

Vocational Funding (now CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE)) History in Washington State

Vocational Education/CTE began with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, which funded Agriculture and Home Economics in local high schools with start-up and additional yearly funding. The following are changes to that model over the years.

1. 1933 to 1977 secondary vocational education programs in Washington State were funded at 2.2 times basic education funding. (1965 BEA = \$305...total of \$671 to Voc Ed)
2. In 1977 the legislature changed a weighted pupil funding mechanism of 2.2 times basic education funding to a staffing ration model and funding was dramatically reduced to 1.2 of basic education or converted to a staffing ratio of 16.67:1. (Voc enhancement = \$546 in 1977...\$874 in 2010)
3. In 1982 a legislative study found that funds allocated for vocational education were not being spent by local districts on vocational education and the legislature cut vocational funding to 18.3. (Editor's note: The districts took the money but failed to spend it in Voc programs)
4. In 1987, 1988, 1991 the legislature increased vocational funding to 17.75, 17.5 and 17.075 respectfully.
5. In 1995, a LEAP study again showed that secondary vocational education funds weren't being spent in vocational education and the legislature again cut vocational funding to 18.3.
6. In 1997 the legislature again found that the funds allocated for secondary vocational education were not being spent on vocational education. Starting with the 1997-98 school year a budget proviso came out (with repealed language) that said "use it or lose it" and staffing was cut to 19.5. The balance of the funding was reallocated to Non-Employee Related Costs (NERCs). 10% indirect lid remained in place as defined by OSPI. (Note: NERCs are now known as MSOC in 2012)
7. In 1997 the repeal of several WAC codes that were to cause districts to spend vocational education funds in vocational education, allowing districts to spend secondary vocational education funds on programs other than vocational education.
8. In 1998 OSPI defines indirect costs to have the 10% lid to apply to only the enhancement – a larger average amount could be charged on the basic education apportionment.
9. In 2001 the legislature removed the 10% indirect lid limit. As a result OSPI repealed ten WAC's that dealt with how the funding should be spent at the local level. (Note: Several districts began charging as much as 44% for indirect costs. In 2000 we began the re-branding of Vocational Education to CTE)
10. In 2002 "Indirect costs charges to secondary vocational programs shall not exceed a total of 15 percent of the basic and enhanced portion of state funds appropriated." Language replaced the 'use it or lose it' language. (Note: Districts began to 'direct charge' to CTE programs non-traditional expenses, such as 'principal's office' expenses) to recoup their loss of indirect charges

11. In 2002 districts were OK'd to begin the direct charging of 'principal's office', counselors, counselor aids, librarians, library aids, office secretaries and other basic education expenses to vocational programs thus reducing funds available in CTE programs.
12. In 2011 the 'Prototypical Funding Model' was put in place for funding K-12, which was to do no harm to the funds available in the previous year in converting from the 'old' funding model to the new.
13. In 2013 - Both Senate and House Budgets proposed reductions in CTE funding by reducing the CTE Materials, Supplies and Operating Costs (CTE MSOC). The Senate proposed a \$49.1M reduction while charging OSPI to review CTE enhanced funding based on incorrect data on how districts deploy resources using the prototypical-funding matrix. The House proposed an \$18.3M reduction along with a reduction of the indirect percentage from 15% to ten. FUNDING WAS RETURNED to the 2013-15 biennial budget and charged OSPI with reviewing Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Skill Center programs' funding enhancement formulas, expenditure accounting systems, and reporting. The review was to include recommendations for revising the funding formulas, including the possibility of conversion to a model that enhances basic education rates, potential revisions to the accounting systems, and recommendations for improving data reporting and transparency.
14. *IN THE 2015 LEGISLATIVE SESSION... the Washington ACTE is advocating for the adoption of the OSPI – CTE and Skill Center Program Funding, Accounting and Data Reporting proposal submitted to OFM June 1, 2014.*