



Association for Professional Development in Career and Technical Education
A Section of the Division of New and Related Services, Association for Career and Technical Education

A Summary Report on the Second Annual Survey on Priorities in CTE Professional Development

Chester P. Wichowski
Temple University
chet.w@temple.edu

Gloria Heberley
Temple University
gloriah@temple.edu

February, 2006



Association for Professional Development in Career and Technical Education

A Section of the Division of New and Related Services, Association for Career and Technical Education

Summary Report

Introduction and Background

The Association for Professional Development in Career and Technical Education (APDCTE) conducted this annual survey as a professional service. The intent behind the conduct of this annual survey activity is to establish longitudinal base line information and, over time, identify trend patterns. Further, it is hoped that the results of these annual surveys will contribute to professional dialogue and serve to influence policy, professional development, and research in the career and technical education priority areas identified.

The original instrument was developed and reviewed for content validity by three independent judges. It includes 49 topical statements describing possible priorities in career and technical education and space for write-in items. This is the second year this survey was conducted. Upon review of the survey returns from last year, it was determined that the same instrument used in 2004 would be used in 2005 without any modification.

The instrument and transmittal letter were electronically distributed to a national population of state directors of career and technical education with a request for them to complete the survey or to pass it on to an individual in their organization responsible for the coordination of professional development activities for career and technical educators. Respondents were directed to identify up to ten items representing priorities in their individual state. All returned instruments included no more and no less than 10 priority items.

A follow-up electronic distribution of the instrument was sent out one month after the first distribution. It should be noted that the 2005 survey was conducted between the end of September 2005 and the middle of November, 2005. The preliminary report was completed at the end of November 2005. Copies of the transmittal letter and survey instrument are included in Appendix A. This summary report with additional data analysis and discussion section was completed at the end of February 2006.

The overall return rate was 70%, (n = 35); the adjusted overall return rate, due to five undeliverable instruments, was 78%. The return rate per region is listed below:

Region 1= 64%, (n=9) Region 2=100%, (n=10) Region 3= 33%, (n=2)

Region 4= 66%, (n=4) Region 5= 66%, (n=10)

Findings

Descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies, and in the event of ties, assigned ranks were computed. In the case of assigned rank ties, the items are listed in the order in which they were originally listed in the instrument. The top “10” (13 due to ties) assigned rank order priorities for professional development identified this year are listed in Table 1. The overall assigned rank order listing of priorities for professional development of all items identified this year is listed in Table 2.

The survey items that received the two highest assigned rank-ordered listing positions for professional development this year were the same as the two highest identified in 2004. The number one assigned rank order position for 2004 and 2005 was survey item 49, “Dual Enrollment/Advanced Standing Programs for Secondary CTE Students”. The number two assigned rank order position for 2004 and 2005 was survey item 8, “Integration of Academic and CTE”. There were, however, several other items in this year’s top “10” assigned rank order listing that were significantly different from those identified 2004.

The largest shift was noted in survey item 21, “Development of Career Clusters” which was 5.5 this year and 29.6 in 2004. Other survey items in the 2005 top ten that were not among the top ten in 2004 included survey item 44, “Student Data for Decision Making” which was 3.5 this year and 13 last year, survey item 12, “Career Pathways Program Related Needs” which was 5.5 this year and 19 last year, survey item 1, “Graduation Follow-up Survey Data” which was 11.5 this year and 19 last year, survey item 30, “Curriculum Development/ Revision” which was 11.5 this year and 19 last year, and survey item 35, “Recruiting & Retaining CTE Teachers” which was 13 last year and 11.5 this year.

A detailed display of the differences between the results of the assigned rank order listing from 2004 and 2005 can be seen in Tables 1 and 2. The assigned rank order listing from 2004 is listed in parenthesis next to each survey item in both of these tables. It should be noted that this year’s survey returns included several respondent write-in items that are listed in Appendix B.

Discussion

An ad-hoc review of the literature on the topic of dual enrollment and the integration of academics into CTE was conducted since these topics dominated the number one and number two positions for two years in a row. The first to be addressed will be the area of dual enrollment. Two reports which were completed within the last several months. One was done by the Community College Research Center, Karp, M, Bailey, T., Hughes, K. & Fermin, B. *State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality*. No. 26, April 2005. The other was done by the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, *Dual Enrollment: Accelerating the Transition to College*. Issue Papers, 2005. A listing of national dual enrollment characteristics has been synthesized from these two sources and presented in Table 3.

From an examination of table 3, it is easy to conclude there is great variation in the form and structure that dual enrollment takes throughout the nation. This variation is to be expected due the relative newness as well as the emerging nature of dual enrollment in many states. It is expected that state-by-state variation will likely remain for some time until the form and

function relationship is more clearly defined through trial and error or until some intervention in the form of Federal legislation comes on the scene.

Although the information in table 3 provides a view of the dual enrollment national landscape, it is not as comprehensive as one might hope. Absent in the reporting on dual enrollment is the presence of career and technical education. Due to this, it is reasonable to ask the following dual enrollment questions:

1. Are dual enrollment programs being used primarily to provide support for an academic study?
2. Are career and technical education programs included under the umbrella of dual enrollment?
3. Are there any state or local dual enrollment programs that serve career and technical students that can serve as a model?

Some additional related questions that also may be considered are:

1. How will the use of industry skill standards and industry skill certificates impact on articulation agreements between secondary and post-secondary institutions?
2. How will the achievement of industry skill certificates by secondary students be treated by post-secondary institutions?
3. Are there any state or local dual enrollment programs that provide for post-secondary advanced standing based on industry skill certificates that can serve as a model?

Although these and other related questions may not have answers at this time, it is important that they are at least asked. Consideration of these questions may serve to stimulate discussion and yield answers.

Federal legislation has exerted a strong influence on the top two priorities identified. The stated purpose of the 1998 Carl D. Perkins Act Amendments provided for the enhancement of vocational and technical skills as well as academic skills. Also suggested in other sections of this legislation is that vocational education is to contribute to high school graduation, entry into post secondary programs through Tech Prep, post secondary graduation and employment. It is not much of a stretch to see that the 1998 version of Perkins has set a conceptual foundation for a revised version sometime in the near future that may include some type of support for dual enrollment for career and technical education students.

The integration of academics and CTE was the second priority area among a field of 49 possibilities surveyed for the last two years. Although this priority came out close to the top once again, it should not be a surprise. This priority, among a pioneer like Gene Bottoms, is not new. It can, at least, be traced back to 1987 when his early efforts with the High School that Works, HSTW, initiative began as a component of the Southern Regional Education Board. The HSTW program has been credited as the first widespread national effort to combine challenging academic courses and a quality career and technical curriculum to enhance the achievement of CTE high school students and may have served as an influence on the integration language of Perkins.

Currently, the HSTW program involves more than 1,100 sites in 27 states. The proportion of students in recent HSTW programs meeting their achievement goals as measured on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, documents gains in reading and science from about 33% to about 50%. In mathematics, gains increased from about 33% to 61%. Other programs that have demonstrated success in regard to the connection between academics and CTE also deserve some comment.

A recent research and development effort completed in 2005 is the Math-in-CTE project by the National Center for Research in Career and Technical Education under the direction of James Stone, University of Minnesota. Based on a pilot in six states, findings from this project show significant gains in math scores on standardized measures between experimental and control groups. Contributing to this success was the use of a math instructional model that delivered mathematics instruction integrated in a sequence of contextualized CTE content followed by more abstract mathematics. The premise of this model is to de-mystify math through the use of a contextual CTE model and then re-introduce the math in a more theoretical format.

Another research and development project that also utilized CTE in a contextual setting was designed to support the enhancement of CTE student reading skills. Initiated as a pilot through the Center for Professional Development Career and Technical Education, Temple University, this project has expanded to more than 100 Pennsylvania secondary and CTC's, Wichowski & Garnes. Utilizing a combination of pre-reading, during-reading, after-reading as well as writing strategies, these contextual CTE instructional practices have been documented to help the marginal reader gain the skills of the accomplished reader. Score increases in the 12% to 15 % range have been recorded on state standardized tests as a result of these practices.

There is little question that the top priorities identified for professional development for two years running may have been influenced as a result of 1998 Carl D. Perkins Act Amendments as well as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. The influence of federal legislation on the delivery of career and technical education has proven to be strong catalyst on the integration of academics. The 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education, NAVE Independent Advisory Panel found a 30% increase in the number of academic courses taken by vocational concentrators between 1982 and 1998. Further, the 2004 NAVE Final Report to Congress found that CTE concentrators had increased their 12th grade test scores by 8 points for reading and 11 points on math on the NAEP test. Students with little or no CTE course work showed no gain in math and only a 4-point gain in reading on the NAEP.

In closing, it should be noted that the APDCTE survey that took place in 2005 and the one that preceded it in 2004 identified national priorities in CTE and added to the continuing development of base line data. Further, the continued use of this survey will contribute to the development of longitudinal data, the identification of trends, and may serve to influence the development of a research and development agenda. Individual states and schools are encouraged to use this data (or use the survey instrument – see Appendix B) to facilitate discussions, identify priorities, and develop action plans to guide the achievement of priorities.

The members of the APDCTE executive committee have made a commitment to continue to conduct this survey as an annual activity once again. The 2006 survey will be conducted early in the fall. The preliminary results of the survey will be reported on at the ACTE Annual Convention in Atlanta, Georgia at the end of November 2006.

Table 1
2005
Top 10* Assigned Rank Order & Frequency of Priorities for
Professional Development in CTE

<u>Assigned Rank</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Survey Item</u>
1.	23	49. Dual Enrollment/Advanced Standing Programs for Secondary CTE Students (1)
2.	20	8. Integration of Academic and CTE (2)
3.5	17	40. Career Awareness of CTE Students/ Parents (8.5)
3.5	17	44. Student Data for Decision Making (13)
5.5	16	12. Career Pathways Program Related Needs (19)
5.5	16	21. Development of Career Clusters (29.6)
7.5	14	27. Use of National Skill Standards (8.5)
7.5	14	36. Reading Programs in CTE (3)
9.	13	9. Assessment Rubrics (13)
11.5	12	1. Graduation Follow-up Survey Data (19)
11.5	12	30. Curriculum Development/ Revision (19)
11.5	12	35. Recruiting & Retaining CTE Teachers (13)
11.5	12	38. Seamless Curriculum Development (8.5)

* Exceeds 10 due to ties in rank ordering.

Note: numbers in parenthesis next to each survey item represent the assigned rank from the 2004 survey

Table 2
2005
Assigned Rank Order & Frequency of Priorities for
Professional Development in CTE

<u>Assigned Rank</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Survey Item</u>
1.	23	49. Dual Enrollment/Advanced Standing Programs for Secondary CTE Students (1)
2.	20	8. Integration of Academic and CTE (2)
3.5	17	40. Career Awareness of CTE Students/ Parents (8.5)
3.5	17	44. Student Data for Decision Making (13)
5. 5	16	12. Career Pathways Program Related Needs (19)
5.5	16	21. Development of Career Clusters (29.6)
7.5	14	27. Use of National Skill Standards (8.5)
7.5	14	36. Reading Programs in CTE (3)
9.	13	9. Assessment Rubrics (13)
11.5	12	1. Graduation Follow-up Survey Data (19)
11.5	12	30. Curriculum Development/ Revision (19)
11.5	12	35. Recruiting & Retaining CTE Teachers (13)
11.5	12	38. Seamless Curriculum Development (8.5)
14.	10	25. Small Learning Communities (19)
15.5	9	6. CTE Teacher Certification (8.5)
15.5	9	7. CTE Teacher Technical Skill Updating (5)
18	8	14. Use of Distance Learning Technologies (8.5)
18	8	16. Senior Projects/ Student Portfolios (29.6)
18	8	45. Business & Educational Partnerships (26.5)
20.5	7	42. Support for Student Career Decisions (35)
20.5	7	47. Contextualization of Instruction (19)
23	6	2. Determination of Employer Needs (19)
23	6	10. Tech-Prep Program Related Topics (26.5)
23	6	48. Student Employability Skills Programs (0)
26.5	4	19. Customized Job Training Programs (0)
26.5	4	22. Support for Transition Programs (19)
26.5	4	39. Implementing Entrepreneurship Programs (8.5)
26.5	4	43. SCANS Skills (35)
31.5	3	11. Limited English Proficiency CTE Student (0)
31.5	3	13. Effective use of Block Scheduling (35)
31.5	3	17. Cooperative Education Programs (35)
31.5	3	26. Recruiting CTE Administrators (15)
31.5	3	28. ISO 9000 School Certification (35)
31.5	3	29. Use of Brain-Based Instruction (29.6)

Table 2 (continued)

**2005
Assigned Rank Order & Frequency of Priorities for
Professional Development in CTE**

<u>Assigned Rank</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Survey Item</u>
38.5	2	5. Preparation for NCLB State Testing (19)
38.5	2	23. Effective use of IEPs (35)
38.5	2	24. Using Teacher Reflective Practices (0)
38.5	2	31. Cultural, Equity and Diversity Awareness (19)
38.5	2	33. Meeting Learning Styles Needs (26.5)
38.5	2	37. Computer and Cyber Technology in CTE (29.6)
38.5	2	41. Student Recruitment (0)
38.5	2	46. Teacher Leader Programs (35)
44	1	3. Updating of School Safety Programs (0)
44	1	32. Meeting Multiple-Intelligence Needs (26.5)
44	1	34. Meeting Emotional-Intelligence Needs (0)
47.5	0	4. Training on Substance Abuse Topics (0)
47.5	0	15. School Emergency Plans (0)
47.5	0	18. Use of O*Net (0)
47.5	0	20. Student Conflict Resolution (0)

Note: numbers in parenthesis next to each survey item represent the assigned rank from the 2004 survey

Table 3

Selected National Dual Enrollment Characteristics

40 States have dual enrollment policies or regulations

33 States address tuition payment for dual enrollment courses

33 States have policies that address student eligibility

23 States allow dual enrollment at a HS or college - 4 others specify that it be delivered at a college

17 States mandate that dual enrollment opportunities be provided to students

14 States regulate course content

13 States directly oversee dual enrollment with defined accountability requirements

13 States have varying eligibility guidelines for instructors of dual enrollment courses

10 States provide dual payment to the HS and the college for dual enrollment programs

10 States have legislation to give HS and colleges the option to provide dual enrollment to students but do not actually require dual enrollment delivery

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
TRANSMITTAL LETTER



Association for Professional Development in Career and Technical Education
A Section of the Division of New and Related Services, Association for Career and Technical Education

Re: Second Annual National Priorities Survey

Dear State Director:

The attached two-part survey has been developed by the Association for Professional Development in Career and Technical Education as a vehicle to identify regional and national priorities. Please complete this survey or pass it on to an individual in your organization that is responsible for the coordination of professional development activities for career and technical educators.

This survey will identify current ongoing professional development efforts that have been categorized as priorities. This information may be of even greater importance as we get closer to the re-authorization of Perkins Legislation. This survey will continue to be conducted annually in order to establish longitudinal base line information and, over time, identify trend patterns. For your information, a summary of the results of the 2004 survey has been summarized on pp. 15-17 of the September 2005 edition of the *Techniques Journal*.

Preliminary findings from this survey will be reported at the Association for Career and Technical Education Convention sometime between December 7 – 10, 2005 in Kansas City, Missouri, (check Convention Program Guide under Wichowski or Heberley in Presenters Directory section for day, time, and location). Further, a report on the findings from this survey will be distributed to you as an e-mail file attachment at a later time.

Your cooperation in the completion or the routing of this survey is greatly appreciated. Do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss this or if you have any questions regarding this activity. I can be reached at (215) 204-6249, chet.w@temple.edu or apdcte@yahoo.com

Return completed survey by **November 10, 2005** as a file attachment to gloriah@temple.edu or FAX to my attention at (215) 204-5154.

Sincerely,

Chester P. Wichowski, President
APDCTE

APDCTE

Association for Professional Development in Career and Technical Education

A Section of the Division of New and Related Services, Association for Career and Technical Education

SECOND ANNUAL NATIONAL PRIORITIES SURVEY

Part 1- Priorities: Directions, place an “X” or a check in the space to the left of **up to 10 items from the list below that you feel are current priorities** for professional development in your state. You are welcome to add additional items and to offer comments in the space provided.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Graduation Follow-up Survey Data | <input type="checkbox"/> 26. Recruiting CTE Administrators |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Determination of Employer Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> 27. Use of National Skill Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Updating of School Safety Programs | <input type="checkbox"/> 28. ISO 9000 School Certification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Training on Substance Abuse Topics | <input type="checkbox"/> 29. Use of Brain-Based Instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Preparation for NCLB State Testing | <input type="checkbox"/> 30. Curriculum Development/ Revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6. CTE Teacher Certification | <input type="checkbox"/> 31. Cultural, Equity and Diversity Awareness |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. CTE Teacher Technical Skill Updating | <input type="checkbox"/> 32. Meeting Multiple-Intelligence Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Integration of Academic and CTE | <input type="checkbox"/> 33. Meeting Learning Styles Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Assessment Rubrics | <input type="checkbox"/> 34. Meeting Emotional-Intelligence Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Tech-Prep Program Related Topics | <input type="checkbox"/> 35. Recruiting & Retaining CTE Teachers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11. Limited English Proficiency CTE Student | <input type="checkbox"/> 36. Reading Programs in CTE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 12. Career Pathways Program Related Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> 37. Computer and Cyber Technology in CTE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Effective use of Block Scheduling | <input type="checkbox"/> 38. Seamless Curriculum Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 14. Use of Distance Learning Technologies | <input type="checkbox"/> 39. Implementing Entrepreneurship Programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 15. School Emergency Plans | <input type="checkbox"/> 40. Career Awareness for CTE Students/Parents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 16. Senior Projects/ Student Portfolios | <input type="checkbox"/> 41. Student Recruitment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 17. Cooperative Education Programs | <input type="checkbox"/> 42. Support for Student Career Decisions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 18. Use of O*Net | <input type="checkbox"/> 43. SCANS Skills |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 19. Customized Job Training Programs | <input type="checkbox"/> 44. Student Data for Decision Making |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20. Student Conflict Resolution | <input type="checkbox"/> 45. Business & Educational Partnerships |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21. Development of Career Clusters | <input type="checkbox"/> 46. Teacher Leader Programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 22. Support for Transition Programs | <input type="checkbox"/> 47. Contextualization of Instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 23. Effective use of IEPs | <input type="checkbox"/> 48. Student Employability Skills Programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 24. Using Teacher Reflective Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> 49. Dual Enrollment/Advanced Standing
Programs for Secondary CTE Students |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 25. Small Learning Communities | |

50. Other: _____

51. Other: _____

Comments:

Part 2- Demographics: Directions, place an “X” or a check in the space to the left of the region in which you are located:

Region 1 (CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME, MI, NH, NY, OH, PA, RI, VT, WV)

Region 2 (AL, FL, GA, KY, NC, SC, TN, VA, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands)

Region 3 (IA, IL, IN, MN, MO, WI)

Region 4 (AR, LA, MS, NM, OK, TX)

Region 5 (AZ, AK, CA, CO, HI, ID ,MT, ND, NE, NV, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY, American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Republic of Palau)

Return completed survey by **November 10, 2005**, as a file attachment to gloriah@temple.edu or by fax to Dr. Gloria Heberley at (215) 204-5154.

APPENDIX B

SUREVEY WRITE-IN ITEMS

COMMENTS

Survey Write-in Items

- R1 - 1. Automated graduate follow-up using unemployment insurance data.
- R1 - 2. Certificates of initial, advanced, and skill mastery, and post-secondary readiness.
- R1 - 3. Programming for significantly cognitively disabled students (differentiated occupational preparation vs. occupational special education).
- R2 - 1. Industry certification for teachers and students.
- R3 – 1. Training on accountability reporting for local program managers.
- R3 – 2. Bridging the gap between secondary schools and business and industry (specifically for OJT opportunities for senior CTE students during the second semester).
- R4 – 1. Seamless transition to post-secondary

Survey Comments

1. Need training and programming streams specific to POST- SECONDARY educators, administrators and counselors/advisors – (1) many work primarily with an adult population who are quite different than secondary students, (2) adult students often require different kinds of support services, (3) many come directly from business and industry with little or no formal training in instruction, (4) they are more focused on workforce development and identifying and meeting the needs of business and industry,(5) emphasizing training and programming streams for post-secondary instructors could encourage more participation in ACTE from this segment.