# NSWG Call Summary
## NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP

**OCTAE-DATE Liaisons**

**John Haigh**
John.Haigh@ed.gov

**Sharon Head**
sharon.head@ed.gov

**Host**

**Steve Klein**
sklein@rti.org

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) call, held on December 10, 2015, began at 2:00 PM EDT.

## Welcome | *Steve Klein*

Facilitator Steve Klein reviewed the call agenda and reminded callers that all materials referenced on the call can be accessed on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) website http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/next-steps-work-group.

## OCTAE Updates | *John Haigh*

John Haigh provided the following updates:

- The 2015 Consolidated Annual Report (CAR). States are in the midst of reporting CAR data. The hope is that everything will be turned in by the end of the reporting period, which runs from October 1 to December 31, 2015. http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/annual-reporting

- State Directors Webinar. The next call takes place on December 17, 2015. Perkins state profiles will be discussed. The profiles should be up on PCRN in approximately 10 days. http://cte.ed.gov/cal/cte-state-directors-webinar

- State Monitoring. The state monitoring portal is being implemented this year. States will be able to input items into the portal to assist with monitoring. More details will follow.

- School Codes for the Exchange of Data (SCED). In the spring, the SCED working group will convene. Please contact John Haigh (John.Haigh@ed.gov) if you are interested in participating.

## Data Quality Institute (DQI) Follow-Up Discussion | *John Haigh, Stacey Cataylo*

Stacey Cataylo provided an overview of the 2015 DQI and instructions on how to access the DQI information on the PCRN website, including the meeting agenda and presentation materials. See http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/2015-dqi.

She noted that the DQI was organized around three strands, with the first two strands addressed on day one of the Institute and the third strand on the following day.

- Strand I: Choosing the Metrics
- Strand II: Sourcing the Data
- Strand III: Using and Presenting the Information

Stacey highlighted Johan Uvin's keynote presentation on the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act* (*WIOA*) and explained how users could access the information on breakout sessions within the strands. Additionally, state attendees at the DQI were asked to share their best practices for data collection, key challenges they face, and any suggested changes their state would like to see with Perkins reauthorization. This information was shared during the event between sessions and will be posted on the DQI page of the PCRN website.

Two training modules are currently in development based on presentations at the DQI. One is based on Johan Uvin's *WIOA* presentation and the other is based on Dale King's presentation on the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (*FERPA*). Once the modules are complete they will be posted on PCRN.

Steve opened a discussion regarding key takeaways from the DQI. John Haigh started the conversation by noting the importance of input

provided by numerous stakeholders groups (i.e., NSWG members, National Association of State Directors Career Technical Education Consortium [NASDCTEc], state career and technical education [CTE] directors) in planning the Institute. He then summarized the following key points from the institute evaluation:

- States preferred the annual face-to-face meetings over the virtual DQI.

- Attendees were split on the pacing of the sessions. Some thought more time was needed for Q&A, while others thought the length and pacing was adequate.

- The speed data(ing) session was popular with attendees because it gave people time to engage with their colleagues in other states and to learn about other work that is occurring.

- Attendees thought that it would be helpful if DQI staff could confirm presenters earlier. Since another face-to-face meeting is planned next year, John shared that outreach efforts would begin earlier to secure the involvement of presenters.

A representative from Montana shared that this was her first DQI and that she really appreciated the "Perkins 101" session. She thought the session could have been longer and suggested moving it to the day before the conference. Additionally, she liked the speed-data(ing) and breakout sessions.

John addressed the venue, noting that there are constraints in selecting the DQI conference site because federal staff have to be in attendance. This limits the location to the Washington, D.C./Baltimore area. In addition, the conference has to take place in a federal building. Finally, there is a $100,000 limit for conferences. John stated that other venue options besides the Maritime museum may be available if state staff are interested.

## Accountability and the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act:* Implications for CTE | *John Haigh*

John explained that oversight of *WIOA* is made up of three core federal partners: the U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Education, and the Rehabilitation Services Administration. Staff from these agencies have been diligently meeting and responding to public comments. Based on the review of public comments, policy papers are being developed to address areas that are major components of the legislation.

Furthermore, a working group comprising staff from the Employment & Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor and Division of Adult Education and Literacy from OCTAE collaborated to offer a presentation at the DQI.

John opened the floor for questions on *WIOA*.

Q: The accountability piece of the legislation is going to be difficult for institutions to handle, specifically, completion rates. For example, institutions in Utah already have a difficult time defining a specific cohort in order to measure completion rates for a given program.

A: There was agreement that those are issues and that the details still need to be worked out.

Q: Is there a difference or preference between a combined vs. a unified plan?

A: Perkins may be a part of the combined plan, but no decision has been made. It was recommended that states reference materials from Johan's presentation at the DQI and visit www.ed.gov/aefla for more information.

Q: Can states define their own metrics based on their environment and population?

A: If states choose to be a workforce partner, then no, they have to use the *WIOA* core metrics. But, if they are just using Perkins for now, then they should be okay. Clarification on this question will be provided once regulations are issued.

## Performance Assessment: State Strategies for Assessing Student Work | *Chelsea Parker, Executive Director, Work-based Learning, Tennessee Department of Education*

Chelsea Parker explained that she and her colleagues in Tennessee have developed a new model of work-based learning (WBL). The new model starts with a foundational belief that in order for a student to become successful in the "capstone" experiences (the immersion piece), that planning for their involvement early on can help with their success. An example of this would be starting instruction as early as elementary school by exposing children to career awareness.

To measure the model, they have defined the student as the center of their measurement, with a focus on assessing student learning, coordination and planning, and finally regional alignment. Course standards were developed based on the skills that Tennessee employers need. Teacher professional development was revamped for the model. Other student metrics also are being tracked, such as their attendance and program participation. The last key step is making sure the model is aligned with the work force needs of the state. In order for students to be successful, they need to be involved in high-growth, in-demand job areas and opportunities.

At the student level, WBL must be student-centered, meaning that it

— produces a portfolio of evidence of employability skills (metric—portfolio quality);

— aligns to the students' long-term goals and interests (metric—personalized learning plans reflect placement within area of elective focus);

— supports students' long-term goals and interests (metric—students participate in WBL from all 16 CTE career clusters); and

— is accessible to all students (metric—demographic and other data).

At the teacher level, WBL must be educator-supported. Tennessee has completely revamped its professional development. Examples of educator supported metrics include the following:

— Require regularly facilitated reflection time to supplement work experience to meet course standards (metric—certification and engagement in professional learning communities by district of WBL coordinators).

— Improves continuously through professional development and district support (metric—teacher TEAM evaluation data and WBL coordinator survey data).

A state-wide assessment survey of all WBL coordinators and CTE coordinators is occurring in 2016 to get an idea of how the first year implementation is going and what adjustments need to occur. It will inform both district and state administrators.

Finally, WBL must be community-aligned, using the Pathways Tennessee model to help track the outreach and engagement pieces. Examples of community alignment metrics include the following:

— Provides access to high-demand, high-wage careers and reflects state and regional workforce needs and trends (metrics—WBL placements reflect state and local workforce data and are reflective of programs of study enrollment).

— Encourages community ownership and collaboration (metric—WBL assessments are implemented locally).

Q: Can you tell us if you are including industry-based certifications?

A: Industry-based certifications are a huge component in Tennessee. The state has an endorsed list of certifications, which also serve as summative assessments for the entire programs of study that are offered. A student participating in WBL has to have at least two prior courses in a program of study in CTE to go on in WBL.

Q: The WBL program assessments are implemented locally, but are they devised by the state education agency?

A: Program assessments are devised and implemented locally, but a lot of guidance is given from the state level.

## New Resources: Perkins State Profiles and Perkins Data Explorer | *Steve Klein*

Steve gave an overview of two new tools that will soon be available on PCRN. Using Iowa as an example, Steve walked NSWG attendees through the new dashboard and the features (e.g., data can be populated as a visualization—charts and graphs or a table). Data reports are also downloadable.

Steve then gave an overview of the Perkins Data Explorer. The data explorer consists of four main areas; CTE Concentrator Enrollment Data, Performance Data, CTE Participant Enrollment Data, and Final Agreed Upon Performance Levels.

The data explorer allows users to look at a variety of data within their own state or across states. For example, in the CTE Concentrator Enrollment report, users can select varying year ranges, states, student populations, career clusters, and education levels. Once a specific data item or sets of data items are selected, a user can generate customized reports. Users also can export the data via Microsoft Excel or as an Adobe PDF file.

In the Performance Data report users can select from among states, education levels, core indicators, years, student populations, success measures, and student category variables. Steve showed NSWG attendees how they can look at their own states in comparison to others, something that was not possible until now.

Q: When will these tools be available?

A: Once we receive all comments from states, it should go live, potentially within a few days.

Comment: States should have already been given access to the beta version of these tools.

Q: Will the data include postsecondary indicators? I noticed the postsecondary indicators in the Iowa example but not all of the indicators.

A: Yes, the majority of the indicators are available.

Q: What do we mean by national performance?

A: It is an average of all of the states. A footnote or disclaimer is needed to make sure folks know that we cannot make a state-by-state comparison.

## Closing Remarks | *Steve Klein*

Steve ended the call at 3:00 pm EST and thanked everyone for their participation. The next call is scheduled for February 11, 2016.

**NEXT CALL:**

February 11, 2016