and implementation of Tech Prep in July, 1991. Although a few states were delayed in receiving federal funds because of issues with their states' plans for Perkins funding, by July 1992 all states had received federal funds to support local Tech Prep activities.

[3] It is important to remember that one of the essential elements of Title III-E, The Tech Prep Education Act, is to provide "equal access for special populations to the full range of Tech Prep programs, including the development of services appropriate to the needs of such individuals." To be in compliance with the law, local consortia may support the goal of providing *access* to Tech Prep but *target* a different group of students--the neglected majority--for enrollment in these programs. Indeed, the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) study of Tech Prep supports this conclusions (Boesel, Rahn, & Deich, 1994).

[4] The federal School-To-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) legislation was signed into law by President Clinton in May 1994. It calls for implementation of three key components designed to enhance school-to-work transition for all students: school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities. Among other strategies, Tech Prep is mentioned as a promising practice with respect to STWOA.

[5] For an in-depth discussion of the origins of Tech Prep, early research on Tech Prep implementation, and findings associated with Tech Prep implementation during the first few years of federal Tech Prep funding, we refer you to our initial report: *Tech Prep Implementation in the United States: Promising Trends and Lingering Challenges* (Bragg, Layton, & Hammons, 1994).

[6] Only the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) study of Tech Prep implementation (Boesel, Rahn, & Deich, 1994) existed at the time our NCRVE report was published in 1994. The first comprehensive report on tech prep implementation conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. was not published until 1995 (Silverberg & Hershey, 1995).

[7] For an in-depth discussion of the sample selection procedure and other aspects of the methods used for the 1993 survey (see Bragg, Layton, & Hammons, 1994).

[8] Further information about Tech Prep in the fifty states was published in an early report by NCRVE report entitled *Educator, Student, and Employer Priorities for Tech Prep Student Outcomes* (Bragg, 1997).

[9] The rural and urban sites dominated the sample because of the priority placed on serving these regions by federal legislation.

[10] In 1998, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) will be in its eighth year of giving the Parnell Tech Prep Award annually to three community colleges that provide exemplary Tech Prep programs involving area high schools and the local business community. All recipients of the award are selected by a panel of national experts who deem the site has "significantly enhanced the high school/community college/employer connection through the implementation of a Tech Prep curriculum" (AACC, 1997).

[11] For further data on organizational involvement and student enrollment in Tech Prep, readers are encouraged to examine the 1996 national Tech Prep evaluation prepared by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (Silverberg, 1996a).

[12] For more detailed information on funding, readers are encouraged to review the Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. national evaluation of Tech Prep report by Silverberg (1996a), entitled *The Continuing Developments of Local Tech-Prep Initiatives*.

[13] This finding is based on respondents' rankings of the five specified goals on a five-point scale, with 1 representing the top goal and 5 the bottom.

[14] For further reading on this perspective toward academic and vocational education, see Badway and Grubb (1997) and Illinois Task Force on Integration (1997).

[15] The concept of stage of implementation is based on a conceptual framework for Tech Prep implementation reported in Bragg, Layton, and Hammons (1994). The scale follows: 1) *Not begun* - indicates the component has not been addressed, 2) *Planning* - includes goal setting, staff orientation, the formation of committees and teams, and the development of plans for a component, 3) *Development* - involves such activities as reviewing, designing, creating, and field testing a component, 4) *Initial implementation* - occurs when plans and products of the development stage begin to be carried out, 5) *Advanced implementation* - occurs when a component is routinely carried out, regularly reviewed and evaluated, and institutionalized so that it continues even if current leaders were no longer responsible for Tech Prep, and 9) *Not addressed (NA)* - indicates that a consortium did not intend to include the component in its Tech Prep initiative.

[16] Respondents were asked to rate the level of implementation of each of these components on a five-point scale where 1 = not begun, 2 = planning, 3 = development, 4 = initial implementation, and 5 = advanced implementation. Responses were analyzed with frequency distributions, means and standard deviations.

[17] Similarly to the 1993 survey, respondents were presented with a list of barriers and asked to rate the level of impact of each according to the following scale: 1 = none, 2 = very minor 3 = minor, 4 = moderate, 5 = major, and 6 = very major.

---

The National Centers for Career and Technical Education are funded by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Please [e-mail](#) us your comments and suggestions.

[Accessibility](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Link Policy](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)