Welcome!

Sharon Lee Miller, Director, Division of Academic and Technical Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE)

Facilitator: Olivia Rice, Education Research Analyst, RTI International

February 12, 2019
8:30–8:40
WELCOME TO THE
2019 PERKINS DATA QUALITY INSTITUTE

SHARON LEE MILLER
DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
OFFICE OF CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION
2019 DQI Conference Attendees

- 135 state participants!
- Representing 47 states, plus the District of Columbia (DC)/Palau/Puerto Rico
- An additional 20+ attendees representing the non-profit sector
Purpose of the Perkins DQI

- Achieve common understanding of the new Perkins V accountability provisions
- Work toward common definitions and measurement approaches for the Perkins V core indicators
- Share promising practices and solutions for implementing the new Perkins V accountability requirements
State and local accountability systems that yield valid, reliable, and complete data on the progress of our nation’s career and technical education students.
UPDATES ON THE STATE PLAN AND CAR GUIDES

- Timelines for issuance
- Indicator name changes
- Selection of program quality indicators
- Other program quality indicators
- Definition of a CTE concentrator
- Submission of postsecondary data via EdFacts
LOGISTICS

- Key Staff
- Facilities
- Parking lot
Additional Housekeeping Items

• Review agenda
• Discuss logistics for sessions/lunch &
Day 1: February 12, 2019, 8:00 am–4:30 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:00 am  | **Welcome**  
The director of the Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE), Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) will provide opening comments and introduce the meeting facilitator.  
➢ **Sharon Lee Miller**, Director, DATE, OCTAE  
➢ **Meeting Facilitator: Olivia Rice**, Research Education Analyst, RTI International |
| 8:30 am  | **What’s New in Perkins Accountability?**  
Major changes to the Perkins V accountability provisions will be reviewed, emphasizing changes having the most significant impact on States’ policies and procedures for gathering and reporting CTE data.  
➢ **John Haigh**, Education Program Specialist, DATE |
| 8:40 am  | **GENERATE: A State-Level Solution for Reporting Data into the EDFacts Submission System (ESS)**  
This session will highlight a data interface that many States have begun using to eliminate the time, effort, and burden associated with gathering and reporting data through the Department’s ESS.  
➢ **Ross Santy**, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)  
➢ **Joe Murphy**, EDFacts Liaison to Program Offices within the Department of Education |
| 9:15 am  | **Virtual Office Break**                                                                                                                  |
| 9:45 am  | **Implementing the New CTE Concentrator Definition** (see table # on badge)  
This session will foster common understanding among participants of the new “CTE concentrator” definition and spur discussion on the possible challenges and solutions for implementing this new definition in States’ Perkins V accountability systems.  
➢ **Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets**, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy |
| 10:00 am | **A New Journey Begins**  
➢ **Scott Stump**, Assistant Secretary, OCTAE |
| 11:00 am | **Working Lunch**  
The working lunch will provide participants an opportunity to meet and network with each other, and with ‘food for thought’ cards provided, will spark discussion among participants on various topics related to the transition to Perkins V. |
## Day 1: February 12, 2019, 8:00 am–4:30 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Postsecondary Credentials</strong> <em>(see table # on badge)</em>&lt;br&gt;This session will foster common understanding of the new program quality indicator addressing “CTE concentrator attainment of postsecondary credentials” and spur discussion on data sources, challenges, and solutions for implementing this new indicator in States’ Perkins V accountability systems.&lt;br&gt;➤ <em>Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets</em>, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Postsecondary Credits</strong>&lt;br&gt;This session will foster common understanding of the new program quality indicator addressing “CTE concentrator attainment of postsecondary credits in a relevant CTE program or program of study” and spur discussion on data sources, challenges, and solutions for implementing this new indicator in States’ Perkins V accountability systems.&lt;br&gt;➤ <em>Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets</em>, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Work-Based Learning</strong>&lt;br&gt;This session will foster common understanding of the new program quality indicator addressing “CTE concentrator participation in work-based learning” and spur discussion on data sources, challenges, and solutions for implementing this new indicator in States’ Perkins V accountability systems.&lt;br&gt;➤ <em>Moderator: Steve Klein</em>, Director, Center for School, Family, and Community, Education Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td><strong>Day 1 Debrief and Closing Remarks</strong>&lt;br&gt;➤ Sharon Lee Miller and John Haigh, DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Adjourn</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Day 2: February 13, 2019, 7:30 am–12:30 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am</td>
<td>Check-in and Networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:00 am | Welcome and Day 1 Reflections  
  ➢ Sharon Lee Miller, Director, DATE |
| 8:15 am | Customized Technical Assistance to States  
  This session will share outcomes and deliverables resulting from customized technical assistance on accountability provided to States during the FY 2017–18 program year.  
  ➢ Sandra Staklis, Senior Research Education Analyst, RTI International |
| 8:45 am | Implementing Other Program Quality Indicators  
  This session will highlight the college and career readiness indicators that States have included in their Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plans—indicators that could serve as “any other measure of student success in CTE” for States to include in their Perkins V accountability systems.  
  ➢ Monica Almond, Senior Associate for Policy Development and Government Relations, Alliance for Excellent Education (All4Ed)  
  ➢ Lindsay Dworkin, Director of Policy Development and State Government Relations, All4Ed |
| 9:45 am | Virtual Office Break and Transition to Breakout Session |
| 10:00 am | Collaboration Roundtable Sessions  
  Participants will work in small groups on one of the topics from the list below to identify related strategies, challenges, innovations, and open questions and document their discussion on a poster board. Participants will then rotate around the room to review the work of the other groups and provide their input. The session will conclude with a whole room discussion and debrief.  
  ➢ Moderator: Olivia Rice, Research Education Analyst, RTI International  
    • Gathering Data on Special Populations  
    • Reporting Data by Career Cluster  
    • Setting State-Determined Performance Levels (SDPLs)  
    • Conducting Local Needs Assessments  
    • Gathering data on Postsecondary Indicators |
| 12:10 pm | Next Steps and Closing Remarks  
  ➢ Sharon Lee Miller and John Haigh, DATE |
| 12:30 pm | Adjourn |
Additional Housekeeping Items

- Review agenda
- Discuss logistics for sessions/lunch
- Social media
  - LinkedIn: [https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8634903/](/https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8634903/)
  - Twitter: #DQI2019
What’s New in Perkins Accountability?

Dr. John A Haigh, Chief, Administration and Accountability Branch, Office of Career Technical and Adult Education, Division of Academic and Technical Education, U. S. Department of Education

February 12, 2019
8:40–9:15
Session Goals

This session will include a high-level review of the major changes to the Perkins V accountability provisions, that have the most significant impact on states’ policies and procedures for gathering and reporting career and technical education (CTE) data, and will provide a timeline to prepare for implementation.
The 2019 DQI sessions are aligned to major changes in Perkins accountability, including:

• Defining CTE concentrators
• Selecting quality indicators
• Setting state determined levels of performance
• Disaggregating data by subgroups/special populations and career clusters
Defining CTE Participants and Concentrators

**CTE Participants**

- completes not less than one course in a CTE program or program of study (POS) (See Sec. 3(13) of Perkins V)

**CTE Concentrators**

- at the **secondary school level**: completed at least two courses in a single CTE program or POS (Sec. 3(12) (A) of Perkins V)
- at the **postsecondary level**: earned at least 12 credits within a CTE program or a POS, or completed such a program if the program encompasses fewer than 12 credits or the equivalent in total (Sec. 3(12) (B) of Perkins V)
Related Session

• Implementing the New CTE Concentrator Definition*
  (2/12, 10:00–12:00)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Check-In and Networking (Hallway and Auditorium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 am</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The director of the Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE), Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) will provide opening comments and introduce the meeting facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sharon Lee Miller, Director, DATE, OCTAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting Facilitator: Olivia Rice, Research Education Analyst, RTI International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 am</td>
<td>What’s New in Perkins Accountability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major changes to the Perkins V accountability provisions will be reviewed, emphasizing changes having the most significant impact on States’ policies and procedures for gathering and reporting CTE data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• John Heigh, Education Program Specialist, DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am</td>
<td>GENERATE: A State-Level Solution for Reporting Data into the EDFacts Submission System (ESS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will highlight a data interface that many States have begun using to eliminate the time, effort, and burden associated with gathering and reporting data through the Department’s ESS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ross Sanya, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joe Murphy, EDFacts Liaison to Program Offices within the Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Implementing the New CTE Concentrator Definition* (see table # on badge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will foster common understanding among participants of the new “CTE concentrator” definition and spur discussion on the possible challenges and solutions for implementing this new definition in States’ Perkins V accountability systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>A New Journey Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scott Stamp, Assistant Secretary, OCTAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 am</td>
<td>Working Lunch*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The working lunch will provide participants an opportunity to meet and network with each other, and with “food for thought” cards provided, will spark discussion among participants on various topics related to the transition to Perkins V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selecting Quality Indicators

• The eligible agency **must include at least one program quality indicator**—5S1, 5S2, or 5S3—and **may include any other quality measure** that is statewide, valid, reliable, and comparable across the State, 5S4.

  • 5S1: Attained Recognized Postsecondary Credential
  • 5S2: Attained Postsecondary Credits
  • 5S3: Participated in Work-Based Learning (WBL)
  • 5S4: Other
Related Sessions

• **Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Postsecondary Credentials**  
  (2/12, 12:45–1:45)

• **Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Postsecondary Credits**  
  (2/12, 1:45–2:45)

• **Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Work-based Learning**  
  (2/12, 3:00–4:00)

• **Implementing Other Quality Indicators**  
  (2/13, 8:45–9:45)
Expectations for disaggregation of concentrator data: 

- Student demographics
- Special populations
- CTE Program of Study (POS), or career cluster (if program-level impractical)
Disaggregating Data on Subgroups and Special Populations

- Individuals with Disabilities IDEA (Secondary only)
- Individuals with Disabilities ADA (Postsecondary only)
- Individuals from economically disadvantaged families, including low-income youth and adults*
- Individuals preparing for non-traditional fields
- Single parents
- Out of workforce individuals
- English learners
- Homeless individuals
- Youth who are in, or have aged out of, the Foster Care system
- Youth with a parent in active military
- Migrant students (Secondary only)

* Red highlight indicates new or modified special populations
Disaggregating Data on Career Clusters

• An eligible agency must provide an unduplicated count of its CTE participants by gender and 16 career clusters developed by Advance CTE:
  • Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources +
  • Architecture and Construction
  • Arts, A/V Technology and Communications +
  • Business Management and Administration +
  • Education and Training
  • Finance
  • Government and Public Administration
  • Health Science
  • Hospitality and Tourism
  • Human Services
  • Information Technology
  • Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security +
  • Manufacturing
  • Marketing
  • Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
  • Transportation, Distribution and Logistics +

• Appropriate for reporting at the career cluster level. States may also provide additional disaggregation by state-specific programs of study, if they wish.
Setting State Determined Performance Levels (SDPLs)

- States need to continually make meaningful progress for all students including student subgroups.
- States must describe process used to determine targets and baselines and include opportunities for public comment (60 days prior to plan submission).
- States must take into account, prior to the third year, other states performance levels.
  - When adjusting SDPLs those adjustments must be higher than actual & performance of the two most recently completed years &
- States must take into account the extent to which the SDPLs advance the goals in the State Plan.
• **Collaboration Roundtables** *(2/13, 10:00‒12:00)*
Timeline to Spring 2020

1. Review data changes
2. Identify measurement approaches
3. Run baseline
4. Determine SDPLs
5. Solicit public comment on SDLPs
6. Complete state plan submission to U.S. Department of Education
## Timeline for Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>CAR Submission Date</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>FSR**</th>
<th>Enrollment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019</td>
<td>12/31/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(last year of Perkins IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020</td>
<td>12/31/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(first year for Perkins V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021</td>
<td>12/31/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consolidated Annual Report (CAR)  
**Financial Status Report (FSR)  
^Thru 2025
Perkins Regional Coordinators

**Northwestern**
Jose Figueroa %


**Southwestern**
Andrew (Andy) Johnson %

Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah

**Mid-Northern**
Jamelah Murrell %

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin

**Mid-Atlantic**
Allison Hill %

Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Palau, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia

**Northeastern**
Sharon Head %

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands

**Southern**
Marilyn Fountain %

Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee
Questions?
GENERATE: A State-level Solution for Reporting Data into the EDFacts Submission System (ESS)

Ross Santy, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Joe Murphy, EDFacts Liaison to Program Offices within the Department of Education

Bill Huennekens, M.A., CDMP

Jim Campbell, MBA, PMP

February 12, 2019
9:15–9:45
New tool from the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID)

- CIID is an Office of Special Education Programs grant funded technical assistance center
- Generate is free to all state education agencies
- Generate is designed to automate, simplify and support timely EDFacts reporting while improving the consistency of data reported to the department
What is Generate?

• Web application based on Common Education Data Standards (CEDS)
• Locally hosted
• Data source is a State Education Agency’s (SEA’s) State Longitudinal Database System (SLDS) or unit record data system(s)
• Three outputs:
  • EDFacts submission files for all 80+ EDFacts Files
  • Specific Reports for IDEA State Performance Plans/ Annual Performance Reports (SPP/APR)
  • User friendly reports
What is CEDS?

An Education Data Management Initiative #
CEDS is a data standard
CEDS is a P20W Data Model
Generate Diagram
Generate Reach

Implementing Generate
Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, OSSE, Washington and West Virginia

Interested in Generate
Generate is freely available to any SEA and can be requested from the CIID website at:
https://ciidta.grads360.org/#program/generate
Generate allows users to calculate, review, and produce state-defined reports and submission-ready federal reports.

**VIEW AVAILABLE REPORTS**

- View **EDFacts Submission Reports**
- View **SPP/APR Submission Reports**
- View Reports Library
CTE Concentrator Placement

ED FACTS SUBMISSION REPORTS

From this screen, you can select a report to be shared with Data Stewards, and/or create the file for federal reporting submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>Category Set</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>C158</td>
<td>0150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports created by Generate are intended for internal use by SEA officials. They may contain small cell sizes and therefore should not be released to the public prior to review by your State’s disclosure review board. Some amount of disclosure assurance may be required before this report is ready for public consumption.

C158: CTE Concentrators Placement
Category Set A - Sex (Membership), Placement Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>SEA ID</th>
<th>Placement Status</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming State Education</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Not Placed</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>5,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Placed</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>5,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>5,196</td>
<td>10,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For EDOT methodology, see [Connection Link](#).
### Migrant Status Category Set

#### ED FACTS Submission Reports

From this screen, you can select a report to be shared with Data Stewards, and/or create the file for federal reporting submission.

![Screenshot of the ED FACTS Submission Reports interface with the C158 report highlighted.]

#### Reports

Reports created by Generate are intended for internal use by SBA officials. They may contain small cell sizes and therefore should not be released to the public prior to review by your state’s disclosure review board. Some amount of disclosure avoidance may be required before this report is ready for public consumption.

**C158: CTE Concentrators Placement**

*Category Set E: Migrant Status, Placement Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>BSA ID</th>
<th>Placement Status</th>
<th>Migratory Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wyoming State Education Agency</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Not Placed</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>4,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placed</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>6,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,054</td>
<td>9,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C158: CTE Concentrators Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migratory Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Placement Status</td>
<td>Migratory students</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming State Education Agency</td>
<td>Not Placed</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placed</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,854</td>
<td>9,854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEA CTE C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>WYSEACTR</td>
<td>c158-0125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CTECONP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this screen, you can select a report to share with Data Stewards, and/or create the file for federal reporting submission.

Reports created by GetReal are intended for internal use by SEA officials. They may contain small cell sizes and therefore should not be released to the public prior to review by your state’s disclosure review board. Some amount of disclosure avoidance may be required before this report is ready for public consumption.

### C154: CTE Concentrators in Graduation Rate

**Category Set E - Migratory Status, Inclusion Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>SEA ID</th>
<th>Inclusion Type</th>
<th>Migratory Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming State Education Agency</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Included in computation as graduated</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in computation as not graduated</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For report methodology, see CEDS Connection*
CEDS Connect

**Connection Title:** SY 2014-15 EDFacts File Specification C154 CTE Concentrators in Graduation Rate

**Selected Descriptors:**
- Subjects of Instruction > Career Education
- Educational Levels, Degrees, and Organizations > Elementary Secondary Education
- Educational Process: Societal Perspectives > Graduation Rate
- Educational Levels, Degrees, and Organizations > Secondary Education
- Subjects of Instruction > Technical Education
- Subjects of Instruction > CTE Concentrator
- EDFacts > File Specification C154: CTE Concentrators in Graduation Rate

**Author:** U.S. Department of Education

**Location:** Not Applicable

**Source for CEDS Connection Information:** EDFacts File Specification C154 version 11.1

**Description of CEDS Connection:**

The unduplicated number of CTE concentrators who were included in the state’s computation of its graduation rate as described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.

**Go Further with this Connection**

You can use this Connection with your own data system. Click on the myConnect logo to apply the elements from your shared map to this Connection.
CEDS Elements Used in the Report

Data Elements

Data Elements for C154

CEDS Elements:

A. K12 -> K12 Student -> CTE -> Career and Technical Education Concentrator
B. K12 -> K12 Student -> CTE -> Career-Technical-Adult Education Displaced Homemaker Indicator
C. K12 -> K12 Student -> CTE -> Program Participation Exit Date
D. K12 -> K12 Student -> CTE -> Program Participation Start Date
E. K12 -> K12 Student -> CTE -> Single Parent or Single Pregnant Woman Status
F. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> American Indian or Alaska Native
G. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> Asian
H. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> Black or African American
I. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> Demographic Race Two or More Places
J. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> Hispanic or Latino Peltiquity
K. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
L. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> Sex
M. K12 -> K12 Student -> Demographic -> White
N. K12 -> K12 Student -> Disability -> Disability Status
O. K12 -> K12 Student -> Disability -> IDEA Indicator
P. K12 -> K12 Student -> Economically Disadvantaged -> Economic Disadvantaged Status
Q. K12 -> K12 Student -> English Learner -> Perkins Limited English Proficiency Status
R. K12 -> K12 Student -> Enrollment -> Enrollment Exit Date
S. K12 -> K12 Student -> Enrollment -> Exit or Withdrawal Year
T. K12 -> K12 Student -> Identity -> Student Identification System
U. K12 -> K12 Student -> Identity -> Student Identifier
V. K12 -> K12 Student -> Migrant -> Migrant Status
W. K12 -> LEA -> Identification -> Local Education Agency Identification System
X. K12 -> LEA -> Identification -> Local Education Agency Identifier
Y. K12 -> SEA -> Address -> State Abbreviation
Z. K12 -> SEA -> Address -> State ANSI Code
AA. K12 -> SEA -> Identification -> State Agency Identification System
AB. K12 -> SEA -> Identification -> State Agency Identifier
Questions?

Connect with CIID, follow activities and get updates on Generate at: 
Twitter: @CIIDTA
Sign-up for our newsletter: ciidta@aemcorp.com
Visit the CIID website: www.ciidta.org
LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/company/CIID
Please **proceed to the table # that is on your badge at the end of the break.**

**BREAK**

February 12, 2019
9:45–10:00
Implementing the New CTE Concentrator Definition *

Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy

February 12, 2019
10:00–11:00
Session Goals:

- Clarify terminology
- Identify measurement options
- Assess potential challenges and solutions
### Terminology: Secondary Concentrator

**Perkins IV**

**Non-regulatory guidance**

- Earned three or more credits in a single CTE program area
- Earned two credits in a single CTE program area with a two-credit sequence

**Perkins V**

**Legislative definition**

- Completed at least two courses in a single CTE program or program of study *(Sec. 3(12) (A) of Perkins V)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Perkins IV</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perkins V</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-regulatory guidance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Legislative definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completes at least 12 academic or CTE credits within a single program</td>
<td>• Earns at least 12 credits within a CTE program or POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completes a short-term CTE program sequence of less than 12 credit units</td>
<td>• Completes a CTE program or POS that encompasses fewer than 12 credits or the equivalent in total (Sec. 3(12) (B) of Perkins V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurement Options

• What constitutes a CTE Program or POS?
  • Option A: Include all technical coursework
    • Counts introductory and advanced course or credits
    • Will likely increase number of concentrators from Perkins IV
    • May have adverse effect on performance levels across legislation

• Option B: Include advanced technical coursework
  • Excludes coursework that may apply to multiple programs or POS
  • Will likely maintain concentrator levels from Perkins IV
  • May have little effect on performance levels across legislation
Measurement Options

• Academic and Technical Credits
  • Include all coursework or limit to technical credits? (  

• Non-Credit Programs or POS
  • Limit to credit-bearing programs or include all offerings?
Table Talk Discussions

• What is your name, title, organization, and how long have you been in your current position?

• Given the different measurement options, how will your state define CTE concentrators at the secondary level? Postsecondary level?

• What challenges do you anticipate in collecting, analyzing, and reporting the required data?

• What are the strategies your state is using to address these challenges?
A New Journey Begins

Scott Stump, Assistant Secretary, OCTAE

February 12, 2019
11:00–11:30
PERKINS

A NEW JOURNEY BEGINS

SCOTT STUMP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education
“We will continue to prepare students for today’s constantly shifting job market, and we will help employers find the workers they need.”

President Donald J. Trump

“Congress came together to expand educational pathways and opportunities and give local communities greater flexibility in how best to prepare students for the jobs of today and tomorrow.”

Education Secretary Betsy DeVos
Expand opportunities for every student to explore and follow a career pathway to earn credentials of value and meet local workforce needs.
To what extent do you have a fully operational State longitudinal data system—one that covers K-12, postsecondary, and workforce systems?

What is your State’s governance structure for accountability? Are all the right players at the table, and what does your seat look like?

How would you assess the validity of your data? The reliability of your data? The completeness of your data?

What is your capacity to report data on the core indicators by career cluster?

What are your policies and strategies for ensuring that local recipients report valid, reliable, comparable, and complete data?

How do you use data for program improvement?

And how do you report data to the public?
Working Lunch ( )
February 12, 2019
11:30–12:45

Northwestern
Tables 6-7(8)'
Alaska, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming'

Mid-Northern
Tables (8)9-10'
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin'

Northeastern
Tables 15-16'
Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands'

Southwestern
Tables 3-5'
Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah'

Mid-Atlantic
Tables 1-2'
Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Palau, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia'

Southern
Tables 11-14'
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee
Transitioning to the next session

- At ~12:30, we will dismiss tables to clean-up.
- At this time, please begin to move to your new table based on the instructions on the table.
Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Postsecondary Credentials

Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy

February 12, 2019
12:45–1:45
Session Goals

• Clarify terminology
• Identify measurement options
• Assess potential challenges and solutions
**5S1: Attained Recognized Postsecondary Credential**
Percentage of CTE concentrators graduating from high school having attained a recognized postsecondary credential.

**2P1: Earned Recognized Postsecondary Credential**
Percentage of CTE concentrators who receive a recognized postsecondary credential during participation in or within one year of program completion.
A credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by the State involved or Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.

*Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act*

(29 U.S.C. 3102, Section 3)
## Credentialing Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Licensure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profession/ occupation</td>
<td>Education/ training derived</td>
<td>Government derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results from an assessment process</td>
<td>Results from an educational process</td>
<td>Pre-determined standard / criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time limited—must be renewed</td>
<td>No time limit</td>
<td>Time limited—must be renewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May require education and professional or practical experience</td>
<td>For both new entrants and experienced professionals alike</td>
<td>May require degrees, certifications, certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded by a third-party organization</td>
<td>Awarded by educational institutions</td>
<td>Issued by governmental agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN)

- Identify certifications by career cluster and pathway
- Sort by certification name or organization
• Does your state plan on using recognized postsecondary credentials as a quality indicator?

• Which of the ‘recognized postsecondary credentials’ identified in the legislation will your state include in this measure?

• How will your state access the data required to calculate this quality measure and what challenges do you face in accessing it?

• What are the strategies your state is using to address these challenges?
Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Postsecondary Credits

Moderator: Robert (Bob) Sheets, Research Professor, George Washington Institute of Public Policy

February 12, 2019
1:45–2:45
Session Goals

• Clarify terminology
• Identify measurement options
• Assess potential challenges and solutions
**5S2: Attained Postsecondary Credits**

Percentage of CTE concentrators graduating from high school having attained postsecondary credits in the relevant CTE program or program of study earned through a dual or concurrent enrollment program or another credit transfer agreement.
Credit Transfer Agreement

A formal agreement, such as an articulation agreement, among and between secondary and postsecondary education institutions or systems that grant students transcripted postsecondary credit, which may include credit granted to students in dual or concurrent enrollment programs, early college high school, dual credit, articulated credit, and credit granted on the basis of performance on technical or academic assessments

(20 U.S.C. 2301, Section 3) Sec. 3(11) of Perkins V
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment

A program offered by a partnership between at least one institution of higher education (IHE) and at least one local educational agency (LEA) through which a secondary school student who has not graduated from high school with a regular high school diploma is able to enroll in one or more postsecondary courses and earn postsecondary credit that is transferable to the IHEs in the partnership and applies towards completion of a degree or recognized educational credential.

*Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*
(20 U.S.C. 7801, Section 8101)
Table Talk Discussions

• Does your state plan on using postsecondary credits as a quality indicator?

• Which of the options for awarding postsecondary credit identified in the legislation will your state include in this measure?

• How will your state access the data required to calculate this quality measure and what challenges do you face in accessing it?

• What are the strategies your state is using to address these challenges?
BREAK

February 12, 2019
2:45–3:00
Implementing New Indicators of CTE Program Quality: Work-based Learning

**Moderator: Steve Klein**, Director, Center for School, Family, and Community, Education Northwest
February 12, 2019
3:00–4:00
Session Goals

• Clarify terminology
• Identify measurement options
• Assess potential challenges and solutions
5S3: Participated in Work-based Learning

The percentage of CTE concentrators graduating from high school having participated in WBL
Considerations

- **Terminology**: How is WBL defined in your state?
- **Qualifying experiences**: What constitutes participation?
- **Instructional connections**: How are WBL experiences integrated into students’ educational program?
- **Fidelity**: How is program quality assured?
- **Measurement**: How are student experiences assessed?
Qualifying Experiences
WBL Framework

- WBL coordinators monitor student experiences
- Personalized learning plans
- Demonstrate work readiness skills
- Student portfolios
- Local evaluation and assessment
Table Talk Discussions

• Does your state plan on using WBL as a quality indicator?
• How will your state document whether a student has participated in WBL?
• What data will be required to calculate this quality measure and what challenges do you face in accessing it?
• What are the strategies your state is using to address these challenges?
Day 1 Debrief and Closing Remarks

*Sharon Lee Miller and John Haigh*, DATE

February 12, 2019
4:00-4:30
Welcome and Day One Reflections!'

Sharon Lee Miller, Director, DATE

February 13, 2019
8:00–8:15
Customized Technical Assistance to States

Sandra Staklis, Senior Research Education Analyst, RTI International

February 13, 2019
8:15–8:45
What is Customized Technical Assistance (TA) to States?

- Supported by Perkins
- Coordinated with Perkins Regional Coordinators
- Focus on Perkins accountability measures, data collection and quality, and using data for program improvement
- Different from the January–April 2019 technical assistance opportunity for state plan development
What is the TA Timeline?

- August—Invitation sent
- Late September—Requests for TA due
- October—Request review
- November—Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education approval
- December or January—TA activities begin
- April or May—TA concludes
How is TA Conducted?

1. (Discuss and refine TA question
2. (Conduct initial research
3. (Review initial findings, determine next steps
4. (Conduct additional research, including reaching out to experts in the field
5. (Presentation or facilitated conversation to review findings
6. (Prepare final TA product
What are States’ Responsibilities?

• No financial cost
• Submit a challenging problem or question
• Share background information
• Meet with TA team monthly
• Provide feedback on interim materials
• Participate in conference calls with subject matter experts
• Logistics for on-site presentations or workshops
Example Topics: 2018 –19

• Developing and implementing a statewide definition of WBL
• Strategies to improve the quality of sub-recipient data submissions *
• Access to data on industry-recognized credentials
• Data collection on *Perkins V* special populations
Example Topics: Prior Years

• Resources for the local evaluation of CTE programs
• Indicators and data for at-risk monitoring of CTE programs
• Disaggregating district-level CTE data to inform program improvement
• Technical Assistance to States page on the PCRN
  https://cte.ed.gov/accountability/technical-assistance-to-states
Example: California

• Support for local program evaluation
• Reviewed evaluation tools and metrics used in the field
• Consulted district CTE staff on their evaluation needs
• Developed evaluation tools aligned with the state’s high-quality CTE framework
Example: Missouri

• Using program data for CTE outreach &
• Reviewed current communication tools and strategies
• Facilitated onsite meeting to discuss & state and local outreach objectives &
• Developed communication plan recommendations
2018-19 Example: Colorado

• Identifying CTE concentrators at the state level
• Approaches for collecting data on continuing and new Perkins indicators (post-program outcomes and WBL)
Learn More &

• Contact John Haigh at john.haigh@ed.gov
• Contact Sandra Staklis at sstaklis@rti.org
• Visit the Customized Technical Assistance to States page on the PCRN 'https://cte.ed.gov/accountability/technical-assistance-to-states
Implementing Other Program Quality Indicators under *Perkins V*: Lessons from College- and Career-Ready Indicators in ESSA Consolidated State Plans

*Monica Almond*, Senior Associate for Policy Development "and Government Relations, Alliance for Excellent Education "

*Anne Hyslop*, Assistant Director for Policy Development and Government Relations, All4Ed

*February 13, 2019
8:45–9:45
Implementing Other Program Quality Indicators under *Perkins V*: Lessons from College- and Career-Ready Indicators in ESSA Consolidated State Plans *

*Monica Almond*

*Lindsay Dworkin*

*Anne Hyslop*
I. Overview of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) accountability requirements compared to Perkins V performance indicators

II. Analysis and key takeaways from how states are measuring college and career readiness (CCR) in ESSA accountability systems

III. Potential alignment between ESSA accountability indicators and Perkins V performance indicators

IV. Lessons learned and recommendations for Perkins V state plans and implementation
I. ESSA Accountability Requirements

By 2025, **68 percent** of jobs will require postsecondary education and training beyond high school.

Source: [https://cew.georgetown.edu/](https://cew.georgetown.edu/) (states-initiative/ (accessed September 23, 2016) (}
ESSA Accountability: Key Requirements

- **State-selected goals** (and timelines) for raising academic achievement and graduation rates
- **Multiple-measure systems**, including required and state-selected indicators of school quality and their relative weights
- **Inclusion of subgroups** in the accountability system
- **System for identifying low-performing schools** for support and improvement
- **School improvement strategies** for identified schools
High School Accountability Indicators in ESSA

1. Proficiency in English/language arts and math
2. Four-year high school graduation rate (may include extended-year graduation rate)
3. Progress toward English language proficiency for English learners
4. State-selected indicator(s) of school quality or student success
   • Must be valid, reliable, comparable, statewide, disaggregated
ESSA vs. Perkins V

True or False:
Both ESSA and Perkins V require postsecondary indicators in the accountability system.
FALSE!!!
Perkins V: Perkins V requires enrollment in postsecondary education or advanced training, military service or a service program, or employment to be an accountability indicator.
[citation paraphrased from Sec. 113(b)(2)(A)(iii) of Perkins V]

ESSA: ESSA does not require postsecondary indicators for accountability, though some states include them.
True or False: 

ESSA and Perkins V allow the percentage of students earning postsecondary credit (e.g., dual enrollment) while in high school to be an accountability indicator.
ESSA vs. Perkins V $ TRUE!!!
**Perkins V:** Perkins V allows states to select the percentage of CTE concentrators attaining postsecondary credit in high school as an indicator of program quality.

**ESSA:** Similarly, several states include the percentage of students earning postsecondary credit through dual enrollment as part of their indicator of school quality of student success.
True or False: %

ESSA and Perkins V both require the $ performance of student subgroups to be $ included within the accountability system. $
ESSA vs. Perkins V +

TRUE!!!
**ESSA vs. Perkins V +**

**Perkins V:** State determined levels of performance must “make meaningful progress toward improving the performance of all career and technical education students, including the subgroups of students described in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of ESEA, and special populations…”  

[Perkins V, Sec. 113(b)(3)(A)(i)(III(bb))]

**ESSA:** The state accountability system must “be based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system under subparagraph (B), for all students and for each subgroup of students...”  

[ESSA, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(C)(i)]
II. How States Measure College and Career Readiness in ESSA State Plans

• **37 states, DC, and Puerto Rico** include at least one college- and career-ready (CCR) indicator in their approved ESSA accountability system

States with no CCR indicator:
- Alaska
- Colorado
- Hawaii
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Maine
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Nebraska
- New Jersey
- Oregon
- Virginia
- Wisconsin
How are CCR indicators structured?

Multiple Indicators

• **29 states and Puerto Rico** use a single indicator of CCR—though the indicator may have several sub-components that are aggregated
  
  • **New York**: College, Career, and Civic Readiness Index is a single indicator that examines multiple measures
  
  • **Vermont**: College and Career Readiness Indicator has two components, one that measures CCR “assessments” and the other that measures CCR “outcomes”

• **Eight states and DC** use multiple indicators of CCR—either two or three—in their ESSA accountability systems
  
  • **Louisiana**: Includes an ACT/WorkKeys Index and a Strength of Diploma Index, with different CCR measures in each
How are CCR indicators structured?

Multiple Measures

- **30 states** use a “menu” approach, where a student meeting any of the CCR measures is counted as “ready” on the CCR indicator
  - Treats all CCR measures equally and interchangeably
  - Can require students to meet multiple CCR measures to be counted as ready for certain/all options on the menu
  - Can give a “bonus” for meeting certain measures
How are CCR indicators structured?

Multiple Measures

- 7 states + DC and Puerto Rico use a “single measure” approach, where the rate of students meeting each of the CCR measures individually is calculated – even if there are multiple measures within the indicator.

- For example, DC measures achievement on the SAT in 2 ways: (1) the percentage of all students meeting College Board’s CCR benchmark score and (2) the percentage of all students meeting a DC-set benchmark.
How are CCR indicators structured?

**Multiple Measures**

- **5 states** use an “index” approach, where a student receives points based on the number or kind(s) of CCR measures he or she meets within the indicator.
  - Enables states to give extra value or weight to students who have demonstrated CCR in multiple ways or who have met CCR measures of higher rigor.
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Outcomes Beyond High School

• **16 states** include a CCR student *postsecondary outcomes* beyond a high school diploma.

States measuring CCR outcomes:

- Alabama
- Arizona
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Georgia
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Michigan
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- Texas
- Vermont
- West Virginia
- Wyoming
What’s measured in CCR Indicators?
Outcomes Beyond High School

- **5 states** include postsecondary enrollment or remediation following high school graduation

  College enrollment
  - Arizona
  - Connecticut
  - Michigan
  - Vermont

  Enrollment without & need for remediation &
  - Georgia
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Outcomes Beyond High School

• **3 states** include workforce participation or military enlistment following high school graduation

  Workforce participation (or trade school enrollment)
  • Vermont

  Military enlistment
  • Alabama
  • Texas
  • Vermont
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Outcomes Beyond High School

• **13 states** include students earning college credits or an Associate degree during high school

  **Earning college credit (CTE or Core Academic Courses)**
  • Alabama
  • Delaware
  • Georgia
  • Illinois
  • Indiana
  • Kentucky
  • Rhode Island
  • South Carolina
  • Vermont
  • West Virginia
  • Wyoming

  **Earning an Associate degree**
  • Louisiana
  • Texas
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Outcomes Beyond High School

- **24 states** include students *passing or completing* dual or concurrent enrollment, without specifying whether college credits are earned.

Some states:
- Specify the course grade a student must receive to count
- Require students to take multiple dual enrollment courses to count
- Specify whether the indicator counts CTE and/or core academic dual credit courses
- Specify the specific dual/concurrent (enrollment programs that count (
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Outcomes Beyond High School

• **21 states** include students earning *industry-recognized credentials* during high school

**Some states:**
- Specify that the credentials must be state-approved or nationally recognized
- Require the credentials to include success on a technical assessment and/or define assessment benchmarks
- Specify that the credentials must be earned at the conclusion of an approved program of study or CTE pathway
- Only count credentials earned by CTE concentrators
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Success on CCR Assessments

• 32 states + DC and Puerto Rico measure student success on standardized college readiness assessments
  • SAT or ACT (25)
  • AP or IB (25)
  • State-developed tests in ELA and math (4)
  • CLEP (3)
  • AICE (2)
  • Cambridge A/AS (2)
  • Accuplacer, ALEKS, COMPASS, etc. (2)
  • PSAT or ACT Aspire (1)
  • Cambridge IGSCE (1)

*1 state also measures CCR assessment participation #
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Success on CCR Assessments

• **14 states** measure student success on standardized career readiness assessments

• Armed Services Vocational Aptitude & Battery (ASVAB) / Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) (9) &
• ACT WorkKeys / ACT National Career Readiness Certificate (7)
• Worldwide Interactive Network National Career Readiness Certificate (1)
• “Nationally certified” or “state-approved” CTE assessment (2) &
• Technical skills assessment (1)
What’s measured in CCR Indicators?
Completion of CCR Experiences

• **25 states + DC** measure student *participation* in and/or completion of college prep courses
  
  - AP or IB course completion (18) or # enrollment (1) #
  - Receipt of CCR diploma, endorsement, or other graduation pathway (7)
  - University entrance CCR course sequence (3)
  - Grade Point Average (3)
  - Algebra II (2)
  - College preparatory, honors, or other state-specific CCR courses (3)
  - Transitional or remedial coursework (2)
  - Computer science (1)
What’s measured in CCR Indicators?
Completion of CCR Experiences

• **25 states** measure student *participation* in or *completion* of CTE courses

  - Completion of a CTE pathway or program of study (10)
  - Completion of CTE coursework [within a *program of study] (8)*
  - Completion of CTE dual/concurrent *enrollment courses (6)*
  - Attainment of CTE diploma endorsements (2)*
  - Participation in career prep activities or *practices course (2)*
  - Attainment of CTE concentrator status (1)*
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Completion of CCR Experiences

• **13 states** measure student completion of work-based learning, apprenticeships, or service learning

**Work-based Learning Experiences**
- Arizona
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Georgia
- Illinois
- Kentucky
- New York
- North Dakota
- Oklahoma
- South Carolina

Some states include minimum # of hours, state approval process, or employer exit survey
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Completion of CCR Experiences

- **13 states** measure student *completion* of work-based learning, apprenticeships, or service learning

**Apprenticeship**
- Idaho
- Kentucky
- Maryland
- Oklahoma

**Community Service**
- Arkansas
- Illinois

**Part-Time / Summer Job**
- Illinois
What’s measured in CCR Indicators? Emerging CCR Measures

• Some states, especially those seeking to use a *broad definition of college and career readiness*, have identified unique measures to include in their ESSA indicators:
  
  • **Seal of Biliteracy or similar** – California, Delaware, Maryland, New York, Rhode Island
  
  • **Identification of career area of interest or career planning** – Illinois, Pennsylvania %
  
  • **Free Application for Student Aid (FAFSA) completion** – Arizona
  
  • **“Military readiness”** such as JROTC participation, physical fitness, leadership, quality citizenship – California, Montana, North Dakota %
  
  • **Co-curricular activities** – Illinois
CCR Indicators in ESSA: Themes

• Signals of readiness vs. actual readiness
  • More emphasis on participation/access to CCR courses or performance on CCR assessments than on outcomes, especially outcomes that students demonstrate following high school completion

• Multiple Measures and Broad Definitions of CCR
  • States put a lot on the “menu”

• College AND Career Counts
  • Increasing interest in measures of military readiness

• Quality Control Challenges
  • Variation in the level of state oversight, data definitions, and approval processes, particularly for CCR “experiences”
  • Lack of specifics in ESSA plans regarding which experiences will result in students to “count” as ready
CCR Indicators in ESSA: Common Measures

- What did states most often include?
  - Reaching benchmarks on college entrance exams
  - Completion of rigorous courses: AP, IB, dual enrollment
  - Early postsecondary opportunities: passing scores on AP/IB or passing (and earning credit for) dual enrollment
  - Attainment of industry credentials and certificates
  - Completion of a CTE pathways or coursework
  - ASVAB results: most popular career-ready assessment
CCR Indicators in ESSA: Uncommon Measures

• What’s missing from states’ CCR indicators?'
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CCR Indicators in ESSA: Uncommon Measures

• What’s missing from states’ CCR indicators?
  • Postsecondary outcomes
    • College enrollment and persistence
    • Remediation rates
    • Credit accumulation after graduating from high school
  • Labor market outcomes
    • Employment after high school, wage data, etc.
  • Postsecondary outcomes students can achieve while in high school
    • Attainment of college credit or certificates/degrees and industry credentials less common than completion of early postsecondary course opportunities (like success in rigorous coursework or dual enrollment)
  • Focus on subgroup performance
    • For accountability, most CCR measures only include the all students group
1. All CCR Measures are not Created Equal. States struggle to:

- Maximize inclusion of numerous pathways to CCR with limitations of current data collections
  - Did states prioritize breadth or quality of CCR measures?
  - Are CCR measures tightly defined, verifiable, and consistently measured?
  - Are certain pathways to readiness excluded due to lack of data?
- Determine the value of different CCR measures
  - If states chose a “menu” approach (each CCR accomplishment or experience receives equal weight), how much variance is there between the items on the “menu”?
- Ensure only high-quality experiences “count”
  - Are dual enrollment experiences similar across districts or courses? %
  - What should the CCR benchmark be on various assessments?
  - What types of industry credentials or CTE pathways are valid?
2. Reluctance to Follow Students Beyond Graduation. States’ priorities:

- Mostly emphasize completion of college or career preparatory experiences during high school...
  - For example: passing AP/IB, dual enrollment, or CTE courses
- ... And sometimes emphasize performance measures that indicate a student is likely prepared for success after high school...
  - For example: meeting ACT CCR benchmarks scores in all subject areas or earning college credits via dual enrollment
- ... But mostly ignore postsecondary outcomes that demonstrate a student was, in fact, prepared for success after high school.
  - For example: postsecondary enrollment, remediation rates, military enlistment, attainment of postsecondary credentials
3. Measuring work-based experiences and outcomes is especially challenging. States grapple with:

- Defining workplace experiences and pathways (i.e., number of hours) and ensuring only quality experiences “count”
- Some leading states require state and/or employer approval:
  - South Carolina: students are career-ready if they complete an approved work-based learning experience with a successful employer exit evaluation
  - Kentucky: only counts state-approved apprenticeships or a state-approved "alternate process to verify exceptional work experience"
- A lack of standards-based, reliable, nationally recognized exams to explicitly measure career readiness against validated benchmarks
  - ACT WorkKeys used less frequently than the ASVAB
III. Opportunities for Alignment between ESSA and Perkins V

Alignment of ESSA CCR Indicators to Perkins Indicators of Performance

- 4-YR ACGR: 52
- Proficiency in Math: 52
- ELA + Math: 45
- Post-secondary outcome: higher education, advanced training, military service or service program, or employment: 7
- Attainment of recognized postsecondary credential in HS: 21
- Attainment of postsecondary credits in relevant CTE program or program of study via dual enrollment: 11
- Participation in work-based learning: 10
- CTE concentrators in CTE programs / programs of study leading to non-traditional fields: 52

State Includes Exact or Very Similar Measure ESSA
State Includes Similar Measure in ESSA
State Does Not Include in ESSA
Opportunities for Alignment between ESSA and Perkins V

Given the degree of alignment between what states are already using under ESSA and what they can use under Perkins V, what are key considerations when choosing performance indicators as a state?

Key Choice #1: Select between (aa), (bb), and (cc), or select multiple indicators?

Key Choice #2: Add “any other measure”, and if so, which ones?
IV. Recommendations. Opportunities between ESSA and Perkins V

**DO leverage Perkins V Plans to Improve ESSA Plans:**

- Increase use of **postsecondary outcomes** for program accountability: required in Perkins, optional in ESSA
- Encourage adoption of aligned, high-quality, and more rigorous measures of **career readiness** in ESSA accountability (e.g., attainment of postsecondary credentials or credits during high school)

**DO leverage ESSA Plans to Improve Perkins V Plans:**

- Opportunity to emphasize success of CTE concentrators in CTE courses or settings as well as **core academics**
- Prioritize measures that are **high-quality**, valid, reliable, and supported by evidence
- Consider **what** is measured as well as **how** it’s measured and for **which students**
Recommendations: Process

In drafting *Perkins V* plans for performance indicators:

- **DO** consult with diverse local stakeholders to create buy-in for your vision for CCR
- **DO** consult with state educational agency (SEA) teams that developed long-term goals and indicators for ESSA to help develop a shared vision for CCR, align the two systems, and leverage existing data.
- **DO** design indicator “menus” carefully and consider collecting underlying, individual data points for CTE concentrators *before* aggregating them:
  - Know the percentage of CTE concentrators who earn an Associate degree in high school vs. the percentage of CTE concentrators who earn an industry-recognized credential first, then report the percentage who earn any recognized postsecondary credential.
- **DO** prioritize indicator quality, reliability, and validity, develop clear data definitions, and establish state processes for validating data for measures that could vary significantly in rigor between districts (e.g., dual enrollment courses).
Recommendations: Measure What Matters

What values does your state want reflected in your *Perkins V* performance indicators? *Use the choices available as a way to emphasize your values.*

1. College **and** Career Readiness
2. Equity for underserved groups of students (
Recommendations: Program Quality

When selecting whether to use “any other measure” of program quality, states should consider:

1. % Using existing ESSA data points that emphasize broader aspects of college and career readiness
   • **Example:** Success in AP/IB

2. % Creating measures that examine outcomes for subgroups
   • **Example:** Minorities, Low-Income Students, Women

3. % Emphasizing completion of a rigorous, high-quality CTE pathway or program of study
   • **Example:** Create an indicator of the percentage of CTE concentrators earning a recognized postsecondary credential, earning postsecondary credits via dual enrollment, **AND** participating in work-based learning
   • **Example:** Use an indicator of the percentage of CTE concentrators who complete a CTE pathway or receive a CTE diploma endorsement
Recommendations: Program Quality

When selecting indicators of program quality from the suggested list of three, states should consider:

1. Selecting *all three* indicators: postsecondary credentials, postsecondary credits, and work-based learning

2. Selecting work-based learning *in conjunction* with postsecondary credentials, postsecondary credit, or “any other measure”
   
   • Consider adopting quality-control mechanisms for approval of work-based learning (e.g., employer surveys state approval)
V. Resources

https://all4ed.org/perkins
Questions?
BREAK

February 13, 2019
9:45–10:00
Collaboration Roundtables *

Facilitator: Olivia Rice, RTI International *

February 13, 2019
10:00–12:10
Roundtable Instructions

• Based on the topic of your table, use the guided discussion questions and develop a poster that summarizes the conversation among the table.

• At 11:30, we will start the lightning round presentations of each group’s poster—giving you the opportunity to consider other topics and groups insights.

• The session will conclude with a whole room debrief discussion.
Next steps and closing remarks

*Sharon Lee Miller and John Haigh*, *DATE*

February 13, 2019
12:10–12:30
Thank you for attending!! &

Continue the conversation at (https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8634903/)