

The May 21, 2015, NSWG call began at 2:00 PM EDT.

Welcome | Steve Klein

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

Steve noted that some work group members may not be receiving emails regarding NSWG information and updates. Anyone who suspects they have not received all NSWG information should email Steve (sklein@rti.org).

OCTAE Updates | John Haigh

John Haigh provided the following updates:

- The Perkins Collaborative Resource Network has a new look. Contact Denise Garland (denise.garland@ed.gov) with questions.
- The Spring NACTEI Conference was held May 11–14, 2015, in San Antonio, Texas, at the Westin Riverwalk.
 - Over 300 people participated.
 - Breakout groups made suggestions to OCTAE about the upcoming Data Quality Institute (DQI), state grant monitoring, and statewide longitudinal data systems (SLDS) design, as well as how OCTAE can assist in these areas.
 - Refer to www.NACTEI.org or contact NACTEI President Dennis Fiscus for more information (dennis.fiscus@azed.gov).

Tracking Student Placement into Advanced Education and Employment: State Approaches for Improving Data Collection | Kansas

Connie Beene, Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR), shared Kansas' approach to improving data collection.

First, challenges in data collection were presented. These include institutions' lack of understanding of the importance of collecting data; absence of methods, timing, and appropriate personnel for following up with students; nonresponsive students and inaccurate/outdated student contact information; and lack of communication between institutional research and career and technical education (CTE) staff. Next, Connie shared the following strategies the state is using to address these issues:

Information Sharing: KBOR developed a data sharing agreement with the Kansas Department of Labor (DOL) to gain access to more and higher quality employment data. Kansas still struggles with developing information sharing agreements with surrounding states. The KBOR data research and planning team continues working to coordinate with other states.

Transparency: KBOR produces the KTIP Report, which pulls all reported data together into a single location. The KTIP Report allows institutions to see the data that are collected and presented to state legislators when they are making decisions around education policy. The report informs faculty and others about what core indicators are and allows them to make comparisons between institutions. The report also is useful in helping institutional staff locate reporting errors, since instructors are often

OCTAE-DATE Liaisons

John Haigh

John.Haigh@ed.gov

Sharon Head

sharon.head@ed.gov

Host

Steve Klein

sklein@rti.org

more familiar than administrators are with student numbers.

Connect with Students: KBOR has been working to help institutions understand the importance of collecting follow-up data and choosing appropriate staff for student follow-up (e.g., department chairs or faculty members). KBOR encourages these contacts to establish communication with students early and maintain contact with them throughout their program and beyond.

Recognize student relationships: The recent KBOR Employer Engagement Initiative provides an opportunity for postsecondary institutions to identify and recognize those business and industry partners who invest their resources in programs and connect with students. These connections may be useful in collecting student data after program completion. For more information about this initiative, refer to

http://www.kansasregents.org/workforce_development/employer_engagement_initiative.

Share Importance of Data Collection: Often, Perkins contacts are the only staff who respond to CTE data collection requests, meaning that college administrators may not understand the importance of this work. KBOR has worked to support Perkins data contacts in sharing the importance of data collection and reporting with their institutions' administration. For example, administrators recently participated in a monitoring visit, which helped them understand OCTAE's reporting requirements.

Q: When states are precluded from collecting social security numbers (SSNs), how can they collect employment data for secondary students?

A: NSWG members discussed strategies for collecting employment data when precluded from collecting SSNs. While some states may request that students volunteer their SSNs in surveys, others are concerned with data security and confidentiality issues, while still others are prevented from collecting, using, or storing SSNs for any reason. For example, Oregon shared that it is a state in which using

SSNs is prohibited; they instead match students to National Student Clearinghouse data (with about a 50 percent match) and a follow-up online survey (with a 4-5 percent match).

State representatives expressed hope that the upcoming reauthorization of *Perkins* and the current DOL Data Quality Initiative will provide guidance and supports in matching students from K-12 into the labor force.

For more information or questions about KBOR strategies for improving data collection, contact Connie Beene (cbeene@ksbor.org).

Data Quality Institute Planning

OCTAE will hold the next DQI November 4-5, 2015, at the Conference Center at the Maritime Institute in Baltimore, Maryland. Distance travelers should plan to arrive November 3, 2015; meals and lodging will be covered using state funds. OCTAE will provide more information as the event date approaches.

OCTAE requests feedback on proposed institute topics for what will be covered this year. A survey that was administered to the NSWG group as well as NACTEI conference attendants helped to inform the topics and breakout sessions. Themes, including potential topics and breakout sessions, are listed below.

Theme #1: Choosing the Metrics

Potential topics include *Perkins* measures (current and potential), Programs of Study, and Career Pathways. Breakout sessions may address the Certification Data Exchange Project, Expanded Measures of Enrollment and Attainment (GEMEnA), and Programs of Study metrics.

Participants suggested additional topics, including coding issues across state and local classrooms, consistency in Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes, alignment between states, and knowledge-based accountability systems that reach beyond target score indicators relative to reading and math.

Participants requested an SLDS status report from each state, to help clarify what is possible to collect and what is not for each state, and adjustments states can make to their metrics and definitions to more closely align with other states.

Theme #2: Sourcing the Data

Potential topics include privacy, SLDS, and labor market data. Breakouts may include assessing industry certification awards with data harvesting tools; the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) project; FERPA guidance by the Privacy Technical Assistance Center; and selecting measures for SLDS using sources such as the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Participants expressed interest in exploring data harvesting tools and suggested that states using data harvesting tools present their experiences with the process and software.

Theme #3: Using and Presenting Information

Potential topics include analytic tools, using data to drive program improvement, and tools for sharing data at the local level. Breakout sessions may include data dashboards, feedback reports, and toolkits.

Other Meeting Options: Data Fair

NSWG participants were asked whether they would be willing to provide a summary of their best practice(s) in advance of the event. This information could be shared at DQI in a number of ways, including participants circulating to check in with other states for five minutes at a time (“speed dat(a)ing”), ideas displayed through some medium throughout the event, and/or concurrent roundtable discussions. Numerous NSWG members reported their willingness to share this information prior to the event. One participant expressed concern that the five minutes proposed for cross-state conversations might not be enough time to exchange information. Another commented that the amount of movement involved may reduce productivity and that roundtable discussions may be more reasonable than speed dat(a)ing; however, others seemed willing to try and noted that a data fair might be helpful.

Q: Will there be funding for states to supplement travel and lodging to DQI?

A: OCTAE is unable to provide additional funding, since the budget for any conference is capped at a maximum \$100,000. More information will be provided as the event date approaches.

For more information or questions about DQI planning, contact Allison Hill (Allison.Hill@ed.gov; 202-245-7775) or John Haigh (John.Haigh@ed.gov; 202-245-7735).

Wrap-up | John Haigh, Steve Klein

OCTAE is currently developing state profiles. John encouraged states to submit ideas to him relating to layout and data to include in these state profiles.

Steve ended the call and reminded participants that all call materials will be posted on PCRN. Steve and John thanked everyone for their participation. The next call is scheduled for August 13, 2015.

NEXT CALL:

August 13, 2015