

Archived Information

SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITIES

Goal: To build School-to-Work (STW) systems that increase student academic achievement, improve technical skills, and broaden career opportunities for all.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: All objectives in this table support the Department’s Strategic Plan Objective 1.2 (schools help all students make successful transitions to college and careers.)

FY 2000—\$55,000,000

FY 2001—\$0 (Program scheduled to be terminated)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALL YOUTH—INCLUDING THOSE WHO ARE DISADVANTAGED, HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY, ARE ACADEMICALLY GIFTED, ARE OUT OF SCHOOL, OR ARE DISABLED—HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ENGAGE ACTIVELY IN SCHOOL-TO-WORK SYSTEMS.

Indicator 1.1 Student Participation in STW Systems: By fall 2000, one million youth will be participating in STW systems. Participation is defined as receiving an integrated academic and occupational curriculum and completing a related work-based learning experience.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of students that participated in STW systems</i>			<p>Status: No 1999 data; trend toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: Performance targets are likely to be met, given a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance to help states develop more intensive workplace learning experiences that connect to student’s academic and technical coursework in school. Performance targets are also likely to be met given the steady increase in the number of students participating in STW and the change to more reasonable and appropriate performance targets.</p>	<p>Source: Progress Measures Survey. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 (for 1999 data)</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, data from other sources, including the national STW evaluation, corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: This survey is voluntary and collects data only from substate-funded, local partnerships. As the Federal investment in state STW initiatives ends—beginning in 1999 with the first eight states that were funded in 1994—fewer local partnerships will be funded and have the resources required to gather and submit data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996:	280,000			
1997:	471,000			
1998:	515,617			
1999:	No data available	750,000*		
2000:		1,000,000*		
2001:		See note**		
<p>*Original performance targets set for this indicator were 1,000,000 students in 1999 and 2,000,000 students in 2000. Those targets were based on a less rigorous definition of STW participation than is now used as a basis for measuring progress. Changes in performance targets reflect more reasonable and appropriate expectations of student involvement given the more rigorous definition.</p> <p>**Performance targets were set only through the year 2000. This is due to the scheduled sunset of the STW legislation in 2001, with final data collection at that time reflecting previous year’s performance.</p>				

OBJECTIVE 2: ALL YOUTH EARN A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR EQUIVALENCY, MEET CHALLENGING ACADEMIC STANDARDS, HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO RECEIVE A SKILL CERTIFICATE, AND ARE PREPARED FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND CAREERS.

Indicator 2.1 Academic achievement: By fall 2000, 80 percent of high school graduates (including vocational concentrators) in STW systems will complete at least 3 years each of math and science.					
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of students who took at least 3 years each of mathematics and science</i>					
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets	
	Math	Science	Both		
1996:	83%	73%	69%	<p>Status: It is likely that performance targets for 2000 will be met.</p> <p>Explanation: Performance targets are likely to be met, given the growing number of states that are requiring <u>all</u> students—including those that participate in STW activities—to take more rigorous academic courses to meet graduation requirements.</p>	
1998:	85%	78%	74%		
1999:	No data available				Continuous improvement
2000:					80%
2001:					See second note under Indicator 1.1
<p>Source: National STW Evaluation, Student Transcripts of High School Seniors in Eight States. Frequency: Biennially. Next Update: 2001 (for 2000 data).</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No data limitations are noted.</p>					

Indicator 2.2 Transition from high school: By fall 2000, 92 percent of high school graduates in STW systems will successfully transition into either further education, employment, or the military.						
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of high school graduates in STW systems that successfully transitioned into either college, employment, or the military</i>						
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
	College	Employment	Military	Total		
1996:	60%	7%	20%	87%	<p>Status: It is likely that performance targets for 2000 will be met.</p> <p>Explanation: Performance targets for 1999-01 are likely to be met, given the steady increase in students taking more rigorous courses (see Indicator 2.1) in preparation for college and careers.</p>	
1998:	Data to become available in spring 2000					
1999:	No data available					Continuous improvement
2000:						92%
2001:						**See second note under Indicator 1.1
<p>Source: National STW Evaluation, follow-up Survey of High School Seniors in Eight States. Frequency: Biennially. Next Update: 2000 (for 1998 data).</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No data limitations are noted.</p>						

Indicator 2.3 Skill Certificates: By fall 2000, 10 percent of students in STW systems will earn skill certificates.					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of seniors who received skill certificates</i>		<p>Status: Progress is expected, but it is unlikely that performance targets for 1999-00 will be met.</p> <p>Explanation: Improvement is expected as a result of a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance and resources to help states develop career major programs that lead to the awarding of skill certificates.</p>		<p>Source: National STW Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 (for 1999 data).</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: This survey is voluntary and collects data only from substate-funded, local partnerships. As the Federal investment in state STW initiatives ends—beginning in 1999 with the first eight states that were funded in 1994—fewer local partnerships will be funded and have the resources required to gather and submit data.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
1996:	2.4%				
1997:	3.6%				
1998:	4.2%				
1999:	No data available				7%
2000:		10%			
2001:		See note under Indicator 1.1			

OBJECTIVE 3: BUILD COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL-TO-WORK SYSTEMS IN EVERY STATE.

Indicator 3.1 High Schools: An increasing percentage of high schools will have implemented key STW components. Implementation of key STW components are defined as offering career major programs that require an extended workplace activity.					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of high schools that implemented key STW components</i>		<p>Status: Progress is expected, but it is unlikely that performance targets for 1999-00 will be met.</p> <p>Explanation: Improvement is expected as a result of a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance and resources to help states develop career majors programs.</p>		<p>Source: National STW Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 (for 1999 data).</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: See note under Indicator 2.3.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
1996:	25%				
1998:	25%				
1999:	No data available				
2000:					40%
2001:		See second note under Indicator 1.1			

Indicator 3.2 Community and Technical Colleges: An increasing percent of community and technical colleges will have articulation agreements with high schools to grant academic credit for work-based learning.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of colleges developing articulation agreements with high schools</i>			<p>Status: Progress is expected, but it is unlikely that performance targets for 1999-00 will be met.</p> <p>Explanation: While the percentage of articulation agreements continues to grow, performance targets are unlikely to be met, given past trends. This may be due in part to the lack of an early investment and strategy in brokering relationships among community/technical colleges and schools and postsecondary institutions. It is likely, however, that given several recent national investments that the percentage of community/technical colleges having articulation agreements with high schools will continue to rise.</p>	<p>Source: National STW Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 (for 1999 data)</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: See note under Indicator 2.3 above.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996:	21%			
1997:	18%			
1998:	20%			
1999:	No data available			
2000:		40%		
2001:		See second note under Indicator 1.1		

Indicator 3.3 Employers providing work-based learning opportunities: By fall 2000, 350,000 employers will be providing work-based learning experiences for students.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of employers providing students with work-based learning experiences</i>			<p>Status: Significant progress is expected, but it is uncertain that performance targets for 1999-01 will be met.</p> <p>Explanation: Improvement is expected as a result of a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance and resources—through employer and labor intermediary organizations—to substantially increase the number of employers providing work-based learning experiences for students. Moreover, current upward economic trends are likely to continue to increase labor demand and, in turn, the extent to which employers use STW as an opportunity to be involved in the training of their future workforce.</p>	<p>Source: Progress Measures Survey. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 1999.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: See note under Indicator 1.1 above.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996:	59,000			
1997:	136,000			
1998:	109,251			
1999:	No data available			
2000:		350,000		
2001:		See second note under Indicator 1.1		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ Providing technical assistance and resources to help grantees develop and sustain STW systems. Assistance includes sponsoring a national information center, hosting intensive STW system-building institutes, identifying exemplary STW models and promising practices, and helping to identify sources of support for states to sustain their STW systems after the Federal legislation sunsets in 2001.
- ❖ Providing leadership for strategies that support state and local STW system-building, such as integrating curriculum and linking work-based learning with school-based learning; aligning postsecondary admissions policies with new methods of assessing high school student performance, and increasing the ability of teachers to use STW approaches in their instructional methods.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ Providing grants to employer and labor intermediary organizations to increase the number of employers providing intensive, work-based learning opportunities that are connected to students' academic and technical coursework.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ The National STW Office is under the joint administration of the Departments of Education and Labor (through the Offices of Vocational and Adult Education and Employment and Training Administration, respectively).
- ❖ In conducting research activities, the National STW Office collaborates with the Employment and Training Administration, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the Office of the Undersecretary's Planning and Evaluation Service.
- ❖ In conducting STW system-building activities, the National STW Office works with DOL's Office of Youth Opportunities, Job Corps, and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.
- ❖ In developing career major programs, the National STW Office works with the Departments of Transportation and Treasury.
- ❖ Beginning in calendar 2000, STW will collaborate with the President's Council on Youth with Disabilities and the Social Security Administration on a project to increase access to STW activities for youth with disabilities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ The lack of a targeted Federal investment in STW initiatives after the scheduled sunset of the legislation in 2001 will interrupt the momentum of states and localities in developing and implementing their STW systems.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 2.2 was strengthened by including data on student transitions into employment and the military.
- ❖ Indicator 4.1 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.1.
- ❖ Indicator 4.2 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.2.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 1.2 was dropped because of low item response on a survey designated to gather this information.
- ❖ Indicator 2.1 was dropped as it is already captured in both this year's Indicators 2.1 and 2.2.
- ❖ Indicator 2.4 was dropped because of low item response on a survey designated to gather this information.
- ❖ Indicator 3.1 was dropped pending identification of a valid and reliable data source.
- ❖ Indicator 3.2 was dropped because it was determined to be a system output measure rather than a student outcome measure.
- ❖ Objective 4 was dropped because it was determined to be already captured in Objective 3.
- ❖ Objective 5 was dropped because it was determined to be already captured in Objective 3.
- ❖ Indicator 5.1 was dropped because it was determined to be a system output measure, rather than a student outcome measure
- ❖ Objective 6 and Indicators 6.1 and 6.2 were dropped because they were determined to be system output measures rather than student outcome measures.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 3.2 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.1.
- ❖ Indicator 3.3 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.2.
- ❖ Indicator 3.4 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.3.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 2.4 was dropped because of low item response on a survey designated to gather this information.
- ❖ Indicator 3.1 was dropped because it was determined to be a system output measure, rather than a student outcome measure.
- ❖ Indicators 2.4 and 1.2 were dropped because they were determined to be system output measures rather than student outcome measures.

New—None.