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• Activity: Using the Tools
Program Approval

Ashleigh McFadden, Advance CTE
What does the tool do?

- Describes the key components of a high-quality policy that will ensure program quality
- Leads an assessment of current policy to pinpoint strengths and opportunities for growth
- Assists with “What now?”
Six core elements

1. Rigorous course standards and progressive, sequenced courses
2. Secondary and postsecondary alignment and early postsecondary offerings
3. Industry involvement
4. Labor market demand
5. High-quality instruction
6. Experiential learning
Section 1: Defining a quality program

• Define the core elements

• Describe affected policy areas, so that you can:
  • Review existing policies
  • Bring in content experts
## Section 2: Self-assessment

### Rigorous Course Standards and Progressive, Sequenced Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to Consider</th>
<th>Rating and Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A) How effectively does your current policy ensure alignment between CTE program standards and relevant industry standards?</td>
<td>4 (Strong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Program and/or course standards, whether developed at the state or local level, have not recently been evaluated for alignment to relevant industry standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are numerous gaps in alignment to industry standards within and/or across CTE programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local CTE programs align and revise CTE program and/or course standards and industry standards at their own discretion, with little to no guidance from the state, so there is no way of knowing the degree of alignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B) How effectively does your policy ensure that CTE programs are thoroughly integrated with relevant academic college and career readiness standards?</td>
<td>4 (Strong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CTE program and/or course standards are considered entirely separate from or do not align with academic standards and instruction or employability standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The state completed a crosswalk of CTE program and/or course standards to academic standards, but it is seen only as a guidance document or resource rather than a requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Program and/or course standards are typically narrowly focused on occupation-specific skills and do not address cross-cutting employability/career-ready skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Ratings

1. **Emerging**: This policy component is not yet defined or is just beginning to emerge; current state policy meets most of the criteria listed.

2. **Building**: This policy component has some bright spots, but there are still many improvements to be made; it meets some of the criteria under number 1 above, but there are key considerations that allow for more optimism.

3. **Promising**: This policy component is fairly well developed, though there are still some improvements to be made; it meets some but not most of the criteria under 4 and is considered to be more developed than a 2.

4. **Strong**: This policy component is extremely well developed and effective, even if there are still minor adjustments to be made; it meets most of the criteria listed under 4.
Section 4: Ongoing quality

- Consider the full cycle of approval and re-approval
- Decide the outcomes that will be measured
- Plan for collecting and using information to evaluate programs
Questions?

Ashleigh McFadden
Advance CTE
State Policy Manager
Washington D.C. Metro Area
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IOWA SECONDARY CTE/PERKINS IV DESK AUDIT

Dr. Fidelis N Ubadigbo, Education Consultant

Iowa Department of Education

(Bureau of Career and Technical Education)
Why desk audit?

- Develop a more reliable approach to Perkins IV and CTE monitoring
- Assess the utilization of Perkins IV funds for CTE programs
- Apply scientific, systemic and statistical approach to data and quality improvement
- Create equitable delivery of CTE programs across community district high schools and consortia
- Cut Cost of travels
Secondary Desk Audit Process

1. Identify Districts and Consortia
2. Sample Members of a consortium
3. Develop a Desk Audit Instrument
4. Collect data
5. Code Data
6. Create SPSS Program
7. Analyze Data
8. Review Other Related Documents
9. Synthesize and Develop Reports
# Secondary Desk Audit Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>REPORTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS</td>
<td>• DEVELOP DESK AUDIT INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>• DEVELOP COMPUTER PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>REVIEW COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CONSORSIUM &amp; SAMPLE MEMBERS</td>
<td>• SEND LETTERS TO RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>• ANALYZE DATA</td>
<td>• REVIEW EXISTING INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MORE THAN ONE HIGH SCHOOLS</td>
<td>• COLLECT DATA</td>
<td>• SYNTHESIZE DATA</td>
<td>• REVIEW DOCUMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CODE DATA</td>
<td></td>
<td>• FORMULATE RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collecting Data

(1) INSTRUMENT DEVELOPED BASED ON PERKINS IV AND STATE GUIDELINES

(2) LETTER SENT TO EACH RESPONDENTS WITH INSTRUMENT ATTACHED

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO RESPONDENTS

(4) INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MULTIPLE HS SUBMIT QUESTIONNAIRE BY SITE

(5) MOST INSTRUMENTS RECEIVED WITHIN THE GIVEN TIMELINE
CTE/PERKINS IV Areas Covered

• Questions #1, #2, and #3: narratives on the district/consortium process, knowledge and understanding of Perkins IV

• Questions #6: special populations (five items)

• Questions #7: career readiness and nontraditional programs (five items)

• QUESTION #8: Perkins IV Required Uses of Funds (sec. 135(b) (local uses of funds) (nine items)

• Question #10: other Perkins IV statement (11 items) including supplementing versus supplanting
Coding

DATA CODED BY:

- ID INSTRUMENT
- REGION
- TYPE
- CONSORTIUM
- DISTRICT
- STAFF
Enlarged
**MSG>** -Warning- The UNDO command is not available until you change
your edit profile using the command RECOVERY ON.

000001 //J2822100 JOB 2822100-01-00,'FIDELIS',PRTY=6,CLASS=B,TIME=10,
000002 // MSGCLASS=T,NOTIFY=T370048
000003 //MAIN ORG=LOCAL,USER=T370048
000004 //STEP1 EXEC PGM=3STTEST
000005 //FORMAT PR,DDNAME=,DEST=SSDE1
000006 /* DOCUMENTATION:T370048.LIB.QUAD129(DESKA2)
000007 /*
000008 /*
000009 //STEP2 EXEC SPSSX
000010 //FT06F001 DD SYSOUT=*
000011 /*
000012 /*FIRST DD DSN=T370048.LIB.QUAD129(DESKA),DISP=SHR
000013 /*
000014 /*
000015 DATA LIST FILE=FIRST/ ID 1-2 REG 3-4 TYPE 5 CONS 6-11 DIST 12-17
000016       STAFF 18 HSITIS 19 QONE 21 QTWO 22 QTHREE 23 QFOUR 24 QFIVE 25
000017       QSEVENA 26 QSEVENB 27 QSEVENC 28 QSEVENH 29 QSEVENI 30 QSEVENJ 31
000018       QSEVENK 32 QSEVENL 33 QSEVENM 34 QSEVENN 35 QSEVENO 36 QSEVENP 37
000019       QSEVENQ 38 QSEVENR 39 QSEVENR 40 QSEVENR 41 QSEVENR 42 QSEVENR 43
000020       QSEVENR 44 QSEVENR 45 QSEVENR 46 QSEVENR 47 QSEVENR 48 QSEVENR 49
000021       QSEVENR 50 QSEVENR 51 QSEVENR 52 QSEVENR 53 QSEVENR 54 QSEVENR 55
000022       QSEVENR 56 QSEVENR 57 QSEVENR 58 QSEVENR 59 QSEVENR 60
000023       QSEVENR 61 QSEVENR 62 QSEVENR 63 QSEVENR 64 QSEVENR 65 QSEVENR 66
000024       QSEVENR 67 QSEVENR 68 QSEVENR 69 QSEVENR 70 QSEVENR 71 QSEVENR 72
000025 VARIABLE LABELS ID 'INST' REG 'REGION' TYPE 'CONSORTIUM OR INDEPENDENT'
000026       CONS 'CONSORTIUM CODE' DIST 'DISTRICT CODE' STAFF 'RESPONDERID'
000027       HSITIS 'HIGH SCHOOL SITE' QONE 'PURCHASES' QTWO 'PERF TARGET'
000028       QTHREE 'IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES' QFOUR 'SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ISSU
000029       QFIVE 'ISSUE RESOLUTION' QSEVENA 'SP ASSISTANCE'
000030       QSEVENB 'SP ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORM' QSEVENC 'SP BARRIER ADJUSTMENT'
000031       QSEVEND 'SP RATES OF ACCESS' QSEVENE 'SP SUCCESS RATE'
000032       QSEVENF 'CAREER READINESS' QSEVENH 'NONTRAD FIELDS'
000033       QSEVENI 'CAREER COUNSELING' QSEVENJ 'LINKAGES TO CAREERS'
000034       QSEVENK 'PROMOTION IN CTE' QSEVENL 'INTEGRATION OF ACADEMICS'
F1=Help     F2=Split     F3=Exit     F4=Expand     F5=Rfind     F6=Rchange
F7=Up       F8=Down     F9=Swap     F10=Left      F11=Right     F12=Cancel
Data Analysis

DATA ANALYZED BY:

• ID INSTRUMENT
• REGION
• TYPE
• CONSORTIUM
• DISTRICT
• STAFF
Analysis Results and Synthesis

- **FREQUENCIES**
- **MULTIPLE REGRESSION**
- **PEARSON CORRELATION**
- **CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS**
- **CROSSTAB TABLES**
- **ANOVA**
- **RELIABILITY TEST**
• Reports were organized according to the ten sections of the desk audit questionnaire (using matrices as needed)
• Each section may or may not receive recommendations or citations for noncompliance
• Consortium/districts have 60 days to react to the desk audit report
• Recommendations may include on-site visit by DE monitoring team
Questions?

Fidelis N. Ubadiqbo, Ph.D.
Education Consultant
Iowa Department of Education

fidelis.ubadigbo@iowa.gov
Playtime!

Move to either the ‘before’ or ‘after’ table to learn more about the tool and how you might apply it within your state.