



Invisible Again:

The Impact of Changes in Federal Funding
on Vocational Programs
for Women and Girls

A Report from the
National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education

October 2001

The **National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE)** is a nonprofit organization formed in 1975, comprised of approximately 50 organizations dedicated to improving educational opportunities for women and girls. NCWGE assists in the development of national education policies that benefit all women and girls; advocates on issues regarding Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; monitors federal agencies' implementation of education programs; and provides a valuable forum for members to share information and strategies to advance educational equity.

NCWGE thanks the following members of its Vocational Education and Training Task Force for their commitment and the extensive time they contributed to complete this report:

Task Force Chair:

Jill Miller, Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment

Task Force Members:

Leslie Annexstein, National Women's Law Center

Camille Inez, Wider Opportunities for Women

Kathleen Keller, National Women's Law Center

Mimi Lufkin, National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity

Jamie Pueschel, American Association of University Women

Dori Travieso, Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment

Nancy Zirkin, American Association of University Women

Many thanks also to those involved in the survey data collection,
graphic design and production of this publication:

Maria Assusa, Women Work!

Regina Bang, Women Work!

Akilah DuVall, Women Work!

Laura Mealiea, Women Work!

Karen Swift, Women Work!

JoAnn Juskus, JoAnn Juskus Design

Leslie Annexstein, Chair
National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education
c/o National Women's Law Center
11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 588-5180
(202) 588-5185 fax
www.ncwge.org

© October 2001

Invisible Again:

The Impact of Changes in Federal Funding
on Vocational Programs
for Women and Girls

A Report from the
National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education

October 2001

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	5
Historical Background of Perkins	5
Perkins III Abandons Specific Funding Requirements	6
Need for Gender Equity Programs As Great As Ever	7
Preparing for the Future	9
National Survey Results	10
Programs' Capacity to Provide Services Are At Risk	10
State and Local Agencies Have Not Stepped In To Help	11
Conclusions: Why Changes in Perkins III Put Programs At Risk	13
State Ratings	15
Chart 1: Detailed State Ratings	17
Recommendations and Next Steps	18
For Women and Girls in Vocational Programs	18
For Program Providers and Educators	18
For Local Policymakers	19
For State Policymakers	19
For Federal Policymakers	19
Information and Resources	21
Chart 2: State Scores For Status Indicators	22
Appendix A: Methodology of Survey	24
Appendix B: Survey	25
Appendix C: Survey Response Rates by State	29
Endnotes	30

Executive Summary

“Perkins III has helped women and girls to become invisible again.”

- Washington Respondent

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education’s Task Force on Vocational Education and Training surveyed hundreds of programs across the country that help women and girls enroll and succeed in vocational programs. The goal of the survey was to assess how changes made in 1998 to the federal law that funds vocational education (commonly known as the “Perkins Act”) have affected these programs. This report provides the national and state-by-state results of that survey. As discussed in the report, **the information raises serious concerns about the capacity of programs to provide much-needed services to women and girls in vocational programs.**

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE) is a nonprofit organization comprised of approximately 50 organizations dedicated to improving educational opportunities for women and girls. NCWGE’s mission is to provide leadership in and advocate for the development of national education policies that benefit all women and girls. The NCWGE Task Force on Vocational Education and Training (“the Task Force”) advocates for policies that will improve the academic, vocational and technical skills of women and girls to better prepare them for lasting and rewarding employment in today’s changing workplace.

National Survey Finds Negative Impact of 1998 Changes to Perkins Act

In 1998, the United States Congress reauthorized the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act* (“Perkins”) – the federal law that funds vocational education programs at secondary and post-secondary institutions across the country. The Perkins Act contained provisions, dating from the 1970s, intended to help ensure that women and girls had equal access and opportunity to succeed in vocational education.

During the contentious reauthorization process in 1998, these provisions, which had long enjoyed bipartisan support, came under fire. Specifically, the provisions set aside a portion of the federal funds to support single parent and displaced homemaker programs, as well as programs to increase gender equity in vocational programs (commonly referred to as the “gender equity set-aside”). The provisions also funded a position in each state’s Department of Education to coordinate sex equity activities in vocational programs. For more than 15 years, the gender equity set-asides and the state sex equity coordinators helped women and girls stay in school and acquire the skills needed to earn a living wage. **The 1998 Perkins Act, which took effect on July 1, 1999 and is known as “Perkins III,” eliminated these provisions.**

In Fall 2000, the NCWGE Task Force surveyed more than 1,500 programs across the country that had received funds under the gender equity set-asides under Perkins II to determine how the 1998 changes in the federal law affected the students they work with and their own ability to provide services. These programs provide a variety of services to foster gender equity in vocational programs or to support students that are single parents, displaced homemakers¹, or individuals studying for an occupation that is “nontraditional”² for their gender. These supportive services are critical to helping female students gain the skills they need for high-wage employment.

More than one-third of the surveyed programs responded, painting a dismal picture of the effects of Perkins III:

- **Funding Slashed:** More than half of programs reported that their funding had decreased since Perkins III took effect, and predicted additional funding cuts in the future.
- **Services to Students Significantly Decreased:** 71% of programs reported that their ability to provide services to the students they work with had decreased.

- **Students’ Unmet Needs Have Increased:** Nearly half of respondents reported that since Perkins III took effect essential student services, such as pre-vocational services, training, dependent care assistance, transportation assistance and tuition assistance, are more scarce than they were before Perkins III took effect. Substantial numbers – between 35% and 57% of respondents for each of these five service areas – reported that assistance is “not close to meeting the needs” of students in their region or is “non-existent” for students in their region.
- **Declining Support from State and Local Educational Agencies for Programs:** About one-third of respondents reported decreased state and local agency support for programs and services to support single-parent students, displaced homemaker students, or students studying for nontraditional occupations since the effective date of Perkins III. Less than 5% of respondents reported increased support.

State-by-State Assessment Indicates All States Need to Increase Efforts to Support Women and Girls in Vocational Programs

Congressional intent behind the removal of the gender equity set-asides and state sex equity coordinator position from Perkins III was to delegate responsibility for the administration of Perkins to the individual states – giving each state greater responsibility in deciding how Perkins funds should be spent. Therefore, this report evaluates each state separately in order to determine whether it continued to support gender equity programs and programs supporting single parent and displaced homemaker students, without federal mandates to do so.

In order to evaluate the individual states, the Task Force disaggregated survey results by state and developed a rating system for the states. States were evaluated based on 11 criteria, drawn from the survey instrument developed by the Task Force. These criteria, referred to as “status indicators,” measure state and local educational agencies’ support for programs and services to assist students who are single parents, displaced homemakers or students preparing for nontraditional occupations. The status indicators measure both the current status of these programs, as well as the changes in their status since Perkins III took effect.

The 11 criteria are:

- 1) State Agency Support (including financial, policy direction and leadership) for Programs Supporting Displaced Homemaker and Single Parent Students
- 2) Changes in State Agency Support for Displaced Homemaker and Single Parent Programs Since the Perkins III Effective Date
- 3) State Agency Support (including financial, policy direction and leadership) for Programs Supporting Students Preparing for Nontraditional Occupations
- 4) Changes in State Agency Support for Nontraditional Programs Since the Perkins III Effective Date
- 5) Local Agency Support (including financial, policy direction and leadership) for Programs Supporting Displaced Homemaker and Single Parent Students
- 6) Changes in Local Agency Support for Displaced Homemaker and Single Parent Programs Since the Perkins III Effective Date
- 7) Local Agency Support (including financial, policy direction and leadership) for Programs Supporting Students Preparing for Nontraditional Occupations

- 8) Changes in Local Agency Support for Nontraditional Programs Since the Perkins III Effective Date
- 9) Funding of Survey Respondents' Programs
- 10) Survey Respondents' Ability to Provide Services
- 11) Survey Respondents' Projections About the Future Security of their Programs

Based on these 11 criteria, states were given an overall rating that indicates the status of programs supporting single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations in their state.

This report provides both an overall rating for each state (see Chart 1, page 17), as well as the state's score on each of the 11 criteria (see Chart 2, page 22).

The results show wide variation among states, with room for improvement in all states. **In far too many states, the support and programs created by the pre-1998 Perkins law are quickly collapsing, leaving many women and girls in jeopardy of losing out on important educational opportunities.**

Rating	State*
Programs Promoted	NO states received this rating.
Programs Protected	Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Michigan, Montana, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia
Programs Losing Ground	California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
Program Support Disintegrating	Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island
Failure	Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee

**The following states had very low response rates (below 15%) to the survey: Alaska, California, Georgia, Maine, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, and Wisconsin. (See Appendix C for a list of response rates by state.) The ratings for these states should be viewed critically, as they may not accurately represent what is happening in these states. The Task Force received no response at all from the District of Columbia and only one incomplete response from Delaware; therefore these states are not rated at all. A low response rate may indicate a particularly urgent situation, as it could be that there were no programs (or very few) left to respond to the survey.*

Description of State Ratings

The following key provides general definitions for each rating category. To evaluate any individual state, please refer to Chart 2 on page 22, which gives the score breakdown for the 11 status indicators.

Programs Promoted: Funding, services and support at least somewhat improved since Perkins II. State and local agency support rated as better than sufficient.

Programs Protected: Funding, services and support generally the same as under Perkins II. State and local agency support generally rated as sufficient or needing improvement.

Programs Losing Ground: Funding, services and support worse than under Perkins II. State and local agency support rated as needs improvement.

Program Support Disintegrating: Funding, services and support worse than under Perkins II, with some cutbacks rated as severe. State and local agency support rated as very poor or needing improvement.

Failure: Funding, services and support worse than under Perkins II, frequently causing severe cutbacks. State and local agency support generally rated as very poor.

Next Steps: Federal Policy Agenda for Women and Girls in Vocational Education

The following federal policy agenda provides some steps that the federal government can take to promote access to and opportunities in vocational education for women and girls.

Through Congressional action and strong administrative agency enforcement of the law, the federal government can provide funding for gender equity programs; establish benchmarks that must be met at the state level for displaced homemakers, single parents and students participating in nontraditional training; and ensure that discriminatory barriers to women and girls' participation in vocational education do not persist. This list of recommendations should be viewed as a starting point for federal government action to support women and girls in vocational education.

- Congress should restore specific federal funding for programs that support gender equity, displaced homemakers, single parents, and students preparing for nontraditional employment.
- Congress should restore federal funding for the position of the state-level gender equity coordinator for vocational education.
- Congress should maintain strong accountability measures, particularly for improving participation and completion rates of students preparing for nontraditional occupations (the fourth “core indicator” of performance in the Perkins law).
- Congress should maintain strong accountability requirements to ensure success of special population students, especially single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations, on all accountability measures.
- The U.S. Department of Education should hold states accountable for meeting the performance indicators provided in the Perkins law, and follow through with sanctions and incentives as delineated in the Perkins law.
- The U.S. Department of Education should require states to use data from the year 1998-99, when set-asides were still in place, to set benchmarks to measure their progress in participation and completion rates of students in non-traditional training and employment.
- The U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights should conduct Title IX compliance reviews in vocational education programs to ensure equal access and opportunity for women and girls.
- The U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Labor should jointly direct states to coordinate their efforts under the Perkins law and the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to support programs and services for displaced homemakers, single parents and individuals preparing for nontraditional occupations.

Introduction

As we move into the 21st century, employers are increasingly demanding high-skilled and better educated workers. At the same time, more women than ever before are working. Yet many do not have the skills necessary to earn the salaries they need to support themselves and their families. Skills training – whether it is called vocational education or career and technical education – is increasingly important for female students at both the high school and post-secondary level.

Changes to federal law, however, have made it increasingly difficult for women and girls to succeed in vocational education and to obtain the skills they will need to compete in the 21st century workforce. When the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act* (the federal law that funds vocational programs offered at secondary and post-secondary levels) was reauthorized in 1998, important provisions that supported gender equity, single parents and displaced homemakers were eliminated. This report, *Invisible Again*, assesses the effects of these changes by providing the results of a national survey of programs that work with single parents and displaced homemakers.

The survey results are a wake-up call for policymakers and educators across the country. **Service providers who work with female vocational students reported a significant decrease in student services, program funding and support from state and local agencies in the year after the 1998 vocational education law was implemented.**

Historical Background of the Perkins Law's Support for Women and Girls

Beginning in the 1970s, Congress allocated funds to help states eliminate gender discrimination in vocational education and to help women access skills training. In 1976, Title II of

the Educational Amendments, which provided funds for vocational education, set aside \$50,000 per state to fund a full-time employee (known as the sex equity coordinator) in each state Department of Education to coordinate efforts to overcome gender bias and stereotyping in vocational education. The law also specified that states could use a portion of their federal vocational education funds to support programs designed to help “displaced homemakers” – women who had previously been occupied as family care givers in their home – gain the skills necessary to re-enter the paid workforce.

In 1984, Congress passed the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act* (now known as “Perkins I”). Congress continued to recognize the importance of addressing the needs of female students and increased funding for the sex equity coordinator position to \$60,000. The Act also required that 3.5% of the Perkins I funds be set aside for programs to foster gender equity in vocational education and that 8.5% of Perkins I funds be set aside to provide services for single parents and displaced homemakers. With this funding, state and local agencies were able to develop programs working with school administrators, teachers and guidance counselors to eliminate gender bias and stereotyping in vocational education. They were also able to provide counseling and preparatory and supportive services to increase the ability of single parents and displaced homemakers to access vocational education programs.

In 1990, Congress reauthorized Perkins I as the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act* (commonly referred to as “Perkins II”). Again, Congress recognized the importance of efforts to support women and girls in vocational training. Perkins II retained the set-aside funds – requiring that 3% of total funds be used for gender equity programs; 7% for programs to support single parents and displaced homemakers; and .5% to be used at the state’s discretion for either of these programs. Perkins II also expanded the

role of the state sex equity coordinator. Nationally, funding for single parent, displaced homemaker and gender equity programs exceeded \$100 million.

The legislative provisions of Perkins I and Perkins II were highly successful in helping millions of women and girls receive the preparatory services and vocational training necessary for economic self-sufficiency. Across the country, these provisions funded an extremely diverse group of programs, helping women and girls explore nontraditional careers and helping single parents and displaced homemakers make the transition from home to the paid workforce. Programs provided a broad range of services, which could include career guidance and counseling; life skills development; child care, transportation and tuition assistance; books and materials; remedial education; study skills training; support groups; mentoring; and job training, development and placement, depending on the resources of the community and the needs of the individuals participating³.

Thanks to these programs:

- State and federal governments saved millions of dollars in public assistance funds by moving women into employment.
 - Hundreds of thousands of single parents and displaced homemakers successfully entered education and training programs and found employment.
 - Thousands of women were trained and placed in non-traditional occupations and given the preparation needed to succeed on the job and become economically self-sufficient.
 - Teen parents were able to access vocational education programs, stay in school, and go on to post-secondary education or skilled employment.
 - Middle and high school girls learned about careers in math, science, high technology and entrepreneurship.
 - Teachers received professional development to help them foster gender equity in the classroom and prepare women for nontraditional employment.
 - States funded critical research to assess the barriers to female students entering and succeeding in vocational and technical programs.
- States developed excellent curriculum resources to assist guidance counselors and teachers in expanding students' career options and shared these resources with educators across the nation.

For more than two decades these programs, funded by the Perkins law, had a track record of success.

Perkins III Abandons Specific Funding Requirement for Single Parent, Displaced Homemaker and Gender Equity Programs

The Perkins Act was last reauthorized in 1998, three years after its scheduled reauthorization, amidst a general Congressional atmosphere favoring block grants and decreased federal regulations for educational programs. The resulting legislation, known as "Perkins III," eliminated funding for and significantly reduced the number of provisions that would encourage gender equity or provide services for displaced homemakers and single parent students. An amendment proposed by Congresswoman Patsy Mink (D-HI), which would have restored these provisions, was narrowly defeated on the floor of the House of Representatives⁴. As a result, Perkins III:

- Eliminated the set-aside funding for single parent, displaced homemaker and gender equity programs. Instead, the law provides two potential avenues for funding:
 - 1) States must reserve between \$60,000 and \$150,000 of the funds allocated for "state leadership" activities to provide services to individuals pursuing nontraditional training and employment.
 - 2) States have the option of reserving 10% of the funds allocated for local educational agencies to be redistributed to the local agencies based on certain criteria (rural location, high vocational enrollment or negative impact by changes in funding formula) and may require the local agencies to use these funds to support programs for single parents, displaced homemakers and students pursuing nontraditional training.
- Eliminated the full-time state employee responsible for coordinating gender equity programs. The functions and

“The attitude is ‘do more with less.’ What I mean by this, is that Perkins III requires more accountability with less funding.”

- Oklahoma Respondent

responsibilities of the state sex equity coordinators have been integrated into general state administration and state leadership programs. It is left to the states to decide whether to fund this position and at what level.

In an effort to meet the stated Congressional goal of greater state accountability, Perkins III requires states to report on the progress of all students in vocational education for four “core indicators” of performance:

- 1) Student attainment of challenging academic, vocational and technical skill proficiencies established by the states;
- 2) Student attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, a proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma, or a post-secondary degree or credential;
- 3) Placement in, retention in, and completion of, post-secondary education or advanced training, placement in military service, or placement or retention in employment; and
- 4) Student participation in and completion of vocational and technical education programs that lead to nontraditional training and employment.

States must report on the progress of “special populations” in meeting these four core indicators and local educational agencies are required to address in their local plans how they will meet the needs of “special population” students.

The law defines “special populations” to include single parents, displaced homemakers and students pursuing nontraditional training and employment. Therefore, through these accountability provisions, states are required to show continuing improvement in moving students into “nontraditional” fields⁵ (an important goal for female students as many high-wage fields are traditionally male) and in program completion and placement for single parents and displaced homemakers.

The reality is that responsibilities for serving these populations rest on the shoulders of local educational agencies. Without the targeted funding of the set-asides, educational agencies are expected to serve these populations using their local Perkins allocation or other local funds⁶.

Need for Gender Equity Programs Is As Great As Ever

The Perkins gender equity programs, including the state sex equity coordinator and the targeted funding for programs for single parent and displaced homemaker students, were created to address gender inequities in vocational education programs and help women move into higher-wage careers. The need for these programs has not decreased since the passage of Perkins III, as women remain clustered into low-wage occupations and continue to face significant barriers to their success in vocational programs.

Despite advancements made by some female students in many education programs over the past several decades, significant disparities persist in vocational education. Vocational classes in both secondary and post-secondary programs contin-

“My assessment of Perkins III is that federal legislators presume that satisfactory ‘advancements’ have been obtained by women and girls in nontraditional fields, that schools are completely equitable for all students, and that [displaced homemakers] are no longer struggling. Hence, they don’t need continued funding.”

- Kentucky Respondent

ue to be highly gender segregated, with female students clustered into traditionally female, low-wage fields. For example:

- In Connecticut’s vocational high schools, as recently as the 1998-99 school year, high school carpentry, electronics and automotive programs were approximately 85% male, while hairdressing and fashion technology programs were 96% female⁷.
- A 1998 study of Wisconsin’s School to Work programs revealed that female students were concentrated in just a few programs, with 81% of them enrolled in health or finance programs⁸.
- In associate degree programs, women are almost four times as likely as men to major in health fields and are also more likely to major in business and office fields. In contrast, male students in associate degree programs are more than five times as likely to major in technical education and more than fourteen times as likely to major in trade and industry programs⁹.

In far too many cases, female students are discouraged from pursuing vocational education because of gender stereotypes in counseling or guidance material; differential treatment by teachers; or harassment by other students. The striking disparities in course enrollment illustrate the continued need for programs to encourage and support female students pursuing vocational education and to eliminate gender stereotyping and other forms of bias in vocational education programs.

There continues to be a great need for programs designed to help prepare female students for supporting themselves and

their families. Census data show there were more than 7 million displaced homemakers and more than 8 million single parents in 1998. The data also tell us that these groups are likely to be poor, unemployed or working in low-wage jobs. In fact, nearly 30% are working in low-paying service jobs that offer few, if any, benefits¹⁰.

Female workers continue to make far less than male workers. Women who do not earn a bachelor’s degree – an important population group for vocational education programs – earn only 68% of male worker’s median earnings¹¹. In part, this wage gap is due to female worker’s concentration in low-wage fields such as child care, health care and the service industry. In 1999, 33% of female workers earned wages at or below the poverty level for a family of four, while only 20% of male workers were earning at this level¹². The Wisconsin School to Work study found that, largely as a result of the gender-stereotyped enrollment patterns of School to Work participants, female graduates of the program earned, on average, two dollars less per hour than their male peers did¹³.

Opening the doors for female students to pursue training for traditionally male occupations, and supporting them in these programs, is an important way of ensuring their future economic security.

Given the persistent disparities in career education, there continues to be a great need for sex equity coordinators in each state Department of Education to promote the needs of women and girls in vocational programs. The state sex equity coordinators funded under Perkins I and Perkins II served as a linchpin for ensuring gender equity in vocational education in their states; providing technical assistance to local educational agencies; managing and monitoring the use of gender equity

“There is definitely a need to have viable nontraditional and traditional occupational training for single parents, displaced homemakers and single pregnant women; and single parent males as well. These programs were the prime locations for viable nontrad[itional] training which led to economic self-sufficiency. States are seeing the need that still exists. . . . Will a new Congress make changes to give direction and accountability to states?”

- New Jersey Respondent

funds; and reviewing state and local plans for addressing gender stereotypes and bias. In many states, they were the only state official responsible for handling compliance under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (“Title IX”), the federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in education programs (although requiring the sex equity coordinator to also function as the required Title IX coordinator was not what the Perkins legislation intended). Title IX requires schools, among other things, to provide students with a learning environment free from sex discrimination; to ensure that counseling, recruiting and promotional activities do not discriminate on the basis of sex or perpetuate gender stereotypes; to ensure access in admissions to programs; and to take action to remedy sexual harassment¹⁴.

However, since the Perkins III changes have taken effect, many states have either eliminated their state sex equity coordinators or have placed significant duties, outside gender equity, on these individuals. The elimination of the funded state sex equity coordinator position has negatively affected every state’s ability to provide coordinated gender equity assistance. And, in some states, this change may mean that students, parents and educators who have concerns about gender discrimination in vocational programs have no one to assist them within the state Department of Education.

Preparing for the Future

The Perkins Act is scheduled to be reauthorized by Congress in 2002. In preparation for “Perkins IV,” the following should be considered:

- How do services for single parents, displaced homemakers and nontraditional training compare to those that were available under Perkins II?
- Are state and local agencies taking advantage of the limited gender equity funding opportunities contained in Perkins III to help meet the needs of single parents, displaced homemakers and students pursuing nontraditional training and employment?
- Do state accountability measures provide the right incentives and support to state and local agencies to protect female students, or does accountability come too late?

This report attempts to help answer these questions by providing the first feedback from programs that are attempting to survive and serve their clients under Perkins III. **The results cast severe doubt on whether Perkins III is providing the support that educational programs need in order to help female students gain the skills required to avoid a life of poverty.**

National Survey Results:

Insufficient Support for Female Students

“[Perkins III] essentially destroyed most single parent, displaced homemaker and nontraditional programs in California. Very few could obtain funding from Perkins III.”

- California Respondent

Programs' Capacity to Provide Services Are at Risk

Survey respondents painted a dismal picture of their ability to continue functioning in the environment created by Perkins III. The vast majority had suffered cutbacks in funding and services, and expected more of the same for the foreseeable future.

- **Funding Cut Drastically:** More than half of the programs surveyed stated that their funding had been cut since Perkins III took effect. Only 10% of the programs reported increases in funding.
- **Services Decreased Significantly:** 71% of the programs reported that their capacity to provide services to their clientele had decreased, including 29% who reported “severe” decreases. 10% reported that they had shut down entirely. Only 8% of programs had been able to increase their services.
- **Additional Cutbacks Anticipated:** 58% of programs predicted additional cutbacks in the future, including 22% that expect “severe” cutbacks and 10% that predict that they will shut their doors.

These percentages may understate the impact of the Perkins III changes because many of the programs that were hardest hit by the funding changes had already shut their doors and therefore could not be contacted.

Respondents' narrative answers demonstrate the hardships imposed by the cutbacks:

- An Iowa program reports, “we’ve lost over half the programs serving this population since Perkins III was enacted,” fearing that “combined with the new WIA [Workforce Investment Act] legislation which demands work before training, most [displaced homemakers and single parents] will never attain true self-sufficiency.”
- A program in Massachusetts writes, “We particularly miss the [gender equity] set aside. Our center used to serve 3,000–5,000 per year and was a great resource for training, materials, and direct services for young women. Its website is still active, but we may not be able to sustain it much longer.”
- A New Jersey program writes, “We had a very successful program prior to Perkins III. We had a placement rate of 90% in two fields... Both fields had starting salaries above \$10/hr. Now we have nothing.”

“What further compromises in student assistance will occur as funds continue to be cut back? This is scary.”

- Wisconsin Respondent

Further, respondents emphasized that essential supportive services for their clientele are insufficient. Respondents rated the availability of five types of services in their area:

- 1) **Pre-vocational Services:** 39% of respondents reported that the availability of pre-vocational services, such as personal and career counseling, life skills development, and job readiness training, under Perkins III is worse than under Perkins II. 65% reported that these services are insufficient to meet the need in their area.
- 2) **Training:** 39% of respondents reported that there is less access to training opportunities under Perkins III than under Perkins II. 65% believe that access to training in their area is insufficient to meet students' needs.
- 3) **Dependent Care Assistance:** 43% of respondents reported that there is less dependent care assistance available to students under Perkins III than there was under Perkins II. 80% reported that dependent care assistance is insufficient to meet students' need, including 20% who reported that there is no dependent care assistance available in their area at all.
- 4) **Insufficient Transportation Assistance:** 45% of respondents said that there was less transportation assistance available to students under Perkins III than there was under Perkins II. 81% reported that there was insufficient transportation assistance for students in their region, including 24% who reported that it was not available at all.
- 5) **Insufficient Tuition Assistance:** 47% of respondents said that under Perkins III there was less tuition assistance available to the students than there was under Perkins II. 76% reported that there was insuf-

ficient tuition assistance to meet students' needs, including 19% who reported that tuition assistance was not available at all.

In each of these five areas, only between two and five percent of respondents were able to say that the services in their area had improved since Perkins III took effect. **Thus, the survey responses make clear that there is an overall shortage of essential supportive services and assistance, and that this shortage is worse than it was prior to Perkins III.**

Respondents emphasized that, without these crucial supportive services, many students will be unable to complete their training. For example:

- A program in Florida wrote, “Funds were cut so drastically that personnel were lost who could have provided services. Support group meetings and other innovative strategies were put in place, but many times lack of financial assistance for tuition and child care caused students to drop out.”
- A Michigan program predicted, “Students will be dropping classes because of no supportive services; transportation and day care.”
- An Iowa program noted that, under Perkins III, “Women, especially, must settle for limited training (if any) and low-paying jobs since there are no supportive services available.”

State and Local Agencies Have Not Stepped In to Help Local Programs Meet Need

Survey responses indicate that, in the vast majority of states, state and local agencies have not filled the gap left by the elimination of federal funding, and have given very low

“Local (college) control of the dollars ended financial support specifically for tuition, fees or child care. This put the clients at a disadvantage.”

- Michigan Respondent

priority to gender equity programs and programs designed to assist single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations.

- **Shrinking State Agency Support:** 39% of respondents reported that their state educational agency’s financial support, policy direction and leadership for displaced homemaker and single parent programs was worse than it was in the year before Perkins III took effect. 33% said such support had also decreased for programs and services to recruit and train women and girls for nontraditional fields. Between 11% and 14% of respondents said that state support for these programs was totally non-existent. Only 2% indicated that state support for either type of program had improved.
- **Shrinking Local Agency Support:** 30% of respondents reported that their local education agency’s financial support, policy direction and leadership for programs to support displaced homemakers, single parents, and students pursuing nontraditional fields was worse than it had been in the year before Perkins III took effect. Between 13% and 15% of respondents said that local support for these programs was totally non-existent. Only 4% stated local support for either type of program had improved.

Respondents’ narrative responses demonstrate that, in most areas, state and local agencies have left gender equity programs to sink or swim on their own, to the detriment of the women and girls depending on these supports to help them prepare for the workforce.

- An Alabama respondent said, “*Displaced Homemakers have always been largely ignored by state and local agencies, so I have not been surprised that this population has been pushed to the side, especially by local schools. If you don’t make them, they won’t do it.*”

- A California respondent contrasted the current lack of support with the assistance provided under Perkins II, writing that “*state education staff had done a wonderful job providing staff development and direction to the field before the [gender equity] set-aside was eliminated.*”
- A Missouri program observed that, “*Even though recruiting, enrolling and placing students in nontrad[itional] fields is one of the core indicators of Perkins III, I see less push for these activities now because there is no [gender equity] set aside or mandatory funding. I believe local and state education agencies will set low standards regarding this population, which will be easy to meet without much effort. Sad!*”

According to respondents, Workforce Investment Boards, established by the federal Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA), have not stepped in to support these programs. These agencies receive poor marks from survey respondents, many of whom fear that inadequate WIA implementation or the “work first” attitude of their local Workforce Investment agencies will result in scant support for training opportunities.

- **Workforce Investment Agencies Ignore Nontraditional Training:** Only 8% of respondents reported that the state or local Workforce Investment agencies provide sufficient financial support, policy direction and leadership to support programs and services to recruit and train female students for nontraditional occupations. More than 20% indicated that the Workforce Investment agencies give these programs no support or leadership at all.
- **Workforce Investment Agencies Ignore Displaced Homemaker and Single Parent Programs:** Only 10% of respondents reported that the state or local Workforce Investment agencies provide sufficient financial support, policy direction and leadership to support programs and services for displaced homemakers and single parent stu-

“Displaced homemakers have always been largely ignored by state and local agencies, so I have not been surprised that this population has been pushed to the side, especially by local schools. If you don’t make them, they won’t do it.”

- Alabama Respondent

dents. About 17% reported that the Workforce Investment agencies give these programs no support or leadership at all.

Conclusions: Why Changes in Perkins III Have Put Programs At Risk

PERKINS III PROVISIONS NOT ADEQUATE TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Although the need for single parent, displaced homemaker and gender equity programs is as great as ever, Perkins III is not driving enough funding to these programs. Competing pressures for funds at the local level and lack of directed guidance from state agencies is resulting in the closure of these programs and a lack of services to these students.

STATE LEADERSHIP SET-ASIDE TOO SMALL TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Many perceive the state leadership set-aside of \$60,000 to \$150,000 to support students preparing for nontraditional occupations as the funding replacement for the gender equity set-asides that existed under Perkins I and II. However, in fiscal year 1998-1999 under Perkins II, 10.5% of the total basic Perkins grant money (an estimated \$106 million) went to single parent and displaced homemaker programs, and programs that promoted gender equity in vocational education. In fiscal year 1999-2000, under Perkins III, only .6% of the total basic Perkins grant money (an estimated \$5.96 million) went to support students preparing for nontraditional occupations – an enormous reduction in overall funding.

SEX EQUITY COORDINATORS ELIMINATED OR ROLES SIGNIFICANTLY DIMINISHED

The state sex equity coordinators funded under Perkins I and Perkins II provided a broad range of services to promote women and girls’ access to and success in vocational programs, such as providing technical assistance to local educational agencies, managing and monitoring the use of gender equity funds, and reviewing state and local plans for ending gender stereotypes and bias. Under Perkins III, only a few states continue to fund a full-time person to fulfill these duties. Without a state sex equity coordinator, there is no one to advocate for programs at the state level and to ensure that local plans are meeting the needs of women and girls.

STATES ARE NOT TAKING ADVANTAGE OF FUNDING FLEXIBILITY

Perkins III contains an optional provision that allows states to reserve up to 10% of the local allocated funds to be distributed to locals based on four criteria: 1) rural schools; 2) schools with high percentages of vocational education students; 3) schools with high numbers of vocational education students; and 4) schools negatively impacted by the change in the secondary funding formula. The state has the option of directing local agencies to give priority to programs for single parents, displaced homemakers and students in nontraditional training programs in the use of these funds. However, after the first year of implementation of Perkins III, only one state (Maine) is using the 10% reserve fund to support these types of programs.

"Without the set-asides for equity and single parent/displaced homemakers, many programs ended. Perkins III is not providing services throughout the entire state like Perkins II provided."

- South Dakota Respondent

LOCAL AGENCIES NOT FUNDING PROGRAMS

Because few states are taking advantage of the funding options available in Perkins III, the responsibility for serving single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations falls on the shoulders of local educational agencies. Without the targeted funding of the set-asides, local educational agencies are expected to serve these populations using their local Perkins allocation or other local funds. However, due to competing pressures at the local level, it appears that local agencies are not using their Perkins III local allocated funds to support services for single parents, displaced homemakers and students pursuing nontraditional careers¹⁵.

ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS NOT YET BEING USED TO IMPACT LOCAL PROGRAM QUALITY

Due to the slow nature of data collection and dissemination, it will take years for the performance measure results provided for by Perkins III's accountability system to be translated into program support. By the time the crisis has been identified through performance data, valuable programs, services and personnel will be gone and many model programs will have to be rebuilt. Currently, states are not making the connection between the existence of quality programs and improving performance on the accountability measures. Few states are even holding local agencies that failed to meet performance measures accountable by requiring improved local plans and programs.

LOCAL PROGRAMS UNABLE TO FIND ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES

Some states have been successful in accessing alternative funding sources for these programs, such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) funds, Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funds, or state vocational education funds. (Pennsylvania, Georgia, Virginia are examples.) This strategy requires strong networks of local programs and advocates at the state agency level to collaborate with other state agencies to identify and access these other sources.

Overall National Finding:

The removal of targeted funding for programs to support single parents, displaced homemakers and gender equity from Perkins has led to a shortage of services and programs to support women and girls in vocational programs. Without a federal mandate to support displaced homemaker, single parent and gender equity programs, they are unlikely to receive the support they need from state or local agencies.

State Ratings

Why Rate the States?

During the 1998 reauthorization of Perkins, Congress believed that states should have more “flexibility” in spending federal money, yet be more accountable in providing vocational education services. By disaggregating the survey results by state, the Task Force sought to determine whether states are using the new “flexibility” to support female students’ attempts to achieve economic self-sufficiency through vocational programs. The survey results revealed a wide variation in state practices. **Unfortunately, in no state did Perkins III seem to improve the status of programs designed to help women and girls pursue vocational education.** Even in the best states, programs seem to be struggling to maintain the level of services they provided under Perkins II. **And in the vast majority of states, programs are much worse off.**

The purpose of rating the states is to help federal policymakers understand what the effects of decentralization have been and to provide local advocates with information about their own state. Policymakers, advocates and other readers of this report are strongly encouraged to look not just at the overall rating given to the state, but at the scores given for each of the 11 criteria. Some states may be performing very well in some areas, but not in others.

How Were the States Rated?

States were ranked based on each state’s performance in 11 key indicators. These indicators are based on the information gathered from the survey questions developed by the NCWGE Vocational Education and Training Task Force to evaluate the status of programs supporting women and girls’ vocational education. The Task Force designed these survey questions to determine the impact of Perkins III, as reflected

in the effects experienced by program administrators in both their ability to provide services and the support they receive from state and local agencies.

Each of the 11 indicators was assigned a maximum point value, ranging from two to four points. Each state was then given a numerical score for each of the indicators, based on the average response among survey respondents from that state. The numerical scores ranged from zero (for states needing the most improvement) up to the maximum point value for the indicator (for states with the best results). The 11 scores for each state were then added together to determine the state’s total score. States were then given an overall rating based on their total score. The state ratings are contained in Chart 1 (page 17). State’s scores, listed by status indicator, are contained in Chart 2 (page 22).

Following are the 11 indicators that formed the basis for the rating, and a brief description of how the numerical scores for each indicator were assigned:

- 1) State Support for Displaced Homemaker/Single Parent Programs
- 2) Changes in State Support for Displaced Homemaker/Single Parent Programs Since Perkins III
- 3) State Support for Nontraditional Programs
- 4) Changes in State Support for Nontraditional Programs Since Perkins III
- 5) Local Support for Displaced Homemaker/Single Parent Programs
- 6) Changes in Local Support for Displaced Homemaker/Single Parent Programs Since Perkins III
- 7) Local Support for Nontraditional Programs
- 8) Changes in Local Support for Nontraditional Programs Since Perkins III

- 9) Funding of Programs
- 10) Provision of Services
- 11) Future Security of Programs

Indicators 1-8 reflect state respondents' responses to survey questions asking them to rate the support (including financial support, policy direction and leadership) provided by their state and local educational agencies for programs and services to assist displaced homemakers and single parents and students studying for nontraditional occupations. Respondents were asked to rate state and local agencies separately, and to rate each agency's support for displaced homemaker, single parent and nontraditional occupation programs separately. Respondents were also asked to compare recent support to the support they had received prior to Perkins III implementation.

Indicators reflecting state and local agencies' current support (indicators 1, 3, 5 and 7) were assigned the following scores based upon respondents' answers:

- Four – "Excellent"
- Three – "Sufficient"
- Two – "Needs Improvement"
- One – "Very Poor"
- Zero – "Non-existent"

Indicators reflecting respondents' assessment of the change in state or local agency support since Perkins III implementation (indicators 2, 4, 6 and 8) were assigned the following scores:

- Two – "Better than Last Year"
- One – "Same as Last Year"
- Zero – "Worse than Last Year"

Indicator 9 is based on survey respondents' answers to the question "Due to changes in Perkins III, what has been the impact of funding on your program?" Scores were assigned as follows:

- Four – "Receive more Perkins funding" or any response that indicated the respondent received replacement funding from the state;
- Three – "Receive the same amount of Perkins funding"

- Two – Any response that indicated the respondent received alternative funding from non-state sources
- One – "Receive less Perkins funding"

Indicator 10 is based on survey respondents' answers to the question "Due to changes in Perkins III, what has been the effect on your ability to provide services?" Scores were assigned as follows:

- Four – "Services have increased"
- Three – "Services have stayed the same"
- Two – "Services have decreased somewhat"
- One – "Services have decreased severely"
- Zero – "We have shut down."

Indicator 11 is based on survey respondents' answers to the question "What do you anticipate for the future of your program?" Scores were assigned as follows:

- Three – "No Changes"
- Two – "Cutbacks"
- One – "Severe Cutbacks"
- Zero – "We Will Shut Down"

The total score a state could receive was 35. No state received that score. States' scores ranged between 8 and 20.

- **No state received the rating of "Programs Promoted."**
- **States scoring between 18 and 20 received a rating of "Programs Protected."**
- **States scoring between 14 and 17 received a rating of "Losing Ground."**
- **States scoring between 10 and 13 received a rating of "Support Disintegrating."**
- **States scoring a 9 or below received a rating of "Failure."**

See Chart 1 on the following page for state ratings.

For detailed scores by Status Indicators, see Chart 2 on pages 22-23.

Chart 1: State Ratings

State	Rating	Total Score for Status Indicators (Out of 35)*
Alabama	Program Support Disintegrating	13
Alaska**	Programs Protected	20
Arizona	Program Support Disintegrating	10
Arkansas	Failure	9
California**	Programs Losing Ground	17
Colorado	Program Support Disintegrating	13
Connecticut	Programs Losing Ground	15
Delaware	--	--
District of Columbia	--	--
Florida	Program Support Disintegrating	11
Georgia**	Programs Protected	19
Hawaii	Programs Protected	20
Idaho	Programs Losing Ground	16
Illinois	Programs Losing Ground	17
Indiana	Program Support Disintegrating	12
Iowa	Programs Losing Ground	16
Kansas	Program Support Disintegrating	13
Kentucky	Failure	9
Louisiana	Program Support Disintegrating	10
Maine **	Programs Losing Ground	14
Maryland	Program Support Disintegrating	10
Massachusetts	Programs Losing Ground	16
Michigan	Programs Protected	18
Minnesota	Programs Losing Ground	17
Mississippi	Programs Losing Ground	14
Missouri	Programs Losing Ground	17
Montana	Programs Protected	20
Nebraska	Program Support Disintegrating	13
Nevada	Program Support Disintegrating	12
New Hampshire	Programs Losing Ground	15
New Jersey	Program Support Disintegrating	13
New Mexico	Programs Losing Ground	16
New York **	Program Support Disintegrating	10
North Carolina **	Programs Protected	19
North Dakota **	Program Support Disintegrating	13
Ohio	Programs Losing Ground	14
Oklahoma	Program Support Disintegrating	13
Oregon	Programs Protected	20
Pennsylvania	Programs Protected	18
Rhode Island **	Program Support Disintegrating	13
South Carolina	Programs Protected	19
South Dakota	Programs Losing Ground	14
Tennessee	Failure	8
Texas	Programs Losing Ground	16
Utah **	Programs Protected	18
Vermont	Programs Losing Ground	14
Virginia	Programs Protected	19
Washington	Programs Losing Ground	17
West Virginia	Programs Protected	20
Wisconsin **	Programs Losing Ground	16
Wyoming	Programs Losing Ground	17

* See Chart 2 for scoring of status indicators.

** In considering these ratings, readers should note that these states had an extremely low response rate (below 15%) to the survey.

Recommendations and Next Steps

This is a critical time for women and girls in vocational programs, as demonstrated by the results of this report. If the trends discussed here continue, drop-outs are likely to increase, supportive programs will continue to disappear, and many women will be locked into traditionally female, low-wage occupational categories. Students, educators, advocates and policymakers must work together to support these students and make sure they continue to have an opportunity to prepare for the world of work and economic independence.

The NCWGE Vocational Education and Training Task Force has developed recommendations for each of these groups. These recommendations are intended as a starting point to ensure that women and girls do not fall by the wayside in the new skill-based economy.

Next Steps for Women and Girls in Vocational Programs

- Share your personal story with your state or federal legislator, the press or an advocacy organization such as Women Work!, the National Women's Law Center, or other member organizations of the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. Let them know how important vocational training is for your economic security, the barriers you face in getting an education, and the need for supportive services.
- Seek out other students with similar needs and experiences to approach school administrators as a group to request the services you need, and to suggest improvements to the program.
- Report any gender discrimination, including sexual harassment and discriminatory policies, against female students. If you believe that you or any student has been subjected to discrimination because of being female or pregnant,

contact your school's Title IX Coordinator, your state Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, or any legal organization, such as the National Women's Law Center.

Next Steps for Program Providers and Educators

- Document the impact of Perkins III on your program and on students. Share your stories with your state or federal legislator, the press or an advocacy organization such as Women Work!.
- Get involved in your local application for Perkins funds. Find out who is coordinating the application process (probably the vocational education director at your school or district). Volunteer to be on the application development committee that the law requires and advocate for funding for programs to support displaced homemakers, single parents, gender equity, and students preparing for nontraditional occupations.
- Keep track of success rates in your program in order to prove the effectiveness of these programs. (For example, the percentage of individuals entering the workforce, wages earned after graduation, government savings in public assistance dollars, etc. .)
- Request in-service training to help educators ensure an equitable learning environment in their programs and learn how to better serve the needs of single parents, displaced homemakers, and students preparing for nontraditional occupations.
- Contact your local policymakers and state and federal representatives to advocate that they take the steps suggested in the next section.

Next Steps for Local Policymakers

- Support and fund local programs that actively recruit single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations. Targeted outreach and recruitment can help increase the participation of women in vocational education, particularly nontraditional training.
- As part of your district strategic planning, determine the needs of single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations and create and provide programs to serve those needs.
- Provide training for teachers to help them ensure an equitable learning environment.
- Leverage additional funds to support these programs from other available sources, such as state Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and Workforce Investment Act funds.
- Advocate with state and federal policymakers to take the steps listed below.

Next Steps for State Policymakers

- Restore the full-time Gender Equity Coordinator position in your state Department of Education to provide technical assistance and professional development to local educational agencies to help them meet the core indicators of performance and succeed in serving single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations.
- Allocate the maximum amount of set-aside funds (\$150,000) to serve students in nontraditional programs. Set aside additional state leadership funds for programs that support single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations. Be creative about the use of these funds so they can have the greatest impact on the improvement of your state's ability to meet the Perkins fourth core indicator of performance – participation in and completion of training for nontraditional employment.
- Require local educational agencies to describe how they will serve single parents, displaced homemakers and

students preparing for nontraditional occupations in their local application for funds.

- Use the 10% reserve option of the 85% within-state allocation (Section 112 of Perkins III) to award grants to eligible recipients to target programs supporting displaced homemakers, single parents and students preparing for nontraditional occupations.
- Improve data collection to accurately identify and track the success of single parents, displaced homemakers and students enrolled in nontraditional programs.
- Set realistic and rigorous performance measures for improving participation and completion rates of students preparing for nontraditional occupations (the fourth “core indicator” of performance in the federal Perkins law). Hold local educational agencies accountable for meeting these measures and for ensuring that the “special populations” defined by the Perkins law, which include students preparing for nontraditional occupations, are performing at the same level as other students.
- Advocate for the state and federal legislatures to allocate funds for programs supporting single parents, displaced homemakers, gender equity, and students preparing for nontraditional occupations.
- Increase Title IX compliance reviews of vocational programs (required of each state by the U.S. Department of Education) to address and remedy instances of gender discrimination in vocational programs, and provide technical assistance as necessary to improve conditions.

Next Steps for Federal Policymakers:

- Restore funding for programs that support gender equity, displaced homemakers, single parents, and students preparing for nontraditional employment.
- Maintain strong accountability measures, particularly for improving participation and completion rates of students preparing for nontraditional occupations (the fourth “core indicator” of performance in the federal Perkins law).
- Maintain strong accountability reporting requirements to ensure success of special population students, especially single parents, displaced homemakers and students preparing for nontraditional occupations, on all accountability measures.

- Hold states accountable for meeting the performance indicators and follow through with sanctions and incentives as outlined in Perkins.
- Increase the number of compliance reviews that the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights conducts in vocational programs, utilizing Title IX and its implementing regulations, as well as the Department's

Vocational Education Programs Guidelines for Eliminating Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of Race, Color, National Origin, Sex and Handicap, to ensure that all vocational programs provide equal access and opportunity for female students.

“When equity set-asides were removed from Perkins funding, the move jeopardized the integrity of the goal. Without adequate training, the single parent and displaced homemaker population can expect to find employment that is typically low-paying and that does not include benefits....In the end, the irony is that those students who would be good candidates for nontraditional training because they are inclined to consider options that pay well are not assisted to the extent that allows them to succeed.

The fact is that without set-asides this population slips through the cracks and their needs are neither recognized nor addressed.”

— Arizona Respondent

For more information and resources, contact:

Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment

1625 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
phone: (202) 467-6346
fax: (202) 467-5366
email: womenwork@womenwork.org
website: www.womenwork.org

National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity

P.O. Box 369
172 Hood Road
Cochranville, PA 19330
phone: (610) 345-9246
fax: (610) 869-4380
website: www.napequity.org

National Women's Law Center

11 Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 588-5180
fax: (202) 588-5185
email: info@nwlc.org
website: www.nwlc.org

**United States Department of Education
Office for Civil Rights (OCR)**

Mary E. Switzer Building
330 C Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202
phone: (800) 421-3481
website: www.ed.gov/ocr

**Office of Vocational and Adult Education
(OVAE)**

4090 MES
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202
phone: (202) 205-5451
website: www.ed.gov/offices/OVAE (case sensitive)

Wider Opportunities for Women

815 15th Street, NW, Suite 916
Washington, DC 20005
phone: (202) 638-3143
fax: (202) 638-4885
website: www.wowonline.org

American Association of University Women

111 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (800) 326-AAUW
fax: (202) 872-1425
website: www.aauw.org

Chart 2: State Scores for Status Indicators Based on Survey Results

	Total Score	Funding of State Displaced Homemaker/ Single Parent Programs (DH/SP)	Changes in State Support Since Perkins III for DH/SP Programs	State Support for Nontraditional Employment (NTO) Programs	Changes in State Support Since Perkins III for NTO programs	Local Support for DH/SP Programs
Total Possible	35	4.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	4.0
Alabama	13	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.4	1.5
Alaska	20	3.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
Arizona	10	0.8	0.3	0.7	0.2	1.0
Arkansas	9	1.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.3
California	17	2.0	0.5	1.8	0.5	2.1
Colorado	13	1.4	0.2	1.8	0.5	1.8
Connecticut	15	1.8	1.0	1.7	0.5	2.5
Delaware	1	*	*	*	*	*
D.C.	n/a	*	*	*	*	*
Florida	11	1.5	0.3	1.1	0.3	1.8
Georgia	19	2.2	1.1	1.9	1.0	2.4
Hawaii	20	2.0	0.7	1.7	2.0	2.0
Idaho	16	1.7	1.3	1.0	0.3	1.7
Illinois	17	2.2	0.6	2.0	0.4	2.1
Indiana	12	0.7	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.7
Iowa	16	2.1	0.5	2.0	0.4	1.7
Kansas	13	1.1	0.7	1.4	0.7	1.3
Kentucky	9	0.8	0.2	0.8	0.2	1.0
Louisiana	10	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5
Maine	14	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.5
Maryland	10	0.5	0.2	0.8	0.8	1.3
Massachusetts	16	1.9	0.4	1.6	0.8	2.0
Michigan	18	2.0	0.5	2.0	0.9	2.0
Minnesota	17	1.5	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.8
Mississippi	14	2.3	0.5	2.3	0.5	2.3
Missouri	17	2.4	0.4	2.4	0.4	2.2
Montana	20	3.3	0.7	2.5	0.7	2.3
Nebraska	13	1.6	0.3	2.0	0.5	1.6
Nevada	12	1.3	0.0	2.0	1.0	1.8
New Hampshire	15	1.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0
New Jersey	13	1.3	0.4	1.0	0.3	1.2
New Mexico	16	1.4	0.6	1.4	0.8	1.4
New York	10	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.3	1.0
North Carolina	19	3.3	1.0	4.0	1.0	2.0
North Dakota	13	3.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Ohio	14	1.4	0.3	1.6	0.4	1.5
Oklahoma	13	1.2	0.2	1.6	0.5	2.1
Oregon	20	2.3	0.9	2.1	0.9	2.5
Pennsylvania	18	2.1	0.8	2.1	0.8	1.9
Rhode Island	13	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
South Carolina	19	1.4	0.9	1.9	0.9	2.1
South Dakota	14	1.5	0.5	2.1	0.7	1.0
Tennessee	8	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.8
Texas	16	2.0	0.6	1.7	0.8	1.9
Utah	18	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0
Vermont	14	1.3	0.3	2.0	0.8	1.0
Virginia	19	2.0	0.8	2.0	1.0	2.2
Washington	17	2.8	0.7	1.8	0.6	2.2
West Virginia	20	2.6	0.7	2.8	0.9	2.1
Wisconsin	16	2.6	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.5
Wyoming	17	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	3.0
National Average	16	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.9

* No survey responses were received for this question from this state

Chart 2: State Scores for Status Indicators Based on Survey Results

	Changes in Local Support Since Perkins III for DH/SP Programs	Local Support for NTO Programs	Changes in Local Support Since Perkins III for NTO Programs	Funding of Programs	Provision of Services	Future Security of Programs
Total Possible	2.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
Alabama	0.4	1.3	0.4	2.0	1.4	1.1
Alaska	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Arizona	0.3	0.7	0.2	2.5	1.7	1.2
Arkansas	0.3	1.8	0.3	1.8	0.8	0.8
California	0.6	1.8	0.7	2.2	2.0	2.1
Colorado	0.4	1.8	0.5	1.5	1.7	1.7
Connecticut	1.0	1.8	0.5	3.0	0.7	1.0
Delaware	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
D.C.	*	*	*	*	*	*
Florida	0.4	1.6	0.4	1.4	1.1	1.4
Georgia	0.9	1.9	1.0	2.2	2.1	2.0
Hawaii	0.7	2.0	1.0	2.7	3.0	2.0
Idaho	0.7	0.7	0.3	3.0	2.3	2.7
Illinois	0.7	1.9	0.5	2.7	2.0	2.1
Indiana	0.5	1.0	1.0	2.7	1.3	1.3
Iowa	0.8	1.4	0.7	2.6	2.1	2.0
Kansas	1.0	1.3	0.6	1.7	1.7	1.6
Kentucky	0.6	0.8	0.6	1.6	0.8	1.3
Louisiana	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.8	2.3	1.5
Maine	1.0	1.5	0.0	1.0	3.0	3.0
Maryland	0.3	0.2	0.8	2.2	1.0	1.5
Massachusetts	0.6	1.9	1.2	2.3	1.3	1.7
Michigan	0.9	2.0	0.8	2.2	2.4	2.4
Minnesota	0.8	2.0	0.8	2.3	2.0	2.3
Mississippi	1.0	2.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.0
Missouri	0.7	2.3	0.7	2.2	1.7	1.9
Montana	0.5	2.3	0.5	2.5	2.8	2.0
Nebraska	0.3	1.7	0.4	1.3	1.4	1.3
Nevada	0.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3
New Hampshire	0.3	2.5	0.5	2.3	1.5	2.5
New Jersey	0.4	0.9	0.4	2.3	1.8	2.4
New Mexico	0.8	1.0	0.8	3.0	2.5	2.3
New York	0.3	1.5	0.5	1.5	0.8	1.3
North Carolina	0.5	2.0	0.5	2.0	1.0	1.3
North Dakota	1.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Ohio	0.3	1.8	0.4	2.5	2.1	1.8
Oklahoma	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.9	1.4	1.2
Oregon	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.5	2.5	2.3
Pennsylvania	0.9	1.7	0.9	3.0	2.3	1.7
Rhode Island	1.0	0.0	1.0	4.0	1.0	2.0
South Carolina	0.8	1.8	0.8	2.9	2.8	2.4
South Dakota	0.8	0.9	0.6	2.1	1.6	1.9
Tennessee	0.7	1.0	0.7	1.3	1.0	1.0
Texas	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.8	2.2	2.1
Utah	1.0	2.0	*	3.0	3.0	2.0
Vermont	0.5	2.0	0.8	2.5	1.8	1.3
Virginia	1.0	2.2	1.0	3.5	1.8	1.5
Washington	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.5	2.2	2.0
West Virginia	0.7	1.9	1.0	2.9	2.3	2.0
Wisconsin	0.7	1.8	0.5	1.4	1.8	1.8
Wyoming	1.3	2.7	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.7
National Average	0.7	1.7	0.7	2.2	1.9	1.9

Appendix A:

Methodology of Survey

The survey was created by the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education's (NCWGE) Vocational Education and Training Task Force, which includes representatives from the American Association of University Women, the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, the National Women's Law Center, Wider Opportunities for Women, and Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment.

Initial drafts of the survey were shared with the organizational members of NCWGE and field-tested on the members of the Women Work! National Governing Board.

The final version of the survey was sent to displaced homemaker programs, single parent programs, gender equity programs and nontraditional training programs in secondary, post-secondary and community-based organizations nationwide. Survey recipients were identified by Women Work! Network membership, the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity's network of state equity coordinators, and the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education. Notice of the survey was also posted on the websites of Wider Opportunities for Women and Women Work!, with information on how Perkins-funded programs could receive a survey. The surveys included a form requesting that respondents identify any additional programs that should receive a survey or that had shut down during the first year of Perkins implementation.

The survey was mailed in August 2000. In order to obtain the highest possible response rate, surveys were sent a second time in November 2000. The Task Force received responses

from every state except the District of Columbia, and one incomplete response from Delaware. In total, the Task Force sent 1,510 surveys nationwide and received 587, more than a third, back. One hundred and forty-two of the returned surveys were from programs that did not receive Perkins funds prior to July 1, 1999 (the effective date of Perkins III) or did not identify the state location of their program. These surveys did not include responses to questions and were therefore excluded from the survey results. **It is important to note that many surveys sent by the Task Force were returned by the postal service as undeliverable, suggesting that many of the programs previously in existence had closed during the first year of Perkins III.**

The survey was anonymous, although some respondents voluntarily supplied contact information. Programs housed in post-secondary institutions comprised 72% of the respondents, while 24% of respondents were from programs housed in secondary institutions, and 14% of respondents were from community-based organizations. Survey respondents represented a variety of programs: 85% of respondents work with displaced homemakers and/or single parents; 66% of respondents work with students preparing for nontraditional occupations; 52% of respondents work on issues of gender equity in vocational education; 31% of respondents work with teen parents; and 33% work on "other" issues. (Totals may be more than 100% because respondents could select more than one category.)

Appendix B: Perkins III Survey

National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education

Vocational Education and Training Task Force

Please use black or blue ink and mark answers clearly.

1. Did you receive Perkins funds prior to July 1, 1999?

☐ Yes

☐ No – Thank you*.

* You do not need to complete the rest of this survey BUT it is important that you still return the survey to us in the envelope provided.

2. In what state does your program operate ? _____

3. What type of institution are you housed in ? (select ALL that apply)

☐ Secondary (H.S.)

☐ Post-Secondary

☐ Community-Based Organization

4. What type of program do you work with ? (select ALL that apply)

☐

Teen Parent

☐

Displaced Homemaker /
Single Parent

☐

Nontraditional

☐

Gender Equity

☐

Other: _____

5. Due to changes in Perkins III, what has been the impact of funding on your programs?

(Select the ONE that best applies)

☐

Receive more Perkins
funding

☐

Receive the same amount of
Perkins funding

☐

Receive less Perkins
funding

☐

Found alternative sources
Please list: _____

6. Due to changes in Perkins III, what has been the affect on your ability to provide services?

(Select the ONE that best applies)

☐

Services have
increased

☐

Services have stayed
the same

☐

Services have
decreased somewhat

☐

Services have
decreased severely

☐

We have shut down

7. What do you anticipate for the future of your programs? (select the ONE that best applies)

☐ No changes
 ☐ Cutbacks
 ☐ Severe Cutbacks
 ☐ We will shut down

For questions 8 and 9, please give both your overall opinion of the current adequacy of these programs and services **AND** your opinion of how programs and services compare with last year.

8. Under Perkins III, how would you rate the availability in your local area of the following types of assistance for displaced homemakers, single parents, and students pursuing nontraditional training and employment:

- Pre-vocational services? (personal & career counseling, life skills development, job readiness)
- Access to training?
- Dependent care assistance?
- Transportation assistance?
- Tuition assistance?
- Other forms of assistance?

Overall Opinion
Check one of the following:

Yes exceeds need	Yes, meets need	Falls somewhat short of need	Not close to meeting need	Non-existent

Compared to Last Year
Check one of the following:

Better than last year	Same as last year	Worse than last year

9. How would you rate the financial support, policy direction and leadership provided by your...

- **State education agency** for programs and services for displaced homemakers and single parents?
- **Local education agency** for programs and services for displaced homemakers and single parents?
- **State education agency** for programs and services to recruit and train women and girls for nontraditional occupations?
- **Local education agency** for programs and services to recruit and train women and girls for nontraditional occupations?

Overall Opinion
Check one of the following:

Excellent	Sufficient	Needs improvement	Very Poor	Non-existent

Compared to Last Year
Check one of the following:

Better than last year	Same as last year	Worse than last year

Overall Opinion
Check one of the following:

Compared to Last Year
Check one of the following:

9. Continued

How would you rate the financial support, policy direction and leadership provided by your . . .

- **State workforce investment board** for programs and services to recruit and train women and girls for nontraditional occupations?
- **Local workforce investment board** for programs and services to recruit and train women and girls for nontraditional occupations?
- **State workforce investment board** for programs and services to train displaced homemakers and welfare recipients, as part of the “displaced workers” population served by the Workforce Investment Act?
- **Local workforce investment board** for programs and services to train displaced homemakers and welfare recipients, as part of the “dislocated workers” population served by the Workforce Investment Act?

Excellent	Sufficient	Needs improvement	Very Poor	Non-existent

Better than last year	Same as last year	Worse than last year

10. Briefly describe your overall assessment of Perkins III. (Use additional pages if necessary.)

11. Provide information about a particularly successful program for displaced homemakers and single parents that has been initiated under Perkins III. (Use additional pages if necessary.)

12. Provide information about a particularly successful program for nontraditional occupations that has been initiated under Perkins III. (Use additional pages if necessary.)

13. As stated in the cover letter, this is an anonymous survey. However, if you would be willing to talk with us regarding the answers you have given here, please give us your contact information below:

Return to:

Jill Miller, Vocational Education and Training Task Force Chair

National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education

c/o Women Work!

1625 K Street, NW, Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

Tel: 202-467-6346

Fax: 202-467-5366

A Postage-Paid, Business Reply Envelope is enclosed for your convenience

Appendix C:

Survey Response Rates by State

State	# of Surveys Sent	# of Surveys Returned*	Percentage
Alabama	29	10	34%
Alaska	17	1	6%
Arizona	23	6	26%
Arkansas	8	4	50%
California	270	35	13%
Colorado	23	6	26%
Connecticut	19	4	21%
Delaware	23	1	4%
District of Columbia	4	0	0%
Florida	48	18	38%
Georgia	69	10	14%
Hawaii	16	3	19%
Idaho	6	3	50%
Illinois	36	15	42%
Indiana	10	3	30%
Iowa	19	11	58%
Kansas	13	7	54%
Kentucky	11	5	45%
Louisiana	11	4	36%
Maine	18	2	11%
Maryland	20	6	30%
Massachusetts	25	7	28%
Michigan	52	26	50%
Minnesota	21	4	19%
Mississippi	18	4	22%
Missouri	23	16	70%
Montana	14	4	29%
Nebraska	17	17	100%
Nevada	8	3	38%
New Hampshire	11	4	36%
New Jersey	45	10	22%
New Mexico	13	6	46%
New York	50	4	8%
North Carolina	41	3	7%
North Dakota	8	1	13%
Ohio	32	13	41%
Oklahoma	25	17	68%
Oregon	34	20	59%
Pennsylvania	42	21	50%
Rhode Island	7	1	14%
South Carolina	65	15	23%
South Dakota	14	8	57%
Tennessee	23	6	26%
Texas	60	31	52%
Utah	7	1	14%
Vermont	16	4	25%
Virginia	26	6	23%
Washington	36	12	33%
West Virginia	20	8	40%
Wisconsin	57	8	14%
Wyoming	8	3	38%
TOTAL	1,510	435**	

* These numbers only include responses from programs that received Perkins funding prior to July 1, 1999. An additional 142 respondents returned surveys but did not receive Perkins funding prior to July 1, 1999 and did not identify their states. Their responses were not included in the results of this survey.

** 10 respondents who did receive Perkins funding prior to July 1, 1999 also failed to designate their state. These surveys were only included in national totals.

Endnotes

¹ A “displaced homemaker” is defined by the Perkins Act as an individual who: 1) has worked primarily without pay to care for home and family; 2) has been dependent on the income of a family member or whose youngest child will become ineligible for TANF within two years, and 3) who is underemployed or unemployed and having difficulty obtaining or upgrading employment.

² “Nontraditional” occupations for women are defined as fields in which women comprise less than 25% of the current workforce. Nontraditional jobs for women, which include many of the new high-technology careers, tend to offer higher wages than traditionally female job categories.

³ *Empowering America’s Families: Documenting the Success of Vocational Equity Programs for Women and Girls*, National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, pp. 2-3, 1995.

⁴ The recorded vote was 214 to 207 against the amendment. House Amendment 256, H.R. 1853, 105th Congress, 1998.

⁵ “Nontraditional training” is defined by the Perkins law, and throughout this report, as training for occupations in which the student’s gender currently represents less than 25% of the workforce. For women nontraditional training can include many of the high-wage, skilled trades jobs, such as in the construction industry, as well as many of the jobs in the new high-tech industry.

⁶ States submitted the first round of accountability data to the U.S. Department of Education between December 2000 and March 2001, but the data is not yet available for public review. Therefore it is uncertain whether states were able to improve performance in these measures, particularly without set-aside funds.

⁷ *Opening the Door to Economic Security: Making Career Education Programs Work for Women and Girls*, National Women’s Law Center Fact Sheet, March 2001.

⁸ *Follow-Up Survey of 1998 Wisconsin Youth Apprenticeship Graduates*, Scholl, Linda and Smyth, Conor. Center on Education and Work, University of Wisconsin-Madison, November 2000.

⁹ *Vocational Education in the United States: Toward the Year 2000*, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Table 100, 2000.

¹⁰ *Women Work, Poverty Still Persists*, Women Work! The National Network for Women’s Employment, 1998.

¹¹ *The Wage Gap by Education*, National Committee on Pay Equity, 1999.

¹² *The State of Working America*, Mishel, Lawrence, et al., Cornell University Press, p. 130, 2001.

¹³ *Follow-Up Survey of 1998 Wisconsin Youth Apprenticeship Graduates*, Scholl, Linda and Smyth, Conor. Center on Education and Work, University of Wisconsin-Madison, November 2000.

¹⁴ In addition, under the Department of Education’s vocational education guidelines, states must conduct a certain number of on-site reviews of vocational programs every year to ensure full compliance with Title IX requirements. (*Revised Procedures for Preparing the Methods of Administration Described in the Vocational Education Guidelines*, U.S. DOE Office for Civil Rights, September 1996).

¹⁵ States submitted the first round of accountability data to the U.S. Department of Education between December 2000 and March 2001, but the data is not yet available for public review. Therefore, it is uncertain whether states were able to improve performance in these measures, particularly without the set-aside funds.

For additional copies of *Invisible Again*, contact:

Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment

1625 K Street, NW Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

phone: (202) 467-6346

fax: (202) 467-5366

email: womenwork@womenwork.org

website: www.womenwork.org

The **National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE)** represents approximately 50 diverse, national organizations committed to improving educational opportunities for women and girls in all aspects of education. NCWGE member organizations include:

Academy for Educational Development	National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity
Alki Middle School	National Association for Girls & Women in Sports
American Association for the Advancement of Science	National Association for Women in Education
American Association of School Administrators	National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators
American Association of University Women	National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education
American Civil Liberties Union	National Council of Administrative Women in Education
American Council on Education	National Council of Negro Women
American Educational Research Association	National Education Association
American Federation of Teachers	National Organization for Women
American Psychological Association	NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund
Association of American Colleges and Universities	National Partnership for Women and Families
Association for Women in Science	National Women's History Project
Association of Junior Leagues International, Inc.	National Women's Law Center
Association of Teacher Educators	National Women's Political Caucus
Business & Professional Women USA	Parent and Teacher Association
Center for Advancement of Public Policy	Partners of the Americas
Center for Women's Policy Studies	U.S. Student Association
Council of Chief State School Officers	Wider Opportunities for Women
Federation of Organizations for Professional Women	Women's Bureau
Feminist Majority Foundation	Women's Edge
Gallaudet University	Women's Research and Education Institute
Girls Count	Women's Sports Foundation
Girls Incorporated	Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment
Girl Scouts of the USA	
Ms. Foundation for Women	
Myra Sadker Advocates for Gender Equity	

Leslie Annexstein, Chair
National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education
c/o National Women's Law Center
11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 588-5180
(202) 588-5185 fax
www.ncwge.org