PROFILES OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN TEXAS

Second of Three Reports on a Human Investment System for Texas

Prepared by Bob McPherson Rik Mackay Annette Gula Frank Curtis Dan O'Shea

August 1991

Center for the Study of Human Resources



Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs The University of Texas at Austin 107 West 27th Street Austin, TX 78712 (512)471-7891



Acknowledgements

The list of individuals who should be acknowledged for their assistance with this report is sufficiently long that we find ourselves reduced to mentioning only a few. Brenda Lovett, David Dennis and Sarah Bailey of the Texas Department of Commerce's Workforce Development Division provided the benefit of their insights and program knowledge and helped to make the product more useful than it otherwise would have been. We enjoyed the active cooperation of administrators and program staff from numerous Texas agencies in addition to Commerce from the outset, including the Texas Department of Human Services, the Texas Education Agency, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, the Texas Employment Commission, the Texas Department of Aging and the Texas Rehabilitation Commission. In addition, as we prepared our analysis, we also benefited from discussions with officials from a number of other states, most notably: Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey and New York.

Staff at the Center have always worked in a collegial fashion throughout its more than twenty-year history. This project was no exception. In addition to the individual staff listed as authors on the title page, Chris King participated in discussions, offered comments and insights at critical stages in the project and reviewed and edited the final version of the reports. Lindy Mings and Amy Whitworth played key support roles, including major editorial assistance.

PROFILES OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN TEXAS

Introduction

Under an Interagency Agreement between the Texas Department of Commerce and the University of Texas at Austin, researchers at the Center for the Study of Human Resources provided technical support for the development of the Human Investment System -- an integrated approach to planning, administering and delivering human resource programs designed to improve the efficiency of service delivery, the effectiveness of the services provided and the overall productivity of the Texas workforce.¹

A significant part of the supporting research effort was directed toward identifying the major barriers to program integration. This involved analyzing education, job training and employment programs that contribute to the development of knowledges and skills of the actual or potential workforce. The primary focus was on the larger federal and state programs that were administered by state agencies through sub-state delivery systems. The objective was to develop and test a framework for profiling programs that would facilitate analyses by policy makers and could be uniformly replicated on a larger scale.

The research was guided by two key assumptions: first, state policymakers want a rational delivery system for workforce development programs that, at the same time, will be flexible enough to respond to local needs; and second, that by proposing such an integrated system policy makers do not want to create a new bureaucratic structure, but rather to move toward a single system by consolidating and strengthening the primary employment and training delivery system already in existence -- a coherent infrastructure where the fundamental intergovernmental relationships have been in place for almost twenty years and the private sector is fast becoming an equal partner with state and local governments.

¹ The terms human resources or workforce development are often used interchangeably in reference to education, job training and employment programs designed to enhance an individual's productivity and employability.

The Approach

After an extensive review of human resource programs, 16 major programs were identified as being directly related to workforce development. As potential candidates for inclusion in an integrated system, these programs were singled out for intensive analysis. They represent most, but not all, of the human resource programs currently operating in Texas. It should be noted that these program profiles were largely developed in the spring of 1991, based on information available at that time. With the help of staff from these programs, some additional work was performed to update the profiles as of August, 1991. Almost by definition such program information will always be slightly out of date.

A few small federal and state programs and all of the federal workforce development programs that are presently administered outside of the state government structure (e.g., the Job Corps) are not included. Though not profiled here, the smaller federal and state programs should definitely be incorporated in any integrated workforce development system that may be developed for Texas.

A standardized approach was used to profile and analyze each of the programs selected. After a careful review of the enabling legislation and implementing rules and regulations, information on each program was organized using a common format that highlights the program's goals, target population, participant eligibility, allowable services, administrative structure, funding flow and nature of the local service delivery system. This format facilitated the identification and analysis of potential barriers to integration from two different, but highly related, perspectives: one related to integrating the management or administrative structures and the other related to integrating program services at the local level.

The profiles that follow represent an initial effort to establish a framework for identifying potential barriers to program integration. Using this framework a number of generic barriers -- those obstacles likely to be encountered when attempting any level of program integration-- are identified. More definitive work on specific barriers cannot be undertaken until state policymakers decide what specific programs they wish to integrate and to what degree. The number and nature of the specific barriers encountered will vary with the nature and degree of integration desired.

The options for the level or degree of program integration are many and range from simply creating mechanisms that encourage state agencies to better coordinate some aspects of separate, but related, programs to actually consolidating the management and service delivery components of separate programs to the point that they lose their former identity to all except the state agency staff who must continue to account for expenditures and report results to separate federal and/or state funding sources.

Generic Barriers to Program Integration

Using the profile format referenced above, a number of common barriers likely to be encountered can be readily identified, regardless of the level or nature of program integration undertaken. There are few, if any, surprises on the list for anyone who has been involved in previous attempts to coordinate workforce development programs; however, they are worth highlighting once again as a lack of proper attention to these obstacles most often undermines even the most thorough program integration efforts.

Lack of Executive Leadership The primary barrier to program integration efforts initiated by state government has been the lack of a clear sense of direction shared by the key state policymakers: the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker. Unfortunately, in Texas -- with the decentralization of power in state government and an executive branch dominated by independent Boards and Commissions -- no one of the above elected officials alone can provide the required leadership, and a significant restructuring of workforce development programs is unlikely to ever come from any one of the administering agencies. The State's elected leaders must be willing to make a sustained and unwavering commitment to a common plan for program integration, clearly articulate the vision over and over again and take the heat inevitably associated with changes required to implement the new system.

Lack of a Conceptual Model for Integration While proponents of integrating workforce development programs hold out prospects for more efficiency, cost cutting and/or more effective programs, there is no generally accepted, conceptual model, or set of general principles to guide any such integration effort. Without such a model, there are no common bases and consistent criteria for evaluating alternative proposals for integration. In this situation any number of program combinations can look equally promising, making

decision making even more difficult and building support among state policymakers for continuing the status quo.

The Reality of Categorical Programs The inherent nature of the public policy process is to react to a specific problem with a specific treatment. With few exceptions, government is unable to respond to problems with more than an incremental or partial solution. The organization of government -- the committee and subcommittee structure of legislative bodies and the implementing bureaucracy of the executive branch -- reflects this reality and produces categorical programs which tend to create separate bureaucracies, funding channels, and reporting systems to account for program activity and expenditures. This environment, which is not likely to change significantly, makes a high level of program integration more difficult, but not impossible.

Institutional Resistance to Change The 16 workforce development programs profiled here are administered by seven separate, relatively autonomous agencies of state government. Most of these programs have been in existence -- in one form or another -- since the 1960s; one since 1917 and another since 1933. Each of these programs has its own well-entrenched constituency -- a separate state bureaucracy, local service delivery system (the traditional service providers), program clients and political supporters. While these groups readily recognize the problems in categorical delivery systems, they each have a strong commitment to the status quo and automatically resist moving from the known to the unknown, regardless of the potential efficiencies. This resistance can, and often does, subvert even the best program integration efforts.

Lack of an Integrated Information Management System Although the technology is available, a single system supporting a common data base capable of performing the accounting and reporting procedures required for an integrated program delivery system is not in place. Building such an information system represents a mammoth task and one of the most formidable barriers to program integration.

Findings and Observations

There are a number of findings and observations from the research that merit serious consideration, regardless of the final decision as to the nature and level of program integration undertaken in Texas.

- 1) The most startling finding from the research is that from a program or systems design perspective there are no insurmountable barriers to integrating the 16 workforce development programs profiled in this report. Indeed, there are innumerable challenges to meet and obstacles to overcome; however, with a sustained commitment, a high level of program integration -- even one approaching a total consolidation of administrative functions and service delivery systems -- can be achieved. The real issue is not one of barriers, but of developing and clearly articulating a logical proposal for program integration and building the political support required for implementation.
- 2) In most discussions of program integration, the technical differences among the various workforce development programs are exaggerated while the fundamental similarities are often overlooked. It is important to recognize that these programs are created by separate laws and implemented with their own set of government rules and regulations. They are funded categorically and administered by a number of different federal and/or state agencies as separate programs. Through special targeting and program eligibility requirements their resources tend to be directed toward somewhat different, yet clearly overlapping, "significant segments" of the population. However, from a broader perspective, the programs are all fundamentally alike. They have similar purposes and goals related to enhancing employability and economic self-sufficiency and almost all are formula funded through agencies of state government to regional or local entities. They also authorize a highly similar set of services that are provided in a remarkably similar fashion. Though the emphasis varies from program to program, they all typically provide:
 - intake, eligibility determination, assessment, and referral services for getting people into the programs;
 - basic education, occupational skills training, job readiness and job search training to develop the clients' knowledges and skills;
 - support services, most often transportation and child care and sometimes counseling, to support clients while they are in the programs; and,
 - job placement and follow-up services to help program graduates find and hold productive employment.

Further, most of the agencies administering these programs follow a common approach to providing services. The state agency (or its designated local entity) uses its

own staff to provide the "front-end services" such as intake, eligibility determination, assessment, referral; to track participants, program activity and expenditures; and to make the necessary reports to the various funding sources. Then, for the most part, they contract with other public and private vendors for developmental services such as basic education, occupational skills training, job placement and various support services.² The similarity in the way services are delivered enhances the likelihood for successful integration of workforce development programs.

- 3) Categorical programming of workforce development programs targeting special population groups has produced separate and highly duplicative administrative structures -- an unnecessary duplication that, in effect, diverts scarce resources from direct services to clients. The duplication is evident from three different perspectives.
 - First, looking horizontally at the existing array of workforce development programs, highly similar administrative functions -- planning, program design, contracting, and monitoring -- are performed for each of the separate programs.
 - Second, looking vertically at the separate program delivery systems, almost all have multiple administrative levels typically including most of the following: federal, federal-regional, state, sub-state, local and finally, at the bottom of the system, the providers of services. This hierarchical structure of federal, state, regional and local bureaucracies needs to be flattened out to reduce the duplication and confusion, to make programs more responsive to local needs and to get more of the available resources spent on direct services to clients.
 - Third, looking at these programs from the perspective of the local service delivery system, there is evidence of needless duplication of front-end services. Each program has its own intake, eligibility determination, assessment and referral system, even though the key eligibility criteria and much of the information required from clients are alike for most of the programs. Consolidating these front-end services for all workforce development programs would result in a more efficient delivery system and much less bureaucratic hassle for potential clients. Often, however, it is argued that technical differences in eligibility requirements, different

² There are some exceptions. For example, job placement services at the Texas Employment Commission are currently provided by agency staff.

measures of income and different definitions of assets prevent the development of a common intake, assessment and referral system. Though problematic, these differences can be accommodated with "expert systems" software. Moreover, if the consolidation includes a large number of different workforce development programs, the technical differences can be managed so that most of the eligible clients can be offered a logical sequence of services needed to enhance their employability.

Any program integration effort needs to address all three types of duplication. Workforce development services can be provided to those in need of assistance without the wasteful balkanization of programs, the multiple administrative layers and the duplication of front-end services we now tolerate.

4) The federal government has long encouraged closer coordination of workforce development programs; however, for the most part, federal programs continue to operate categorically. A classic case in point is the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration where the Unemployment Insurance, Employment Service and Job Training Partnership Act programs are administered by three separate divisions. State-initiated program integration efforts must recognize that program consolidation at the federal level is not likely to go beyond legislative language that encourages coordination at some other level in the intergovernmental system. Successful integration of programs and services at the state level will require accounting and reporting systems that accommodate the realities of the federal structure.

INDEX TO PROGRAMS

Adult Education: Adult Education Act, Title III-B and State Funding

Secondary Vocational Education: Foundation School Program— State Funding

Secondary Vocational Education: Perkins, II-B, Subpart 1

Secondary Vocational Education: Perkins, II-C

Postsecondary Technical Education: Community Colleges and Technical Institutes— State Funding

Postsecondary Technical Education: Community Colleges and Technical Institutes— Perkins II-B, Subpart 1

Postsecondary Technical Eduction: Community Colleges and Technical Institutes— Perkins II-C

Job Training Programs for Disadvantaged Adults and Youth: Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Title II-A (78%)

Summer Youth Employment and Training Program: Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
Title II-B

Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance (EDWAA): Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Title III

Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS): Family Support Act, Social Security Act and State Funding

Food Stamp Employment and Training Services (FSE&T): Food Stamp Act and State Funding

Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP): The Senior Texans Employment Program (STEP), The Older Americans Act

Employment Service: Wagner-Peyser Act

Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA): Trade Act

Vocational Rehabilitation Program: Vocational Rehabilitation Act and State Funding

Program/Funding	TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE (TAA)		
Source	TRADE ACT		
Purpose	•To provide employment services, training and allowances to persons who lose their job as a result of increased imports.		
Legislative	•FEDERAL: Trade Act of 1974, as amended by the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.		
Authority	-STATE: None.		
Goals	•To enable eligible workers to find new employment.		
Target Population	-Workers who lose their jobs or whose hours of work and wages are reduced as a result of increased imports.		
Particlpant Eligibility	•AGE: None. •INCOME: None. •U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No. •OTHER: A group of at least three workers (or their union or authorized representative) must first file a petition to establish group eligibility with the federal government through the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance of the USDOL. If a Certification of Eligibility is issued, the workers must have lost their employment (or had wages and hours reduced to 80% or less of their average weekly wage) during the specific period of time contained in the Certification.		
Participant Services	Occupational skills training		
Administrative Structure Federal State Local	-US Department of Labor -Texas Employment Commission (TEC)Texas Employment Commission Local Offices. Approximately 50-60 Local Offices are involved with TAA participants at any one time.		
Program Funding Program Year Amount/Service Level	October 1 September 30 (i.e., the Federal Fiscal Year)FFY 1991 (ending 9-30-91), approx. \$12.2 million (all federal) and 13,143 served. Additionally, approximately \$600,000 of the 10% Wagner-Peyser Governor's discretionary funds are used to fund 32 staff positions in the TEC State and Local Offices who work with the TAA program.		
• Federal/State • State/Local	Pederal funds are advanced quarterly to the State based on a state projection of need for the upcoming quarter. The funds flow directly from the TEC State Office. The Participant Service Plan is developed by the TEC Local Office and approved by the State Office. The State Office directly reimburses Service and Training Providers and pays allowances directly to participants.		
• Constraints	*The certification process does not allow state and local funding discretion. *Typically 15-20% of the funds received by the state may be expended for administrative costs in addition to program funds.		
Program Management Planning	•TAA planning occurs largely at the federal level. Each component of the program is reactive in nature to specific situations in which workers lose their jobs due to imports, petition USDOL for program services, and are certified by USDOL. •There are no planning requirements placed upon the state or local level.		
 Evaluation Management Information System 	*There is no evaluation system in place. *The TEC centralized, automated data system for individual job applicants (Applicant Data System) is used for TAA participants.		
Service Delivery System • Intake, Eligibility Determination and	•The TEC state office secures a list of those certified by USDOL and sends a call-in notice to individual workers asking them to contact the local TEC office.		
Assessment - Case - Management	•Not used.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	Federal program only available to certified workers in specific lay-offs due to imports.		

Program/Funding Source	ECONOMIC DISLOCATION AND WORKER ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE (EDWAA) JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) TITLE III		
Purpose	•To provide effective planning and delivery of job training and employment services to persons experiencing employment dislocation because of downturns in local labor market or shifts in the general economy.		
Legislative Authority	FEDERAL: Job Training Partnership Act of 1982; amended by the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Act, Section 6302 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act (OTCA) of 1988. STATE: Texas Job Training Partnership Act of 1983.		
Goals	•To establish an early adjustment capacity for workers and firms facing economic dislocation. Programs attive to provide comprehensive services to workers regardless of the cause of dislocation; foster labor, management and community partnerships with government; and emphasize retraining and employment services rather than income support.		
Target Population Participant Eligibility	Workers who have been terminated or laid-off or have received a notice of termination or lay-off or who are long-term unemployed. AGE: 16 and older INCOME: No. U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No. OTHER: Eligible dislocated workers refers to individuals who: A). have been terminated or laid off, or who have received notification of termination or lay off, are entitled to unemployment compensation, and are unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation; B). have been terminated or have received notification of termination due to permanent closure of or any substantial lay off at an employment facility, plant, or enterprise; C). are long-term unemployed and have limited opportunities for employment in the same or similar occupation in their area of residence, (including older individuals who may face substantial barriers to employment by reason of age); D). were self-employed (including farmers and ranchers) and are unemployed as a result of economic conditions or natural disasters. A displaced homemaker may also qualify for services as an "additional dislocated worker".		
Participant Services	*Cocupational skills training *Counseling and assessment *Support services (including needs-related *Literacy *Basic Education *Bob placement *Remediation *Job development *Remediation		
Administrative Structure	Technology and the action of t		
• Federal • State	*U.S. Department of Labor *Office of the Governor. The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) provides program oversight and directs policy recommendations to the Governor. Each state is required to designate a Dislocated Worker Unit (DWU) or office. In Texas this designation has been assigned to the Work Force Development Division (WFDD) of the Texas Department of Commerce (TDOC). The WFDD administers the Title III / EDWAA Formula Funds (60%), the State Reserve Funds (40%), the Rapid Response Activities, and the Secretary's National Reserve Fund programs, in addition to providing support for the SJTCC and bearing administrative responsibility for other JTPA programs.		
• Local	*The Governor, after receiving recommendations from the SITCC, designates sub-state areas (SSAs) for service delivery and a sub- state grant recipient for each SSA in accord with an agreement among the Governor, the Chief Elected Official(s) and the Private Industry Council(s) for each SSA. In Texas there are currently 33 SSAs whose boundaries and grant recipients approximate the ITPA IIA service delivery structure.		
Program Funding Program Year Amount/Service Level	-July 1 - June 30 -PY 1990 \$39,866,018 and 24,294 participants.		
Federal/State State/Local	*Of the total appropriated federal Title III funds, 80% is allocated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor to each of the states by a formula that allots one-third on the basis of relative number of unemployed individuals, one-third on the basis of the relative number of excess unemployed individuals ("excess number" defined as the number which represents unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5% of the civilian labor force in the state), and one-third on the basis of the relative number of individuals unemployed for 15 weeks or more. The remaining 20% of the federal appropriation is held as the Secretary's National Reserve Fund and is allocated to the states for specific projects and emergency situations. *The Governor may reserve not more than 40% of the State allotment for administration, technical assistance, program coordination with the unemployment compensation system, special projects, and rapid response activities. The remainder is allocated to the substate areas by a formula prescribed by the Governor based on the most appropriate information available. Minimally, this		
• Constraints	information shall include insured unemployment data; unemployment concentration data; plant closings and mass layoff data; declining industries data; long-term unemployment data; and farmer/rancher economic hardship data. At least 50% of the funds expended by the substate grantee must be for retraining services. (The SSA may appeal for a waiver.) Not more than 25% of the funds expended by the SSA or the Governor may be used to provide supportive services, including needs related payments. Not more than 15% of the funds expended by the SSA or the Governor may be used to cover administrative costs.		
Program Management	- True more user 15 % of the funds experience by the 5500 of the Governor may be used to cover authorities costs.		
• Planning	Annually, the Governor is required to develop a statement of goals and objectives for job training and employment programs. Additionally, in order to receive the state's Title III allotment, the Governor is required by law to submit a biennial State Plan for Title III to the U.S. Secretary of Labor. This plan describes how the state will operate its dislocated worker program. The Title III state plan is incorporated into the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan by reference. The Plan, developed and recommended to the Governor by the SJTCC, describes and evaluates JTPA resource utilization for the preceding biennium, and portrays the projected goals, objectives, means, policy, and measures for the forthcoming two year planning period. The Plan provides state policy guidelines to the SSAs, which are responsible for program design, operation, and management at the local level.		
• Evaluation	 -At the local level, each substate grantee is required to submit to the Governor a job training plan, reviewed by the SITCC, for two program years. The local plan describes service delivery to dislocated workers, costs, participant characteristics, performance goals, eligibility procedures, expenditures and coordination efforts with the unemployment compensation system. -ITPA legislation enables the the Secretary of Labor to establish performance standards for Title III programs based on placement and retention in unsubsidized employment. Each substate area tracks the number of participants and terminations. Current performance 		
Management Information System	measures in Texas are the Entered Employment Rate, the Average Placement Wage, and a Minimum Expenditure Rate. •Elements of the system are established by the USDOL. At the state level there is a centralized, automated data system containing program and participant characteristics. Each SSA is linked to the state system and inputs data. Information can be reported back to the SSA in several program, participant, and service provider configurations.		
Service Delivery System • Intake,	The intake and assessment process is locally designed and varies by SSA. Eligibility is determined in strict accordance with statewide criteria. TEC staff may work closely with Title III program operators by assisting eligibility verification through Unemployment Insurance data or by identifying potential participants and making referrals to Title III programs. (In some cases, TEC is the Title III program operator.)		
Case Management State-Level Barriers to Program	Not required. Used at local discretion. The style and degree of optional case management vary with each SSA and with different service providers within each SSA. None.		
Integration			

Program/Funding Source	SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (ITPA) TITLE II-B		
Purpose	*To provide summer programs for youth to increase basic educational skills, encourage school completion or enrollment in		
Legislative	alternative school programs and to provide youth with work experience. •FEDERAL: Job Training Partnership Act of 1982.		
Authority	•STATE: Texas Job Training Partnership Act of 1983.		
Goals	'To enable economically disadvantaged youth to acquire job and educational skills during the summer in order to complete school.		
Target Population	Economically disadvantaged youth.		
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: 14 through 21 •CITIZENSHIP: No.		
	*INCOME: At least 90% of participants must be "economically disadvantaged", i.e. an individual who (a) receives, or is a member of a family that receives, cash welfare payments under a federal, state or local welfare program; (b) receives food stamps; (c) has family income for the six month period prior to application for the program that was not in excess of the higher of (i) the poverty level determined in accordance with criteria established by the Office of Management and Budget or (ii) 70% of the Lower Living Standard Income Level (an income level determined annually by USDOL that is adjusted for regional, urban and rural differences and family size); (d) is a foster child on behalf of whom state or local government payments are made; (e) qualifies as a homeless individual under the federal McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; or (f) is a handicapped adult whose own income meets the program limit but whose family's income exceeds it. Up to 10% of participants may be individuals who are not economically disadvantaged if such individuals have encountered significant barriers to employment which are identified in the local plan.		
Participant Services	Counseling and assessment Occupational skills training Literacy		
	*Work experience Job search activities Basic education		
	•Supportive services •Secondary education •Remediation		
Administrative Structure	- Notionation		
• Federal	•U.S. Department of Labor		
• State	•Office of the Governor. Day-to-day administration is delegated to the Texas Department of Commerce, Workforce Development Division (TDOC). The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC), appointed by the Governor, advises the Governor on the state and local summer youth plans.		
• Local	The Governor and the SITCC create local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). There are 35 SDAs in Texas which cover the entire state. In each SDA, the Chief Elected Officials are identified. For each SDA, the Chief Elected Officials appoint the Private Industry Council (PIC) which are certified by the Governor. A majority of the PIC is required to be representatives of the private sector with the remainder representing educational agencies, rehabilitation agencies, organized labor, economic development agencies and community-based organizations. The Private Industry Council and the Chief Elected Officials, through a Local Partnership Agreement, agree on who will be the SDA's (a) planning entity, (b) administrative entity and (c) grant recipient.		
Program Funding			
Program Year Amount/Service Level	*July 1 - June 30. *PY 1990, \$59,944,324 (all federal) and 36,809 youth participants.		
Federal/State Federal/State State/Local	•Federal funds are allocated to the states by a formula that allots (a) one-third on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals residing in areas of substantial unemployment in each state as compared to the total number of such unemployed individuals in all such areas of substantial unemployment in all the states, (b) one-third on the basis of relative excess number of unemployed individuals who reside in each state as compared to the total excess number of unemployed individuals in all the states, and (c) one-third on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged individuals within the state compared to the total number of economically disadvantaged individuals in all states. The term "area of substantial unemployment" means any area which has an average rate of unemployment of at least 6.5 percent for the most recent twelve months. The term "excess number of unemployed" means the number which represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in the state. •Funds are allocated by the state to each SDA using the same formula.		
• Constraints	Expenditures for program activities and services to participants may only be made during the period between school years. Not more than 15% can be spent on administration.		
Program Management Planning	•The Governor is required to submit to USDOL an annual statement of goals and objectives for the Summer Youth Program. Additionally, the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan, developed by the SITCC is submitted by the Governor to USDOL for a two-year planning period and includes the Summer Youth Program. •At the local level, each SDA is required to submit to the Governor a plan for the Summer Youth Program for its Service Delivery Area in order to receive funding from the state.		
Evaluation	•There are no state-wide performance standards. Each SDA submits an Annual Plan that lists goals and objectives. The performance of each local program is evaluated by the state against the planned figures.		
Management Information System	•Elements of the system are established by USDOL. At the state level, there is a centralized, automated data system containing program and participant characteristics. Each SDA is linked to the state system and inputs data. Information can be reported back to the local SDA in several program, participant and service provider configurations.		
Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination and	-The intake and assessment process is locally designed and varies by SDA. Identification of eligible participants is determined at the SDA level in accordance with statewide criteria. At a minimum, assessment of participants must include an Employability Development Plan and a determination of minimum reading level.		
Assessment - Case Management	•There are no statewide requirements for case management, and the amount varies by SDA.		
Management State-Level Barriers	*Limited time during which program can be operated.		
to Program	- semistran mira marmB manis kraBranis anis an akasamani		
Integration			

Program/Funding	JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED ADULTS AND YOUTH		
Source	JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) TITLE II-A (78%)		
Purpose	•To provide job training programs that prepare youth and unskilled workers for entry into the labor force.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Job Training Partnership Act of 1982.		
Goals	STATE: Texas Job Training Partnership Act of 1983. To assist the economically disadvantaged to become employed and self sufficient through participation in job training and		
Guais	educational programs. To establish administrative structures at the state and local level through which a public/private partnership of job training and		
Target Population	educational programs is conducted. • Economically disadvantaged youth and adults as well as non-poor who face significant barriers to employment. Approximately 40% of the funds must be for programs for youth aged 14 through 21.		
Participant Eligibility	 		
r aucipan Engionis	•AGE: 14 and older. •INCOME: At least 90% of participants must be "economically disadvantaged", i.e. an individual who (a) receives, or is a member of a family that receives, cash welfare payments under a federal, state or local welfare program; (b) receives food stamps; (c) has family income for the six month period prior to application for the program that was not in excess of the higher of (i) the poverty level determined in accordance with criteria established by the Office of Management and Budget or (ii) 70% of the Lower Living Standard Income Level (an income level determined annually by USDOL that is adjusted for regional, urban and rural differences and family size); (d) is a foster child on behalf of whom state or local government payments are made; (e) qualifies as a homeless individual under the federal McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; or (f) is a handicapped adult whose own income meets the program limit but whose family's income exceeds it. Up to 10% of participants may be individuals who are not economically disadvantaged if such individuals have encountered significant barriers to employment which are identified in the local plan.		
Participant Services	Counseling and assessment Literacy Supportive services including needs-		
·	Occupational skills training *Job search assistance *Job development/Job placement *Remediation *High School equivalency *Basic education *Youth work experience *Education-to-work experience		
	-Customized training		
Administrative Structure Federal	-U.S. Department of Labor.		
• State	Office of the Governor. Day-to-day administration is delegated to the Texas Department of Commerce, Workforce Development Division (TDOC). The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC), appointed by the Governor, advises the Governor on state and local job training plans, reviews the operation of programs, identifies the employment and training needs of the state and assesses the state's response to the needs of the unemployed.		
• Local	The Governor and the STTCC create local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). There are 35 SDAs in Texas which cover the entire state. In each SDA, the Chief Elected Officials appoint the Private Industry Council (PIC) which are certified by the Governor. A majority of the PIC is required to be representatives of the private sector with the remainder representing educational agencies, rehabilitation agencies, organized labor, economic development agencies and community-based organizations. The Private Industry Council and the Chief Elected Officials, through a Local Pantnership Agreement, agree on who will be the SDA's (a) planning entity, (b) administrative entity and (c) grant recipient.		
Program Funding Program Year Amount/Service Level	•July 1 - June 30. •PY 1990, \$119,369,397 (all federal) and 67,122 participants.		
• Federal/State	*Federal funds are allocated to the states by a formula that allots (a) one-third on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals residing in areas of substantial unemployment in each state as compared to the total number of such unemployed individuals in all such areas of substantial unemployment in all the states, (b) one-third on the basis of relative excess number of unemployed individuals who reside in each state as compared to the total excess number of unemployed individuals in all the states, and (c) one-third on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged individuals within the state compared to the total number of economically disadvantaged individuals in all states. The term "area of substantial unemployment" means any area which has an average rate of unemployment of at least 6.5 percent for the most recent twelve months. The term "excess number of unemployed" means the number which represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in the state.		
State/LocalConstraints	Funds are allocated by the state to each SDA using the same formula. *Approximately 40% of the funds must be spent on youth ages 14 through 21. *Of the funds received by each SDA, no less than 70% must be spent on training and the remainder is divided between administration and supportive services. Not more than 15 percent can be spent on administration.		
Program Management • Planning	•The Governor is required to develop an annual statement of goals and objectives for job training programs. The Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan, developed by the SITCC, is submitted by the Governor to USDOL for a two-year planning period and sets the parameters for local planning to be developed. This plan describes the goals, objectives, strategy and performance measures for all JTPA resources in the state for the upcoming two-year period, evaluates program performance over the past two years, establishes criteria for coordination of related job training programs at the local and state levels for specific program areas (education, vocational education, public assistance, employment service, rehabilitation, economic development and any other activities as determined by the Governor) and describes state oversight and support activities. •At the local level, each SDA is required to submit to the Governor a job training plan for the upcoming two years (with annual modifications) for its area in order to receive funding from the state. The plan is to be developed according to procedures agreed to by the Chief Elected Officials and the PIC in the Local Partnership Agreement for the SDA. The plan must identify the grant recipient and the administrative entity (which may be separate entities), performance goals, services to be provided and their cost, the budget for the two years, the methods to be used to comply with the coordination criteria established in the Governor's Plan and the		
 Evaluation Management Information 	procedures for the selection of service providers and participants. *USDOL has established performance standards for II-A (78%) programs for the following six criteria: Adult Follow-up Employment Rate, Adult Follow-up Weekly Earnings, Adult Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate, Adult Welfare Follow-up Weekly Earnings, Youth Entered Employment Rate and Youth Employability Enhancement Rate (attainment of specified educational or employment levels). The Governor may allow variations in the federal performance standards for each SDA within parameters established by USDOL. If local SDAs fail to meet the standards for two consecutive years, corrective action is required. Annual incentive grants are available to SDAs which exceed the performance standards. *Elements of the system are established by USDOL. At the state level, there is a centralized, automated data system containing program and participant characteristics. Each SDA is linked to the state system and inputs data. Information can be reported back to		
System Service Delivery System	the local SDA in several program, participant and service provider configurations.		
 Intake, Eligibility Determination and 	•The intake and assessment process is locally designed and varies by SDA. Identification of eligible participants is determined at the SDA level in accordance with statewide criteria. At a minimum, assessment of participants must include an Employability Development Plan and a determination of minimum reading level.		
Assessment Case Management	•There are no statewide requirements for case management, and the amount varies by SDA.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•None.		

Program/Funding	POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION		
Source	COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES — PERKINS II-C		
h	(The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board uses the word technical to denote vocational and technical.)		
Purpose	•To make the US more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of all segments of the population. Title II-C provides federal assistance for secondary, postsecondary and adult vocational education programs within the state.		
Legislative	FEDERAL: Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 as amended by		
Authority	Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990. -STATE: None.		
	NOTE: Effective date of the Act is July 1, 1991. Federal rules and regulations governing the Perkins Amendments and the State Plan are not yet available. As such, sections of this profile may be affected when they are released.		
Goals	To improve educational programs leading to academic and occupational skill competencies needed to work in a technologically		
	advanced society.		
Target Population	 Emphasizes services and equal access for special populations — the handicapped, educationally or economically disadvantaged inclusive of foster children, those not properly served because of sex bias, those of limited English proficiency, and individuals in correctional institutions. 		
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: No. •INCOME: No. •U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No. •OTHER: Emphasis is on inclusion of special populations.		
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Vocational education •Supplementary services meeting the need		
	Remediation Tech-Prep education of special populations(e.g., equipment modification, instructional sids/devices)		
Administrative Structure	*Tutoring *Apprenticeship modification, instructional aids/devices)		
• Federal	•U.S. Department of Education.		
• State	Interdepartmental Task Force (Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services) is responsible for examining data requirements, possible common objectives, definitions, measures and standards for programs under Perkins, Adult Education Act, ITPA, Rehabilitation Act and Wagner-Peyser Act; and considering integration of research and development conducted with federal assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. -State Board of Education (SBOE), the Joint Advisory Committee, and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The SBOE is the sole state agency and is responsible for setting statewide education policy. The Joint Advisory Committee consisting of three members of the SBOE, three members of THECB, one member of the Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE) and an ex officio representative from the Texas Department of Commerce, makes recommendations to the SBOE. THECB is the administrative agency with its own Board for postsecondary education planning and policy.		
• Local	•TCOVE, previously known as the Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education, is a separate state agency funded by both the state and federal government. TCOVE's duties include involvement in the planning process from the beginning as well as making recommendations concerning the state plan to the SBOE and conducting an evaluation of vocational education programs and efforts at least once every two years, among others. -Community and technical colleges and other postsecondary institutions that have approved technical education programs. -In PY 1990, 49 community college districts, the four campuses of Texas State Technical College (TSTC), Texas A&M Engineering Extension, and the Lamar University System (selected campuses offering associate degrees in applied science) operated programs. -Postsecondary institutions are governed by local boards of trustees elected by voters within the district or by a board of regents appointed by the governor.		
Program Funding			
Program Year Amount/Service	 July 1 - June 30. PY 1992, \$47 million (estimate) for both secondary and postsecondary programs. Approximately \$18.8 million will be distributed 		
Level	to postsecondary programs.		
Federal/State State/Local	*Formula allocation (relevant share) of Title II funds to the state is as follows: 50 percent based on the ratio of the number of Texans aged 15-19 to the number of such persons in all States; 20 percent, aged 20-24; 15 percent, aged 25-65; and 15 percent, aged 15-65. This allotment is them adjusted by a per capita income ratio that enables poorer states to receive increased allotments. *At least 75 percent of the within state Title II allocation must be used for basic programs under Part C. *Federal funds are received by the SBOE. Distribution of federal funds between secondary and postsecondary is developed collaboratively by staff of the Texas Education Agency and the THECB for review by the Joint Advisory Committee and		
 Constraints 	recommendation to the SBOE. Monies are formula allocated to the eligible institutions based on their relevant share of the state's Pell grant recipients. States may submit a waiver requesting to use an alternative formula allocation. Within institutions, priority must be given to a limited number of sites or program areas which serve the highest concentrations of		
	students from special populations. Basic grant to local recipient must exceed \$50,000. Local administrative costs are limited to no more than 5 percent.		
Program Management	-best gant to local feetpear must exceed 30,000. Local aminimals are costs are finined to no more than 5 percent		
• Pianning	•Statewide goals are developed by THECB in cooperation with TEA and approved by the SBOE. •State submits an initial three-year state plan followed by a two-year plan for federal vocational education funding. Prior to developing the plan, the state must conduct an assessment of the quality of its vocational education programs, measure the responsiveness of programs to unique needs of the special populations, and describe how the planned use of funds reflects the assessment. The SBOE must also develop measurable objective criteria to assess program quality. Whereas in the past this plan was primarily a compliance document, it is now viewed as a planning tool by DOE. •Each institution must submit an annual application for federal funds.		
 Evaluation 	•Quantifiable, statewide objectives will be developed as part of the PY 1992 planning process. •State must establish a Committee of Practitioners to make recommendations to the SBOE for developing and implementing a statewide system of core standards and measures of performance. System must be in place within two years of the law's enactment. The statewide system must include: measures of learning and competency gains; measures of performance; incentives or adjustments and procedures for utilizing resources and methods developed in other federally-assisted programs (JTPA and JOBS). •The effectiveness of programs must be evaluated annually using the core standards and measures of performance. Programs that do not make substantial progress in meeting the standards and measure in the first must develop a plan for program improvement with input from teachers, parents and students. If after one year of implementing the local improvement plan sufficient progress is not made, the state will work jointly with the school, teachers, parents and students.		
• Management Information System	*TCOVE must conduct an evaluation at least once every two years on 1) extent to which vocational education, employment and training programs represent a consistent, integrated and coordinated approach to meeting economic needs of the state, 2) adequacy and effectiveness of the vocational education and job training program delivery systems in achieving their purposes, and 3) the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination between vocational education and JTPA. Data collection is coordinated by THECB's Information Services Division, Educational Data Center. State data requirements, addressed in Reporting and Procedures Manual for Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes, include student data, TASP class enrollment, faculty data and graduation statistics. Efforts to develop standardized definitions for data elements are currently underway.		
Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment Case	*Admission process varies by campus. Identification of students is the responsibility of the local institution. Prior to completing nine hours of college-level course work, new students must take and pass the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP). Students who do not pass TASP are placed in remediation to help them develop the reading, writing or math skills they need to do postsecondary course work. Not used.		
Management State-Level Barriers	•Eligible institutions limited to institutions of higher education, local educational agencies serving adults or certain area vocational		
to Program	education schools.		
Integration	•Highly decentralized decision-making system.		

Program/Funding Source		B OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS (. ORT ACT, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND	
Purpose	•To assure that parents and caretakers with	h economically disadvantaged children obtain th	
Legislative	•FEDERAL: Family Support Act of 198		
Authority	Social Security Act as amendedSTATE: Human Resource Code, Chapte		
Goals	•To encourage, assist and require AFDC	parents and caretakers to fulfill their responsibil	lities to support their children by preparing
	for, accepting and retaining employment. To encourage the state to provide individuals with the opportunity to acquire the education and skills necessary to qualify for		
	employment and the support services, inc	luding transitional child care and medical assist	tance, to enable them to participate.
		ination of services at all levels of government in a of long-term welfare dependency and to maxi	
Target Population	•Parents and caretakers who are receiving		
	•Target Groups are: -Custodial parents under 24 who don't be	nave recent work experience or a high school di	iploma or its equivalent.
	-Members of a family whose youngest -Caretakers who have received AFDC f	child is within two years of age ineligibility; a for 36 of the preceding 60 months.	und,
	•State has designated AFDC youth 16 and	d 17 not in school or training as a priority for s	ervice.
Participant Eligibility	•Members of a two parent family eligible AFDC ELIGIBILITY	: for AFDC.	
t mucchan cargionny	•AGE: Parent or approved caretaker of a		U.S. CITIZENSHIP: Citizen or specified
	dependent child under the age of 18 who for various reasons is deprived of	than a \$1000 in resources with certain exemptions and have an income less than the	alien
	support or care.	amount necessary to meet basic needs.	alound and "namented" to the west forms
	•All AFDC recipients must participate in		
	 Volunteers (those with exemptions who from the target groups are given first prior 	would like to be in JOBS and over age 15) are not for service within their target order	eligible to participate and volunteers
		minimi aton miles Rionh	
	JOBS ELIGIBILITY •RELATION: A parent and dependent chi	ild under age 18 who is deprived of support or c	care of a parent and who lives with a parent o
	other specified relative.		
		designated JOBS county and resources permit	tting must participate in JOBS unless
	exempted. •An individual may be exempt for reason:	s including; caring for a child under 3 years, is	remote from services, attends school, in 20
	or incapacitated or cares for someone who	o is, is pregnant or is over 60.	
	Volunteers (those with exemptions who the target groups are given first priority for	would like to be in JOBS and over age 15) are or service within their target group	eligible to participate and volunteers from
Participant Services	JOBS program optional components.	The JOBS program required components.	•All AFDC recipients who have received
	Group and individual Job Search On-the-job training.	•Education —high school/GED	AFDC 3 out of the last 6 months and who leave the grant because of earned income
		—basic and remedial —education in English	are eligible for transitional benefits up to one year of paid Medicaid and child care.
	JOBS program Support Services	•Job Skills Training	one year or para memoria and cities care.
	Child Care Transportation	Job Readiness Activities Job Development/Job Placement	
	One-time work related expenses	a an and the same	
Administrative Structure	•Transitional Benefits		
FederalState	Department of Health and Human Service Department of Human Services (DHS).	CS CS	
· Local	•The JOBS program is administered local	lly by the DHS Client Self-support Services (C	SS) staff. It is structured to provide
		use local resources. DHS does intake, assessmeare and refers to training or education services	
The state of the s		ind other service providers to specify referral an	
Program Funding Program Year	•September 1 to August 30		
Amount/Service Level	•FY 1991 (9/1/90 - 8/31/91), estimated \$	36.6 million (federal, \$20.7 million; state,\$15. the Texas Education Agency. \$16.3 million of	
Live	delivery of services by DHS staff. The ba	lance will be contracted out for employment se	
· Federal/State	 The number of participants is projected in the sum of the sum of	for FY 1991 to be 12,484 per month. t equal to the sum of the State's FY 1987 WIN :	allotment and an amount allocated by
	formula from remaining federal funds bas	ed on the State's relative number of adult AFD(
· State/Local		ocated from the state to the regional level by for	
· Constraints	Statement (ESS) with factors such as perc	entage of caseload, percentage target population the state must meet minimum federal participal	ns, and percentage unemployed.
- Constitution	-7% for FY 1991	ore some most most imminimit teneral participat	ose ere espeimilië iëlës.
	-rates increase in later years -40% for FY 1994 for the Unemployed Pa	arent program	
Program Afanas	-Expend 55% of the available JOBS funds		
Program Management Planning		plementation of JOBS, but the agency does no	
J	training and supportive services resources	required for success. The agency created a stat and supportive service resources which could be	te/local planning process that involved those
	responsible for developing a regional plan	that utilizes local resources in accordance with	h state rules and guidelines. Most regions
	used the Job Training Partnership Act's se on JOBS policy and implementation are n	ervice delivery areas (SDA) for planning areas in nade by the DHS board.	within the DHS regions. All final decisions
. Funlmastan	•Program year is September 1 to August :	30, so planning takes place in the spring and co	
 Evaluation 	There are no formal plans for evaluations recipients will be measured by a number of	s of the JOBS program at this time. However, of state and federal objectives.	ine state's performance in serving AFDC
	•The state objectives are:	JOBS participants leaving AFDC; and,	
	-To place JOBS participants in jobs pay	ing on average the previous year's JTPA wage	standard for the service delivery area
	(SDA). •The federal objectives are;		•
	-To serve, at an average of 20 hours a	week, 7% of the non-exempt AFDC population	on in FY 1991, 11% in FY 1992 with
	increasing rates in later years; and,	funds on the three federal target groups.	
	-Custodial parents under 24 who don't	t have a high school diploma or its equivalent	
	-Members of a family whose younger	st child is within two years of age ineligibility	and
	-Caretakers who have received AFDC	. for so of the preceding of months.	
 Management Information 		First 50 of the preceding ou months. ERR is the main participant record system for sets of a number of computer screens used by eligible.	

Program/Funding Source	SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOUNDATION SCHOOL PROGRAM — STATE FUNDING		
Purpose	To provide financial support for public education programs including vocational education, in public schools.		
Legislative Authority	*FEDERAL: None. *STATE: Texas Education Code, Sections 16.155, Vocational Education Allotment; 21.101, Required Curriculum; 21.111, Vocational and Other Educational Programs; and 21.112, Approval and Review of Vocational Programs. *NOTE: Numerous aspects of secondary vocational education are addressed in other sections of the Code. Examples include Sections: 21.113, Master Plan for Vocational Education; and 21.115, Vocational Education Integrated Delivery System.		
Goals	*To prepare students to live and work in the changing Texas economy and to provide a well-balanced curriculum so that students are able to make informed occupational choices, determine educational needs/options, and develop employability traits/acquire marketable skills.		
Target Population Participant Eligibility	Students who have the interest, aptitude and ability to benefit from vocational education programs. AGE: Yes, students of public school INCOME: No. U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No. age (SZI) in grades 7-12. Further age and/or grade restrictions apply to specific vocational courses. OTHER: Dependent on the vocational program, other criteria may apply (e.g., handicapped, educational deficiencies).		
Participant Services	*Counseling and assessment *Remediation *Remediation *Job placement activities *Possible to the control of the control o		
Administrative Structure Federal State Local	•None. «Central Education Agency which is comprised of the State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA). The SBOE is responsible for setting policy and TEA is the administrative agency. "The Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE), previously known as the Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education, is a separate state agency funded by both the state and federal government. *Local school districts that have approved programs. School districts are classified into categories by their governance structure and their ability to raise local revenue. The vast majority of districts have locally elected governance boards. A limited number of districts are governed by the county commissioners court or the city council. *Each school district must also have a districtwide local advisory council for providing insight on current job needs and the relevance of programs/courses offered. *In PY 1990, 950 of 1,068 school districts operated vocational education programs with state and federal funding.		
Program Funding Program Year Amount/Service Level Federal/State	*August 1 - May 31. *PY 1991, \$241,071,617 (est.). and 86,863,931 studentd enrolled		
State/Local Constraints	•None. •The FSP is a financing system designed to ensure that each district can provide public education programs. Both state and local funds are included in determining shares. The state's share is supplied by the Available School Fund and the Foundation School Fund. These Funds receive monies from the Permanent School Fund (a public education trust fund), dedicated revenues and general revenue. The local share, also known as the Local Fund Assignment (LFA), is paid by local property tax collections. The LFA is the minimum property tax rate required by the state to be eligible for FSP. •Two tiers of funding are provided by the FSP: the Basic Alloument (BA) and the Guaranteed Yield Program (GYP). The BA is a per capita allotment based on student counts and supplemented by payments (weights) for students enrolled in special programs such as vocational education. The vocational education weight for approved programs is 137. Student counts are now based on average daily attendance in approved programs. Actual payments are the difference between the minimum program cost per student and the LFA. School districts are not eligible for FSP aid if their LFA is adequate to meet minimum program costs. The second tier of FSP, GYP, attempts to equalize funding among districts by providing additional funds for program enrichment within property-poor districts. The GYP provides aid up to a set level of combined state and local revenue per student. The amount of aid provided by GYP is directly dependent on the tax effort (i.e., tax rate) of the school district. •NOTE: Legislation is currently pending that will affect the flow of funds from the state to the local school district.		
Program Management Planning	*Statewide goals are developed by TEA and approved by the SBOE. The Career Opportunities in Texas: A Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education sets forth objectives for the forthcoming school year and long-term goals for the following five years. Priorities for local, regional (state planning regions) and statewide services are addressed. The Master Plan is updated once each biennium and serves as the blueprint for restructuring vocational education in Texas. Progress and compliance with the Master Plan is reported biennially to the legislature, the governor and TCOVE. *Twenty-four regional Quality Work Force Planning Committees assist in identifying programs that prepare students for occupations in demand and with wages significantly above minimum wages. Initiated by a tri-agency partnership between the Texas Department of Commerce, TEA and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, committee membership includes educators, employers and representatives from the public sector. The regional boundaries are coterminous with the state planning regions. *All new and additional secondary vocational education programs must include an articulation plan between the proposed offering and existing postsecondary programs in the area. *Each school district must submit an annual plan/application (a single plan for both state and federal funds).		
Evaluation Management Information System	Quantifiable, statewide objectives applicable to all accondary vocational education programs will be developed as part of the PY 1992 planning process for federal funds. The statewide system of measures and standards developed for the Perkins Act will eventually be applied throughout the secondary vocational education system. Each vocational education program is approved by the SBOE. Secondary vocational education enrollment data are collected as part of the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). PEIMS is an automated, centralized data collection system with individual-level data and statewide, standardized definitions. Though operational, PEIMS is still being refined. The manner in which data are sent to the state varies by school		
Service Delivery System • Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case	«Identification of students and determination of eligibility are the responsibility of the local school district. Students receive an individual assessment of their vocational interests, abilities and special needs. Students are reassessed by evidencing mastery of the essential elements. A competency profile is maintained for students enrolled in grades 11 and 12. «Varies by school district and student needs. Support Centers, where handicapped and disadvantaged students can receive		
Management	individualized help, are one example. As part of the vocational guidance and counseling program, school districts are encouraged to provide the following: individual assessment of interests, shilities and aptitudes; occupational information which matches the individual inventory; guidance and counseling, through group and individual instruction, to assist students make course selections most suited to their educational and career plans; placement in jobs, continuing education and/or postsecondary training relevant to student training and interest; and follow-up data collection of student completers. The extent to which each district provides these services is dependent on their funding.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	Eligible recipients limited to school districts. Highly decentralized decision-making system.		

Program/Funding	EMPLOYMENT SERVICE		
Source	WAGNER-PEYSER ACT		
Purpose	*To establish and maintain a national system of public employment offices administered through the state Employment Security (ES) agencies to facilitate matching workers and jobs.		
Legislative	FEDERAL: Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 as amended by the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982.		
Authority	-STATE: None		
Goals	•To provide job search and placement services to job seekers.		
	*To provide recruitment services for employers.		
	•To provide services for groups with special needs (e.g. females, minorities, migrant workers, youth, veterans, handicapped). •To develop labor market information.		
Target Population	Ob Seekers		
Participant Eligibility	*AGE: 14 and older *INCOME: No *U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No		
Participant Services	Counseling and assessment Job search assistance Labor market		
Administrative Structure	Dob matching Employer services information		
Federal	-U. S. Department of Labor		
• State	•Texas Employment Commission (TEC). Day-to-day operational responsibility is assigned to the TEC Regional and Local Offices		
51214	with support functions assigned to the Job Services Operations Division of the State Office.		
• Local	-10 TEC Regional Offices administer Employment Service through 138 TEC Local Offices in 105 Texas cities.		
Program Funding			
Program Year	•July 1 - June 30.		
Amount/Service	•PY 1990, \$51,500,223 (all federal) and 1,717,301 referrals for 506,261 job openings that resulted in 388,068 placements.		
Level • Federal/State	Today 6 made any formula allocated to the grate hand your thirds on the grate than a functional shallow blue for the first the		
. Lenciangrate	 Federal funds are formula allocated to the state based two-thirds on the state's share of national civilian labor force and one-third on the state's share of unemployed individuals in the nation. 		
State/Local	•Of the funds allocated to the state, 90 per cent are allocated to each TEC Region using a five-factor formula that allots 30% based		
	on the number of job applications of individuals, 30% based on a TEC productivity standard, 30% based on the entered employment		
	per staff year worked, 5% based on the number of total placements and 5% based on the number of individuals who entered		
	employment. Each Regional Office uses the same formula for TEC Local Offices with some discretion allowed by the TEC State		
	Office.		
	*The remainder of the state's funds are used at the Governor's discretion to provide (a) services for groups with special needs, (b) performance incentives for Employment Service offices and (c) exemplary models for basic labor exchange services.		
- Constraints	Performance incentives for employment Service offices and (c) exemplary models for basic labor exchange services.		
Program Management			
• Planning	The Texas Employment Commission submits an annual operational plan to the U. S. Department of Labor. This plan is based		
	upon the Employment Service plans of the Regional and Local Offices. The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC)		
	reviews the plans to assure that (a) Private Industry Councils (PICs) and Chief Elected Officials have participated in the development		
	of the plans and (b) the plans are consistent with the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan. A strategic plan, with specific state, regional and local projects, is also developed annually by the State Office through a process that involves the Regional		
	and Local Offices.		
	-At the local level, a plan is jointly developed by the Regional and Local Office to meet performance standards established by the		
	State Office. Local plans are developed taking into consideration any Employment Service proposals of the PICs and the Chief		
	Elected Officials. Local Job Service Employer Committees (JSECs)—private sector employer advisory committees—may participate		
Evaluation	in the development of the local plan. The plans are submitted to the Governor, the State Office and the SITCC. •The federal Act authorizes the Secretary of Labor to establish performance standards but such standards have never been developed.		
· Evaluation	TEC Regional and Local Offices in Texas are evaluated against productivity standards developed by the State Office (i. e. 275		
	individuals placed per staff year, 375 individual placement transactions per staff year, 475 entered employment per staff year and		
	specific standards for females, youth, handicapped, minorities and Unemployment Insurance claimants). If performance falls from		
	year-to-year, the funding level for the Local Office may be decreased.		
Management Tofannation	-At the state level, there is a centralized, automated data system that contains characteristics and information concerning the		
Information System	individual job applicant (Applicant Data System). Employer job openings are automated into the Job Bank Information System. These two MIS systems can be cross-matched to the qualifications of the job secker and the employer through the Job Service		
Statem	Matching System. Cumulative Employment Service data is maintained through the Employment Service Automated Reporting		
	System. Each Local Office is linked to the state system and inputs data. Information can be reported back to Regional and Local		
	Offices in several formats.		
Service Delivery System			
· Intake,	 Local Offices perform these functions. Eligibility criteria are minimal and determination is simple to process. Assessment of most job seekers is informal and determines qualification criteria for job matching. Based upon the assessment and availability of services, 		
Eligibility Determination	Job seekers is unformal and determines quantication criteria for Job matching. Hased upon the assessment and availability of services, individuals may be referred to other in-house services administered by TEC under contract with other funding sources such as JOBS		
and	welfare reform, JTPA training, Food Stamp Employment and Training and an ex-offender program.		
Assessment	E-Same		
• Case	•Not used.		
Management			
State-Level Barriers	•None.		
to Program Integration			
turckisting	<u> </u>		

THE SENIOR TEXANS EMPLOYMENT PROCRAM (STEP) To promote suited paradines reported personnel of the process of t	Program/Funding	SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (SCSEP)		
Legislative Authority Carlot of the Object Americana Act of 1965. Authority Carlot Ca		THE SENIOR TEXANS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (STEP)		
Authority STATE: None Coals 1	Purpose	•To promote useful part-time employment opportunities that provide community service activities and income for unemployed, low income persons 55 years and older.		
Target Population Target Population Those 55 years and older, to those most economical diseasement of the membrane and evelops and allow membrane and evelops and the membrane and the membrane and evelops and the membrane and evelops and the membrane and evelops and the membrane and the membran		•FEDERAL: Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965.		
Case Constraints Constra	Goals			
OTHER, None. OT	Target Population	-Those 55 years and older, unemployed and low income. Priority is given to persons 60 years and older, to those most economically disadvantaged, and to former program enrollees.		
Counterling and assessment soft benefits Administrative Structure Preferal State The US Department of Labor (DOL) And the state agencies and right national approaching expensions. The US Department of Labor (DOL) And the state agencies and right national approaching expensions. The US Department of Labor (DOL) And the state agencies and right national approaching the state into service areast with the national enganizations serving the uthins areas. All areas of the State is a state wide SCSEP program called the Scalior Texans Employment Program (TEXP). All gight national enganizations are operating a programs in the state; I Note and Council on Aging. Local Program Panding Program Funding	Participant Eligibility			
- Federal - State - St	Participant Services	Counseling and assessment and benefits Support services		
The State of Texas and eight national organizations provide services in Texas. They divide the state into ervice areas with the national organization or sgency. The Texas Department of Aging (TDOA) contract with the DOL to operate a SCSEP put subcontract when whole program to the Temmer. Union Development Association to operate a state wide SCSEP program is the Employment Program (STEP). All eight national organizations are operating programs in the fament. In the Dol Long of Persons and Stephenous, 2) USA Persons Strives, 30 Green Thumb, 4) National Usan Legaps, 5) National Council on Aging, 6) National Council of Section Citizens. National Council on Aging, 7) Association Netional Pro Personsa Mayores, and 8) National Council of Section Citizens. National Council on Aging, 7) Association Netional Pro Personsa Mayores, and 8) National Council of Section Citizens. National Council on Aging, 7) Association Netional Pro Personsa Mayores, and 8) National Council of Section Citizens. National Council on Aging, 7) Association Netional Pro Personsa Mayores, and 8) National Council of Section Citizens. Program Funding Pro	Administrative Structure			
- Local - STEP is a rural program. (The national organizations serve the urban counties). STEP coordinates the development of programs that will host employment slots and the filling of eligible alots through the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) which assist in developing local programs, i.e., the creation of job slots, and the recruitment of program practicipants. STEP divides its portion of the state inno five regions with a field supervisor for each. The field supervisors have area supervisors who oversees the sponsoring agencies and the participants. There is at least one job slot in every county in Texas. - Frederal/State - Federal/State - Federal/State - Federal/State - Federal/State - Federal/State - For the supervisor of the supervisor of the supervisor will be shown to fish million. As a result, sponsariately 2,800 job islot with the national sponsors will be shown to fish million. As a result, sponsariated polyment of job slots with the national sponsors will be shown to fish million. As a result, sponsariated employment is sponsor is "equitable" of the validation for the number of job slots with the national sponsors will be shown to fish will be filled by approximately 2,800 job slots with the national sponsors will be shown to fish will be filled by approximately 2,800 job individuals. - The fill supervisors who oversees the sponsoring sponsor will be shown to fish million. As a result, sponsoriated to sponsoriate greater sponsors will be shown to fish million. As a result, sponsoriately 2,800 job slots with the national sponsor will be sponsoriately 2,800 job slots with the national sponsor will be sponsoriately 6% of a visible funds he altocated to a state of the sponsoriate greated programs and 22.8 to the national sponsors will be sponsoriated programs and 2.8 to the national sponsoriate programs and programs and the fill state positions which will be filled by a position of the state sponsoriate programs and the state of the state sponsoriate programs and the state of the same programs in		The State of Texas and eight national organizations provide services in Texas. They divide the state into service areas with the national organizations serving the urban areas. All areas of the State are served and no area of the State is served by more than one organization or agency. The Texas Department of Aging (TDOA) contracts with the DOL to operate a SCSEP but subcontracts the whole program to the Farmers Union Development Association to operate a state-wide SCSEP program called the Senior Texans Employment Program (STEP). All eight national organizations are operating programs in the state; 1) American Association of Retired Persons, 2) USDA Forest Service, 3) Green Thumb, 4) National Urban Lesgue, 5) National Indian Council on Aging, 6)		
Program Year Amount/Service Level 1. Amount/Service Level 2. Evel	• Local	*STEP is a rural program. (The national organizations serve the urban counties). STEP coordinates the development of programs that will host employment slots and the filling of eligible slots through the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) which assist in developing local programs, i.e., the creation of job slots, and the recruitment of program participants. STEP divides its portion of the state into five regions with a field supervisor for each. The field supervisors have area supervisors who oversee the sponsoring		
- Amount/Service Level Level Level Level Level Level Level - STEP funding of FY 1991 (July 1 to June 30, 1992) is 84.78 million (Exclered \$4.3 million, State 478,000). This money will upply subsidiated provisions (slots) and 16 state positions which will be filled by approximately 900 individuals. Total funding for the eight national sponsors will be about 16.8 million. As a result, approximately 2,800 job slots with the national sponsors will employ sboat 3,360 people. (A 20% tumover rate accounts for the difference in the number of job slots and anticipated employment. - Federal/State - Federal/State - The Labor-Hill Appropriations Acts specified that 78% of available funds be allocated to the national sponsors and 22% to the states. DOL allocates by formula to the state agency (not the nationals) on relative shares of the population over the age of 55. Funding to the national sponsors in "equilibrile" and based on historical shares among them. - Constraints - Constraints - Constraints - Constraints - Constraints - Constraints - Aminimum 10% match is required, either each or in-kind, for the state's SCSEP grant. - There is a 13.5% each over 55 population. Each county is awarded at least one slot. - Aminimum 10% match is required, either each or in-kind, for the state's SCSEP grant. - There is limited flexibility for reallocating resources due to the unlimited time participants may remain in the program. Some participants have been in the same jobs for years. - Annually, one out of five enrollees is expected to find employment outside of SCSEP. - SCSEP (STEP) enrollees cannot displace regular employees or fill open job descriptions. - For planning at the state level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for slots in each county in the state the local level, the number of slots for each county is determined by formula based on the distribution of the 55 and over population. Area Agencies on Aging allocate job slots within counties, otherwise there is no planning. Once				
The Labor-HIIS Appropriations Acts specifies that 78% of available fund be allocated to the national sponsors and 22% to the state. DOL allocates by formula to the state agency (not the nationals) on relative shares of the population over the age of 55. Funding to the national sponsors is "equitable" and based on historical shares among them. At the state level, the allocation is of job slots and not funds. Each county is given a percentage of the available slots based on relative share of the over 55 population. Each county is awarded at least one slot. A minimum 10% match is required, either cash or in-kind, for the state's SCSEP grant. There is in all 5.5% cap on administrative counts. At least 73% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is limited flexibility for reallocating resources due to the unlimited time participants may remain in the program. Some participants have been in the same jobs for years. Annually, one out of five enrollees is expected to find employment outside of SCSEP. **SCSEP (STEP) enrollees cannot displace regular employees or fill open job descriptions. **For planning at the state level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for slots in each county in the state of the level of the state level, the number of slots for each county is determined by formula based on the distribution of the 55 and over population. Area Agencies on Aging allocate job slots within counties, otherwise there is no planning. Once responsibility is established, the sponsoring agencies recruit local host speciaes seeking a balace between service to the general community and the aging community. There is no board or citizens commuties exercising oversight or participating in planning. **The TSTEP program has two quantified objectives for 1991: 1) to curoll 86 older Texans in authorized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 enrollees in unaubsidized jobs outside the STEP program special community. There	Amount/Service	*STEP funding of FY 1991 (July 1 to June 30, 1992) is \$4.78 million (Federal \$4.3 million, State 478,000). This money will fund approximately 709 federal positions (slots) and 116 state positions which will be filled by approximately 990 individuals. Total funding for the eight national sponsors will be about 16.8 million. As a result, approximately 2,800 job slots with the national sponsors will employ about 3,360 people. (A 20% tumover rate accounts for the difference in the number of job slots and		
State/Local Constraints At the state level, the allocation is of job alots and not funds. Each county is given a percentage of the available slots based on relative share of the over 55 population. Each county is awarded at least one slot. A minimum 10% match is required, either each or in-kind, for the state's SCSEP grant. There is a 13.75% cap on administrative costs. At least 75% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is in 13.75% cap on administrative costs. At least 75% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is in 13.75% cap on administrative costs. All least 75% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is in 13.75% cap on administrative costs. At least 75% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is in including must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is in including must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is including must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. There is inmited flexibility for reallocating resources due to the unlimited time participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program some participants may remain in the program. Some participants may remain in the program. S	• Federal/State	• The Labor- HHS Appropriations Acts specifies that 78% of available funds be allocated to the national sponsors and 22% to the states. DOL allocates by formula to the state agency (not the nationals) on relative shares of the population over the age of 55.		
*There is a 13.5% cap on administrative costs. *At least 75% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. *There is limited flexibility for reallocating resources due to the unlimited time participants may remain in the program. Some participants have been in the same jobs for years. *Annually, one out of five enrollees is expected to find employment outside of SCSEP. **SCSEP (STEP) enrollees cannot displace regular employees or fill open job descriptions. *For planning at the state level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for alots in each county in the state At the local level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for alots in each county in the state At the local level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for alots in each county in the state At the local level, the number of slots for each county is determined by formula based on the distribution of the 55 and over population. Area Agencies on Aging allocate job slots within counties, otherwise there is no planning. Once responsibility is established, the sponsoring agencies recruit local host agencies seeking a balance between service to the general community and the aging community. There is no board or citizens communities exercising oversight or participating in planning. *The STEP program has two quantified objectives for 1991: 1) to entrol 86 older Texans in authorized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 enrollees in unsubsidized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 enrollees in unsubsidized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 enrollees in unsubsidized Senior Community Service Employment Program and sends there in a unsubsidized Senior Community Service Dollees of the STEP program and acceptance. TDOA then forwards reports to DOL. *There is no formal evaluation system. *The cight national sponsors and programs are dev		•At the state level, the allocation is of job alots and not funds. Each county is given a percentage of the available slots based on relative share of the over 55 population. Each county is awarded at least one slot.		
-Annually, one out of five enrollees is expected to find employment outside of SCSEPSCSEP (STEP) enrollees cannot displace regular employees or fill open job descriptions. Program Management - Planning - For planning at the state level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for slots in each county in the state At the local level, the number of slots for each county is determined by formula based on the distribution of the 55 and over population. Area Agencies on Aging allocate job slots within counties, otherwise there is no planning. Once responsibility is established, the sponsoring agencies recruit local host agencies seeking a balance between service to the general community and the aging community. There is no board or citizens committee exercising oversight or participating in planning. - Evaluation - The STEP program has two quantified objectives for 1991: - 1) to curoll 86 older Texas in authorized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and - There is no formal evaluation system. - Management - Information - System - Intake, - Eligibility - Determination - Assessment - The STEP program coordinates the development of programs and the filling of eligible slots through the Area Agencies on Aging - (AAA). Once local sponsors and programs are developed, the mass media, including public service announcements, are used to advertise employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of slots through local Texas Employment Commission offices when available. Selection of trainces is accomplished through a personal interview process. STEP state firm embers, area supervisor or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal history and job preference. The applicant also must complete a general physical examination. Through personal interview, trainee applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community service job ava	Constraints	•There is a 13.5% cap on administrative costs. •At least 75% of total funding must be expended for enrollee salaries and benefits. •There is limited flexibility for reallocating resources due to the unlimited time participants may remain in the program. Some		
Program Management Planning Planning Program Management Program Manage		-Annually, one out of five enrollees is expected to find employment outside of SCSEP.		
For planning at the state level, the nine sponsors meet every two years to divide responsibility for alots in each county in the state At the local level, the number of slots for each county is determined by formula based on the distribution of the 55 and over population. Area Agencies on Aging allocate job slots within counties, otherwise there is no planning. Once responsibility is established, the sponsoring agencies recruit local host agencies seeking a balance between service to the general community and the aging community. There is no board or citizens committee exercising oversight or participating in planning. *The STEP program has two quantified objectives for 1991: 1) to carroll 86 older Texans in authorized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 errolless in unsubsidized jobs outside the STEP program. *There is no formal evaluation system. *The cight national sponsors each have their own reporting and information systems. The state SCSEP contractor has a computerized system linking it to its 5 field offices and to TDOA. Reporting to the DOL is done manually. STEP prepares report and sends them to TDOA for evaluation and acceptance. TDOA then forwards reports to DOL. *The STEP program coordinates the development of programs and the filling of eligible alots through the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA). Once local sponsors and programs are developed, the mass media, including public service announcements, are used to advertise employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of alots through local Texas Employment Commission offices where available. Selection of traines is accomplished through a personal interview, traine applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community service job available. Trainees who lack basic skills or require assistance in reinforcing past skills are offered training courses through educational, vocational or tra	Program Management	Conta (C. 12) And the desired and the service of th		
1) to curoll 86 older Texans in authorized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 enrollees in unsubsidized jobs outside the STEP program. *There is no formal evaluation system. *There is no formal evaluation system. *The eight national sponsors each have their own reporting and information systems. The state SCSEP contractor has a computerized system linking it to its 5 field offices and to TDOA. Reporting to the DOL is done manually. STEP prepares report and sends them to TDOA for evaluation and acceptance. TDOA then forwards reports to DOL. Service Delivery System *Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment *The STEP program coordinates the development of programs and the filling of eligible slots through the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA). Once local sponsors and programs are developed, the mass media, including public service announcements, are used to advertise employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of slots through local Texas Employment Commission offices where available. Selection of trainees is accomplished through a personal interview process. STEP staff members, area supervison or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal history and job preference. The applicant also must complete a general physical examination. Through personal interviews, trainee applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community service job available. Trainees who lack basic skills or require assistance in reinforcing past skills are offered training courses through educational, vocational or trade schools. *Personal evaluations and worksite reviews as a part of on-site monitoring are done at least three times a year. These monitoring reports by the STEP field representatives contain observations and personal assessments on each trainee. *Not used. *There are eight national contractors to DOL independently opera	_	population. Area Agencies on Aging allocate job slots within counties, otherwise there is no planning. Once responsibility is established, the sponsoring agencies recruit local host agencies seeking a balance between service to the general community and the aging community. There is no board or citizens committee exercising oversight or participating in planning.		
Information System Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment Assessment Assessment Computerized system linking it to its 5 field offices and to TDOA. Reporting to the DOL is done manually. STEP prepares report and sends them to TDOA for evaluation and acceptance. TDOA then forwards reports to DOL. The STEP program coordinates the development of programs and the filling of eligible slots through the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA). Once local sponsors and programs are developed, the mass media, including public service announcements, are used to advertise employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of slots through local Texas Employment Commission offices where available. Selection of trainees is accomplished through a personal interview process. STEP staff members, area supervison or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal history and job preference. The applicant also must complete a general physical examination. Through personal interviews, trainee applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community service job available. Trainees who lack basic skills or require assistance in reinforcing past skills are offered training courses through educational, vocational or trade schools. Personal evaluations and worksite reviews as a part of on-site monitoring are done at least three times a year. These monitoring reports by the STEP field representatives contain observations and personal assessments on each trainee. *Not used. There are eight national contractors to DOL independently operating older worker employment programs in Texas. These contractors are managing about 75% of the funds that would otherwise be available.	• Evaluation	1) to enroll 86 older Texans in authorized Senior Community Service Employment Program positions, and 2) to place 139 enrollees in unsubsidized jobs outside the STEP program.		
• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment Assessment Assessment Case Management • The STEP program coordinates the development of programs and the filling of eligible slots through the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA). Once local sponsors and programs are developed, the mass media, including public service announcements, are used to advertise employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of slots through local Texas Employment Commission offices where available. Selection of trainees is accomplished through a personal interview process. STEP staff members, area supervisor or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal interview process. STEP staff members, area supervisor or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal history and job preference. The applicant also must complete a general physical examination. Through personal interviews, trainee applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community service job available. Trainees who lack basic skills or require assistance in reinforcing past skills are offered training courses through educational, vocational or trade schools. •Personal evaluations and worksite reviews as a part of on-site monitoring are done at least three times a year. These monitoring reports by the STEP field representatives contain observations and personal assessments on each trainee. •Not used. *There are eight national contractors to DOL independently operating older worker employment programs in Texas. These contractors are managing about 75% of the funds that would otherwise be available.	Information System	computerized system linking it to its 5 field offices and to TDOA. Reporting to the DOL is done manually. STEP prepares reports		
Eligibility Determination and devening employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of slots through local Texas Employment Commission offices where available. Selection of trainees is accomplished through a personal interview process. STEP staff members, are supervison or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal interview process. STEP staff members, are supervison or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal history and job preference. The applicant also must complete a general physical examination. Through personal interviews, trainee applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community service job available. Trainees who lack basic skills or require assistance in reinforcing past skills are offered training courses through educational, vocational or trade schools. Personal evaluations and worksite reviews as a part of on-site monitoring are done at least three times a year. These monitoring reports by the STEP field representatives contain observations and personal assessments on each trainee. Not used. State-Level Barrlers There are eight national contractors to DOL independently operating older worker employment programs in Texas. These contractors are managing about 75% of the funds that would otherwise be available.		The STEP program coordinates the development of programs and the filling of eligible slots through the Area Agencies on Aging		
through educational, vocational or trade schools. -Personal evaluations and worksite reviews as a part of on-site monitoring are done at least three times a year. These monitoring reports by the STEP field representatives contain observations and personal assessments on each trainee. -Not used. State-Level Barriers -There are eight national contractors to DOL independently operating older worker employment programs in Texas. These contractors are managing about 75% of the funds that would otherwise be available.	Eligibility Determination and	(AAA). Once local sponsors and programs are developed, the mass media, including public service announcements, are used to adventise employment opportunities. STEP coordinates availability of slots through local Texas Employment Commission offices where available. Selection of trainees is accomplished through a personal interview process. STEP staff members, area supervisors or local project sponsors interview all applicants to verify income, personal instory and job preference. The applicant also must complete a general physical examination. Through personal interviews, trainee applications and medical examinations, STEP attempts to identify the interests, skills and capabilities of each applicant to determine the most suitable part-time community		
State-Level Barriers •There are eight national contractors to DOL independently operating older worker employment programs in Texas. These contractors are managing about 75% of the funds that would otherwise be available.		through educational, vocational or trade schools. Personal evaluations and worksite reviews as a part of on-site monitoring are done at least three times a year. These monitoring reports by the STEP field representatives contain observations and personal assessments on each trainee.		
	State-Level Barriers			

Program/Funding Source	FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING SERVICES (FS E&T)		
Purpose	•To assist members of households partici	FOOD STAMP ACT AND STATE FUNDIN pating in the food stamp program in gaining al	tills, training, or experience that will
Legislative	increase their ability to obtain regular employment. •FEDERAL: Food Stamp Act of 1977 as amended.		
Authority	•STATE: None		
Goals	To assist food stamp recipients to become employed and self-supporting through participation in employment, education and/or vocational training activities. Maximize the number of eligible individuals receiving services.		
Target Population	•Members of households who are receiving	g food stamps and are not receiving public assi	stance.
Participant Eligibility	FOOD STAMP ELIGIBILITY		
	•AGE: All non-exempt persons age 16 through 59 not employed fulltime must participate in employment services (be a work registrant) prior to a determination of eligibility (there are reasonable exemptions).	-INCOME: Except for households with an elderly or disabled member and households in which all members are approved for AFDC or SSI, households cannot have more than \$2000 in resources with certain exemptions and must meet both a monthly gross and net income test (e.g. family of four, gross = \$1376, net = \$1059 per month).	U.S. CITIZENSHIP: Citizen or eligible alien.
	-an individual may be exempt from w physically or mentally unfit for emple for a child under 6, applying for unem attending school or training on at leas -some work registrants may have indi transportation, remoteness and child c -must reside in one of the 56 FS E&.	vidual exemptions from FS E&T participation are barriers or by being a migrant in the work I counties	ling; under 16 over 59, of AFDC, caring incapacitated household member, or for medical, language, stream.
	self-refer to service providers are cour	program at this time because of insufficient fun- nted as participants but their costs are not cover	aing (volunteers who ed by FS E&T.
Participant Services	FS E&T (one or more) directed job search job search training work experience vocational training refugee services	—educational services including literacy basic skills high school equivalency	*Support services includingtransportation (cash up to \$25 a month)child care (up to \$160/month/child)
Administrative Structure			
Federal State	•US Department of Agriculture •Texas Department of Human Services		
• Local	•Through two state contracts, DHS contra	cts the local administration and service delivers and the Texas Association of Private Industry	y for the FS E&T program to the Texas Councils for 3 counties.
Program Funding Program Year Amount/Service Level Federal/State State/Local Constraints	FY 1991. *Matching rate is 50% for all funds expensions registrants. *Prior to FFY 1992, federal funds were all relative share of number of individuals which established a new formula based on formula change is to be phased in over a to There is no eap on the funds available on "The Federal government provides a basic Funds are used to contract with the Texas 53 counties and to the Texas Asociation of	deral funds, \$3,146,075 state funds). Approxir ded above the basic grant level. Future changes located by formula to states; 80% on relative sh to participate in program components or receive the number of mandatory work registrants rath wo year period with Texas expected to gain \$1	s have basic grant funds by relative share of sare of all food stamp recipients, 20% on a notice of adverse action. Legislation her than food stamp recipients only. The .5 million annually in basic grant funds. In the same state of the matched dollar for dollar, or administration and service delivery in these. Contracts for services are based on the
Program Management Planning Evaluation Management Information System	October 1, start-up. There is no public pa •One process measure is in use now; to plaction for non-participation. Measures rel •The SAVERR system is used to store all	of operation is completed by DHS staff and sub- inticipation or review. ace 50% of the mandatory participants in programate to employment and educational gain are li- application and demographic information. Tap- program enrollment, participation and non-com-	am components or give notice of adverse kely to be used at that time. e matches from TEC and the ITPA program
Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment Case Management State-Level Barriers	outreaches and refers FS E&T eligibles to counties for job search services (job search Private Industry Councils (TAPIC) is und Alamo, Rural Coastal Bend and Rural Caprimary contractor, TAPIC also provides An assessment is conducted by the contraeducation services or to directed job searc the number of participants.	ctors to determine whether the participant will h or job search training. In-depth assessment of gram. Contractors are required to contact partic	ssion (TEC) in 53 of the 56 FS E&T three counties, the Texas Association of hree JTPA service delivery areas (SDA); bbock and McLennan) in which TEC is the be referred to community training and or testing is not feasible at this time due to
to Program Integration	January of the state of the sta		

Program/Funding	POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES — PERKINS II-B, SUBPART 1		
	(The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board uses the word technical to denote vocational and technical.)		
Purpose	•To make the US more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of all segments of the population. Title II-B, Subpart 1 provides federal assistance for programs that provide single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women with marketable skills. •NOTE: Subpart 1 also provides for programs that promote the elimination of sex bias. However, sex equity programs are not addressed in this profile.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990. •STATE: None. NOTE: Effective date of the Act is July 1, 1991. Federal rules and regulations governing the Perkins Amendments and the State		
Goals	Plan are not yet available. As such, sections of this profile may be affected when they are released. To improve educational programs leading to academic and occupational skill competencies needed to work in a technologically advanced society.		
Target Population	Single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women.		
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: No. •INCOME: No •U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No		
Participant Services	*Career guidance and counseling *Preparatory (basic academic and *Occupational *Job placement activities *Transportation		
Administrative Structure Federal State	•U.S. Department of Education. -Interdepartmental Task Force (Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services) is responsible for examining data requirements, possible common objectives, definitions, measures and standards for programs under Perkins, Adult Education Act, ITPA, Rehabilitation Act and Wagner-Peyser Act; and considering integration of research and development conducted with federal assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. -State Board of Education (SBOE), the Joint Advisory Committee, and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The SBOE is the sole state agency and is responsible for setting statewide education policy. The Joint Advisory Committee consisting of three members of the SBOE, three members of THECB, one member of the Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE) and an ex officio representative from the Texas Department of Commerce, makes recommendations to the SBOE. THECB is the administrative agency with its own Board for postsecondary education planning and policy. At least one full-time position must be designated at the state-level as the Sex Equity Coordinator. Position has historically been placed at the Texas Education Agency (TEA).		
• Local	The Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE), previously known as the Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education, is a separate state agency funded by both the state and federal government. TCOVE's duties include involvement in the planning process from the beginning as well as making recommendations concerning the state plan to the SBOE and conducting an evaluation of vocational education programs and efforts at least once every two years, among others. -Local institutions that can operate programs of sufficient size, scope and quality to be effective are eligible to submit proposals. The Act also allows proposals to be submitted by qualified, community-based organizationsIn PY 1990, these monies were allocated as part of the basic grant formula to 49 community college districts, the four campuses of Texas State Technical College (TSTC), Texas A&M Engineering Extension, and the Lamar University System (selected campuses of effering associate degrees in applied science).		
Program Funding Program Year Amount/Service Level Federal/State	•July 1 - June 30. •PY 1992, \$4.5 million (estimate) for both secondary and postsecondary programs. Approximately \$1.8 million will be distributed to postsecondary programs. •Formula allocation (relevant share) of Title II funds to the state is as follows: 50 percent based on the ratio of the number of Texans aged 15-19 to the number of such persons in all States; 20 percent, aged 20-24; 15 percent, aged 25-65; and 15 percent, aged 15-65. This allotment is them adjusted by a per capita income ratio that enables poorer states to receive increased allotments. •At least 10.5 percent of the within state Title II allocation must be used for programs under Part B. Subpart 1. Of this amount, 7 percent must be used for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women and 3 percent for sex equity. The remaining .5 percent may be used for either program. At least \$60,000 of the 5 percent of Title II that is used for state		
State/Local Constraints	administration must be used to support the functions of the state-level Sex Equity Coordinator. -Federal funds are received by the SBOE. Distribution of federal funds between secondary and postsecondary is developed collaboratively by staff of TEA and the THECB for review by the Joint Advisory Committee and recommendation to the SBOE. -Monies will be allocated to institutions on a competitive basis. (Further details were not yet developed. In the past, these monies were distributed as part of the basic formula allocation.) -Funds reserved for Title II-B activities must be maintained at no less than their 1990 level unless Title II funds as a whole are reduced when compared to the 1990 allocation.		
Program Management Planning Evaluation Management	*In cooperation with the SBOE, THECB will develop a plan to address the needs of postsecondary students. *TCOVE must conduct an evaluation of programs funded with Perkins monies at least once every two years on 1) extent to which vocational education, employment and training programs represent a consistent, integrated and coordinated approach to meeting economic needs of the state, 2) adequacy and effectiveness of the vocational education and job training program delivery systems in achieving their purposes, and 3) the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination between vocational education and JTPA. Data collection is coordinated by THECB's Information Services Division, Educational Data Center. State data requirements,		
Information System	addressed in Reporting and Procedures Manual for Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes, include student data, TASP, class enrollment, faculty data and graduation statistics. Efforts to develop standardized definitions for data elements are currently underway.		
Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment	•Anticipated that it will vary by grant recipient but THECB is waiting on the issuance of Federal rules and regulations.		
Case Management	•Not used.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	None identified at this level of analysis.		

Program/Funding	POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION		
Source	COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES — STATE FUNDING (The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board uses the word technical to denote vocational and technical.)		
Purpose	To provide partial state support for postsecondary technical education.		
Legislative Authority	FEDERAL: None. STATE: Texas Education Code. Sections 130.0011, Public Junior Colleges, Role and Mission; 130.003, State Appropriation for Public Junior Colleges; 135.01 Texas State Technical Institute, Role and Mission; and 61.051, Coordination of Institutions of Public Higher Education. NOTE: Numerous aspects of postsecondary technical education are addressed in other sections of the Code.		
Goals	•Economic and occupational competence for all Texas adults.		
Target Population	-All those who seek and qualify for admission.		
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: No. •U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No. •OTHER: Students must qualify for admission, varies by program.		
Participant Services	Counseling and assessment Job placement activities A Technical education program areas Remediation with 3400 degree and certificate programs		
Administrative Structure			
• Federal • State	•None. •An 18-member board and the staff of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The Board is responsible for setting statewide postsecondary education policy and THECB is the administrative agency. The Community and Technical Colleges Division of the THECB is responsible for approving all associate degree programs, inclusive of those offered by senior and proprietary institutions. •The Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE), previously known as the Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education, is a separate state agency funded by both the state and federal government.		
• Local	Community and technical colleges and other postsecondary institutions that have approved technical education programs. In PY 1990, 49 community college districts, the four campuses of Texas State Technical College (TSTC), Texas A&M Engineering Extension, and the Lamar University System (selected campuses offering associate degrees in applied science) operated programs. Postsecondary institutions are governed by local boards of trustees elected by voters within the district or by a board of regents appointed by the governor.		
Program Funding			
Program Year Amount/Service Level	September 1 - August 31. PY 1990, approximately \$248 million. PY 1990, 233,335 enrolled in degree or certificate programs and 134,077 in adult technical credit/non-credit courses (number served from all combined sources of federal, state and local resources).		
Federal/State State/Local	•None •None •State support is provided by biennial appropriations based on a formula developed by the THECB. In the fall of each odd-numbered year, an analysis is made of expenditures for eight elements of cost for the most recently completed fiscal year. The biennial analysis calculates a statewide median cost per contact hour for each of the 39 program areas that is used to determine the recommended formula rates. Local institutions are required to use the designated formulas in preparing their appropriations requests. Although the actual appropriation may be less than the recommended amount, subsequent allocations are still keyed to the formula.		
Constraints	State funds cannot be used to maintain and operate the physical plants of community colleges.		
Program Management Planning Evaluation	The Career Opportunities in Texas: A Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education sets forth qualitative objectives for the forthcoming school year and long-term goals for the following five years that have been approved by the THECB. Priorities for local, regional (state planning regions) and statewide services are addressed. The Master Plan is annually updated and serves as the blueprint for restructuring technical education in Texas. Progress and compliance with the Master Plan is reported biennially to the legislature, the governor and TCOVE. *Twenty-four regional Quality Work Force Planning Committees assist in identifying programs that prepare students for occupations in demand and with wages significantly above minimum wages. Initiated by a tri-agency partnership between the Texas Department of Commerce, the Texas Education Agency and THECB and administered by TEA, committee membership includes educators, employers and representatives from the public sector. The regional boundaries are coterminous with the state planning regions. *An annual plan for state funding from each institution is not required *Quantifiable, statewide objectives for all postsecondary technical education will be developed as part of the PY 1992 planning process for federal funds. The statewide system of measures and standards developed for the Perkins Act will eventually be applied throughout the postsecondary technical education system. *Each technical education program is approved by the THECB and reviewed at least once every five years. A recommendation to		
 Management Information System 	continue, continue with revision, deactivate or sunset review. A sunset review requires a second, more extensive review to determine to continue or close the program. -Every ten years, postsecondary institutions undergo an accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As of 1985, this process has placed an increased emphasis on institutional effectiveness, particularly the evaluation of educational results or outcomes. However, no prescribed format or standards exist. Data collection is coordinated by THECB's Information Services Division, Educational Data Center. State data requirements, addressed in Reporting and Procedures Manual for Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes, include student data, TASP, class enrollment, faculty data and graduation statistics. Efforts to develop standardized definitions for data elements are currently underway.		
Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment Case	*Admission process varies by campus. *Prior to completing nine hours of college-level course work, new students must take and pass the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP). Students who do not pass TASP are placed in remediation to help them develop the reading, writing or math skills they need to do postsecondary course work. *Not used.		
Management			
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	Punds are line appropriations for the community and technical colleges. Highly decentralized decision-making system.		

Program/Funding Source	SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERKINS ILC		
Purpose	PERKINS, II-C To make the US more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of all segments of the population. Title II-C provides federal assistance for secondary, postsecondary and adult vocational education programs within the state.		
Legislative Authority	*FEDERAL: Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990. STATE: None. NOTE: Effective date of the Act is July 1, 1991. Federal rules and regulations governing the Perkins Amendments and the State		
Goals	Plan are not yet available. As such, sections of this profile may be affected when they are released. *To improve educational programs leading to academic and occupational skill competencies needed to work in a technologically		
Target Population	advanced society. •Emphasizes services and equal access for	special populations such as th	he handicapped, educationally or economically disadvantaged
Participant Eligibility	inclusive of foster children, those not pro- correctional institutions. •AGE: No. (Age and/or grade	eINCOME: No.	iss, those of limited English proficiency, and individuals in • U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
randpas enginency	restrictions apply to specific vocational courses offered by the state.) •OTHER: Emphasis is on inclusion of sp		•U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Remediation	Vocational education Tech-Prep education Apprenticeship	 Supplementary services meeting the needs of special populations(e.g., equipment modification, instructional aids/devices)
Administrative Structure • Federal	*U.S. Department of Education. *Interdepartmental Task Force (Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services) is responsible for examining data requirements, possible common objectives, definitions, measures and standards for programs under Perkins, Adult Education Act, JTPA, Rehabilitation Act and Wagner-Peysez Act; and considering integration of research and development conducted with federal		
• State	assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. «Central Education Agency which is comprised of the State Board of Education (SBOE) and Texas Education Agency (TEA). The SBOE is responsible for setting policy and TEA is the administrative agency. «The Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE), previously known as the Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education, is a separate state agency funded by both the state and federal government. TCOVE's duties include involvement in the planning process from the beginning as well as making recommendations concerning the state plan to the SBOE and conducting an evaluation of vocational education programs and efforts at least once every two years, among others.		
• Local	-Local school districts that have approved programs. School districts are classified into categories by their governance structure and their ability to raise local revenue. The vast majority of districts have locally elected governance boards. A limited number of districts are governed by the county commissioners court or the city council. -Each school district must also have a districtwide local advisory council for providing insight on current job needs and the relevance of programs/courses offered. -In PY 1990, 950 of 1,068 school districts operated vocational education programs with state and federal funding.		
Program Funding Program Year	•July 1 - June 30.		
Amount/Service Level	•PY 1992, \$47 million (estimate) for both to secondary programs.	secondary and postsecondar	ry programs. Approximately \$28.2 million will be distributed
• Federal/State	•Formula allocation (relevant share) of Ti aged 15-19 to the number of such persons	s in all States; 20 percent, age capita income ratio that enable	ollows: 50 percent based on the ratio of the number of Texans d 20-24; 15 percent, aged 25-65; and 15 percent, aged 15-65. es poorer states to receive increased allotments. for basic programs under Part C.
• State/Local	•Federal funds are received by the SBOE. collaboratively by staff of TEA and the Ti (includes three members of the SBOE, the representative from the Texas Department	Distribution of federal funds least Higher Education Coordines members of the Coordinate of Commerce) and recomme	between secondary and postsecondary is developed linating Board for review by the Joint Advisory Committee ing Board, a member of TCOVE and an ex officio endation to the SBOE.
	formula: 70 percent based on Chapter 1 fu individualized education programs, and 10 programs. Entitlements that are not appli	ands received, 20 percent base 0 percent based on the number ed for by eligible recipients w	education programs based on the following relative share and on the number of students with handicaps who have a rof students enrolled in school and adults enrolled in training will be reallocated to other eligibles evidencing the greatest
 Constraints 	of students from special populations.	given to a limited number of	sites or program areas which serve the highest concentrations granted by the state. Local administrative costs are limited to
Program Management Planning	developing the plan, the state must condu responsiveness of programs to unique nee	lan followed by a two-year pl ct an assessment of the qualit ds of the special populations,	lan for federal vocational education funding. Prior to ty of its vocational education programs, measure the and describe how the planned use of funds reflects the is to assess program quality. Whereas in the past this plan
- Evaluation	was primarily a compliance document, it -Each school district must submit an annu -Quantifiable, statewide objectives will be -State must establish a Committee of Pra- statewide system of core standards and m	is now viewed by DOE as a usl application (a single one for a developed as part of the PY citioners to make recomment easures of performance. Syst	planning tool. or both state and federal funds).
	and procedures for utilizing resources and *The effectiveness of programs must be ex- not make substantial progress in meeting input from teachers, parents and students. made, the state will work jointly with the *TCOVE must conduct an evaluation at le training programs represent a consistent, is effectiveness of the vocational education a	methods developed in other fe- valuated annually using the co- the standards and measure in. If after one year of impleme school, teachers, parents and least once every two years on I integrated and coordinated app- and job training program delivers.	ederally-assisted programs (ITPA and JOBS), are standards and measures of performance. Programs that do the first must develop a plan for program improvement with enting the local improvement plan sufficient progress is not laudents. 1) extent to which vocational education, employment and meach to meeting economic needs of the state, 2) adequacy and very systems in achieving their purposes, and 3) the adequacy
Management Information System	(PEIMS). PEIMS is an automated, central	nt data are collected as part of lized data collection system w	A. the Public Education Information Management System ithe Public Education Information Management System ith individual-level data and statewide, standardized anner in which data are sent to the state varies by school
Service Delivery System • Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management	must outreach and provide special populat opportunities prior to the student's entry is interests, abilities and special needs. Stud is maintained for students enrolled in grad "Varies by school district and student need individualized help, are one example. *As part of the vocational guidance and co	tion students and their parents into ninth grade at the latest. Sents are reassessed by evidences 11 and 12. s. Support Centers, where har sunseling program, school dist	ensibility of the local school district. Each local school district with information on vocational education programs and Students receive an individual assessment of their vocational cing mastery of the essential elements. A competency profile adicapped and disadvantaged students can receive tricts are encouraged to provide the following: individual in which matches the individual inventory; guidance and

Program/Funding Source	SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERKINS, II-B, SUBPART 1		
Purpose	*To make the US more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of all segments of the population. Title II-B, Subpart 1 provides federal assistance for programs that provide single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women with marketable skills. *NOTE: Subpart 1 also provides for programs that promote the elimination of sex bias. However, sex equity programs are not addressed in this profile.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 as amended by Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990. •STATE: None. NOTE: Effective date of the Act is July 1, 1991. Federal rules and regulations governing the Perkins Amendments and the State Plan are not yet available. As such, sections of this profile may be affected when they are released.		
Goals	 To improve educational programs leading to academic and occupadvanced society. 		
Target Population Participant Eligibility	Single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant wome AGE: No. (Age and/or grade INCOME: No. restrictions apply to specific vocational courses offered by the state.)	eu. S. CITIZENSHIP: No.	
Participant Services	*Career guidance and counseling *Preparatory (basic academic and occupational) *Occupational *Parenting classes*	Educational materials Dependent care Transportation	
Administrative Structure • Federal	*U.S. Department of Education. *Interdepartmental Task Force (Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services) is responsible for examining data requirements, possible common objectives, definitions, measures and standards for programs under Perkins, Adult Education Act, JTPA, Rehabilitation Act and Wagner-Peyser Act; and considering integration of research and development conducted with federal		
· State	assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. -Central Education Agency which is comprised of the State Board of Education (SBOE) and Texas Education Agency (TEA). The SBOE is responsible for setting policy and TEA is the administrative agency. At least one full-time position must be designated at the state-level as the Sex Equity Coordinator. -The Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE), previously known as the Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education, is a separate state agency funded by both the state and federal government. TCOVE's duties include involvement in the planning process from the beginning as well as making recommendations concerning the state plan to the SBOE and conducting an evaluation of vocational education programs and efforts at least once every two years, among others. -Local school districts that can operate programs of sufficient size, scope and quality to be effective are eligible. Each participating school district must have a teacher/coordinator assigned to the project. The Act also allows proposals to be submitted by qualified, community-based organizations. -Each participating school district must also have a local advisory council that includes representation from TEC, local community college, DHS, TTPA, and TDH, among others.		
• Local			
Program Funding	-In PY 1990, 76 school districts received funding.		
 Program Year Amount/Service 	-July 1 - June 30PY 1992, \$4.5 million (estimate) for both secondary and postsec	ondary programs. Approximately \$2.7 million will be distributed	
Level • Federal/State	to secondary programs. Formula allocation (relevant share) of Title II funds to the state is as follows: 50 percent based on the ratio of the number of Texans aged 15-19 to the number of such persons in all States; 20 percent, aged 20-24; 15 percent, aged 25-65; and 15 percent, aged 15-65. This allotment is them adjusted by a per capita income ratio that enables poorer states to receive increased allotments. At least 10.5 percent of the within state Title II allocation must be used for programs under Part B, Subpart 1. Of this amount, 7 percent must be used for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women and 3 percent for sex equity. The remaining .5 percent may be used for either program. At least \$60,000 of the 5 percent of Title II that is used for state administration must be used to support the functions of the state-level Sex Equity Coordinator. Federal funds are received by the SBOE. Distribution of federal funds between secondary and postsecondary is developed collaboratively by staff of TEA and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for review by the Joint Advisory Committee (includes three members of the SBOE, three members of the Coordinating Board, a member of TCOVE and an ex officio representative from the Texas Department of Commerce) and recommendation to the SBOE. Monies are allocated to school districts on a competitive basis. Competition for projects is divided into two categories: small or		
• State/Local			
· Constraints	rural school districts of less than 5,000 students eligible for awards of up to \$25,000; and medium and large school districts of 5,000 or more students eligible for awards of up to \$50,000. -Funds reserved for Title II-B activities must be maintained at no less than their 1990 level unless Title II funds as a whole are reduced when compared to the 1990 allocation.		
Program Management Planning Evaluation	•The Sex Equity Coordinator is responsible for developing an annual plan for approval by the SBOE. •There are no statewide, quantifiable objectives. Each project is individually assessed and an evaluation component will probably be part of future projects. The Sex Equity Coordinator is responsible for developing procedures and for evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of programs. Past reports have included data on numbers served, services delivered and final outcomes. •TCOVE must conduct an evaluation of programs funded with Perkins monies at least once every two years on 1) extent to which vocational education, employment and training programs represent a consistent, integrated and coordinated approach to meeting		
 Management Information System 	economic needs of the state, 2) adequacy and effectiveness of the achieving their purposes, and 3) the adequacy and effectiveness of Secondary vocational education enrollment data are collected as p (PEIMS). PEIMS is an automated, centralized data collection syst definitions. Though operational, PEIMS is still being refined. The district. Additional data that are collected on each project (independent of loutcomes. The process is similar to the Data Collection Kit used	coordination between vocational education and JTPA. sart of the Public Education Information Management System em with individual-level data and statewide, standardized he manner in which data are sent to the state varies by school PEIMS) include numbers served, services delivered and final	
Service Delivery System • Intake, Eligibility Determination and	Identification of students and determination of eligibility are the responsibility of the local school district. An Individualized Education and Career Planning Record is maintained on each student and updated at least once a semester.		
Assessment Case Management	•Yes. The teacher/coordinator serves as the case manager.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	None identified at this level of analysis.		

Program/Funding Source	ADULT EDUCATION ADULT EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III-B AND STATE FUNDING		
Source Purpose	ADULT EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III-B AND STATE PUNDING To improve educational opportunities for adults; to provide the educational prerequisites for effective living, gainful employment		
<u> </u>	and citizenship; to expand and improve the current delivery system; and to encourage establishment of adult education programs.		
Legisiative Authority	FEDERAL: Adult Education Act of 1966 as amended in 1988 (Title III, Part B-Basic State Grant). STATE: Texas Education Code, Chapter 11, Section 11.18, Adult Education.		
Goals	•To eliminate illiteracy and enable adults to acquire basic educational skills and/or complete a secondary education.		
Target Population	 Adults, 17 and older, who lack sufficient mastery of basic educational skills or who have not graduated from secondary school. Operationally, highest priority given to adults functioning below the ninth grade level. 		
	FEDERAL: At least 10 percent of basic grant is carmarked for corrections education and other institutionalized adults. STATE: At least one million dollars annually for FY 1990 and 1991 must be used to expand education and training services to AFDC recipients in accordance with the Family Support Act of 1988.		
Participant Eligibility	*AGE: ≥17. *U.S. CTTIZENSHIP: No. *U.S. CTTIZENSHIP: No. *OTHER: Educational Status, officially withdrawn from school; Educational Level, functioning below the 12th grade level.		
Participant Services	Counseling and assessment Basic education English language Secondary education Life coping skills		
Administrative Structure			
Federal State Local	*U.S. Department of Education. *Central Education Agency which is comprised of the State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Texas does not have a State Advisory Council on adult education for the purposes of the Adult Education Act that is supported by federal funds and appointed by the Governor. SBOE rules designate the Texas Council on Vocational Education (TCOVE) as the committee authorized by the Texas Education Code for advising the SBOE on needs, priorities and standards for adult education. *Adult education cooperatives (currently 61) which are comprised of public school districts, public colleges and universities, and		
, poca.	regional education service centers. Each cooperative has a locally selected fiscal agent that serves as the contracting agency and manages the federal, state, county and local adult educational resources. The fiscal agent is selected by a coordinating committee made up of representatives of the member education agencies. The coordinating committee is also responsible for developing the program plan and application, making recommendations to the fiscal agent concerning program implementation, and monitoring the activities of the cooperative. A local community advisory committee with representatives from the public and private sector also participates in the planning, delivery and evaluation of services. Decisions as to the breadth and depth of services offered as well as geographic areas served are locally-driven by needs evidenced in the community and resource availability. The cooperatives are responsible for coordination with other agencies and organizations within their service areas that can provide support services, thereby leveraging local resources in terms of volunteer time, facilities and services. Roughly 90 percent of the paid instructional staff are part-time.		
Program Funding • Program Year	-July 1 - June 30. Converting to a September-to-August cycle for state funds in PY 1990 and maintaining a July to June cycle for federal funds.		
Amount/Service Level	•PY 1990, \$16,825,032 and 220, 027 individuals served.		
• Federal/State	•Formula allocation (relevant share) to the state is based on the ratio of the number of Texas adults beyond compulsory school age without high school diplomas or equivalent certificates to the number of such adults in all States. State must submit an application and a four-year plan.		
• State/Local	•After funds have been set aside for state administration and state- and federally-required uses such as discretionary monies for teacher training and special projects, the remainder of state and federal funds are allocated to fiscal agents based on school district boundaries and rules adopted by the SBOE in October 1986 — 75 percent of the funds available for local programs are allocated on the basis of		
 Constraints 	student contact hours evidenced in the previous fiscal year and 25 percent are allocated on the basis of the number of eligible adults residing in the service delivery area as reported by the Census. Each fiscal agent must submit an annual application and a three-year plan. Distribution of allocations made to each school district within the cooperative are in accordance with local cooperative policic approved by participating schools. Each cooperative must expend at least 10 percent of its federal allocation for corrections education and other institutionalized adults. •FEDERAL: At least 10 percent of basic grant for corrections education/other institutionalized adults; at least 10 percent for teacher		
· Constraints	training and special projects; no more than 20 percent for secondary level services, grades 9-12; no more than 5 percent or \$50,000, whichever is greater, for state administrative costs; and 15 percent (cash) match required in 1990, will increase to 20 percent in 1991 and 25 percent in 1992 and subsequent years. -STATE: Not less than two million dollars annually in FY 1992 and 1993 must be used to expand education and training services to AFDC recipients by entering into contracts or arrangements with the Texas Department of Human Services in accordance with the Family Support Act of 1988.		
Program Management			
• Planning	-Statewide goals are developed by TEA and approved by the SBOE. Three plans affect adult education: the Long-Range Plan for Texas Public School Education (five-year plan), the Plan for Adult and Community Education (four-year plan) and the Texas State Plan for Federal Adult Education Funding (four-year plan). The first two are state documents and the third is a compliance document for federal funds. Each cooperative's coordinating and community advisory committees develop local goals that complement and address the state goals. These are submitted in an annual application (Standard Application System, SAS) and a three-year plan. Services provided by cooperatives reflect local area needs and the resource capacity of the cooperative.		
 Evaluation 	*Objective of adult education at the state level is to serve an estimated minimum of 140,000 adults in adult basic education and 80,000 in adult secondary education annually during 1990 to 1993. Other statewide, program performance measures for PY 1990-1993 include: percent of secondary level students obtaining GED or diploma (30-33 percent); cumulative percent of LEP students completing one ESL instructional level (82-85 percent); percent of basic level students completing that level (39-42 percent); and the state average number of contact hours per student (46.8-55). The Annual Performance Report is used statewide to collect data on the number of students served, their demographics, number of contact hours, student accomplishments and descriptions of progress made toward accomplishing goals. On-site compliance monitoring is conducted every three years and every four years at least one-third of the cooperatives are evaluated in terms of planning, program content, curriculum, instructional materials, equipment, personnel qualifications, and effect on subsequent work		
	experience of graduates. Each cooperative must also conduct student evaluations and obtain at least a 10 percent response rate. -Cooperative performance is evaluated in terms of actual versus planned. There are no statewide performance standards imposed on the local cooperatives. TEA is developing a statewide performance-based system of accountability. The system is envisioned as having two components: one for assessing learner outcomes and a second for assessing programs (The latter will function similar to an accreditation process.).		
Management Information System	*There is no centralized, automated data system containing individual, student-record data at the state level. Only aggregate data by cooperative is available. Data collection is responsive to federal requirements. There are no additional state requirements. For federal purposes, basic student information collected includes: sex, age, race/ethnicity by educational functioning level; and selected group characteristics such as status upon enrollment and achievements.		
Service Delivery System Intake, Eligibility Determination	*The intake, eligibility determination and assessment process is locally designed. As such, the process varies by cooperative. Technical assistance is provided by TEA. *Intake forms vary by cooperative. Enrollment is open provided there is room (i.e., first come first served). Determination of		
and Assessment	participant eligibility is informal, relying primarily on self-declaration. Adult education participants are predominantly voluntary walk-ins that exhibit a high degree of self-initiative. In some cooperatives, however, the level of referrals is increasing — primarily as a result of contractual relationships with private sector businesses and industries, JTPA PICs and service providers, and DHS programs serving AFDC clients. Though each cooperative designs its own assessment process, they are encouraged by TEA to develop a comprehensive package that meets the client's needs and the cooperative's capacity. Standardized testing, though used, is not promoted as a preliminary assessment tool. Instead, unobtrusive instruments such as oral interviews, completion of an enrollment form, or informal reading inventories are encouraged. The tendency is not to intimidate or inhibit the participant's motivation. Typically, at some point during or after the assessment process, a personalized study plan is prepared for each participant. There is no standardized format for the plan. The scope and content of each plan varies by cooperative and is often		
· Case	directly dependent on the administrative resources available. Not used.		

Program/Funding Source	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM PEHABILITATION ACT AND STATE HIDDING		
Purpose	REHABILITATION ACT AND STATE FUNDING •To help people with mental and physical disabilities prepare for and find competitive employment.		
Legislative	FEDERAL: Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended.		
Authority	*STATE:Section 111.051 Human Resource Code, Vernon's Texas Codes Annotated, Texas Senate Bill 110, 61st Legislature		
Goals	•To help people with mental and physical disabilities prepare for and find competitive employment.		
Target Population	Persons 16 and older who have a mental or physical disability and have the potential to be rehabilitated for employment. From this		
	population priority is given to clients with the most severe disabilities who have rehabilitation potential.		
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: 16 and older. •U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No. •OTHER: Must have mental or physical disability which constitutes a handicap to working and be legally able to work.		
	-An individuals ability to pay is considered for non-counseling services.		
Participant Services	Persons with visual disabilities are not served through this program. Counseling and Assessment Prosthetic devices Vocational adjustment training		
rarticipant Services	Diagnostic exams Occupational skills training Transportation		
	-Surgery and hospitalization -Supported work -Income support		
Administrative Structure			
 Federal 	•U.S. Department of Education		
• State	*Texas Rehabilitation Commission		
Local	•The Texas Rehabilitation Commission (TRC) has a network of six regional and 115 local offices that offer vocational rehabilitation		
Program Funding	la		
Program Year Amount/Service Level	•October 1 to September 30 (Federal Fiscal Year) •PY 1990, \$115,571,977 (federal \$89,492,300; state \$26,079,677) and 63,329 clients were served during FY 1990.		
• Federal/State	•Each state receives three separate formula allotments from two separate appropriations.		
	•From the basic Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services appropriation, each state receives: (1) an allotment equal to the amount		
	received in FY 1978; plus (2) from any excess over the FY 1978 level, an allotment determined by a complicated formula based on		
	population shares, prior allotment and per capita income.		
	From any additional VR services appropriation, each state receives an amount based on the ratio of their allotment in the first two		
64 4 48 4	parts to that of all other states.		
• State/Local	-Funds are distributed to the regional level based on the assignment of one VR counselor per 45,000 of general population and then the allocation of \$160,000 per counselor per year in case service funds and an administrative factor for the distribution of overhead costs.		
• Constraints	Federal grants to states require state matching funds in amounts sufficient to meet the maintenance of effort provisions of the law. The methodology used results in a federal/state split of approximately 75%/25%.		
Program Management			
 Planning 	Planning and Evaluation is a functional area within the Financial and Planning Services Department. Within an environment of		
_	continued decentralization, the Planning function supports an interactive planning system made up of interlocking planning boards. Boards consist of a Commission manager, his immediate supervisor, the employees supervised and any other person in the		
	commission that can facilitate the planning process.		
	The Commission also makes extensive use of a Consumers Advisory Board on all policy and service issues.		
	•Major reporting requirements of the budget and planning function are the preparation of the Legislative Appropriations Request		
	(LAR), Operating Budget, Performance and Funds Management report, Appropriations Allocation report and revenue estimates. The federal compliance plan is required every three years but is updated annually.		
Evaluation	-Annual performance for Vocational Rehabilitation is measured by five standards:		
	-Eligible clients served (must receive services under an Individualized Written Rehabilitation Program [IWRP]);		
	-Eligible clients rehabilitated and employed (must be employed at least 60 days);		
	-Rehabilitated cases as a percent of all eligible cases closed;		
	-Number of eligible clients for whom IWRPs are initiated; and		
	-Average total costs per rehabilitant.		
 Management Information 	The TRC uses a mainframe computer supported by the central administration. All local offices are tied into the mainframe through		
System	Local Areas Networks. Normal day-to-day operations are highly dependent upon real-time access to mainframe information which includes all client and service data.		
Service Delivery System	areas as a surface and solution used.		
• Intake,	*Local intake eligibility determination and assessment is done by VR Counselors in 115 field offices serving all areas of the state.		
Eligibility	There are speciality counselors in the larger field offices to provide specialized services to individuals with catastrophic disabilities.		
Determination	VR Counselors use case service funds under their discretion (\$160,000 per counselor per year) to purchase training, restoration, and		
and	other services to prepare the client for employment. Where possible, other sources of services (such as insurance, federal and state		
Assessment	programs local agencies, etc.) are used before VR program funds are used. Priority is given to those with the most severe disabilities		
	who have rehabilitation potential. Applicants for the program participate in an evaluation of their disabilities and their potential		
	employment. This assessment may involve outside physicians, psychologists or other professionals. Eligible clients plan with the		
	VR Counselors an IWRP of services they need to go to work. The services called for in the IWRP are provided until the client is		
	suitably employed for a minimum of 60 days. - Recically, TPC and a a generalized intake point for an individual referral system, which has recovered to purchase consider for clients.		
	 Basically, TRC acts as a centralized intake point for an individual referral system which has resources to purchase services for clients or to refer clients to services in the community. 		
· Case	•VR Counselors use a case management approach.		
Management			
State-Leval Barriers	•The almost complete priority for the severely disabled will make it difficult to integrate Vocational Rehabilitation into other		
to Program	employment and training programs because other programs and jobs are not well structured to accomodate the disabled.		
Integration			