

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 November 10, from 2:00 to 3:00pm EST.

OCTAE Updates | DATE staff

Allison Hill, liaison for the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) – Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE) shared the following announcement and response to a community question:

1) Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) Advisory Team

Anyone interested in attending Web-based sessions to brainstorm updates and revisions to the PCRN website as a member of the PCRN Advisory Team should contact Denise Garland at denise.garland@ed.gov to get involved. Please direct any questions to Denise or Steve Klein.

2) Question regarding the use of “Limited English Proficient” (LEP) vs. “English Learner” (EL) in reference to *Perkins IV*

LEP is still the appropriate term since there has been no change to Section 3(16) of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)*. The *Every Student Succeeds Act* and *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act* reference EL, but until new legislation is passed or nonregulatory guidance is received, LEP will remain the correct term. The only granted exception to this is a waiver for Puerto Rico to use the term “Limited Spanish Proficient” since Spanish is the primary language of instruction.

Collecting Placement Data | Geoff Grove (Ohio Department of Education), Betty McGrath (North Carolina Department of Commerce)

Steve Klein introduced state presenters and let participants know that the slides are available for

download on the NSWG page of the PCRN: <http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/next-steps-work-group>.

Geoff Grove began by sharing Ohio’s approach to collecting placement data from students. Six months after graduation, districts and joint vocational schools contact former students to gather data on what they are doing academically or professionally. While Ohio is a local control state and cannot mandate the use of standardized data collection resources and tools, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) provides a variety of resources on its website for districts and schools across the state, such as a guidance document for how to gather follow-up data, an example survey that can be used or modified to collect data from graduates, and an Excel-based tracking form for organizing student follow-up data related to the certifications they have earned and their placement into apprenticeship, employment, postsecondary education/advanced training, or the military.

Ohio’s main challenge when collecting placement data is that, by law, state administrators cannot associate students’ names or social security numbers with their data; each student is issued a unique identifying number, but this number cannot be used to track students after graduation. This means the onus of collecting data and contact information falls on teachers and district administrators. The Excel sheet provided on the ODE site is designed to store multiple forms of contact information before students leave school and connect this information to the data obtained from follow-up. Best practices recommended for data gathering include getting contact information before students leave the system, communicating with students about follow-up activities and following up subsequently, and sending them a

copy of their report for verification before submission to the state.

Once the information is at ODE, state staff create local report cards for schools and districts to measure outcomes. These report cards include a grading scale for sites' positive placement rate and a grade promotion/demotion based on the percentage of students whose status is known (e.g., knowing more than 80 percent of student outcomes gives a grade bump-up). Overall, the state has been able to successfully track about 95 percent of graduates.

Next, Betty McGrath spoke about the North Carolina Common Follow-Up System, which was created in the early 1990s as a voluntary reporting program to collect information about workforce programs in the state. This reporting system was codified under state law in 1995 and is currently undergoing enhancements funded by a Workforce Data Quality Initiative grant from the U.S. Department of Labor. These upgrades focus on improving the quality of data and methods of collection and storage, as well as assisting staff in interpreting and understanding data.

Betty showed a breakdown of types of longitudinal data available, which included wage data and other information on state education and workforce programs. The state office is mandated to write reports on employment and wage outcomes in multiple areas, including career and technical education (CTE). This system uses students' social security numbers and student identification numbers to track their employment and wage data or enrollment in further education for up to five years following graduation. This matching process allows the state to find up to 92 percent of eligible students. A new reporting system has been developed to report information to the North Carolina General Assembly. This site can be viewed at www.nctower.com.

Back by Popular Demand: Follow-Up with Data Quality Institute Session Presenters | Julie Tyznik (Wisconsin), Katie Graham (Nebraska), Bobby Sanborn (Tennessee)

Steve Klein provided a brief summary of the 2016 Data Quality Institute, which took place on October 27 and 28, noting the opportunities it afforded for inter-state collaboration around three themes: data access, data analytics, and data communications. These themes were key to activities for state networking regarding challenges in data collection. Day one focused on framing the challenges and synthesizing discussion ideas around this topic; day two featured collaboration roundtables where representatives from different states met and brainstormed solutions to common challenges they identified. A selected representative from each roundtable group shared challenges and next steps for each of the following topics:

1) Collecting Data and Assessing the Quality of Industry Certifications and Licensure

Julie Tyznik shared the findings of her roundtable discussion and identified areas for the future collection of information. These included investigating certification data capture options; assessing certification quality; identifying different state practice for collecting and storing information; and finding ways to obtain disaggregated licensure data. The group's goal is to make this a national system.

2) Communicating CTE Data and Outcomes with Various Stakeholders

Katie Graham reported on the four areas of focus identified by her large and geographically diverse roundtable group for this current year. These included identifying common measures to communicate CTE effects (outside of data reported for the Consolidated Annual Report); generating research questions and the data to answer them; sharing promising practices for current work; and creating methods and tools for data dissemination.

3) Defining Quality Work-Based Learning (WBL) and Collecting/Sharing Outcome Data

In the absence of a representative from this group, Steve Klein shared the areas of focus identified by states. These included finding and creating common definitions for WBL terms; creating ways to discuss practices and share resources across states, possibly through a discussion board; designing a flow chart to help staff decide which WBL experiences lead to credit; and identifying obstacles to data collection sharing, including those unique to locally controlled states.

4) Sharing Promising CTE Data Practices Within and Between States

Bobby Sanborn shared discussion points raised within his group, including collecting promising practices using one-page templates; designing strategies for reviewing and vetting promising practices to ensure they are of high quality; creating a dissemination hub to house materials related to promising practices; and developing a method of capturing states' feedback on the value of selected resources.

When the floor was opened for questions, Jay Savage noted that some promising practices in states are a direct result of their own laws and contexts and will not necessarily be applicable across states and contexts. He encouraged states to contact their Regional Accountability Specialist for help making connections to similar states. Bobby responded that states can share some practices widely, but in some cases modifications would be needed.

Closing Remarks | Allison Hill and Jay Savage

Allison Hill and Jay Savage shared that being able to learn and get feedback about these state-identified challenges was very valuable to OCTAE. The information provided was believed to be helpful in setting the tone for the new legislation and entering administration. States are able to share findings and best practices with one another and how OCTAE can best provide support. Steve Klein thanked everyone for joining and asked participants to send any questions or requests to get involved in any of these working groups directly to him at sklein@rti.org.

The next call is scheduled for 2:00 to 3:00 pm EST on February 9, 2017.

NEXT CALL:

February 9, 2017