

OCTAE-DATE Liaisons

Allison Hill

allison.hill@ed.gov

John Haigh

john.haigh@ed.gov

Hosts

Steve Klein

sklein@rti.org

Rebecca Moyer

rmoyer@rti.org

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) call was held on July 12, 2018, from 2 to 3 pm EDT.

Updates and Announcements | DATE Staff & RTI International

Allison Hill from the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE), Division of Adult and Technical Education (DATE) facilitated the following announcements:

1) Consolidated Annual Report (CAR) Beta-Testing and Training Sessions

Sharon Head shared that the CAR portal will be open for beta-testing from August 27 to 31. An email will be sent during the first week of August to solicit volunteers to beta-test the portal.

Additionally, the annual CAR training sessions will be held on September 24 and 26. These dates are posted on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) website, and an email with more information about these trainings will be sent to states soon. Please contact Sharon Head (Sharon.Head@ed.gov) with any questions about the CAR portal and trainings.

2) Technical Assistance (TA) to States, State Profiles, and Data Stories

John Haigh announced that the TA to states reports will be posted to the PCRN website soon. The call for TA applications for the 2018–19 program year will open in August 2018.

John also shared that the new and enhanced state profiles will be posted to the PCRN website at the end of July. State directors will receive an email once the profiles have been posted. John believes these updated profiles will be useful and valuable communication tools for states.

OCTAE would like states to share any stories about career and technical education (CTE) data

published by local education agencies, newspapers, and other sources. It is interested in hearing about state-level data successes.

3) 2019 Data Quality Institute (DQI)

OCTAE then turned the call to Rebecca Moyer who announced dates for the upcoming DQI. The 2019 DQI will be held on February 5–6, 2019, in Washington, D.C., at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building.

States are invited to share topics for discussion and presentations ideas as well as to indicate any willingness to serve on a panel about the newly updated state profiles. Please contact Steve Klein (sklein@rti.org) for more information. It should be noted that, due to the possible reauthorization of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)* legislation, presentation and discussion topics may be subject to change.

To preface the “You Want It When?” topic on strategies for the CAR submission process, Rebecca asked call participants to think about two topics: 1) CAR submission tips from veteran submitters and 2) questions and challenges that those newer to the CAR submission process might have.

How Are We Doing?: State Assessment and ESSA Indicators | Sharon Miller (OCTAE), Cathie Raymond (Arizona Department of Education), Luke Rhine and Melvin D’Souza (Delaware Department of Education)

Rebecca introduced Sharon Miller, Director of DATE to speak about a “pain point” around *Perkins IV* indicators 1S1 and 1S2.

At the Advance CTE Spring Leadership Meeting, Sharon presented the most recent CAR data from

project year 2016–17. Overall, she noted that there are good upward trends for most secondary and postsecondary indicators required under *Perkins IV*, but there are also two areas of concern:

- 1) The average performance of CTE concentrators on academic assessments in reading and language arts fell from 80.19% in 2009 to 60.88% in 2017 (indicator 1S1).
- 2) Similarly, the average performance of CTE concentrators on academic assessments of mathematics fell from 77.32% to 60.87% during the same period (indicator 1S2).

Despite these two areas of concern in the data, Sharon is confident the overall data show that CTE provides students with good secondary and postsecondary outcomes; students who enter CTE programs with a lack of proficiency in reading and language arts and mathematics are still proficient enough in their technical skills that they can enter the workforce or pursue postsecondary education and training.

While in many states reading, language arts, and mathematics proficiency is measured before a student becomes a CTE concentrator, the *Perkins IV* legislation outlines that it is still the responsibility of states, districts, and schools to help all students become proficient across all indicators. OCTAE is committed to helping states overcome these performance shortfalls and, through the help of Regional Accountability Specialists, has begun to gather state-specific information about performance on indicators 1S1 and 1S2. Sharon wanted to use this call as an opportunity for OCTAE and state representatives to come together and collectively discuss the motivations behind these downward trends and how they can be addressed.

Sharon turned the call back to Rebecca who introduced Cathie Raymond, Deputy Superintendent and State Director for CTE in Arizona to provide insights. Arizona experienced a large drop in performance during the academic year 2015–16 that coincided with the adoption of a

new statewide academic assessment. Prior to academic year (AY) 2015–16, Arizona used a state-developed assessment called AMES, but in that academic year the state began using AZ Merit, a purchased test. Because of the assessment change, Arizona was aware that student scores would drop, and since some high-achieving students were given an opportunity to opt out during that first year, scores were especially low. The state saw some improvements in AY 2016–17 as more students took the new assessment, and more growth is anticipated as time progresses. During AY 2017–18, districts could choose from 10 different assessments approved by the state board of education, of which AZ Merit is one option, so this could pose a challenge to setting state performance levels in the future.

Sharon interjected with a question for Cathie regarding what changed on the assessment: a cut score or differences in standards expected of students. Cathie responded that it was both. Previously, Arizona's standards were 100% aligned with Common Core, but with the change in assessment, the state shifted to its own college and career readiness standards which only overlapped with the Common Core by about 85%. Additionally, the assessment was entirely different, with a focus on subject matter rather than a general assessment. AZ Merit questions included more problem-solving components and students were required to show their work for their answers which is more involved than the multiple-choice questions typical of the AMES test. Cathie is unsure how testing will change across the state and which districts will keep AZ Merit.

Sharon also asked Cathie whether there is an opportunity at the local level for CTE and academic teachers to work together to raise performance on academic assessments through curriculum integration. In Arizona, some districts have what they call "Prop. 301" in which CTE instructors can earn a bonus at the end of the year for collaborating with academic teachers on reading, writing, and mathematics. Now that state standards are being readopted by the state board, CTE teachers will continue to work on this by giving

academic credit through CTE, but this practice is not widespread. The state is also unsure how it will work in the transition from “highly qualified teachers” to “highly effective teachers.” Once the state standards are adopted, Cathie’s team will bring together teams of academic and CTE teachers to do crosswalks for academic credits through CTE classes.

Rebecca thanked Cathie and then introduced Luke Rhine, Director of Career and Technical Education and STEM Initiatives, and Melvin D’Souza, Education Associate, from the Delaware Department of Education to discuss their state performance on 1S2.

In Delaware, about 70% of students in 9th–12th grades are CTE participants, and more than 50% of the state’s graduating senior class completes a CTE program each year. In AY 2014–15, the last year under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, Delaware administered the Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) for mathematics and English Language Arts (ELA) for students in their 10th-grade year. In AY 2015–16, under the Flex Waiver, Delaware administered the Smarter Balanced assessment using new Delaware state assessment standards aligned to the Common Core state standards and noted a decrease in the percentage of students who were “proficient.” Delaware anticipated a drop in student proficiency for all students, not only CTE students, due to the change in expectations of the assessment.

In AY 2016–17, students took the SAT in their junior year. In the same year, Delaware moved to a common denominator for all Perkins reporting which provides a benchmark comparison of how CTE students are doing relative to other students. AY 2016–17 will serve as a new baseline for performance reporting in Delaware for the 1S1 and 1S2 metrics. Melvin added that the numbers from AY 2016–17 are more reflective of what the Delaware Department of Education expects to see long term since the SAT is taken by almost all students.

Rebecca then asked the presenters some questions posed by the online audience.

Q: Are the assessments high stakes examinations for graduation?

A: Cathie shared that the AMES test formerly used in Arizona was a high stakes exam that students had to pass to graduate. The AZ Merit test is not high stakes. Luke added that passing assessments is not required for graduation, but all students are required to take the test (formerly DCAS and Smarter Balanced, currently the SAT). Delaware’s participation rate exceeds 97% of all students.

Q: Are you developing pathways? Do you think this would help with CTE and academic integration?

A: Delaware shifted the way it approves CTE programs during AY 14–15 and shifted the accountability structure in AY 15–16. The state has tightly integrated academic and technical coursework and ensured students are proficient both academically and technically within a particular pathway. For example, Delaware created a state pathway in Allied Health. Additionally, students, during their senior year, are required to complete a five-credit dual enrollment course in anatomy and physiology that is benchmarked with Delaware’s two- and four-year higher education institutions. For students to participate in that course, they must have mastered the ELA standards required of a 12th-grader. Two groups are participating: students who are currently juniors who have demonstrated ELA mastery through the SAT and a group who has not yet mastered ELA standards. To assist students who have not yet mastered these standards, Delaware built a bridge program with the higher education system for students to complete their remedial coursework alongside their normal ELA courses in their junior year or over the summer. Students who complete the remedial course show they have mastered the ELA standards in their junior year and can then proceed to dual-enrollment coursework in their senior year. Delaware has tried to ensure that academic and technical coursework is sequenced so students can access competitive employment and continuing education opportunities. The state

has also created stopgap instruments to address gaps in service to allow students to demonstrate capacity in ELA and mathematics.

Arizona has introduced programs of study, but it has not created pathways to that degree. Implementation is dependent on the school district, and affiliated community college and dual enrollment policies vary by college. Academically, students are encouraged to take certain courses, but there are no required pathways.

Q: How many states are using SATs as the benchmark for ELA and math? We would be interested in seeing a broader consensus of benchmarks.

A: In Arizona, there will be a menu of assessments available. Advance CTE did a survey of states regarding use of the ACT, so it may have more information on other assessments. Kathleen Mercer from Kansas shared that state assessments in Kansas are aligned to the ACT, but the state does not use the ACT or SAT.

You Want It When?: Preparing for and Surviving the CAR Submission Process | Steve Klein (RTI International)

Rebecca introduced Steve Klein to discuss available resources for the CAR submissions process. Steve began by acknowledging that the CAR submission process can be challenging, and with reauthorization coming there will be new metrics to learn. This topic aims to help states prepare for the process of data collection and reporting by having states share information on challenges encountered and strategies used to report data.

Steve introduced resources available on the PCRN for CAR portal, such as a recorded training session, the CAR user guide, and email addresses of DATE staff who may be contacted for general guidance and technical support. These resources are located at

<https://cte.ed.gov/accountability/consolidated-annual-report>.

Steve then reintroduced the discussion questions:

- 1) For veteran submitters, what are some tips you can share with the group?
- 2) For those newer to the process, what are some questions you have or challenges you face in the CAR submission process?

To start off the conversation, Steve introduced Connie Beene from Kansas who volunteered to share her team's process for submitting the CAR. In the past, when she was collecting information from sites, grantees would submit documents that simply said "activity completed" without providing details of how activities were completed. This was difficult because state staff had no information to use when writing the CAR report narrative. To remedy this, a few years ago, Connie took questions from the CAR report and linked them to the reporting system sites use. Now institutions write to the points included in the CAR. While it took some time to transition, institutions now have a better understanding of why sharing this information is important. Additionally, Connie has worked with the regional *Perkins IV* coordinators in Kansas to help them find ways of collecting this information from sites without creating a reporting burden.

Stacy Wyman of Washington state also volunteered to speak about the state's process. Last year was her first year completing the CAR, and to help her and other people new to the team, Stacy held a "kick-off" meeting and invited both program and data staff to attend. It was a successful way to introduce the process to everyone. During this kick-off meeting, the team reviewed the previous year's CAR report so all team members had a chance to identify where they fit into the report and what their pieces looked like. Stacy also created a planning calendar and shared it with the entire team so it had an understanding of reporting deadlines. Based on the team's feedback, she created a master calendar to share with everyone. This helped team members to know where their pieces fit and how report sections depend on others. Stacy also created a contact list including everyone involved and their role in the

process to aid in communications. Finally, at the end of the submission process, she purposefully thanked everyone involved and made sure their supervisors were aware of the work they had done for the CAR.

Steve then opened the call up to anyone to share their CAR experiences, strategies, and challenges.

Cathie shared that last year was also her first year submitting the CAR, but her fiscal director had many years of experience and knew how to lead the writing process. They broke up the pieces that needed to be written and sent them to the appropriate people, comparing the report content with the previous year's content to make sure things were consistent.

Patrick Bell from Nevada shared that the state uses a process similar to Kansas in which it takes the CAR narrative questions and sends them to local education agencies (LEAs) to gather feedback on those items. When soliciting input, he finds it best to ask LEAs to provide exact and concise information as it makes the writing process easier. He likes the idea of making the CAR reporting process more team oriented as, currently, the responsibility falls to him.

Donna Brant from Oregon mentioned that one challenge the state faces is getting secondary data ready for submission by December 31. Similarly, Paula Marchner from North Dakota shared that she has difficulty getting the graduation rates prepared in time, and North Dakota has decided to move their timeline up so that she does not have to rush at the end of the year. Jill Kroll from Michigan also has difficulty with graduation rates because the state department of education's *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* deadline for submitting graduation rates is not until January, but the *Perkins IV* deadline is December 31. This misalignment makes things difficult since *ESSA* is larger than *Perkins* and has the potential to be more influential on state deadlines. Laura Schiebe of South Dakota shared via the chat box that *ESSA* report cards will now be due on December 31, eliminating this misalignment.

Steve posed a question from the chat box to the general audience regarding methods of making sure that data are accurate and complete before uploading to the CAR portal. Cathie shared that Arizona has created its own state CTE data portal that LEAs submit to and they then pull information from that database. This allows state staff to track more data than it could in the past. Felicia Swanson shared that Alaska uses a similar system and that all the data for their department is together in one place so they can access the *ESSA* graduation rate and other data, but their burden is receiving data from the postsecondary level in a timely fashion. Paula Marchner shared that she contacts her postsecondary partners early in the process to remind them of the CAR and to ask for data. In Wisconsin, the postsecondary system has a management information data reporting system that makes data collection from postsecondary levels much easier, but it is slower to receive necessary secondary data.

Steve prompted veteran submitters to share their one big takeaway from the CAR reporting process for those newer to CAR reporting. Stacy shared that an overview calendar of major deadlines is helpful when working across the secondary and postsecondary systems. Jeralyn Jargo of Minnesota shared that her strategy is to start early and communicate often. Minnesota also uses a calendar and work plan to consistently communicate progress across the team. Pat Thieben shared that Iowa has started using a cohort approach which makes reporting easier since they follow a single cohort.

Closing Remarks | Rebecca Moyer

To conclude the call, Rebecca asked OCTAE for any additional updates. Allison thanked everyone for joining the NSWG calls during the 2017–18 year, the July call presenters, and the NSWG planning team: Fidelis Ubadigbo (Iowa), Gabriela Borcoman (Texas), Guy Jackson (Wyoming), Katie Graham (Nebraska), Bobby Sanborn (Tennessee), and Michael Tinsley (Tennessee). Allison reiterated that NSWG is “for the states, by the

states” and that all input, ideas, and attendance is appreciated.

Allison turned the call back to Rebecca who shared a link to the evaluation survey for the 2017–18

NSWG calls:

<https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/4416803/2017-18-NSWG-Evaluation>. The survey asks members to evaluate this year’s calls and to provide ideas for call topics for next year. Rebecca also asked members interested in joining the 2018–19 Planning Team to contact her via email (rmoyer@rti.org). She then concluded by thanking presenters and participants for joining.

The next NSWG call will be held on September 13, 2018.

NEXT CALL:

September 13, 2018