



# 2019 Legislative Action Plan

## Focus: Resources for CTE Programs

### **Solution #1: Direct the use of current funding allocation for CTE programs within districts.**

#### **The Problem (What):**

Resources from the state do not entirely flow as intended to all CTE programs equally from district to district across the state. Lost funding is needed to maintain and expand quality CTE programming. Students need equal and equitable access in all districts, not to be limited by zip code.

#### **The Need (Why):**

To assure funding provided from the state is used for its intended purpose by:

- Removing the use of CTE funds in activities unrelated in directly delivering CTE programs. Many districts “direct charge” for non-CTE expenditures such as (but not limited to) counselor salaries, administrative salaries, and even photocopy machines. This allowable “direct charging” diverts monies intended for CTE student programming.
  - Retain the 5% indirect charge to CTE for district expenditures such as these.

Directing State funding for CTE in this way will help compensate for:

- The loss of funding to CTE due to the current Average Annual FTE calculation (10% average reduction statewide).
- The loss of minutes due to modified bell schedules allowing for student Advisory Periods and Early Release Days (CTE funding is based on the calculation of minutes).

#### **How:**

Remove the use of CTE funds in activities unrelated in directly delivering CTE programs.

#### **Effect:**

State funds, as intended, will then fully support CTE programs in the ability to meet business and industry expectation to maintain and grow high quality CTE programs that address economic development and skilled workforce needs. This supports the academic and economic success of students, and positions CTE in the future development of career connected learning, youth apprenticeships, and student engagement and success.

### **Solution #2: Fund skill center students by headcount.**

#### **The Problem (What):**

The change in FTE calculation in 2018-2019 has reduced the ability of skill centers to access already allocated budget capacity. The unintended consequence limits the ability to meet business and industry expectation to maintain and grow high quality CTE programs that address economic development and skilled workforce needs.

#### **The Need (Why):**

- Expectations to expand access to industry certification options and work-site experiences (e.g., pre-apprenticeship, apprenticeship, and internships) and career ready students.
- Skill centers have high cost industry specific curriculum, specialized equipment requirements, and staff professional development costs.
- Skill centers have high fixed costs and do not have access to the same additional revenue stream costs that school districts have (e.g., enrichment levies and tech levies).

#### **How:**

Change to a head-count apportionment model based on 0.6 FTE per skill center student allowing the skill center (0.6 FTE) and the sending school (0.6 FTE) the ability to access what is currently allowed for and budgeted by the state.

#### **Effect:**

Both skill centers and sending schools will have the ability to access the resources to meet the student and workforce expectations.