

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

This report was prepared with funds provided through Interagency Cooperation Contract IAC(90-91)0745 from the Texas Department of Commerce to the Center for the Study of Human Resources, The University of Texas at Austin. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not represent the positions of the agency or of The University.

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 Education: 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 Source	TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE (TAA) TRADE ACT		
Purpose	•To provide employment services, training and allowances to persons who lose their job as a result of increased imports.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Trade Act of 1974, as amended by the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988. •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.		
Participant 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 •Remediation	•Job search allowances •Relocation allowances	•Monetary benefits payments--Trade Readjustment Allowances (TRA)--after exhaustion of Unemployment Insurance Benefits
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 • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints	•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 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. •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 • Evaluation • Management Information System	•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. •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 Assessment • Case Management	•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. •Not used.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•Federal program only available to certified workers in specific lay-offs due to imports.		

AUGUST 1991

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 strive 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	•Workers who have been terminated or laid-off or have received a notice of termination or lay-off or who are long-term unemployed.		
Participant Eligibility	•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	•Occupational skills training •Literacy •Basic Education •Remediation	•Counseling and assessment •Job search assistance •Job placement •Job development	•Support services (including needs-related payments) •Relocation assistance
Administrative Structure	• Federal • State • Local		
Program Funding	• Program Year • Amount/Service Level • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints		
Program Management	• Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System		
Service Delivery System	• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•None.		

Program/Funding Source	SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) TITLE II-B		
Purpose	•To provide summer programs for youth to increase basic educational skills, encourage school completion or enrollment in alternative school programs and to provide youth with work experience.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Job Training Partnership Act of 1982. •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 •Work experience	•Occupational skills training •Job search activities •Supportive services	•Literacy •Basic education •Secondary education •Remediation
Administrative Structure	• U.S. Department of Labor • 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 SJTCC 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 • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints		
Program Management	• Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System		
Service Delivery System	• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	• Limited time during which program can be operated.		

Program/Funding Source	JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED ADULTS AND YOUTH 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. •STATE: Texas Job Training Partnership Act of 1983.		
Goals	•To assist the economically disadvantaged to become employed and self sufficient through participation in job training and educational programs. •To establish administrative structures at the state and local level through which a public/private partnership of job training and educational programs is conducted.		
Target Population	•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	•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. •U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No.		
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Occupational skills training •Job search assistance •Job development/Job placement	•Literacy •Basic education •Secondary education •Remediation •High School equivalency •Customized training	•Supportive services including needs-related payments •Youth work experience •Education-to-work experience
Administrative Structure	• Federal • State • Local •U.S. Department of Labor. •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. The Governor and the SJTCC 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 • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints •July 1 - June 30. •PY 1990, \$119,369,397 (all federal) and 67,122 participants. •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. •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 • Evaluation • Management Information System •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 SJTCC, 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 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 the local SDA in several program, participant and service provider configurations.		
Service Delivery System	• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management •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. •There are no statewide requirements for case management, and the amount varies by SDA.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•None.		

Program/Funding Source	POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES — PERKINS II-C (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 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 occupational skill competencies needed to work in a technologically advanced society.		
Target Population	•Emphasizes services and equal access for <i>special populations</i> — 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. •OTHER: Emphasis is on inclusion of <i>special populations</i> .	•INCOME: No.	•U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Remediation •Tutoring	•Vocational education •Tech-Prep education •Apprenticeship	•Supplementary services meeting the needs of special populations(e.g., equipment modification, instructional aids/devices)
Administrative Structure	• Federal • State • Local		
Program Funding	• Program Year • Amount/Service Level • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints		
Program Management	• Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System		
Service Delivery System	• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration			

Program/Funding Source	JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS (JOBS) FAMILY SUPPORT ACT, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND STATE FUNDING		
Purpose	To assure that parents and caretakers with economically disadvantaged children obtain the education, training, support services and employment that will enable them to become economically self-sufficient.		
Legislative Authority	FEDERAL: Family Support Act of 1988 Social Security Act as amended. STATE: Human Resource Code, Chapter 22		
Goals	To encourage, assist and require AFDC parents and caretakers to fulfill their responsibilities 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, including transitional child care and medical assistance, to enable them to participate. To encourage the state to promote coordination of services at all levels of government in order to make a wide range of services available, especially for individuals at risk of long-term welfare dependency and to maximize the use of existing resources.		
Target Population	Parents and caretakers who are receiving AFDC benefits. Target Groups are: -Custodial parents under 24 who don't have recent work experience or a high school diploma or its equivalent. -Members of a family whose youngest child is within two years of age ineligibility; and, -Caretakers who have received AFDC for 36 of the preceding 60 months. State has designated AFDC youth 16 and 17 not in school or training as a priority for service. Members of a two parent family eligible for AFDC.		
Participant Eligibility	AFDC ELIGIBILITY AGE: Parent or approved caretaker of a dependent child under the age of 18 who for various reasons is deprived of support or care. OTHER: For the two parent AFDC-UP family, the primary wage earner must be unemployed and "connected" to the work force. All AFDC recipients must participate in JOBS unless exempted. Volunteers (those with exemptions who would like to be in JOBS and over age 15) are eligible to participate and volunteers from the target groups are given first priority for service within their target group JOBS ELIGIBILITY RELATION: A parent and dependent child under age 18 who is deprived of support or care of a parent and who lives with a parent or other specified relative. AGE: 16 through 59. OTHER: All AFDC recipients living in a designated JOBS county and resources permitting must participate in JOBS unless exempted. An individual may be exempt for reasons including; caring for a child under 3 years, is remote from services, attends school, is ill or incapacitated or cares for someone who is, is pregnant or is over 60. Volunteers (those with exemptions who would like to be in JOBS and over age 15) are eligible to participate and volunteers from the target groups are given first priority for service within their target group		
Participant Services	JOBS program optional components. Group and individual Job Search On-the-job training. JOBS program Support Services Child Care Transportation One-time work related expenses Transitional Benefits	The JOBS program required components. Education —high school/GED —basic and remedial —education in English Job Skills Training Job Readiness Activities Job Development/Job Placement	All AFDC recipients who have received AFDC 3 out of the last 6 months and who leave the grant because of earned income are eligible for transitional benefits-- up to one year of paid Medicaid and child care.
Administrative Structure	Federal State Local Department of Health and Human Services Department of Human Services (DHS). The JOBS program is administered locally by the DHS Client Self-support Services (CSS) staff. It is structured to provide maximum flexibility at the local level to use local resources. DHS does intake, assessment and completes employability plans, provides support services, arranges child care and refers to training or education services in the community. Non-financial and financial agreements exist between DHS and other service providers to specify referral and service delivery mechanisms.		
Program Funding	Program Year Amount/Service Level Federal/State State/Local Constraints		
Program Management	Planning Evaluation Management Information		
	September 1 to August 30 FY 1991 (9/1/90 - 8/31/91), estimated \$36.6 million (federal, \$20.7 million; state, \$15.7 million). \$1,000,000 of the state funds are dedicated to Adult Basic Education at the Texas Education Agency. \$16.3 million of the total funds will be used for the direct delivery of services by DHS staff. The balance will be contracted out for employment services. The number of participants is projected for FY 1991 to be 12,484 per month. DHS receives federal funds in an amount equal to the sum of the State's FY 1987 WIN allotment and an amount allocated by formula from remaining federal funds based on the State's relative number of adult AFDC recipients. State revenue must be appropriated and expended to match the federal dollars. All JOBS and JOBS related funds are allocated from the state to the regional level by formulas prescribed by the Equity of Service Statement (ESS) with factors such as percentage of caseload, percentage target populations, and percentage unemployed. To qualify for the maximum match rate, the state must meet minimum federal participation and expenditure rates. 7% for FY 1991 rates increase in later years 40% for FY 1994 for the Unemployed Parent program Expend 55% of the available JOBS funds on the target groups		
	DHS is ultimately responsible for the implementation of JOBS, but the agency does not have all the necessary education, job training and supportive services resources required for success. The agency created a state/local planning process that involved those agencies having education, job training and supportive service resources which could be used for JOBS participants. Each region is responsible for developing a regional plan that utilizes local resources in accordance with state rules and guidelines. Most regions used the Job Training Partnership Act's service delivery areas (SDA) for planning areas within the DHS regions. All final decisions on JOBS policy and implementation are made by the DHS board. Program year is September 1 to August 30, so planning takes place in the spring and contracting in the summer. There are no formal plans for evaluations of the JOBS program at this time. However, the state's performance in serving AFDC recipients will be measured by a number of state and federal objectives. The state objectives are: To have employed at least 50% of the JOBS participants leaving AFDC; and, To place JOBS participants in jobs paying 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 in FY 1991, 11% in FY 1992 with increasing rates in later years; and, To expend 55% of the available JOBS funds on the three federal target groups. Custodial parents under 24 who don't have a high school diploma or its equivalent Members of a family whose youngest child is within two years of age ineligibility and Caretakers who have received AFDC for 36 of the preceding 60 months. Four separate systems are used. 1) SAVERR is the main participant record system for eligibility and the issuance of benefits. 2) The Generic Work Sheet (GWS) consists of a number of computer screens used by eligibility workers to determine eligibility.		

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	•Students who have the interest, aptitude and ability to benefit from vocational education programs.	
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: Yes, students of public school age (≤21) in grades 7-12. Further age and/or grade restrictions apply to specific vocational courses. •INCOME: No. •U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No. OTHER: Dependent on the vocational program, other criteria may apply (e.g., handicapped, educational deficiencies).	
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Remediation •Job placement activities •Nine vocational education program areas: agricultural science and technology; home economics; marketing; trade and industrial; health occupations; office education; industrial technology education; career investigation; and special needs programs.	
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 •State/Local •August 1 - May 31. •PY 1991, \$241,071,617 (est.) and 86,863,931 students enrolled •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 Allotment (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 1.37. 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. •School districts must meet their LFA before receiving FSP aid.	
Program Management	•Planning •Evaluation •Management Information System •Statewide goals are developed by TEA and approved by the SBOE. The <u>Career Opportunities in Texas: A Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education</u> 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). •Quantifiable, statewide objectives applicable to all secondary 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 district.	
Service Delivery System	•Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment •Case Management •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 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, abilities 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 Source	EMPLOYMENT SERVICE 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 Authority	•FEDERAL: Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 as amended by the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982. •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	•Job Seekers	•Employers	
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: 14 and older	•INCOME: No	•U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Job matching	•Job search assistance •Employer services	•Labor market information
Administrative Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal • State • Local 		
Program Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Year • Amount/Service Level • Federal/State • State/Local 		
• Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •U. S. Department of Labor •Texas Employment Commission (TEC). Day-to-day operational responsibility is assigned to the TEC Regional and Local Offices with support functions assigned to the Job Services Operations Division of the State Office. •10 TEC Regional Offices administer Employment Service through 138 TEC Local Offices in 105 Texas cities. 		
Program Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System 		
Service Delivery System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management 		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •None. 		

Program/Funding Source	SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (SCSEP) THE SENIOR TEXANS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (STEP) THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT		
Purpose	•To promote useful part-time employment opportunities that provide community service activities and income for unemployed, low income persons 55 years and older.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965. •STATE: None		
Goals	•To meet project objectives for enrollments and employment placement. •To improve and conserve natural resources and develop human resources.		
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.		
Participant Eligibility	•AGE: 55 years and older •OTHER: None	•INCOME: 125% of poverty (OMB defined)	•U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
Participant Services	•Program orientation •Counseling and assessment	•Part-time public service employment -salary and benefits •Job readiness training	•Job development/ job placement •Support services
Administrative Structure	• Federal • State • Local		
Program Funding	• Program Year • Amount/Service Level • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints		
Program Management	• Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System		
Service Delivery System	• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•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.		

Program/Funding Source	FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING SERVICES (FS E&T) FOOD STAMP ACT AND STATE FUNDING		
Purpose	•To assist members of households participating in the food stamp program in gaining skills, training, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment.		
Legislative Authority	•FEDERAL: Food Stamp Act of 1977 as amended. •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 food stamps and are not receiving public assistance.		
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. FOOD STAMP E&T ELIGIBILITY •AGE: Age 16 through 59 certified for Food Stamps. •INCOME: Same as Food Stamps U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No. •OTHER: All food stamps recipients who are work registrants must participate in FS E&T unless exempted -an individual may be exempt from work registration and FS E&T for reasons including: under 16 over 59, physically or mentally unfit for employment, already subject to work requirements of AFDC, caring for a child under 6, applying for unemployment compensation benefits, caring for an incapacitated household member, or attending school or training on at least a half-time basis. -some work registrants may have individual exemptions from FS E&T participation for medical, language, transportation, remoteness and child care barriers or by being a migrant in the work stream. -must reside in one of the 56 FS E&T counties -volunteers are not accepted into the program at this time because of insufficient funding (volunteers who self-refer to service providers are counted as participants but their costs are not covered 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 including —transportation (cash up to \$25 a month) —child care (up to \$160/month/child)
Administrative Structure	• Federal • State • Local •US Department of Agriculture •Texas Department of Human Services •Through two state contracts, DHS contracts the local administration and service delivery for the FS E&T program to the Texas Employment Commission for 53 counties and the Texas Association of Private Industry Councils for 3 counties.		
Program Funding	• Program Year • Amount/Service Level • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints •Federal Fiscal Year (FFY): October 1, to September 30 •FFY 1991, \$13,235,989 (\$10,089,906 federal funds, \$3,146,075 state funds). Approximately 187,562 participants were served in FY 1991. •Matching rate is 50% for all funds expended above the basic grant level. Future changes have basic grant funds by relative share of work registrants. •Prior to FFY 1992, federal funds were allocated by formula to states; 80% on relative share of all food stamp recipients, 20% on relative share of number of individuals who participate in program components or receive notice of adverse action. Legislation which established a new formula based on the number of mandatory work registrants rather than food stamp recipients only. The formula change is to be phased in over a two year period with Texas expected to gain \$1.5 million annually in basic grant funds. There is no cap on the funds available on a matching basis to the states. •The Federal government provides a basic grant which can be augmented by state funds and be matched dollar for dollar. •Funds are used to contract with the Texas Employment Commission (TEC) for local program administration and service delivery in 53 counties and to the Texas Association of Private Industry Councils (TAPIC) for 3 counties. Contracts for services are based on the projected number of work registrants to be referred for FS E&T services in each participating county. •None		
Program Management	• Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System •By August 15 of each year, a state plan of operation is completed by DHS staff and submitted to the USDA for approval for October 1, start-up. There is no public participation or review. •One process measure is in use now; to place 50% of the mandatory participants in program components or give notice of adverse action for non-participation. Measures related to employment and educational gain are likely to be used at that time. •The SAVERR system is used to store all application and demographic information. Tape matches from TEC and the JTPA program with SAVERR are used to confirm/track program enrollment, participation and non-compliance.		
Service Delivery System	• Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment • Case Management •DHS is responsible for the intake, eligibility determination and work registration requirements of food stamp applicants. DHS outreaches and refers FS E&T eligibles to its contractor the Texas Employment Commission (TEC) in 53 of the 56 FS E&T counties for job search services (job search training in Dallas County). In the remaining three counties, the Texas Association of Private Industry Councils (TAPIC) is under contract to DHS and in turn subcontracts to three JTPA service delivery areas (SDA); Alamo, Rural Coastal Bend and Rural Capital Area. In four counties (Ector, Nueces, Lubbock and McLennan) in which TEC is the primary contractor, TAPIC also provides job search training classes. •An assessment is conducted by the contractors to determine whether the participant will be referred to community training and education services or to directed job search or job search training. In-depth assessment or testing is not feasible at this time due to the number of participants. •Case management is not used in this program. Contractors are required to contact participants at least monthly to track program participation and compliance.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•There are no significant barriers to program integration.		

Program/Funding Source	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 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	•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)	•Vocational education •Job readiness skills •Job placement activities	•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 assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. • State •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). •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 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 organizations. •In 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 offering 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 then 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. • State/Local •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.) • Constraints •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 • 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, addressed in <u>Reporting and Procedures Manual for Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes</u> , 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 Management •Anticipated that it will vary by grant recipient but THECB is waiting on the issuance of Federal rules and regulations. •Not used.		
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•None identified at this level of analysis.		

Program/Funding Source	POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION 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. •OTHER: Students must qualify for admission, varies by program.	•INCOME: No. •U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Remediation	•39 Technical education program areas with 3400 degree and certificate programs
Administrative Structure	•Federal •State • Local <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. •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 • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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). •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. •State funds cannot be used to maintain and operate the physical plants of community colleges. 	
Program Management	• Planning • Evaluation • Management Information System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The <i>Career Opportunities in Texas: A Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education</i> 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 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 <i>Reporting and Procedures Manual for Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes</i>, 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 Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. 	
State-Level Barriers to Program Integration	•Funds are line appropriations for the community and technical colleges. •Highly decentralized decision-making system.	

Program/Funding Source	SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERKINS, II-C		
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 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 occupational skill competencies needed to work in a technologically advanced society.		
Target Population	•Emphasizes services and equal access for <i>special populations</i> such as 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. (Age and/or grade restrictions apply to specific vocational courses offered by the state.) •OTHER: Emphasis is on inclusion of <i>special populations</i> .	•INCOME: No.	•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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. • State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •July 1 - June 30. • Amount/Service Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PY 1992, \$47 million (estimate) for both secondary and postsecondary programs. Approximately \$28.2 million will be distributed to secondary programs. • Federal/State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 then 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. • State/Local <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 that have approved vocational education programs based on the following relative share formula: 70 percent based on Chapter 1 funds received, 20 percent based on the number of students with handicaps who have individualized education programs, and 10 percent based on the number of students enrolled in school and adults enrolled in training programs. Entitlements that are not applied for by eligible recipients will be reallocated to other eligibles evidencing the greatest need. Funds may also be received by a consortium of school districts. • Constraints <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Within school districts, 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 \$15,000 unless a waiver is granted by the state. Local administrative costs are limited to no more than 5 percent. 		
Program Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Statewide goals are developed by 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 by DOE as a planning tool. • Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Each school district must submit an annual application (a single one for both state and federal funds). •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. •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. • Management Information System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 district. 		
Service Delivery System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Identification of students and determination of eligibility are the responsibility of the local school district. Each local school district must outreach and provide special population students and their parents with information on vocational education programs and opportunities prior to the student's entry into ninth grade at the latest. 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. • Case Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Varies by school district and student needs. Support Centers, where handicapped and disadvantaged students can receive 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, abilities and aptitudes; occupational information which matches the individual inventory; guidance and 		

Program/Funding Source	SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERKINS, II-B, SUBPART 1		
Purpose	<p>•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.</p> <p>•NOTE: Subpart 1 also provides for programs that promote the elimination of sex bias. However, sex equity programs are not addressed in this profile.</p>		
Legislative Authority	<p>•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.</p> <p>•STATE: None.</p> <p>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.</p>		
Goals	•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. (Age and/or grade restrictions apply to specific vocational courses offered by the state.)	•INCOME: No.	•U. S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
Participant Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Career guidance and counseling •Preparatory (basic academic and occupational) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Vocational education •Job readiness skills •Parenting classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Educational materials •Dependent care •Transportation
Administrative Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 assistance in vocational education and related areas, such as emerging technologies. Submit a report to Congress every two years. • State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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, JTPA, and TDH, among others. •In PY 1990, 76 school districts received funding. 		
Program Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •July 1 - June 30. • Amount/Service Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PY 1992, \$4.5 million (estimate) for both secondary and postsecondary programs. Approximately \$2.7 million will be distributed 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 then 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/State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 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. • State/Local <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. • Constraints 		
Program Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Sex Equity Coordinator is responsible for developing an annual plan for approval by the SBOE. • Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 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. • Management Information System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 district. •Additional data that are collected on each project (independent of PEIMS) include numbers served, services delivered and final outcomes. The process is similar to the Data Collection Kit used by the National Displaced Homemakers Network. 		
Service Delivery System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intake, Eligibility Determination and Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. • Case Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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		
Purpose	•To improve educational opportunities for adults; to provide the educational prerequisites for effective living, gainful employment and citizenship; to expand and improve the current delivery system; and to encourage establishment of adult education programs.		
Legislative 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 earmarked 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. •OTHER: Educational Status, officially withdrawn from school; Educational Level, functioning below the 12th grade level.	•INCOME: No.	•U.S. CITIZENSHIP: No.
Participant Services	•Counseling and assessment •Literacy	•Basic education •Secondary education	•English language •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 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 • Amount/Service Level • Federal/State • State/Local • Constraints	•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. •PY 1990, \$16,825,032 and 220,027 individuals served. •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. •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 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 policies 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 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 • Evaluation • Management Information System	•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. •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). •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 and Assessment • Case	•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 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 directly dependent on the administrative resources available. •Not used.		

