NSWG Call Summary

NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP

Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education
Division of Academic and Technical Education
Accountability and Performance Branch
Perkins Collaborative Resource Network
http://cte.ed.gov

OCTAE-DATE Liaisons

Allison Hill
allison.hill@ed.gov

John Haigh
john.haigh@ed.gov

Host

Steve Klein
sklein@rti.org

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) call was held on February 9, from 2:00 to 3:00pm EST.

OCTAE Updates | DATE Staff

John Haigh and Allison Hill, liaisons for the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) – Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE) shared the following announcements:

1) State Plan and Trainings

The State Plan submission site will be open from March 1 until April 25. There will be two State Plan trainings, scheduled for February 28 at 1pm EST and March 2 at 11am EST, that will provide an overview of the Perkins Web Portal and a demonstration of the State Plan online submission. See the FY2017 Perkins State Plan Guidance Memo posted on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) for more information.[1]

2) Consolidated Annual Report (CAR)

OCTAE is working to finalize the CAR. To help with this, Regional Accountability Specialists and Program Administrative Liaisons have solicited feedback from states. States are asked to respond to these questions as soon as possible in order to begin drafting the Report to Congress.

3) G9 Group

Members of the G9 Group (nine states that provide voluntary feedback to inform OCTAE activities) were recently contacted for input on a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) project collecting high school transcript data. OCTAE is interested in reevaluating the composition of the G9 Group and asks any states interested in participating to contact John at john.haigh@ed.gov.

4) NSWG May Call

In order to incorporate more state perspectives, the conversation about data collection for special populations has been moved to the May 11 call. States interested in sharing promising and/or best practices for collecting data about special populations should contact Steve Klein at sklein@rti.org. States with strategies for addressing performance gaps and the academic and technical needs of special populations—including gender, race, ethnicity, nontraditional students, English language learners, single parents, displaced homemakers, students with disabilities, and the economically disadvantaged—are encouraged to present.

Assessing Career Readiness: Sample Indicators for Measuring Student Outcomes | Ryan Reyna (Education Strategy Group)

Steve introduced Ryan Reyna, Senior Associate at the Education Strategy Group (ESG). Ryan shared strategies to support states in integrating college- and career-readiness measures into their accountability systems.

The ESG is partnering with the Council of Chief State School Officers and Advance CTE on the New Skills for Youth project (funded by JPMorgan Chase), to support states in expanding career pathways options for students. An expert working group was convened to propose approaches for measuring career readiness. Group findings will be published in a report, due out in March 2017.

[1] https://s3.amazonaws.com/PCRN/docs/FY2017_Perkins_State_Plan_Guidance_Memo.pdf

The working group focused its attention on four guiding principles around strengthening the career aspect of "college and career readiness." These principles include

1. providing students with more career pathways;
2. recognizing the academic, technical, and professional skills students need when they enter the workforce;
3. measuring program success based on student transitions to programs beyond high school and
4. valuing the unique context and perspectives across states and providing clear pathways for each state to improve.

In keeping with these principles, the work group has recommended four categories of measures for college and career readiness, each with a unique measure addressing student work and state commitment and resources.

Category 1: Progress toward a post–high school credential

Measure: Percentage of the ninth-grade student cohort that demonstrated successful progress toward a credential of value while in high school.

Levels of Attainment:

Fundamental: Completion of a state-defined college- and career-ready course of study.

Advanced: Attainment of *Fundamental*, plus the completion of a pathway of three or more credits, aligned to the student's academic and career plans.

Exceptional: Attainment of *Fundamental* and *Advanced*, plus the attainment of one or more postsecondary credits in high school.

Measure requirements: A college- and career-ready course of study; identification of high-quality career pathways leading to credentials of value; and identification of the student's academic and career plans.

Category 2: Co-curricular Learning and Leadership Experiences

Measure: Percentage of the ninth-grade student cohort that successfully completed a co-curricular Learning and Leadership Experience (work-based learning, career and technical student organizations, etc.)

Levels of Attainment:

Fundamental: Completion of a state-defined co-curricular Learning and Leadership Experience.

Advanced: Attainment of *Fundamental*, plus alignment between the student's academic and career plans and Learning and Leadership Experience.

Exceptional: Attainment of *Fundamental* and *Advanced*, plus a third-party evaluation showing that students met expectations and demonstrated a gain of academic, technical, and/or professional skills through a Learning and Leadership Experience.

Measure requirements: A state-defined list of eligible co-curricular Learning and Leadership Experiences; a validation process for these experiences; identification of the student's academic and career plans; and a quality instrument for judging academic, technical, and professional skills.

Category 3: Assessment of Readiness

Measure: Percentage of the ninth-grade student cohort that assesses at the college- and career-ready level.

Levels of Attainment:

Fundamental: Attainment of a state-defined college- and career-ready level on the high school summative assessment.

Advanced: Attainment of *Fundamental*, plus completion of a pathway-aligned assessment for the demonstration of technical skills (AP, IB, etc.).

Exceptional: Attainment of *Fundamental* and *Advanced*, plus a performance-based demonstration of professional skills within an academic or technical context (capstone project, etc.)

Measure requirements: A pathway-aligned assessment validated and/or judged by employers; an industry-recognized credential in an in-demand

field; AP or IB exams; and a rubric for a capstone project or other skills demonstration.

Category 4: Transitions beyond high school

Measure: Percentage of the ninth-grade student cohort who successfully transitioned to postsecondary education or the workforce within 12 months of graduation.

Levels of Attainment:

Fundamental: Enrollment in a two- or four-year institute of higher education (IHE) or postsecondary training.

Advanced: Attainment of *Fundamental*, plus enrollment in an IHE without remediation or employment at a state-defined wage threshold.

Exceptional: Attainment of *Fundamental* and *Advanced*, plus enlistment in the military, enrollment in a certificate or registered apprenticeship program, or employment in a state-defined field (as defined by the state's *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act [WIOA]* plan).

Measure requirements: Individual student data from postsecondary and workforce data sources; access to military enrollment data; information regarding IHE remediation; and a state-defined threshold and in-demand fields aligned with the state's *WIOA* plan.

The work group emphasized the importance of making sure these measures adequately reflect the work in each state. There are issues that remain to be addressed, such as common definitions of critical terms, the validation of measurement quality from outside K–12 education, an appropriate timeline for measurement; and the balancing of expectations for progress by setting realistic targets. There also are data issues that need attention, such as transitioning from collecting self-reported data to collecting individual student data, defining industry-recognized credentials with value to create an ongoing identification and validation process, and creating a data collection plan that protects student privacy.

Ryan then fielded questions from NSWG members.

Q: Are there any states that plan to include these measures in their Every Student Succeeds Act *accountability systems?*

A: Tennessee has been documenting these measures in place with regard to postsecondary transitions, work-based learning, and Learning and Leadership Experiences in its report card, and its ratings will show AP/IB dual enrollment. Illinois and California are also capturing data on these measures, though Illinois is focused on Learning and Leadership Experiences, while California is emphasizing multiple performance levels.

Q: What are one to two immediate steps that a state could take if it wanted to implement the recommended measures?

A: The first step is creating a plan for how to begin collecting and including information in public report cards. It is an opportunity to examine the connection between preparation and readiness based on postsecondary success. Standardizing definitions for clearer data collection is also an important step

Q: What do you see as the biggest hurdles for a state to incorporate these measures?

A: Data is a significant hurdle—both access and links to workforce data are essential, but little collection is happening. It is important to start setting goals and working toward data collection now so that processes are in place for the future.

Sharing What Works: Strategies for Gathering, Vetting, and Disseminating Promising Data Collection and Reporting Strategies Among States | Bobby Sanborn (Tennessee Department of Education)

Steve introduced Bobby Sanborn, Executive Director of the Divisional Support and Accountability office with the Tennessee Department of Education, to review progress made by the 2016 Data Quality Institute (DQI) roundtable group on sharing promising career and technical education (CTE) data practices within and between states.

After a short summary of the DQI and focuses of other roundtable groups, Bobby introduced the work done by his roundtable group around identifying and sharing promising state practices. They focused on the following areas:

1. Promising practice collection – can be done using a common, one-page template for all states.
2. Dissemination hub – a centralized practice repository, possibly hosted on the PCRN.
3. Capturing feedback – collecting promising practice proposals.
4. Vetting structure – using stakeholders to review proposals for overall quality.

These areas of focus align well with the process used to collect promising practices in Tennessee. Bobby directed participants to the "Promising practices in college and career readiness" Web page for the state of Tennessee.[2] This page acts as a state dissemination hub for idea sharing between counties and school districts. Site write-ups provide a quick overview of processes used and their alignment with state CTE goals. Each sheet outlines necessary activities and resources as well as contact information, and is intended to serve as a springboard for collaboration.

Based on the templates from Tennessee, the roundtable group has created a draft template to collect promising CTE data collection and reporting practices from across the country. The template is organized as an online survey and features fields for data analysts to enter the title of their promising practice; topical areas covered; resources needed to launch and maintain their effort; and the benefits, challenges and lessons learned. Contact information also may be entered. The roundtable group seeks feedback on this form to gauge its utility. Once promising practices have been collected using this template, the intention is to work with stakeholder groups to vet these practices and then post for sharing with all states.

NSWG call participants then had the opportunity to weigh in and provide feedback on the form. John from OCTAE expressed concern that participation like this had been the original intention behind creating the PCRN (then known as the Peer Collaborative Research Network), however OCTAE discovered early in the process that practices and expectations were different across states, such that it was difficult to get consistency and validation for these activities and practices. He also noted that the federal government is not likely to provide any additional resources to help in this process.

Other members expressed that the simplicity of the form can be misleading; states function very differently and the logistics to create a repository of best practices would be difficult. Bobby reiterated that these practices are not intended to function in the same way in different states; the intention is to share ideas and practices that are helpful so that no one needs to "recreate the wheel".

Jay Savage from OCTAE noted OCTAE's intention to structure the 2017 DQI in a way that allows states time to exchange ideas. Any ideas on topics to be covered should be directed to Jay (jay.savage@ed.gov) or John (john.haigh@ed.gov).

The promising practices template has been posted on the PCRN and is ready for feedback and review.[3] Feedback should be sent to Steve at sklein@rti.org.

Closing Remarks | Allison Hill

Allison thanked Ryan and Bobby for their presentations and state representatives for joining. She also asked states interested in presenting during the NSWG May call on data collection for special populations to contact Steve at sklein@rti.org.

The next call is scheduled for 2:00 to 3:00 pm EST on May 11, 2017.

NEXT CALL:
May 11, 2017

[2] https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/promising-practices-in-ccr

[3] https://form.jotform.com/70331182479153