

**Supplement versus Supplant:
What to Consider When Budgeting and Expending RPP Funds
September 2017**

The department initially communicated that a RPP has to take into consideration the “supplement vs. supplant” provision of the federal Carl Perkins act when expending the state CTE funds. However, in recent conversations with the U.S. Department of Education, it was made clear that this provision does not apply to the state CTE funds. In short, a RPP and school district should view Perkins and state CTE funds as interchangeable – one cannot supplant the other.

For example, if a district previously used federal Perkins funds to support CTE teacher professional development, it **could use** state CTE funds in the future to pay for the same expenses – this is an eligible use of both Perkins and state CTE funds, and would not be considered supplanting. Conversely, if a district previously used other, non-Perkins funds to support CTE teacher professional development, it **could not use** state CTE funds in the future to pay for the same expense – though an eligible expense, this would be supplanting because the expenses were previously paid for using non-Perkins funds. The chart below may be used as a quick reference to determine whether an expense would be considered supplanting.

New Expense Purchased With...

	Perkins	State CTE	Other
Expense Replaced With...	Perkins	State CTE	Other
Perkins	OK	OK	NO
State CTE	OK	OK	NO
Other	OK	OK	OK