NSWG Call Summary
NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP

OCTAE-DATE Liaisons

Allison Hill
allison.hill@ed.gov

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 February 11, 2016, began at 2:00 PM EST.

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 | *DATE staff*

John Haigh announced that Allison Hill, Education Program Specialist, will be taking over for Jay Savage and John Haigh as the primary liaison to the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) – Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE) for future NSWG calls.

Updated *Perkins* and *WIOA* Reporting Requirements | *Sharon Miller, DATE Director*

Dr. Sharon Miller, DATE Director, provided an overview of recent changes to the state plan revision budgets for grant awards for program year 10. Memoranda and letters to states regarding anticipated changes in reporting can be found on the front page of the PCRN Web page under "Quick Links." States are encouraged to work with their *Perkins* Program Administration Liaisons or Regional Accountability Specialists (RAS).

A Dear Colleague Letter addresses the transition authority in the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* and the impact on *Perkins* reporting requirements. States will not be required to submit performance against their annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for school years 2014–2015

and 2015–2016. States using AMOs to guide performance levels in language arts and mathematics may need to revisit and adjust their *Perkins* state-adjusted performance levels for core indicators for impacted years. States deep in transition should use their RAS as the point of contact for guidance.

A memoranda dated February 5, 2016, is on the PCRN and was sent to State Directors of CTE. It addresses potential changes in reporting requirements based on *ESSA* provisions, as well as *Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA)* requirements.

- States submitting combined plans (about seven or eight states to date) must submit their *Perkins* State Plan revisions, budget, and performance levels to the *Perkins* State Plan Portal **by April 1, 2016**. These states must then incorporate *Perkins* data into the Strategic and Operational Elements of their *WIOA* Combined State Plan. The *WIOA* portal is in development and not yet live.

- States not submitting *WIOA* Combined State Plans must submit their *Perkins* State Plan revisions, budget, and performance levels to the *Perkins* State Plan Portal **by April 18, 2016.**

Information about the State Plan Portal, including training sessions and URLs, will be sent in a forthcoming letter and posted on the PCRN. States should direct questions about *WIOA* or *Perkins* State Portal submissions to Sharon Head (Sharon.head@ed.gov).

States should anticipate an additional memo about *WIOA* submissions and a presentation describing *ESSA* impact on *Perkins* requirements.

Q: The memo says states should revisit and adjust 1S1 and 1S2 AMOs as appropriate. What does that mean?

A: States were previously instructed to use AMOs to guide their performance targets. Now that they are not required to report AMOs for the specified years, the Department of Education (ED) is allowing them to develop other performance levels by looking at their baseline and trend data.

Q: Can states determine their own performance levels?

A: Yes, as long as they are looking at trend data and meeting *Perkins* requirements by improving performance.

Q: What are requirements for states with *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)* waivers?

A: It depends on the waiver; contact your RAS.

Q: Will states still be tied to *ESEA* measures for 1S1 and 1S2 in school year 2016–2017?

A: Contact your RAS; legal and policy teams will review and DATE will make the information available to all states.

Advancing Innovations in CTE Opportunities | *Albert Palacios*

Albert Palacios, Education Program Specialist in the College and Careers Transitions Branch described the Advancing Innovations in Career and Technical Education (CTE) program to the group. The Advancing Innovations in CTE program has developed field challenges to inspire new ideas and solutions in technology. The challenges are unique in that they only pay for successful products, a strategy which draws a larger audience of problem solvers to the area of CTE and increases cost effectiveness and return on taxpayer dollars. The project encompasses three grant competitions:

- The **Reach Higher Career App Challenge** ($225,000–$250,000) seeks creative solutions for a mobile application to navigate career and education options for students and career counselors. Approaches will be shared among the CTE community to inspire new ideas and develop even more apps. Winners will be announced early summer 2016.

- The **EdSim Challenge** ($68,000–$300,000) identifies 3-D immersive simulations to effectively deliver CTE. ED received contributions from virtual reality companies. Finalists will be announced summer 2016 and winners will be announced as late as March 2017.

- The **CTE Makeover Challenge** ($200,000–?) has benefited from multiple external contributions. ED plans to identify a cohort of "makerschools" that plan to transform their CTE spaces or create mobile innovation spaces. Grant recipients must be *Perkins*-eligible high schools and will be required to share best practices with the larger CTE community. The cohort will be announced in March 2016, and schools will present at the National Maker Faire (June 2016) and the World Maker Faire (October 2016).

More information, including sign-up for email updates, can be found at www.edprizes.com. Contact Albert at albert.palacios@ed.gov with questions or comments.

Q: Does only funding successful ideas stifle innovation?

A: ED is looking for new ideas based on the level of innovations, and ideas will be evaluated and shared so everyone involved will see new solutions in CTE. The grant competitions are intended to stimulate rather than stifle creativity.

Q: At what point is success measured for funding to be received?

A: These challenges don't follow the typical grant process. Typically, funding is released and then success is measured. These challenges are looking for proven models that have already demonstrated some level of success, even if they don't exist yet.

State Longitudinal Data Systems: Update on State Grant Activities and Implications for CTE | *Jay Pfeiffer*

Jay Pfeiffer described a paper he and Steve Klein recently submitted and that will soon be released by the National Center for Innovation in Career and Technical Education (NCICTE). This paper describes State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grant activities and includes suggestions to researchers, data specialists, policy makers, and other interested stakeholders about the implications of SLDS in the field of CTE, as well as strategies for addressing potential challenges moving forward. These implications in CTE may contribute to the sustainability of SLDS funding beyond the federal grant awards.

The paper also explores the potential research application of SLDS data. CTE research is uniquely positioned to address potential SLDS issues, as there has already been a need to examine data across sectors and over time in the field of CTE.

The SLDS grant program was announced by the National Center for Education Statistics in 2005 and has been administered over six rounds. To date, over $725 million has been utilized by 47 states, with grants from the most recent round extending through 2019. Additional funds have been provided to states by various foundations.

Early grants were awarded to help states firmly establish K–12 systems with individually identifiable student data. In 2005, most states collected only aggregate reports. Student-level data were needed to connect the data longitudinally and across systems such as pre-K and postsecondary and through to workforce.

The first two rounds of grants were used to develop new systems or increase the breadth and/or function of existing systems. The third, fourth, and fifth rounds sought to connect K–12 to other systems. In 2009, the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act* not only significantly increased grant funds but also encouraged states

to commit to connecting systems from pre-K to workforce.

The sixth round was announced in 2015 and was the first to emphasize the utilization of the data, focusing on one or two of six categories, such as financial equity and return on investment, early education, and college and career. ED received 43 applications from states and territories and awarded 16 grants.

A list of detailed elements, similar to those that may be contained in an SLDS, is provided in the paper. Element categories include student characteristics, student engagement, student success, and student identity. In each category, some elements may be part of an SLDS in general, while others are specific to CTE.

One reason that funding for SLDS may not be sustained beyond the federal grant awards is that it is difficult for stakeholders to understand the uses of data. A good research program could assist states in developing use cases to describe what the data are being used for, topical areas, and methodological approaches. Feedback from researchers could be invaluable for developing high quality SLDS. For example, when technicians pull data together, they deal with a myriad of issues that never need to be addressed again and may not be properly recorded or shared. Researchers need to understand the data at that deeper level, so they may advise states about data issues in exchange for access.

Again, it is essential that stakeholders are engaged in SLDS development and sustainability. The CTE community is among the widest in data systems and includes faculty, administrators, elected officials, board members, students, parents, and more. Stakeholders may have many concerns, including privacy. While students, parents, and schools have well-founded concerns about privacy, these may be somewhat alleviated if they are provided with compelling use cases, as the paper suggests. Another way to alleviate privacy concerns could be to limit time periods for which databases are compiled for *Perkins* purposes to no longer than three years and to focus on key

transitions—high school to college, undergraduate to graduate, etc.

John Haigh suggested SLDS work may also be sustained with the help of state and local administrators, as well as by connecting use cases to Programs of Study and career pathways. OCTAE may explore this report further at the next Data Quality Institute in the fall of 2016. John suggested the NSWG may benefit by forming a subcommittee to begin to address the questions posed by this report and to strategize potential solutions to data issues and use cases for SLDS data in the field of CTE.

NCICTE will announce the release of this report to the NSWG members. Questions can be directed to Jay Pfeiffer and/or Steve Klein.

PLEASE NOTE: Jay's contact information has changed. His new email address is pfeifferpfarm@gmail.com.

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 May 19, 2016.

NEXT CALL:

May 19, 2016