

Sustaining School-to-Work Systems

A REPORT ON SELECTED STATES

June 1998

Prepared for:

Hawai'i School-to-Work
Dr. Herbert Randall, State STW Director
874 Dillingham Blvd.
Honolulu, Hawai'i, 96817

Prepared by:

Frank T. Hammons, Project Director
Mary Haley
Alejandro Rodriguez
Nancy Scheel

The Institute for Workforce
Competitiveness
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33199
(305) 348-6529 (voice)
(305) 348-6524 (fax)
xiwc@fiu.edu (e-mail)
<http://www.fiu.edu/~xiwc>



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	2
PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABILITY	3
Coherent STW Planning and Implementation Strategy	3
STW Integration with Economic and Workforce Development Systems	3
Strategic Planning.....	4
Evaluation and Accountability	4
Combination of Top-Down and Decentralized Strategies.....	5
Alignment and Integration with Education Reforms	5
Support for State and Regional or Local Coordination.....	6
Sustained Leadership.....	6
Involvement of Stakeholders	7
METHODOLOGY.....	8
Research Design.....	8
Sample	8
Interview Protocol.....	9
Interviews	10
Document Review	10
Content Analysis and Reporting	11
RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	11
Coherent STW Planning and Implementation Strategy	11
Assumptions.....	11
Scope of the Study.....	12
Findings	12
Implications for Sustainability	14
Combination of Top-Down and Decentralized Strategies.....	15
Assumption	15
Scope of Study	15
Findings	15
Implications for Sustainability	16
Alignment and Integration with Education Reforms	17
Assumption	17
Scope of Study	17
Findings	17
Implications for Sustainability	18
Support for State and Regional or Local Coordination.....	19
Assumption	19
Scope of Study	19
Findings	20
Implications for Sustainability	21

Sustained Leadership.....	21
Assumption	21
Scope of the Study.....	21
Findings	21
Implications for Sustainability	22
Involvement of Stakeholders	23
Assumption	23
Scope of Study	23
Findings	23
Implications for STW Sustainability	24
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HAWAII.....	25
Preface	25
Recommendations	26
CONCLUSION.....	30
REFERENCES	31
APPENDICES	33
Appendix A: State Economic and Demographic Data.....	33
Appendix B: Interview Protocol	37
Appendix C: Responses to Forced-Choice Items	43

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: States Included in the Sample	9
Table 2: Interview Questions by Sustainability Principle	10

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Institute for Workforce Competitiveness would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to all of the School-to-Work state directors and coordinators who took time out of their busy schedules to participate, and to provide their perspectives and insight into the sustainability of this initiative. Thank you's go to all of the IWC colleagues who provided critiques and feedback on the work contained within. A very special thanks goes to Michael P. Brawer, Florida's former STW director, who helped immensely with the state director/coordinator phone interview process.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to obtain firsthand information about how School-to-Work (STW) sustainability efforts are taking shape in selected states, in order to assist the State of Hawai'i in its efforts to develop strategies for ensuring the sustainability of its STW initiative after federal funding is terminated. The study's findings are based on the analysis of interview data from guided interviews of state STW directors and related document analysis.

The initial picture of STW sustainability emerging from this interview study is multi-faceted, reflecting enabling conditions and implementation approaches unique to each state. Some states in the study appear to have made greater progress than others in the system-building aspect of School-to-Work. However, every state exhibits at least *some* strategies that enhance STW sustainability, and every state is grappling with conditions or issues that pose a serious challenge to their initiative's sustainability. In other words, no one state has a proven "blueprint for sustainability"; yet taken together, these states' experiences will stimulate the thinking of STW practitioners and researchers.

This study followed a composite research design that combined and relied on the joint strength of three different data analysis techniques: (1) structured telephone interviews of thirteen (13) state STW directors; (2) a review of organizational documents relevant to School-to-Work; and, (3) statistical quantitative data. The study's major findings and implications for sustainability are summarized within each principle below.

Principles, Major Findings, and Implications for Sustainability

Coherent STW Planning and Implementation Strategy

School-to-Work is an integral part of a larger state-level workforce development system. Three elements critical for the successful institutionalization and subsequent sustainability of School-to-Work are (1) the enactment of a legislative mandate and agreement on a policy framework, (2) formulation of a strategic plan to maximize results or outcomes through coordination of efforts and effective alignment of resources of all partner agencies and entities; and (3) the development of an ongoing evaluation and accountability system as an integral component of the implementation strategy to measure results and promote sustained improvement.

Major Findings

- Nine of the thirteen states have enacted legislation in the areas of workforce and economic development, and education reform. Of these, seven states specifically address School-to-Work as part of their more comprehensive workforce development initiative.
- Where workforce development legislation has been enacted and specifically supports School-to-Work, a more coherent and systemic STW implementation strategy seems to have developed.

Implications for Sustainability

Legislation as well as strategic planning defines roles, functions and collaboration mechanisms for all partner entities. They determine resource allocation and how results are to be measured for sustained system improvement.

Combination of Top-Down and Decentralized Strategies

Both top-down and bottom-up (decentralized) strategies are necessary to sustain a STW system, and both are more effective when designed to complement each other.

Major Findings

At the state level, the bottom-up approach is described as local flexibility or local control. Along with making funds available, two kinds of state strategies for enabling local flexibility appear to be (1) removing obstacles and (2) making requirements -- dictating the "what" but not the "how."

Implications for Sustainability

Focusing the STW system-building primarily at the local level without complementary top-down strategies can hinder the sustainability of the STW initiative. States should focus state-level strategies on (1) providing a coordinating structure and (2) removing obstacles to local implementation through marketing, professional development, and state-driven automated follow-up system and evaluation efforts.

Alignment and Integration with Education Reforms

School-to-Work is not a "program," but rather a systemic education reform initiative, implemented in an educational context where many other reforms are also impacting the system. School-to-Work must be aligned and integrated with other reforms and initiatives.

Major Findings

- Higher student competency or academic standards, statewide assessment of student achievement, comprehensive career development and guidance systems, inclusion of industry-specific skills in the curriculum and elimination of the general track have been initiated in all ten or more of the thirteen states in the study.
- School-to-Work is isolated from other reform initiatives, making it appear to be more of a "program" than an initiative to promote systemic reform.
- School-to-Work is not an education priority item.

Implications for Sustainability

School-to-Work must be aligned and integrated with other reform efforts. If not, other reforms efforts may overshadow or clash with School-to-Work, or create a frustrating reform climate. One encouraging example of STW integration is the explicit inclusion of STW-related skills into a state's prescribed academic content or student performance guidelines. While unable to sustain either the systemic or programmatic aspects of the initiative itself, such inclusion may ultimately sustain STW principles and practices.

Support for State and Regional or Local Coordination

The coordinator functions at the state and local levels are important for ensuring the continuity of system-building efforts and collaboration of crucial stakeholders.

Major Findings

- School-to-Work office or staff responsibility for administering other initiatives may play a role in STW sustainability. Of the nine states that report having at least partial responsibility for administering other education, labor or workforce development initiatives, seven also report the existence of a permanent state-level office that will continue STW activities after the termination of federal funds. The initiative most commonly cited as administered by STW staff was Tech Prep. Others cited include *High Schools That Work*, career academies, volunteer initiatives, youth apprenticeship, and a certificate of mastery program encompassing workplace skills.
- A majority of states have or partly have state-level strategies in place or being developed to ensure the continuation of the regional or local STW coordinator position.

Implications for Sustainability

At the state level, strategies for sustaining the STW coordinating function will be enhanced by integrating responsibility for administering other related initiatives under the direction of the STW staff. States should also address the sustainability of the local STW coordination. If not, there is the obvious danger that the coordinator role may be sustained in some areas but not others, making problematic the continued development and maintenance of a comprehensive, state-wide system of STW transition.

Sustained Leadership

Strong leadership organized across crucial STW stakeholder groups at different levels is necessary for building and sustaining the STW system.

Major Findings

- Ten of thirteen directors report that their states have or partly have the STW leadership they believe is needed for STW sustainability.
- State STW directors expressed concern over the mobilization and alignment of leadership at state government levels.
- In the states where there is the most confidence in leadership for sustainability, business partners are important leaders at the state level.

Implications for Sustainability

Policy and political environments will be a critical factor in sustainability of school-to-work, with key roles played by state-level education, government, and legislative leaders. Leadership for sustainability should focus multiple strategies for influencing policy, including developing effective liaisons to those with power to effect policy changes, overcoming turf issues and maximizing collaboration across sectors and agencies at the state leadership level, leveraging the influence of major business partners on policymakers and developing strong advocacy for school-to-work among the constituencies of legislators and other policymakers.

Involvement of Stakeholders

Developing a critical mass of support and involvement by stakeholder groups will be a key factor in STW sustainability.

Major Findings

- More than three-fourths of the state STW directors cited the reluctance, misconceptions, or lack of acceptance of key stakeholder groups or individuals as a major barrier to STW leadership, implementation or sustainability.
- The major industries of most states are actively participating in developing their workforce via the STW system.
- In more than three-fourths of the states, local school districts have been influenced to use existing staff development resources to address STW-related priorities. Also, many have revised the job descriptions of school-based personnel, at least partly, to incorporate STW activities and responsibilities.
- More than half of the state STW directors discussed increasing stakeholder support or engagement at either the state or the grass roots levels as a key strategy for sustainability.

Implications for Sustainability

The involvement of a full range of interested stakeholders at both the state and the local levels will be needed to remove barriers to STW sustainability. Strategies include ensuring that departments of commerce/economic development are STW partners at the state level; ensuring employer representation at the state leadership level; focusing communication and other resources on educating and generating buy-in and support from key stakeholders, especially policy-makers, educators and parents; and building capacity and enabling district staff to implement School-to-Work through school-level changes.

Recommendations

The following recommendations and rationale for implementation strategies to enhance sustainability are provided to the State of Hawai'i and the Hawai'i STW Executive Council as appropriate.

Recommendation: Utilizing the leadership of the established State of Hawai'i STW Executive Council, develop a long-range dynamic strategic plan to sustain School-to-Work, linking economic development, educational delivery systems, and workforce preparation. This particular recommendation has the greatest potential of having the most significant impact on the development, implementation, and, sustainability of a Hawaiian School-to-Work/workforce development system.

Rationale. The State is commended for the passage of legislation in support of STW, but legislation alone is not enough to sustain STW. The development of a long-range strategic plan, which complements the existing legislation, is warranted to sustain this initiative.

Recommendation: The membership of the established STW Executive Council should take the lead role in the promotion and marketing of this initiative in order to garner the necessary support from internal, external, public and private constituents to ensure the success of their effort.

Rationale. The success of almost any initiative is related to the overt and visible support of the highly respected and visible leaders within that particular initiative. It is imperative that each member of the STW Executive Council take a high-profile leadership role in promoting the STW initiative to the citizens of Hawai'i.

Recommendation: The State of Hawai'i should critically examine the opportunities to diversify its labor market into high-wage, high-skill, environmentally clean industries that are currently or will be soon available within the technological industries and careers now emerging within the new information and knowledge economy. The Executive Council can take a lead role in pushing for and promoting this economic diversification strategy to the State's economic and political leadership.

Rationale. Due to Hawai'i's current economic downturn in its tourist and service industries, it is opportune for the state to examine the feasibility of diversification into high-wage, high-skill, environmentally clean industries. Technological advances, coupled with Hawai'i's unique geographic location, could be advantageous and could very well propel the state to serve as the economic and technological link between the commerce of the Pacific Rim and the U.S. mainland.

Recommendation: Provide ongoing funding, resources and strategies to sustain the positions for the state level, regional, and local personnel charged with the implementation of the School-to-Work/workforce development system.

Rationale. In order to have any degree of success, state-level, regional, and local direction and coordination must remain consistent. Existing resources and personnel can be realigned (i.e., updating the job descriptions of permanent personnel to include this initiative). Due to the complexities maintaining the necessary coordination and contacts between state-level agencies and state, regional and local stakeholder groups, the leadership provided by the state director/coordinator position is key to the success of this effort.

Recommendation: Directly link state-level coordination of STW to other complementary education and/or workforce development reforms/initiatives.

Rationale. School-to-Work implementation states that have treated this initiative as inclusive rather than a stand-alone program have noted a greater amount of success in its implementation. These states reported a higher level of understanding for STW, better working relationships between agencies, departments and initiatives, and conserved resources.

Recommendation: Continue the development of an ongoing statewide marketing campaign that promotes the vision, goals and outcomes, and which clearly and consistently communicates the concepts and benefits of Hawai'i's School-to-Work/workforce development initiative.

Rationale. Major problems associated with STW implementation have resulted from the lack of general awareness, understanding and involvement by certain stakeholder groups. An ongoing aggressive marketing campaign that consistently and clearly communicates the vision, goals, and outcomes of this initiative will greatly aid in the elimination of these problems. Also, an evaluation/feedback mechanism with benchmarks for success must be in place so that the marketing campaign can communicate the initiative's successes as they occur.

Recommendation: The State of Hawai'i should provide the necessary resources for specific professional development activities for all educational persons/institutions involved in STW/workforce development.

Rationale. In order to use the existing public school system to prepare Hawai'i's future workforce, a substantial commitment of resources will be needed for professional development to impact the culture of the existing institution(s).

INTRODUCTION

In America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages! (1990), a national bipartisan commission concluded that the United States may have the worst STW transition system of any advanced industrial country. A STW transition system encompasses all of the connections between what takes place in the education of students and the knowledge and skills that they will need in the workplace. "The premise of the School-to-Work approach is that academic and career preparation should be integrated to support the career goals of virtually all students" (Ryan & Imel, 1996, p. 2).

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 represented a significant change in educational strategies for preparing all students for education and career opportunities. The Act did not establish another categorical program. Instead, it provided venture capital to the States and a national framework for engaging a broad range of stakeholders as partners in the development of an integrated STW transition system that reflects local and regional market needs. Sustainability of the STW system after federal funds are terminated is a clear intent of the Act. It mandates the use of federal funds as venture capital to finance "the initial costs of planning and establishing statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems that will be maintained with other Federal, State and local resources" (School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994, Section 3(a)(4)). The legislation identified the common components of a STW transition system – school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities - but gave states broad discretion to formulate systems to respond to their needs and resources.

The challenge faced by STW systems is that of integrating school and work through the core components of school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities. The school-based learning component includes high academic goals for all students, integrating career awareness, exploration and guidance throughout the school experience, and a wide variety of curriculum and classroom strategies to keep learning focused on the application of academic skills, to motivate students to achieve their goals, and to prepare them for further education or work. In the work-based learning component, students participate in planned, high quality and relevant work experiences structured as learning experiences. Work-based learning opportunities give students the chance to explore an industry they may be interested in or preparing to enter while learning important and transferable workplace skills and attitudes. Connecting activities provide coordination between school-based and work-based activities, connecting students with employers, providing technical assistance to employers, teachers and counselors, and linking students with other services based on special needs.

State implementation strategies for School-to-Work have evolved from education reform initiatives, workforce development efforts, and economic development efforts. Regardless of the roll-out strategy employed, School-to-Work encompasses innovations in both organizational and programmatic contexts. School-to-Work requires the collaboration of partners across a range of organizations and levels in building a STW transition system. School-to-Work also requires changes in educational programs to emphasize the integration of academic and vocational instruction and expanding work-based learning opportunities.

In September 1997, the U.S. Departments of Education and Labor reported that 37 states had been awarded implementation grants and 13 states development grants under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. Now that we are in the fourth year of a seven-year initiative, an increasingly important concern at all levels is how to sustain STW efforts when the Act expires in 2001. The federal monies were intended only as seed money for a five-year period, whereas the timetable and resources needed for each state to fully implement and integrate a STW system will require a much longer perspective and the leveraging of additional resources. At this stage, it is not clear whether or how the momentum in developing STW systems will be maintained. There is a pressing need to identify the factors affecting the sustainability of STW efforts and to expand knowledge of state approaches to sustaining their SWT initiatives.

This study represents an initial effort to describe the multi-faceted picture of sustainability that is emerging now that states are more developmentally mature. It was undertaken on behalf of the State of Hawai'i in order to help identify potential strategies for sustaining the STW initiative in that state.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary aim of this study was to obtain firsthand information about how STW sustainability efforts are taking shape in selected states, in order to assist the State of Hawai'i in its efforts to develop strategies for ensuring the sustainability of its STW initiative. Sustainability refers to the process by which STW states and partnerships identify and secure alternate resources and strategies to continue STW activities, linkages, and systems building after federal School-to-Work Opportunity Act funds are no longer available. When this process results in long-term infusion of STW principles and practices into daily practices, then the School-to-Work initiative can be described as having been sustained.

The study focused specifically on approaches taken at the state level to develop and perform functions that will ensure the sustainability of STW efforts. Additional areas of suggested research include STW sustainability at both the national and local partnership levels.

The objectives of the study are:

- To identify and develop core principles of sustainability for STW systems.
- To develop and refine an interview protocol for use with state STW directors based on these principles.
- To identify and document the work of selected states in developing strategies for STW sustainability using guided interviews of state STW directors and document analysis.
- To make recommendations for the sustainability of Hawai'i's STW initiative based on findings and conclusions from the study.

The framework for this study are the principles of sustainability, as described below.

PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABILITY

This study is framed within the principles of sustainability described in the following paragraphs. They are general principles drawn from research and literature in the areas of education reform, partnerships, and School-to-Work.

Coherent STW Planning and Implementation Strategy

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 promotes a coherent and systemic statewide approach to implementing sustainable STW systems. According to this view, states are faced with the challenge of developing implementation strategies based on the following elements: (1) the enactment of a legislative mandate or state policy integrating and coordinating STW systems elements with reforms in state economic and workforce development strategies; (2) a strategic planning process that promotes the active involvement, commitment, and coordinated efforts of all relevant stakeholders; and (3) the development of an ongoing evaluation and accountability system. These three elements are elaborated in the following discussion.

STW Integration with Economic and Workforce Development Systems

While specific examples of STW system sustainability might be evident at the local STW partnership level, some of the conditions that promote sustainability are inherent in state-level workforce development strategies. Recognizing that various strategies are used to implement workforce development, this study assumes that School-to-Work is a core principle and a very effective strategy to implement workforce development.

The term workforce development system refers to the “overarching framework that includes the structure, legislative authority, and core implementation strategies used by all the stakeholders in the system” (Wills, 1995). Implementation strategies would include all of the programmatic elements designed to support and improve all the transitions made by current and prospective members of the workforce: school to work, school to school, welfare to work, and work to work. Consequently, a STW system is more likely to be sustained in states that have developed a comprehensive workforce development system.

As states have become more active in promoting technological and economic development, they have recognized the need to coordinate and/or integrate these efforts with workforce development efforts in order to address issues comprehensively. To accomplish technological and economic development, a state’s comprehensive workforce development system requires:

- (1) coordination of efforts at both the state and local levels among education, job training, economic development, and private entities to accomplish goals while minimizing duplication and waste;
- (2) strategic planning to integrate efforts at all levels and across relevant agencies and stakeholders; and,

-
- (3) fiscal, legislative, and leadership commitment in support of workforce development.

States are also rethinking and restructuring the roles and responsibilities of state government and its relationship to the private sector, moving toward strategic integration of efforts at all levels and across agencies. Where School-to-Work is a core component of a comprehensive economic and workforce development system, STW concepts will be integrated and made part of strategic plans across agencies and at all levels of implementation; and will be supported by legislative and fiscal initiatives. In short, School-to-Work should ultimately be an integral part of a larger state-level workforce or economic development system.

“States that have made progress towards sustainability usually have established strong leadership on behalf of STW and incorporated the tenets of STW into education reform, workforce preparation and economic development initiatives. Other steps that some successful States have taken to are: realign resources, enact legislation, and craft State policies implementing legislation” (Departments of Education and Labor, 1997, p. 42).

Strategic Planning

Strategic planning is important in sustaining STW systems. Strategic planning requires identification of all relevant stakeholders, clarification of stakeholder roles, clear statement of goals and mission, and coordination and evaluation mechanisms in order to realize a vision of School-to-Work. The relevance of strategic planning to STW systems is that the planning process promotes coordination, involvement, and commitment of all relevant state and local levels among education, job training, economic development, private business/industry, and community organization entities. The more that stakeholders are actively and fiscally committed to STW initiatives, the more likely the STW system will be sustained.

Evaluation and Accountability

A study of school-to-career programs established prior to the STWOA found that those that continued to grow years after their initiation all had short-and long-term goals and regularly assessed where they were in relation to the goals (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1997). Demonstrating the impact of School-to-Work on students, the community and employers will be critical not only for building an effective STW system, but also for generating support for continued implementation and sustainability of the initiative.

Measurement of progress and accountability are important state-level functions that may impact the sustainability of School-to-Work. Some states have developed statewide performance benchmarks as a way of quantifying state goals, assessing progress toward the goals, and building commitment to a shared vision in a system made up of organizationally independent stakeholders.

In terms of sustainability, accountability may also be defined as ensuring that STW funds are used in long-term capacity building for all intended beneficiaries of the initiative. From this perspective, long-term capacity relates to the integrative and systems-building aspects of

School-to-Work. Fiscal accountability per se is not important if it does not discriminate between the use of funds for systemic educational reform outcomes and other categorical programs that do not contribute to building long-term capacity.

Accountability is also important at the operational level. Aligning of formal roles and responsibilities for state and district level administrators and teachers, as well as district and school improvement plans and report cards, to reflect STW principles would promote sustainability of School-to-Work. School-based personnel may believe in School-to-Work but may be reluctant to formally commit to its sustainability when there is no accountability at the district, school, or individual levels.

Combination of Top-Down and Decentralized Strategies

Sustainability of a STW system is the result of both top-down and bottom-up strategies. Top-down strategies are developed from the perspective of the state's policy-making executive bodies. Bottom-up or decentralized strategies result from a STW system design that allows autonomy at lower levels to develop structures and decision-making mechanisms that best fit local needs.

A combination of top-down and decentralized strategies facilitates implementation and sustainability of STW concepts. On the one hand, a top-down strategy develops the enabling policies, state-level organizational structure, and governance mechanism that promote the institutionalization of STW systems. A decentralized strategy allows partnerships to develop governance and organizational structures to best address their local needs, encourage alignment with other school-based initiatives, and promote commitment agreements of all partners. The existence of both top-down and decentralized strategies is a critical factor in sustainability. Some issues are more effectively addressed by top-down strategies and others by bottom-up or local strategies. However effective either of the two strategies might be, they are more effective in sustaining STW principles when they complement each other.

Alignment and Integration with Education Reforms

"STW may be based in any number of State and local agencies. Its foundation may be shaped more by education reform in one State, more by economic development in another or, by workforce preparation in yet another. At this stage, it is not clear whether one area gives STW a better opportunity to meet its full potential for providing meaningful educational opportunities for every student and for being sustained past its Federal investment. However, we know that STW cannot be successful if it does not connect all three dimensions. In particular, it must be incorporated into any education reform movement that takes place in a State or it is unlikely that it will succeed" (Departments of Education and Labor, 1997, p. 59).

Another core principle that promotes STW system's sustainability is the degree of alignment and integration accomplished by states and local partnerships with other school reform and initiatives. The greater the degree of alignment and integration, the greater the likelihood that STW initiatives would be sustained beyond federal funding. Ensuring that School-to-Work

is part of the broader school-reform efforts in any state is one of the key challenges in sustainability.

Support for State and Regional or Local Coordination

At both the state and the regional or local levels, coordination is obviously required to minimize duplication of efforts while maximizing the STW system's effectiveness. At the state level, coordination is typically provided by a new administrative structure for STW, headed by the state STW director, that integrates formerly isolated programs and coordinates the efforts of state-level agencies and partners in building the STW system. The continuance of this administrative function or office beyond the termination of federal STW funding would be a factor in sustaining STW collaborative and system-building efforts.

At the local level, coordination of local STW partnership activities, and specifically the partnership coordinator's role, is fundamental to the sustainability of the STW initiative. Research on business-education partnerships indicates that successful partnerships are likely to have a full-time or near full-time coordinator or manager (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1998; Grobe, 1993). The coordinator role spans the boundaries of stakeholder organizations in the STW system, identifying who can contribute needed resources, developing networks that can lead to and nurture collaborative opportunities, and ensuring that partners remain committed to the STW mission and goals. In that regard, stability and low turnover in the STW coordinator's position ensures continuity of efforts and promotes sustainability of STW activities. Any strategy undertaken at the state level to ensure the continued existence of the coordinator positions at the local level would be an important move toward sustainability.

Sustained Leadership

Studies of business-education partnerships show that partnerships which are lasting and which make an impact received sustained attention from leaders (Grobe, 1993; Tushnet, 1993). In the context of STW systems, the presence of high-level support from leaders (both formal and informal) is an important factor in sustainability at both the state and the local partnership levels.

Leadership needed to build and sustain an integrated STW system is different from leadership needed to maintain the status quo. Leaders who are building a new system must have in their minds a vision of what is being built and seek to communicate this vision to stakeholders in order to build a broad base of support. They must also ensure the adequacy of resources, technical support, and professional development to those charged with building the STW system. STW challenges many established assumptions, habits, relationships and practices, requiring leadership that is very different from the leadership needed for getting people to comply with traditional roles or improve an existing system. At both the state and regional or local levels, leaders in the partnering agencies and groups will need to both model and sustain commitment to the collaborative and systems-building processes of STW and the ability to function during organizational transition.

Leadership for STW sustainability is based on the assumption that sustainability will be brought about through a combination of political process and restructuring of institutions. Strong, visible, and vocal leadership for STW would optimally be provided by all of the following leaders:

State Level:

- State legislature, governor's office, and cabinet
- State school board and chief education officer
- State STW director and administrative staff
- Executives of partnering state agencies
- State-wide business, industry and labor leaders
- Economic and workforce development policymakers.

Regional/Local Level:

- District school boards and superintendents
- Regional economic & workforce development leaders
- School principals, teachers, and other school reform leaders
- Local government, business and labor leaders
- Parent and community group leaders

Strong, active leadership in all of these settings will be essential for promoting STW sustainability.

Involvement of Stakeholders

A systematic approach to implementing and sustaining STW principles requires the participation of key stakeholders in the system and communication strategies for disseminating information related to the initiative. Educators and employers together, as the primary partners, can move the agenda forward, but they cannot effectively implement the vision without the support and involvement of students, counselors, government agencies, community organizations, parents, policy-makers, and other groups who have a stake in the STW system. For key stakeholders, two primary goals of School-to-Work are:

- to promote understanding of STW principles and what the state or local STW system is and is not, and
- to promote involvement in both partnership activities and in building a comprehensive STW system.

It is particularly important that STW leaders provide support to organization members, particularly educators and employers, who will need to change behavior, roles, or relationships in order to sustain School-to-Work. Earlier studies on the initiation of educational innovations indicate "beyond a shadow of a doubt that ...sustained *interaction and staff development* are crucial regardless of what the change is concerned with" (Fullan,1991, as cited by Tushnet, 1993, p. 6).

Achieving buy-in by parents and other community members involves changing the

traditional public perception of "academic vs. vocational education" to the School-to-Work/Career philosophy (School-to-Work is for all; School-to-Work is a vehicle for improving education for all students). States as well as local partnerships that have established multiple communication mechanisms and strategies are more likely to gain commitment from all stakeholders and sustainability of the STW initiative.

It is important for the long-term viability of STW to maintain an ongoing commitment by key parties. This has not yet happened in all States that have received implementation funding (Departments of Education and Labor, 1997, p. 6)

Another aspect of communication as it relates to sustainability is whether the quality and level of communication with stakeholders has kept pace with the scale of implementation of the school-based and work-based components of School-to-Work. Recognizing that states and partnerships are in different stages of the implementation process, carrying forward current successes will in any case depend partly on the level of support for School-to-Work among stakeholder groups. A state that is far along in its STW implementation may be able to boast high numbers of students participating in work-based learning activities; however, the initiative's sustainability is still in jeopardy if there is no public support for continuing linkages between school and work after the federal STW funding is gone.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study followed a composite research design that combined and relied on the joint strength of three different data analysis techniques: (1) structured telephone interviews of thirteen (13) state STW directors; (2) a review of organizational documents relevant to School-to-Work; and, (3) statistical quantitative data.

The findings from the interviews, the document review, and the statistical data were compared, or *triangulated*. This method of using different data information sources and different analysis techniques helps to ensure that concepts being studied are measured correctly (Kidder & Judd, 1986) and makes strong inferences possible (Yin, 1989). While the collection of information from different data sources is encouraged (Yin, 1989), this study's methodological triangulation (Patton, 1987) further improves the overall research quality of the study.

Sample

The states selected for the study and their first year of implementation under a federal School-to-Work grant are shown in Table 1. As the contractor for the study, Hawai'i s included for comparison purposes.

Table 1
States Included in Sample

State	STW Implementation Year	STW Director
Colorado	1996	Stephanie Cunningham ^a
Florida	1996	Michael Brawer
Kentucky ^b	1995	Dianne H. Smithers
Hawai'i	1996	Herbert Randall
Maine ^b	1995	Chris Lyons
Massachusetts ^b	1995	Kathy Flynn
New Jersey ^b	1995	Thomas Henry
New York ^b	1995	Jean Stevens
North Carolina	1996	Loretta Martin
Oklahoma	1996	Belinda McCharen
Oregon ^b	1995	Nancy Hargis
Pennsylvania	1996	Michael Snyder
West Virginia	1996	Ron Grimes

^aDirector's designee. ^bFunded in first round of federal funding.

Selection of states for this study was based on a number of criteria. First, it was considered important to include early implementation states funded by the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. With more implementation experience, these states were assumed to be developmentally more mature in at least some respects and therefore more likely to have addressed sustainability issues. We were able to include six of the eight states that were first in STW implementation in 1995.

The remaining states were included in the study for a variety of reasons. The original intent was to include states economically and demographically similar to Hawai'i. While some states have a predominantly service-oriented economy in common with Hawai'i, there is in fact no state that is similar to Hawai'i on all of the key economic and demographic variables. (These variables are summarized for the sample states in Appendix A.) Therefore, other states were included in the study because of promising practices or features of their School-to-Work, education reform, or workforce development systems, and accessibility of the state STW director for the interview.

Interview Protocol

The focus of this study was to explore and describe the efforts of individual states toward sustaining their STW initiatives beyond the end of federal STW funding. Therefore, a semi-structured interview protocol for state STW directors was developed which focused on anticipated principles of sustainability while allowing for both these or alternative principles and strategies of sustainability to emerge during the course of the interview. This interview protocol is found in Appendix B.

The interview protocol was structured around the topics corresponding to the sub-headings in the **Principles of Sustainability** section of this report. An overview of the interview questions by principle of STW sustainability is shown in Table 2. Questions included both forced-choice items and open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were frequently designed to elaborate or give further information on the state’s STW structure or strategy as indicated in another question.

Table 2
Interview Questions by Sustainability Principle

Principle	Interview Questions
Coherent STW Planning and Implementation Strategy:	
Integration with economic development and workforce development systems	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 15
Strategic planning	9, 15
Evaluation and accountability	1, 7, 8
Combination of top down and bottom-up strategies	1, 4, 5, 10, 15, 17
Alignment and integration with education reforms	1, 9, 16
State support for state/regional/local coordination	1, 10, 11, 13
Sustained leadership	6
Involvement of stakeholders	3, 4, 18, 19, 20, 21
All Principles	2, 22, 23, 24

Interviews

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the state STW director from each state in the sample using the interview protocol. State STW directors were contacted by telephone to request their participation in the study and schedule a telephone interview time and date. One of two individuals conducted each telephone interview, lasting approximately one to one-and-a-half hours. The same questions were asked of every state STW director based on the interview protocol.

The interviewer documented responses to the interview questions during and immediately following the interviews. Follow-up calls were made by project staff as necessary to clarify information gathered in the interviews.

Document Review

Documents were reviewed to obtain descriptive data on the states and their STW systems pertaining to the questions in the interview protocol (see Table 2, above, and Appendix B). Documents were selected based upon their relevance to supplementing and supporting the

interview data. The documents reviewed varied by state, but included state STW plans and proposals, quarterly narrative reports, web site documents, and other reports and descriptive materials.

Content Analysis and Reporting

The responses to forced-choice and Likert-type survey questions were analyzed using SPSS® statistical software. The answers to open-ended interview questions and key information from the document reviews were documented in narrative form for content analysis using QSR NUD*IST® qualitative analysis software. Project staff reviewed the narrative responses and coded them using the conceptual framework of the sustainability principles outlined in the previous section as a starting point. In a series of analytic meetings, staff reviewed the coded narrative data and the survey responses to develop the findings presented in the following section.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The specific findings presented in the following sections are organized according to the principles of sustainability previously developed. Inherent in these principles is the notion of sustaining School-to-Work in two contexts -- *organizational* (i.e., collaborative, systems-building process) and *programmatic* (bringing to scale the school-based and work-based components).

The initial picture of STW sustainability emerging from this interview study is multi-faceted, reflecting enabling conditions and implementation approaches unique to each state. Some states in the study appear to have made greater progress than others in the system-building aspect of School-to-Work. However, every state exhibits at least *some* strategies that enhance STW sustainability, and every state is grappling with conditions or issues that pose a serious challenge to their initiative's sustainability. In other words, no one state has a proven "blueprint for sustainability" that can be simply documented and replicated; yet taken together, these states' experiences will stimulate the thinking of both STW practitioners and researchers.

Throughout the following discussion, state identities have generally been withheld because of the often sensitive nature of the topics. However, when a promising strategy is highlighted as an example, the state is named to enable the reader to find further information, if desired. Finally, Appendix C shows the results of the forced-choice interview items.

Coherent STW Planning and Implementation Strategy

Assumptions

The institutionalization of a STW system requires both a congruent and coherent multiple-effort strategy, and a strategically envisioned state-level legislative mandate. Thus, for the purpose of this study it was assumed that the elements critical for the successful institutionalization and subsequent sustainability of School-to-Work are:

-
- the enactment of a legislative mandate and agreement on a policy framework;
 - formulation of a strategic plan to maximize results or outcomes through coordination of efforts and effective alignment of resources of all partner agencies and entities; and,
 - the development of an ongoing evaluation and accountability system as an integral component of the implementation strategy to measure results and promote sustained improvement.

This study also assumes that School-to-Work is an integral part of a larger state-level workforce development system. As states have become more active in promoting technological and economic development, they have recognized the need to coordinate and integrate these efforts with a workforce development strategy in order to address issues comprehensively.

Finally, for the purpose of this study, accountability is defined both as a system that ensures that STW funds are used in long-term capacity building for all intended beneficiaries of the initiative, and as a system that maximizes opportunities to align resources among all STW stakeholders. Alignment of resources (fiscal, personnel, equipment, etc.) can be thought of as the coordinated and integrated use of assets belonging to different stakeholders in accomplishing a shared vision. The focus is on accountability systems that measure results rather than outputs. That is, it is more important to assess post-completion indicators related to job placement, job advancement, salaries, etc., than measuring outputs such as number of students participating in STW activities or high school graduation rates.

Scope of the Study

Assessing whether states have formulated a coherent planning and implementation strategy to help sustain STW systems is a challenging task. The analysis for this issue was based on the responses given by state STW directors to the questions related to STW legislation, accountability and evaluation systems, and the director's self assessment on inter-agency collaboration and coordination. The analysis of this data was augmented by a review of organizational documents (i.e., strategic plans) and legislative materials. However, the study's findings are limited by the fact that not all strategic plans and legislation was accessible.

Findings

Of the thirteen states in the study, nine (69%) have enacted recent legislation in the areas of workforce and economic development, and education reform. Of these, seven states responded that such legislation specifically addresses School-to-Work as part of their more comprehensive workforce development initiative, while two others responded that the legislation partly addresses School-to-Work. Four states (31%) responded that no legislation has been enacted in support of workforce development or the establishment of a STW system.

Where workforce development legislation has been enacted and specifically supports School-to-Work, a more coherent and systemic STW implementation strategy seems to have developed. States that have passed STW legislation are more likely to have (1) instituted accountability and automated follow-up systems; (2) arranged for a permanent State office to continue STW activities after federal funding is no longer available; and (3) have secured commitments to share overhead costs with partner agencies.

The state STW directors were asked to provide a self-assessment of their states' efforts related to coordination, integration of efforts, and the degree of collaboration among agencies involved in implementing STW system components (see Appendix C). On a scale of one to five with 1 being "lowest" and 5 being "highest," the level of STW planning was rated the highest (4.0) and the cooperative use of resources to support STW was rated lowest (3.2). These ratings are not surprising in that it is easier to carry out an interagency planning exercise than actually sharing resources between the agencies. However, sharing resources will be key to STW sustainability.

An overall score for this assessment of collaboration, coordination and integration is possible by averaging scores for all four sub-categories in Question 15. The findings suggest that the majority of the states have made progress on developing collaboration and coordination mechanisms. Nine state STW directors (69%) reported scores between 3.0 and 3.8; three (23%) reported 4.0 or greater; and only one (8%) self-assessed the state's efforts below a 2.5 score.

Examples. States support School-to-Work in a variety of ways. Most have enacted legislation that links workforce development, economic development, and School-to-Work as supporting strategies. Common to states' strategies is a concern with accountability, evaluation and development of benchmarks; developing a strategic vision; clarifying roles, establishing coordinating mechanisms, and creating an organizational structure charged with implementing STW systems. The following are specific examples of states' strategies to support School-to-Work.

Florida seeks to upgrade dramatically Floridians' workplace skills, economically benefiting the workforce, employers, and the state by adhering to a set of well-defined principles. These principles focus on maximizing outcomes not process, arranging coordinating mechanisms among partner agencies, and ensuring an accountability of both successes and failures. The legislation created both the Enterprise Florida Jobs and Education Partnership and the Workforce Florida Interagency Coordinating Council to assist in the formulation and coordination of the state's economic policy regarding workforce development. School-to-Work is one element of the four-prong workforce development plan.

Colorado promotes work-based learning by giving any employer a 10% credit towards direct costs incurred as result of hiring a School-to-Career student. In Colorado, the Governor has established a Workforce Coordinating Council and a STW office responsible for overall system leadership and management. An Interagency Coordinating Team staffed by representatives from education, labor, job training is charged with aligning programs, promoting reform efforts, and providing technical assistance. Colorado's strategic plan calls

for the development of a "School-to-Career Sustainability Plan that provides long-term support for workforce development system" (National Employer Leadership Council, 1997).

Kentucky's legislation specifically established a STW Office as a state government entity and mandates the development of an implementation plan based on a strategic agenda of short-term and long-term strategies to achieve the goals established by the legislation. Kentucky's Education Reform Act also addressed the State STW organizational structure and mandates an employer-led curriculum initiative.

The Massachusetts School-to-Work Connecting Activities Act provides matching funds -- \$1 for every \$2 spent by the private sector on student wages to support further integration of classroom and workplace learning. A permanent School-to-Work committee was established by executive order within the MassJobs Council to ensure that the STW system is part of the broader employment and training system in the state.

The New York State STW initiative is integrated and financially supported by a Workforce Preparation Pilot Program. In 1994-95, following the recommendation of the State Task Force on Career Pathways, the state awarded \$3.75 million to local partnerships and charged them with developing STW system components.

The Oregon Education Act for the 21st Century legislation actually predates the federal STW Act of 1994. It calls for a comprehensive reform of education and related youth services. Progress on the implementation of this reform is measured through the Oregon Benchmarks, which include 272 different indicators. School-to-Work programs are coordinated through regional workforce councils charged with formulating strategic plans for economic development.

Hawaii's legislation is designed to encourage private employers to participate in the STW system. The legislation designates the State as the "responsible employer for the purposes of workers' compensation" to exempt private employers from STW students' claims. Additionally, legislation was enacted that "exempts employers from paying unemployment insurance for student interns."

Implications for Sustainability

The enactment of STW legislation and formulation of a strategic plan have tremendous implications to the sustainability of STW systems. Both processes promote coordination, involvement, negotiation and commitment of all relevant state and local levels among education, job training, economic development, private, and community organization entities. Sustainability of STW systems is more likely the more stakeholders are actively and fiscally committed to STW initiatives.

Legislation as well as strategic planning defines roles, functions, and collaboration mechanisms for all partner entities. They determine resource allocation and how results are to be measured for sustained system improvement.

Combination of Top-Down and Decentralized Strategies

Assumption

A STW system is the result of both top-down and bottom-up (decentralized) strategies. Both types of strategies are necessary to sustain a STW system, and both are more effective when designed to complement each other. Reviews of the thirteen states in this study shows that achieving this balance is challenging at the very least.

Scope of Study

The scope of this study did not allow a detailed review of states' strategies or prescriptive recommendations about which strategies are best designed as top-down or bottom-up. However, the data from the study provide insight into states' experiences and suggest implications for STW sustainability.

Findings

At the state level, the bottom-up approach is described as local flexibility or local control. Many states use such language to describe their STW systems. For example:

Our philosophy is to provide the state support for local reform efforts while allowing for the maximum amount of flexibility and innovation. Long-term systemic reform that will outlast seed money or isolated program development is a bottom up process that begins in our communities and school and has the support and commitment of the people that make up those communities. (State of Colorado Office of the Lieutenant Governor, 1996)

States' follow-through of their intentions varies. Along with making funds available, two kinds of state strategies for enabling local flexibility appear to be (1) removing obstacles and (2) making requirements -- dictating the "what" but not the "how." Some examples of strategies used by states in the study are as follows:

Removing Obstacles

- Legislation providing tax credits or other financial support towards workers' compensation, unemployment insurance or direct wages for students in work-based learning experiences.
- Legislation making the state legally responsible for students in work-based learning activities.

Making Requirements

- Designating STW system components through the Request For Proposal (RFP) funding process
- Requiring grantees to address sustainability (e.g. system, coordinators, etc.)
- Requiring commitments from districts to work with partners
- Requiring grantees to identify specific outcomes and propose performance standards
- Limiting funds, requiring fund matches

Implications for Sustainability

States who focus the STW system-building at the local level want to capitalize on local innovation and to increase local buy-in for the STW initiative. However, when unsupported by complementary top-down strategies, this type of strategy can hinder the sustainability of the STW initiative. The study indicates two caveats.

First, strategies for local flexibility cannot substitute for effective marketing and communication strategies. Some states focusing at the local level cited lack of state-level support for STW as a major barrier to sustainability. While strong local success *should* garner state-level support, primary reliance on local success is a very risky approach to ensuring state-level support. Others states cited lack of local support, including schools, parents and the general public. Enabling local control does not automatically result in the local partnership's constituents embracing the initiative.

Second, the local implementation may lack cohesion, resulting in overlapping partnerships and a confusing array of programs. The ensuing inefficiency, turf issues and frustration among partners clearly hinder sustainability. For example, Pennsylvania had a hands-off approach to local implementation, but changed this approach to establish county-wide partnerships under ten geographic workforce development regions:

The original plan was to have partnerships self-select. These partnerships would begin to blur the boundaries of traditionally separated funding streams and move from "program" mentalities to system building. Realistically, this is much easier said than done. (Snyder, 1997, p.1)

... the participants in these business and industry roundtables emphasized the value of successful local initiatives integrated into a larger, coordinated School-to-Career program. While few if any employers want an outside agency, including State government, to tell them how to run their STC projects, nearly all would agree that STC is so large and so significant that innumerable overlapping committees only get in each others' way. As customers and sponsors of School-to-Career, employers strongly believe in the importance of a comprehensive, statewide, locally specific strategy (Reingold Associates, 1997, p. 20).

Providing a coordinating structure is a key top-down strategy. States in this study have taken diverse approaches as described elsewhere in this report.

Based upon the experiences of the states in this study, the *removal of obstacles* is an important guideline for creating top-down strategies that complement decentralized strategies. As seen, several states provided legislative solutions to the obstacle of the costs to businesses of student employees. The data from the study suggest that other local obstacles should also be addressed by the state:

- The public's lack of general understanding about School-to-Work can be addressed by a statewide marketing campaign and visible, high-level state support.
- Teachers' lack of knowledge about applied learning methods can be addressed by professional development.

-
- Lack of hard data about the impacts of School-to-Work for performance improvement can be addressed by state-driven automated follow-up systems and evaluation efforts.

States' use of resources and expertise in these areas can reduce local obstacles and thus increase the sustainability of strong local STW efforts.

Alignment and Integration with Education Reforms

Assumption

The federal concept is that School-to-Work is not a "program," but rather a systemic education reform initiative. It is implemented in an educational context where many other reforms are also impacting the system. If School-to-Work is aligned and integrated with other reforms and initiatives, then this overall systemic effort should help sustain the individual STW component. It was expected that the greater the alignment and integration of School-to-Work with other education reforms, the greater the likelihood of STW sustainability beyond federal funding.

Scope of Study

Education reform is a highly complex area, and the scope of this study did not allow a detailed review of each state's reform efforts. However, conclusions about sustainability can be drawn from data showing general relationships between School-to-Work and other reforms. This study touched on reform initiatives that were considered likely to be related to School-to-Work, but did not explore such issues as alternatives to public schools, district funding equity, and school governance.

Findings

One of the survey questions asked state STW directors whether certain education reforms had been initiated in their state, and if so, to what extent each reform had been supported by STW actions or funds (see Appendix C). The responses show a great diversity of reform context, with no two states alike.

Reforms Initiated

- Reform to raise student competency or academic standards has been initiated in all states (100%, n=13).
- Statewide assessment of student achievement and comprehensive career development and guidance systems have been initiated in all but one state (92%, n=12).
- Inclusion of industry-specific skills in the curriculum has been initiated in all but two states (85%, n=11) and elimination of the general track has been initiated in all but three (77%, n=10).

School-to-Work Support for Other Reforms

- Where initiated, labor market-driven funding for occupation/technical programs and elimination of a general track received (on average) the most support from School-to-Work.

-
- Certificate of Mastery of STW competencies and scholarships for students received the least support from School-to-Work.

In response to another survey question about the significant impacts of the state's STW initiative, four state STW directors discussed career development and guidance. Florida has an increased focus on career development across the curriculum, and Maine's Career Advantage program has demonstrated positive results in the workforce. The number of schools offering comprehensive career planning in Oklahoma has increased from about 10% in 1994 to 50% currently. Pennsylvania has developed CD-ROM training to implement comprehensive career development at all levels of education.

Combined with interview data, additional document and data review helped create an overall picture of each state's education reform efforts. Two findings were of particular interest and have clear implications for sustainability of the STW initiative.

1. School-to-Work Isolation. School-to-Work's isolation from other education reform initiatives makes it appear to be much more of a "program" than an initiative to promote systemic reform. In many states, School-to-Work appeared quite separate from other initiatives. School-to-Work documentation sometimes invoked other existing reforms, but documents about other reforms rarely referred to School-to-Work. General reform rhetoric often spoke of preparing students to be productive citizens, but tended to emphasize such issues as raising students' performance levels, granting districts greater local control, and increasing school accountability. A review of state websites serves as an example. School-to-Work was sometimes found under education "programs," and was often not mentioned or highlighted under sections on "issues and reform." At some state websites, it is easy to miss School-to-Work completely. In short, it is not obvious that School-to-Work has been integrated with other reform efforts.

2. Reform Priorities. School-to-Work is not a state education priority item. In addition to its isolation, School-to-Work was sometimes overshadowed by the other reform activity. One state STW director said that the greatest barrier to STW implementation in that state was "the intense focus" on meeting the new higher academic standards. In some states, there were even conflicting goals between the priority reform efforts and School-to-Work. Another state STW director cited a "clash" between the goals of School-to-Work and the goals of the state's reform efforts. In yet another state, the strategic plan of the department of education strongly emphasized high student *academic* achievement and then listed other goals, but made no mention of STW principles or activities. Finally, there was a hint of another problem related to intense reform activity: too much of a good thing. In one state with much state-led education reform, the state STW director noted general opposition, saying that local educators feel that the rules keep changing and that they "lack a stable playing field" in school reform.

Implications for Sustainability

These findings suggest both discouraging and encouraging implications for STW sustainability. It appears that the integration and alignment of School-to-Work with other school reforms *is* critical for STW sustainability, but that achieving such integration is

difficult. As shown, the existence of reform activity can be a barrier in a number of ways. School-to-Work supports other reform initiatives, but often they do not seem to support School-to-Work.

More encouraging is the level of STW support for other reforms and the apparent positive impact of School-to-Work on career development and guidance. Even without a comprehensive STW system in place, career development activities can be sustained if supported by schools, students and parents. Such activities can help ensure that all students are made aware of the career avenues available and the educational requirements for reaching these career goals.

Also encouraging are some states' efforts to explicitly include STW-related skills in their prescribed academic content or student performance guidelines, whether they be content standards, curricula, competencies, or (in one state) a certificate of advanced mastery. These skills vary from state to state but can include basic workplace readiness, career development, and industry-specific skills. Such skills become a sustainable part of the education system to the extent that a state adopts the entire package. For example, Oregon's legislation establishing state academic and career-related reforms (including the certificate of advanced mastery) preceded federal STW legislation, and is likely to continue after federal funding. Also, the embedding of STW-related skills into state-mandated guidelines may yet prove to be a driving force behind changes in teaching methodology. An example is the New Jersey's state STW director's response when asked about the one strategy that would have the most impact on the sustainability of the state's STW initiative. This director said that when the state's new core curriculum content standards are fully implemented, alternative teaching strategies will be needed to increase student performance. In other words, traditional education practices will not suffice if students are to achieve the new state-mandated content standards that include STW-related skills. Schools and teachers will need to make applied and/or work-based learning a more regular part of the student experience.

In summary, there is a complicated relationship between School-to-Work and other school reform initiatives. The current structure of existing reforms do not generally include School-to-Work and therefore will not aid in sustaining the initiative. However, the inclusion of specific STW-related skills in state academic guidelines may ultimately sustain STW principles and practices. While unable to sustain either the systemic or programmatic aspects of the initiative itself, such inclusion offers the hope of being a catalyst for change that might, over time, come to resemble the original vision of School-to-Work.

Support for State and Regional or Local Coordination

Assumption

The coordinator functions at the state and local levels are important to ensuring the continuity of system-building efforts and collaboration of crucial stakeholders.

Scope of Study

The interview questions included a number of items on how coordination for STW is provided at the state level and whether provisions are being made for sustainability of

existing coordinating staffs or offices. The study did not include an in-depth review of the sub-state partnership structure in each of the 13 states in the study. However, the study inquired into strategies for continuing the local coordinator positions after the termination of federal STW funds.

Findings

Several questions were directed at understanding how STW coordination is being carried out and possibly sustained at the state level. STW directors were asked whether the state STW operational staff have responsibility for administering other state education, labor, or workforce development initiatives in addition to the federal STW funds. The majority reported they have (62%, n=8) or partly have (8%, n=1) responsibility for administering other initiatives, with the rest (31%, n=4) reporting that they did not have responsibility for other initiatives. The initiative most commonly cited as administered by STW staff was Tech Prep. Others cited include *High Schools that Work*, career academies, volunteer initiatives, youth apprenticeship, and a certificate of mastery program encompassing workplace skills.

In a related question, directors were asked if there is a permanent, state-level office, not funded by federal STW monies, that will continue STW activities after the termination of federal STW funds. More than three-fourths answered “yes” (54%, n=7) or “partly” (23%, n=3) to this question, indicating that planning and efforts to sustain STW coordination at the state level are well underway.

In another question on state-level coordination, directors were asked whether state agencies contribute overhead and operating costs for STW. Responses to this question were nearly evenly and completely split between “yes” (46%, n=6) and “no” (46%, n=6), with one director answering “partly.” While the responses to this question were not as positive overall, they still indicate a surprising level of fiscal support.

Cross-tabulation of responses on strategies related to coordination indicates that STW office or staff responsibility for administering other initiatives may play a role in STW sustainability. For example, of the nine states that report having at least partial responsibility for administering other education, labor or workforce development initiatives, seven also report the existence of a permanent state-level office that will continue STW activities after the termination of federal funds. Also, of the seven states that reported that state agencies contribute overhead and operating costs to STW, five also report that STW operational staff have responsibility for administering other initiatives. Overall, it appears that STW operational staff with responsibility for related initiatives enjoy greater support, fiscally and organizationally, than those that do not.

Coordination for STW at the local level was addressed in a question asking whether there are any state-level strategies in place to sustain the local coordinator’s position after the end of federal funds. Interview responses generally support the assumption that the regional or local coordinator will play an essential role in STW sustainability. When STW directors were asked whether there were any state-level strategies in place or being developed to ensure the continuation of the regional or local STW coordinator positions, 11 of 13 directors answered “yes” (46%, n=6) or “partly” (38%, n=5). Following are examples of strategies reported:

-
- Amending state administrative code.
 - Formation of a state-wide subcommittee to address the issue.
 - Requiring grantees to address sustainability of the coordinator in the request for proposals (RFP) process.
 - Pushing for shared responsibility for the coordinator position.
 - Limiting the percentage of STW dollars that can be used for coordinators.
 - Redirection of other state and federal funds.

School-to-Work directors who maintained that sustaining the coordinators is essentially a local rather than state issue cited strategies that are emerging at the local level. In some areas, the coordinator position is picked up by the fiscal/administrative agent (community college or school district), and in others the coordinator is moving to a local or regional workforce development board or community-based organization. These represent a redirection of funds at the local level.

Implications for Sustainability

Coordination of efforts at the state and local levels are an important aspect of STW sustainability. At the state level, strategies for sustaining the STW coordinating function would be enhanced by integrating responsibility for administering other, related initiatives under the direction of the STW staff. This is not only in keeping with the integrative, system-building aspects of the STW legislation, but is also critical for sustaining efforts after the termination of federal funds. At the level of local STW coordination, the obvious danger in relegating continuity of the coordinator positions to local strategies is that the coordinator role may be sustained in some areas but not others. This will make problematic the continued development and maintenance of a comprehensive, state-wide system of STW transition.

Sustained Leadership

Assumption

Strong leadership organized across crucial STW stakeholder groups at different levels is necessary for building and sustaining the STW system.

Scope of the Study

State STW directors were asked if, in their judgment, there is adequate leadership for STW sustainability in their state. In a related question, directors were asked if major industry and business partners were represented at the state STW leadership level. In addition, leadership emerged as an issue across interview responses to other questions, including barriers to implementation and sustainability, governance structure and others.

Findings

When state STW directors were asked whether their state has the STW leadership they believe is needed for sustainability, ten of 13 directors responded "yes" (38%, n=5) or "partly" (38%, n=5). Two directors (15%) indicated they did not have the leadership needed, and one (8%) did not respond.

The following major issues or barriers related to the quality of leadership for STW sustainability were cited in the interviews:

- The absence of demonstrated commitment and leadership from the state’s chief school officer. (two states)
- Concern about turnover in high-level education, government and political leadership positions with the power to effect policy impacting STW. (two states)
- The need for continual state legislative or cabinet-level buy-in and support. (six states)
- Institutional turf issues; i.e., the difficulties of inter-agency and cross-sector collaboration and the inability to see and work across agendas.

The greatest concern expressed by the state STW directors was over the mobilization and alignment of leadership at state government levels. One state reported that at the leadership level, school-to-work is still a controversial term, and others showed concern about political alignment in support of school-to-work. Because building a STW system results in profound changes in education, the administrative, policy, and legislative frameworks will need to develop in concert with other aspects of the system. If political leadership at the state level is absent, the policy consensus needed for STW sustainability will not come about.

When asked whether major STW business partners were represented at the state leadership level, fewer than half answered “yes” (46%, n=6). More than half indicated that business partners were either partly represented (23%, n=3) or not represented (31%, n=4) at the state leadership level.

A cross-tabulation of responses to the leadership questions shows that in the states where there is the most confidence in leadership for sustainability, business partners are important leaders at the state level. Specifically, five of the six state directors who indicated their state has the leadership needed for STW sustainability also indicated that their major business partners are represented at the state STW leadership level. This may be an important strategy for obtaining buy-in for school-to-work from state policymakers.

Implications for Sustainability

It appears from the issues and concerns raised by state STW directors that policy and political environments will be a critical factor in sustainability of school-to-work, and that key roles will be played by state-level education, government, and legislative leaders. If this is the case, leadership for sustainability will focus multiple strategies for influencing policy, including strategies for the following:

- Developing effective liaisons to those with power to effect policy changes.
- Overcoming turf issues and maximizing collaboration across sectors and agencies at the state leadership level.
- Leveraging the influence of major business partners on policymakers (One strategy is to ensure they are represented in state STW leadership teams and councils.)

-
- Developing strong advocacy for school-to-work among the constituencies of legislators and other policymakers.

Involvement of Stakeholders

Assumption

Developing a critical mass of support and involvement by stakeholder groups will be a key factor in STW sustainability. Also, communication with key stakeholders should keep pace with the scale or stage of implementation of the STW system.

Scope of Study

Questions relating to stakeholder involvement focused primarily on engaging employers and educators as the primary participants in building a STW system. However, many of the responses to questions on sustainability strategies and barriers addressed the entire range of STW stakeholders.

As with other questions, the primary focus in the study was on state-level strategies for sustainability. As part of this research it was hoped to compare the communication mechanisms and tools developed in each state for supporting the involvement of various stakeholder groups, but the project timeframe for completion was too limited.

Findings

System-wide sustainability will require the substantial commitment from stakeholders to a shared vision of School-to-Work. However, more than three fourths of the STW Directors interviewed (77%, n=10) cited the reluctance, misconceptions, or lack of acceptance of key stakeholder groups or individuals as a major barrier to STW leadership, implementation or sustainability.

Business Partners. In response to questions about employer involvement in School-to-Work, the majority indicated that major industries in their states are actively participating in developing their workforce via the STW system (85%, n=11). However, only 7 of those 11 states indicated that their STW business partners are in the same industries as those targeted by their state's economic development efforts. This indicates a degree of incongruity in the integration and coordination of efforts at the state level to engage business and industry in comprehensive strategies for making the state economically competitive.

In a related finding, in states where the commerce or economic development department is one of the state-level STW partners (54%, n=7), business and industry expertise and involvement at the state level appear are leveraged. All but one of the seven states that include the economic development agency in their state-level STW partners also report that their STW partners are in the same industries targeted by their state's economic development efforts.

Only six of the 13 states (46%) indicated that their major business partners are represented at the state STW leadership level (see the Leadership section). Florida, for example, requires

that 51% of its State STW Leadership Team be private sector representatives.

Schools. School administrators, teachers and counselors are viewed as central to effective sustainability. Of all the STW stakeholders, school-based personnel are being asked to make the most substantive changes in their practice, and the reluctance of the educational community to change has been cited as a major barrier. In order for sustainability to take place, school-based personnel must understand and take on as their own the issues that are driving the demand for changes such as integration of academic and vocational instruction, contextual, applied and cooperative learning strategies, career guidance and development, and better links between schools and workplaces.

Professional development has been cited as an important way to influence the views held by school personnel of School-to-Work, the benefits they perceive for students, and their readiness and willingness to undertake change. More than three-fourths of the directors (77%, n=10) reported that local school districts in their states have been influenced to utilize existing staff development resources to address STW-related priorities. In addition, more than three-quarters indicated that job descriptions of school-based personnel had been revised, at least partly, to incorporate STW activities and responsibilities (77%, n=10). To a lesser extent directors report that school reports or school improvement plans have been at least partly revised to include STW activities (31%, n=4).

Public. The need to communicate clearly and consistently with the public is apparent in state STW directors' comments. Parents are a critical group for marketing STW because of a continuing mindset that perceives a career development focus as a lesser pathway to higher education than the traditional college/university preparatory route. They must develop a new understanding of the relationships between education and work and how a comprehensive and integrated STW system will ultimately benefit their children. Parents and other stakeholders will continue their involvement in School-to-Work and advocate for sustainability to legislators and other policy makers only if they understand and see how School-to-Work meets their needs. In some states, this has been made more problematic by vocal, conservative grass-roots opposition to School-to-Work.

Strategies. When asked to describe the strategy or action that would have the greatest positive impact on sustainability in their state, more than half of the state STW directors (62%, n=8), discussed increasing stakeholder support or engagement at either the state or the grass roots levels. Noting that legislators, parents, employers and local districts need to be aware of STW success stories in order to see the "value added" by School-to-Work, the STW directors recommended marketing directly to legislators as well as to parents and employers. One director recommended a stronger evaluation system in order to be able to show the success stories. In addition to marketing, the directors also cited professional development for teachers as a way to promote STW sustainability. One director elaborated that a "major infusion of funds over a two- to five-year period for teacher inservice" was needed.

Implications for STW Sustainability

There is considerable consensus among state STW directors interviewed that the involvement of a full range of interested stakeholders at both the state and the local levels will be needed

to remove barriers to STW sustainability. Strategies for sustainability would include the following:

- Ensuring that departments of commerce/economic development are a STW partner at the state level is a strategy for leveraging private sector expertise and involvement in building and sustaining the STW system.
- Employer support is too critical for sustainability to be left only to local strategies. Ensuring employer representation at the state leadership level is important for generating business partner commitment and buy-in, and for developing shared responsibility for the STW system between the public and private sectors. Strategies for employer involvement are important at both the state and the local levels.
- Communication and other resources should be focused on educating and generating buy-in and support from key stakeholders, especially policy-makers, educators and parents.
- Strategies for school districts should be directed toward achieving buy-in on a large scale, building capacity and enabling district staff to implement School-to-Work through school-level changes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HAWAI'I

Preface

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 contained rhetoric stating that the United States was the only industrialized nation that did not have a formally established workforce preparation "system." The central tenet of this legislation was to provide participating States with venture capital on a time-limited basis to create this system by pulling together existing programs and initiatives to provide services to "all" students regardless of their in-school or out-of-school status. As part of this system-building process States have been challenged to mobilize the support of statewide business and industry partners, "all" educational delivery areas, public and private agencies including Human Services and Departments of Labor and Education, parents and parental organizations, community-based organizations, churches and communities.

Passage of this legislation provided incentive funding to states for only five years. This legislation does not provide adequate time or resources for significant impact and system development, particularly in those states where little evidence of a system previously existed.

The following recommendations and rationale for implementation strategies to enhance sustainability are provided to the State of Hawai'i and the Hawai'i STW Executive Council as appropriate, and are based on: a) review of the literature; b) data collected during the telephone interviews with thirteen current state STW director/ coordinators; and c) the

experience gained from the Institute for Workforce Competitiveness' direct involvement with states' School-to-Work implementation.

Recommendations

Recommendation: Utilizing the leadership of the established State of Hawai'i STW Executive Council, develop a long-range dynamic strategic plan to sustain School-to-Work, linking economic development, educational delivery systems, and workforce preparation. This particular recommendation has the greatest potential of having the most significant impact on the development, implementation, and, sustainability of a Hawaiian School-to-Work/workforce development system.

Rationale. The State is commended for the passage of legislation in support of STW, but legislation alone is not enough to sustain STW. The development of a long-range strategic plan, which complements the existing legislation, is warranted to sustain this initiative. The Hawai'i STW sustainability plan should include, but not be limited to, the following characteristics/components:

Components

- The vision and goals to support the future economic development, workforce preparation, and educational delivery "systems," including the Hawai'i Board of Education and Board of Regents, to enhance Hawai'i's economic growth and future prosperity.
- Links between current and projected policy and agencies that involve economic development, workforce preparation, and education initiatives (i.e., student academic standards; Tech Prep; vocational-technical education).
- Stated measurable outcomes that include the persons/agencies accountable for oversight and implementation, and projected time line for system component implementation.
- A feedback/performance improvement and evaluation mechanism that provides current information, research, data, and recommendations to *all* stakeholders on the progress and impact of the vision, goals, and projected outcomes of the plan.
- The identification and earmarking of specific funds and resources from public and private agencies to ensure the necessary ongoing fiscal support.

Characteristics

- The plan must be dynamic and flexible in order for the proposed system to develop, expand, and adapt and capitalize upon the unforeseen opportunities that will be available within the emerging information/technological economy.
- The process must include multi-partisan stakeholder input, buy-in and consensus in the development and ongoing implementation of the vision, goals, and outcomes of the plan. The overall success of the implementation of this initiative will depend upon

the extent of active involvement of those citizens/stakeholders that are directly and indirectly impacted by this process. Therefore, it is imperative that all interested persons and agencies at state, regional, and local levels have an open-door opportunity to participate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Recommendation: The membership of the established STW Executive Council should take the lead role in the promotion and marketing of this initiative in order to garner the necessary support from internal, external, public and private constituents to ensure the success of their effort.

Rationale. The success of almost any initiative is related to the overt and visible support of the highly respected and visible leaders within that particular initiative. Therefore, it is imperative that each member of the STW Executive Council, at every opportunity, take a high-profile leadership role in verbalizing to the citizens of Hawai'i exactly what the Council is trying to do in regard to School-to-Work/workforce preparation, and how it will positively impact them and the State. Additionally, the Council's membership should actively encourage the members of the executive and legislative branches of the state government to enact further legislation in support of workforce development and School-to-Work, and join with them in promoting and marketing this initiative.

Recommendation: The State of Hawai'i should critically examine the opportunities to diversify its labor market into high-wage, high-skill, environmentally clean industries that are currently or will be soon available within the technological industries and careers now emerging within the new information and knowledge economy. The Executive Council can take a lead role in pushing for and promoting this economic diversification strategy to the State's economic and political leadership.

Rationale. Due to Hawai'i's current economic downturn in its tourist and service industries, it is opportune for the state to examine the feasibility to begin the diversification into high-wage, high-skill, environmentally clean industries. Vice President Al Gore has recently announced that within three years global instantaneous point-to-point electronic communications will be available: anyone desiring to contact another location on the surface of this planet will have the capability to do so instantaneously. Additionally, current state-of-the-art satellite telecommunication systems have eliminated old cost-limiting factors such as time and distance, and make almost every location accessible to the global marketplace. These technological advances, coupled with Hawai'i's unique geographic location, could be advantageous and could very well propel the state to serve as the economic and technological link between the commerce of the Pacific Rim and the U.S. mainland. Once the State has determined which technological industries it is seeking to pursue and diversify into, leaders from those industries should be invited to join the membership of the STW Executive Council. Note: It is assumed that the STW Executive Council membership includes those major business and industry leaders that have significant impact on the growth and development of the State's economy. If not, then aggressive steps should be taken to include those business and industry leaders in this leadership process.

Recommendation: Provide ongoing funding, resources and strategies to sustain the positions for the state level, regional, and local personnel charged with the implementation of the School-to-Work/workforce development system.

Rationale. One of the major ongoing barriers noted for the implementation of STW has been the turnover and/or lack of personnel in critical staff positions directly involved in the implementation process. In order to have any degree of success, state-level, regional, and local direction and coordination must remain consistent for timely implementation of the overall vision, goals, and outcomes of the proposed plan. Constant turnover of personnel due to a time-limited "project" mentality critically impacts the continuity of the implementation process. Time lost in rehiring/retraining of personnel is just that -- time lost. It is not necessary, in every instance, to develop and employ a group of *new* personnel, but rather realign resources and existing personnel in order to provide the internal leadership necessary (i.e., updating the job descriptions of permanent personnel to include this initiative). It must also be remembered that due to the complexities of implementing this initiative, and of maintaining the necessary coordination and contacts between state-level agencies and, state, regional, and local stakeholder groups, the sustainability of the leadership provided by the state director/coordinator position is key to the success of this effort.

Recommendation: Directly link state-level coordination of STW to other complementary education and/or workforce development reforms/initiatives.

Rationale. STW implementation states that have treated this initiative as inclusive rather than a stand-alone program have noted a greater amount of success in its implementation. An inclusive approach is consistent with the basic tenet of the STW legislation that STW is "nothing new" but rather an opportunity for states to better coordinate and enhance their current educational and workforce reform efforts. The STW director/coordinator's office should have formal linkages between different state agencies (e.g., Labor; Education; Commerce), within the Department of Education's different divisions directly relating to these issues (e.g., pk-12, postsecondary, curriculum and instruction, vocational-technical education), and between educational initiatives (e.g., Tech Prep, gender equity). States that have taken this approach reported a higher level of understanding for STW, better working relationships between agencies, departments and initiatives, and conserved resources by reducing the duplication of effort.

Each state designs a system that meets its specific needs. The states of Florida and Oregon might serve as examples. In Florida, School-to-Work is one of four key workforce development strategies (along with Welfare-to-Work, High Skill/High Wage, and One-Stop Career Centers) overseen by regional Workforce Development Boards. At the operational level, the State STW Joint Services office is staffed by both Department of Education and Department of Labor personnel who have direct linkages to education and workforce development reforms and initiatives. In Oregon, the Governor established the Office of Education and Workforce Policy to provide statewide policy direction on education and workforce issues. The office is assisted by a cabinet of education and and workforce agency administrators and others. The office also leads the School Transformation Advisory

Council and a team of specialists in providing technical assistance and support to Oregon's 15 Workforce Regions and Regional Workforce Committees. For more information, see <http://www.governor.state.or.us/governor/oewp/index.htm>, along with other related pages in the Governor's website.

Recommendation: Continue the development of an ongoing statewide marketing campaign that promotes the vision, goals and outcomes, and which clearly and consistently communicates the concepts and benefits of Hawai'i's School-to-Work/workforce development initiative.

Rationale. Major problems associated with STW implementation have resulted from the lack of general awareness, understanding and involvement by certain stakeholder groups (for example, resistance from certain conservative groups that have been very vocal in the opposition to this initiative). An ongoing aggressive marketing campaign will greatly aid in the elimination of these problems. This campaign must consistently and clearly communicate the vision, goals, and outcomes of this initiative. Also, an evaluation/feedback mechanism with benchmarks for success must be in place so that the marketing campaign can communicate the initiative's successes as they occur.

The Hawai'i STW Executive Council is commended for its active participation in the development and implementation of strategies in which to market this initiative. Upon review of the Executive Council's meeting minutes, it was noted that the Partnership Building Task Force adopted Lieutenant Governor Hirono's suggested title: Hawai'i School-to-Work *The Career Connection Linking education and business in a comprehensive career preparation for all students* (Hawai'i School-to-Work Newsletter, February 1998). It must be noted that in several states, the term "School-to-Work" has created local resistance to implementation activities. States that have avoided the STW term, developed their own workforce development title, and/or replaced the term "work" to "careers" have had less resistance from some groups. For example, The Hawaiian Economic and Workforce Development Initiative for the Millennia (HEWDIM) may be more palatable than the term "School-to-Work." Regardless of what title is utilized, caution should be exercised when developing the marketing campaign to ensure that the title does not distract from the overall vision, mission, and goals of the initiative. In this particular instance, it does not appear to do so.

Recommendation: The State of Hawai'i should provide the necessary resources for specific professional development activities for all educational persons/institutions involved in STW/workforce development.

Rationale. In order to use the existing public school system to prepare Hawai'i's future workforce, a substantial commitment of resources will be needed for professional development to impact the culture of the existing institution(s). *Time* is a major resource that is cited again and again as a major barrier to implementation and change within educational environments. For example, educators frequently comment about the impact of the lack of time to plan and coordinate activities/lessons, develop curricula, visit worksite/workplaces and provide additional student support.

The professional development activities to support STW/workforce development are all inclusive. If students are to compete for jobs in a technological/knowledge economy, they must have high academic skill achievement coupled with demonstrable workplace vocational-technical skills; therefore, *all* teachers must participate in professional development activities. Additionally, school administrators must be provided professional development to better understand the necessity of change to support student opportunities for postsecondary education and competition for jobs in the global economy. Last but not least, school guidance counselors must be given the most current information regarding education and skill preparation for students to enter the new and emerging careers created by the impact and rapid change of technology. Suggested targeted professional development activities include:

- training in contextual teaching/learning methods and curriculum development
- work-based learning experiences for administrators, teachers, guidance staff
- integration of academic and vocational-technical content
- utilization of computers and related technology
- development and implementation of comprehensive career guidance systems for school guidance staff
- time to meet with other educators and business and industry to discuss, plan, and develop "real-world" learning activities for students.

CONCLUSION

It is clear from this study that there are a variety of forces and conditions that will facilitate sustainability of STW systems, and that some combination is optimal depending upon the particular state context. The State of Hawai'i is commended for some of the actions it has already taken, including enacting STW legislation and focusing on a state marketing campaign. Recommendations have been made for additional actions to enhance the sustainability of the STW initiative.

This report is one of the first examinations into the area of STW sustainability, and due to the limitations on this project's sample size, selected participants, budget and time reporting constraints, it is noted that additional research is warranted in this area. The Institute for Workforce Competitiveness is available to assist interested states, researchers, graduate students, and/or agencies that would like to continue and/or pursue this line of research inquiry.

REFERENCES

- America's choice: High skills or low wages. (1990). Report of the Commission on the skills of the American workforce. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (1997). Sustaining school-to-career systems for urban youth. Report on the national conference of the State-Urban Initiative, Cincinnati, OH, October 23-25, 1997. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Departments of Education and Labor. (1997). 1997 Report to Congress on Implementation of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. Washington, D.C.: Authors.
- Grobe, T. (1993). Synthesis of existing knowledge and practice in the field of educational partnerships. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Hawai'i School-to-Work The Career Connection Newsletter Vol. II, No 2. (February 1998). [On-line]. Available: <http://www.hcc.hawaii.edu/stw/newsletters/news2-1998.html>
- Kidder, L. & C.M. Judd (1986). Research methods in social relations (5th ed. New York: Holt, Rinhart and Winston.
- National Employer Leadership Council (1997). Colorado strategic plan for employer involvement. NELC building a system/tools [On-line]. Available: <http://www.nelc.org/colstrat.htm>
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reingold Associates (1997). Roundtable report: Business and industry leaders discuss School-to-Career in Pennsylvania [On-line]. Available: <http://www.stw.ed.gov/products/933/933.htm>
- Ryan, R. D. & Imel, S. (1996). The School-to-Work transition: Genuine reform or the latest fad? The ERIC Review, 4-2, 2-11.
- Snyder, M. (1997). Countywide partnerships: Regional concept for School-to-Work. School-to-Work newsletter, Fall 1997 [On-line]. Available: <http://www.outreach.psu.edu/PASTW/News/Quarterly/Fall97/Initiative.html>
- State of Colorado Office of the Lieutenant Governor. (1996). The Colorado School-to-Career partnership's vision. [On-Line] . Available: http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/schooltowork/vision.htm

-
- Tushnet, N. C. (1993). A national perspective on educational partnerships. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 361 848)
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1997). Statistical abstract of the United States [On-line]. Available: <http://www.census.gov/statab/www/states/>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. (1998). Survey of current business [On-line]. Available: <http://www.doc.gov>
- U.S. School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (H.R. 2884). [On-line]. Available: [http://www.stw.ed.gov/factsht/act.htm#Section 101](http://www.stw.ed.gov/factsht/act.htm#Section%20101)
- Wills, J. (1995). Workforce development: The policy debate. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 68-4, 17-37.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: State Economic and Demographic Data

State Economic Data

State	Per Capita Gross State Product ¹	Per Capita Personal Income ¹	Percent of Population below Poverty Level ²	Unemployment Rate ³
Colorado	19,918	25,084	8.8	3.0
Florida	16,506	24,104	16.2	4.6
Hawai'i	23,516	25,159	10.3	5.3
Kentucky	16,966	19,687	14.7	4.0
Maine	16,279	20,826	11.2	4.0
Massachusetts	22,539	29,439	11.0	2.9
New Jersey	23,549	31,053	7.8	5.1
New York	22,814	28,782	16.5	5.8
North Carolina	19,087	22,010	12.6	3.6
Oklahoma	15,817	19,350	17.1	3.7
Oregon	17,658	22,668	11.2	5.1
Pennsylvania	18,515	24,668	12.2	4.3
West Virginia	14,842	18,444	16.7	6.6
<i>Sources</i> ¹ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (1997) ² U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis (1998) ³ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1998)				

State Economic Data, continued			
State	Domestic Tourism Spending in State-1993 ¹ (Mil \$)	Tourism Jobs as percent of total (1995) ¹	Retail sales per household (1995) ²
Colorado	6,122	14.5	24,823
Florida	28,629	13.7	25,688
Hawai'i	5,866	23.4	32,911
Kentucky	3,567	10.6	22,663
Maine	1,483	10.8	24,348
Massachusetts	7,352	10.1	23,652
New Jersey	11,134	9.4	25,979
New York	19,950	8.9	20,759
North Carolina	7,884	9.7	23,698
Oklahoma	2,698	11.1	20,727
Oregon	3,795	10.9	25,416
Pennsylvania	10,060	9.2	22,749
West Virginia	1,371	9.0	19,193
Sources: ¹ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis (1998) ² U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (1997)			

State Demographic Information

State	Total Resident Population (1,000)	Percent of Population under 18 years old (1996)	Percent of Population Graduating High School as of 1996	Percent of Population Graduating College as of 1996
Colorado	3,893	26.1	89.1	30.4
Florida	14,654	23.8	81.5	20.4
Hawai'i	1,187	25.9	84.4	23.9
Kentucky	3,908	24.9	74.0	17.5
Maine	1,242	24.1	84.7	19.7
Massachusetts	6,118	23.3	84.9	32.4
New Jersey	8,053	24.9	84.9	28.3
New York	18,137	25.0	81.6	25.6
North Carolina	7,425	25.0	76.0	21.0
Oklahoma	3,317	26.7	83.8	20.1
Oregon	3,243	25.2	87.5	22.8
Pennsylvania	12,020	24.0	81.6	22.3
West Virginia	1,816	23.1	74.7	14.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (1997)

Appendix B: Interview Protocol

STATE STW DIRECTOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

We are carrying out a study of the school-to-work effort in various states. We are interested in the conditions that promote or hinder sustainability of school-to-work and in the strategies and practices that you are using, either directly or indirectly, to enhance the sustainability of school-to-work efforts in your state.

Interview Questions

1.	Has legislation been enacted over the past several years in the areas of workforce and economic development and education reform?	Yes Partly No
	If so, does the legislation include specific references to or provisions for STW?	Yes Partly No
	If so, what are they?	
2.	Describe the major barriers to STW implementation in your state.	
3.	Are major industries in your state actively participating in developing their workforce via the STW initiative?	Yes Partly No
	If so, what are they?	
	Are these business partners represented at the state STW leadership level?	Yes Partly No
	Are these business partners in the same industries as those targeted by your state's economic development strategy?	Yes Partly No
4.	What strategies have you used to target industries and develop private sector commitment to STW at the state level?	
	As a result of these strategies, what types of formal commitments to STW have your major business partners made at the state level?	
5.	How is STW governance structured within the state? (authority, responsibility, and accountability at the state and regional/ local levels)	
6.	Does your state have the STW leadership that you believe is needed for sustainability?	Yes Partly No
	If not, what is needed?	
7.	Is a formal accountability system in place for STW with benchmarks and/or outcome measures?	Yes Partly No
	If so, give examples.	
8.	Is there a statewide automated follow-up system for labor market and education outcomes?	Yes Partly No
	Is it used to determine outcomes for the STW system?	Yes Partly No
9.	To what extent are state agencies other than yours involved in strategies to sustain STW?	
	What are these specific strategies?	

10.	Is there a permanent state-level office, not funded by STW, that will continue STW activities after the termination of federal STW funds?	Yes Partly No
	If so, describe it (where housed, how staffed, etc).	
	If not, what would you recommend?	
11.	Does the state STW operational staff have responsibility for administering other state education, labor, or workforce development initiatives in addition to the federal STW grant?	Yes Partly No
12.	Is the STW operational staff an interagency team?	Yes Partly No
	If so, what agencies are included in its composition?	
13.	Do state agencies contribute overhead and operating costs for STW?	Yes Partly No
	If yes, describe any financial commitments.	
14.	Are there state-level strategies in place to keep regional/local coordinator positions in place after the termination of federal STW funding?	Yes Partly No
	If so, what are these strategies?	
15.	On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "lowest" and 5 being "highest," how would you rate the following:	
	... the overall level of STW collaboration and integration of efforts among state agencies?	1 2 3 4 5
	... the level of STW planning?	1 2 3 4 5
	... the level of STW support provided by interagency structures?	1 2 3 4 5
	... the level of cooperative use of resources to support STW?	1 2 3 4 5
	What external funds and resources have been leveraged for your state's STW sustainability after the termination of federal funds?	
16.	Which of the following types of reform have been initiated in your state? On a scale of one (1) to five (5), with 1 being "minimally" and 5 being "substantially," indicate the extent to which the reform has been supported by STW actions or funds.	
	Higher student competency/academic standards	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: 1 2 3 4 5
	Statewide assessment of student achievement	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: 1 2 3 4 5
	Inclusion of industry-specific skill standards, including SCANS, in curriculum	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: 1 2 3 4 5
	Issuance of Certificate of Mastery of STW Competencies	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: 1 2 3 4 5
	Labor market-driven funding for occupational/technical programs	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: 1 2 3 4 5
	Comprehensive career development and guidance system	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: 1 2 3 4 5

Scholarships for students	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Elimination of general educational track	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Other (Specify):	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Which of the following initiatives are administered under the umbrella of the state STW office? On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "lowest" and 5 being "highest," indicate the level of implementation of each initiative.							
Tech Prep	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
JTPA Youth Year-Round	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
<i>High Schools That Work</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Career Academies	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Jobs for America's Graduates	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Vocational Education	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Adult Education	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5
Other (Specify):	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes:	1	2	3	4	5

17.	What strategies are used to encourage collaboration, consistency, and coherence in local program priorities, design and implementation? (funding, consolidation of RFP process, oversight, etc)	
-----	---	--

18.	What types of formal commitments, if any, are school districts asked to make to the regional or local partnership in support of STW sustainability?	
-----	---	--

19.	Have school report cards and/or school improvement plans been revised to include work-based learning or other STW activities?	Yes	Partly	No
-----	---	-----	--------	----

20.	Have the job descriptions of school personnel, including teachers, counselors, and principals, been revised to incorporate STW activities and responsibilities?	Yes	Partly	No
-----	---	-----	--------	----

21.	Has your state influenced local school districts to include STW principles/components into their professional development activities?	Yes	Partly	No
	If so, give examples.			

22.	What has been the most significant impact of the STW initiative in your state?	
-----	--	--

23.	What is the most significant barrier to STW sustainability in your state?	
-----	---	--

24.	What action or strategy would you recommend that would have the greatest positive impact on sustainability of STW in your state?	
-----	--	--

Appendix C: Responses to Forced-Choice Items

Structured Interview Responses

Question	Yes	Partly	No	No Answer	Total
1. Has legislation been enacted over the past several years in the areas of workforce and economic development and education reform?	7 54%	2 15%	4 31%	0 0%	13 100%
If so, does the legislation include specific references to or provisions for STW?	8 80%	2 20%	0 0%	0 0%	10 100%
3. Are major industries in your state actively participating in developing their workforce via the STW initiative?	11 85%	1 8%	1 8%	0 0%	13 100%
Are these business partners represented at the state STW leadership level?	6 46%	3 23%	4 31%	0 0%	13 100%
Are these business partners in the same industries as those targeted by your state's economic development strategy?	7 58%	2 17%	3 25%	0 0%	12 100%
6. Does your state have the STW leadership that you believe is needed for sustainability?	5 38%	5 38%	2 15%	1 8%	13 100%
7. Is a formal accountability system in place for STW with benchmarks and/or outcome measures?	9 69%	1 8%	3 23%	0 0%	13 100%
8. Is there a state-wide automated follow-up system for labor market and education outcomes?	4 31%	5 38%	4 31%	0 0%	13 100%
Is it used to determine outcomes for the STW system?	5 50%	3 30%	2 20%	0 0%	10 100%
10. Is there a permanent, state-level office, not funded by STW, that will continue STW activities after the termination of federal STW funds?	7 54%	3 23%	3 23%	0 0%	13 100%
11. Does the state STW operational staff have responsibility for administering other state education, labor, or workforce development initiatives in addition to the federal STW grant?	8 62%	1 8%	4 31%	0 0%	13 100%
12. Is the STW operational staff an interagency team?	9 69%	1 8%	3 23%	0 0%	13 100%
13. Do state agencies contribute overhead and operating costs for STW?	6 46%	1 8%	6 46%	0 0%	13 100%
14. Are there state-level strategies in place to keep regional/local coordinator positions in place after the termination of federal STW funding?	6 46%	5 38%	0 0%	2 15%	13 100%
19. Have school report cards and/or school improvement plans been revised to include work-based learning or other STW activities?	2 15%	2 15%	9 69%	0 0%	13 100%
20. Have the job descriptions of school personnel, including teachers, counselors, and principals, been revised to incorporate STW activities and responsibilities?	5 38%	5 38%	2 15%	1 8%	13 100%
21. Has your state influenced local school districts to include STW principles/components into their professional development activities?	10 77%	3 23%	0 0%	0 0%	13 100%

State Interagency Collaboration and Integration (Question 15)

	State Ratings														Average Rating
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M		
Overall level of STW collaboration and integration of efforts among state agencies	4	4	4	2	5	2	4	5	3	3	3	5	4	3.7	
Level of STW planning	4	5	3	2	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	5	5	4.0	
Level of STW support provided by interagency structures	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	5	4	4	2	3	5	3.8	
Level of cooperative use of resources to support STW	3	4	4	2	2	3	3	5	4	4	3	1	4	3.2	
Average State Rating	3.8	4.3	3.8	2.3	3.8	3.0	3.8	5.0	3.8	3.5	3.0	3.5	4.5		

Question 15: On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "lowest" and 5 being "highest," how would you rate the following.

STW Support of Education Reform (Question 16)

	State Ratings														Number of States Implementing the Reform	Average Rating
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M			
Higher Student Competencies	5	4	5	3	4	3	3	5	3	1	4	3	5	13	3.7	
Statewide Assessment of Student Achievement	2	3	5	1		2	4	5	2	4	1	3	5	12	3.1	
Industry Skill Standards	4	4	3	1		2	3	5	4		5	5	5	11	3.7	
Certificate of Mastery of STW Competencies			1		2		3				3		3	5	2.4	
Labor-Market-Driven Funding for Occupational & Technical Programs		5	4		3		2	5		5		4		7	4.0	
Career Development & Guidance	4	5	3		2	4	4	3	1	4	4	5	5	12	3.7	
Scholarships for Students		2	4									3	3	4	3.0	
Elimination of General Track		5	3		3	5	3	5	5	3		4	4	10	4.0	

Question 16: Which of the following reforms have been initiated in your state? On a scale of one (1) to five (5), with 1 being "minimally" and 5 being "substantially," indicate the extent to which reform has been supported by STW action or funds.

