NSWG Call Summary

NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP

OCTAE-DATE Liaisons

Allison Hill
allison.hill@ed.gov

John Haigh
john.haigh@ed.gov

Host

Rebecca Moyer
rmoyer@rti.org

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) call was held on October 25, 2018, from 2 to 3 pm ET.

Updates and Announcements | OCTAE-DATE Staff

Allison Hill from the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE), Division of Adult and Technical Education (DATE) shared the following announcement.

Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V) State Plan Guide

Sharon Miller sent an email with the State Plan Guide for *Perkins V* to career and technical education (CTE) state leads. This guide will have a 60-day review period for states to provide feedback on its contents. After the commenting period ends, a revised version of the guide will likely be available in January 2019. Please contact the OCTAE-DATE team with any questions or concerns about this process (cte@ed.gov).

Introduction | Sharon Miller (OCTAE)

Now that the State Plan Guide has been published for review, two major activities related to *Perkins V* are happening right now.

1) Consolidated Annual Report (CAR) Guide: This guide will be available soon and will also have a 60-day review period for states to provide comments. The guide will include all requirements for the data states are required to collect under *Perkins V*.

2) ED*Facts* Submission System (ESS) Proposal: OCTAE is considering ways to streamline how CTE data is collected; in recent years, secondary-level data has been collected through the ESS, which

has helped the U.S. Department of Education (ED) immensely. OCTAE is proposing that postsecondary data also be collected through the ESS rather than the CAR portal, as in the past. This proposal will be released at the same time as the CAR Guide and have a separate 60-day review period. The ESS is run by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), spearheaded by Joe Murphy, Ross Santy, and Kelly Worthington.

In advance of the release of these documents, OCTAE asked for questions and comments from states on the call. OCTAE requested states' perspectives on the potential challenges and/or opportunities to reduce state data reporting burdens through this new system. OCTAE will use the feedback to provide the best possible customer service to states as everyone navigates the new *Perkins V* data and reporting requirements.

Timelines for *Perkins V* Data Collection Systems | Sharon Miller (OCTAE)

Sharon introduced the timelines for *Perkins V* data collection systems. The final dates will be released with the CAR Guide, and states are advised to refer to the CAR Guide for data reporting timelines for the end of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (*Perkins IV)*, the transition year, and the beginning of *Perkins V*.

The Academic Year 2018–19 *Perkins V* Performance Data Report | Sharon Miller and John Haigh (OCTAE), Joe Murphy and Kelly Worthington (NCES)

Sharon reviewed the *Perkins V* core indicators. Full descriptions of each indicator can be found in the PowerPoint presentation from the call:

https://s3.amazonaws.com/PCRN/docs/NSWG/October2018_NSWG_Slides.pdf.

The secondary-level indicators are as follows.

Secondary Indicator Name	Code
Four-Year Graduation Rate	1S1
Extended Graduation Rate (optional – to be included at state's discretion)	1S2
Academic Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts	2S1
Academic Proficiency in Mathematics	2S2
Academic Proficiency in Science	2S3
Postsecondary Placement	3S1
Nontraditional Program Enrollment	4S1
States to pick at least one:	
Program Quality – Attained Recognized Postsecondary Credential	5S1
Program Quality – Attained Postsecondary Credits	5S2
Program Quality – Participated in Work-based Learning	5S3
Program Quality – Other (must be statewide, valid, reliable, and comparable across the state)	5S4

The postsecondary-level indicators are as follows.

Postsecondary Indicator Name	Code
Postsecondary Retention and Placement	1P1
Earned Recognized Postsecondary Credential[1]	2P1
Nontraditional Program Enrollment	3P1

Sharon then asked John Haigh to review the forms for reporting disaggregated postsecondary indicator data in the ESS that will be included in the CAR Guide. John explained that these forms are very similar to what states are used to seeing, except for the headings at the top. States will populate data for "Number of Students in the Numerator," "Number of Students in the Denominator," and "State Determined Level of Performance." After these data are entered, the columns under "Actual Level of Performance," "State Determined vs. Actual Level of Performance," and "Met 90% of Adjusted Level of Performance" will be automatically generated by the ESS.

For gender, the categories are again "male" and "female," and the options under "Race/Ethnicity" reflect the 1997 revised standards. The special populations are the same except for three new categories: "homeless individuals," "individuals in foster care," and "students with parents on military active duty." These new special populations for *Perkins V* match the special populations of the *Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015.*

In the next section, the levels of education reflect the awards that students receive—certificate, associate degree, baccalaureate degree, advanced training, military service or national or community service or Peace Corps (new for *Perkins V*), and employment.

Also new for *Perkins V* is the reporting of data by career cluster, and OCTAE is looking for input from states on what it would be like to collect and report this data.

Julie Tyznik of Wisconsin asked how the state-determined level of performance would be reported by career cluster since these had previously been counts in *Perkins IV*. Sharon answered that it will remain as it has in the past—states will only report

---

[1] Note: A student gets counted under this indicator whether the student obtains the credential during participation or within 1 year of completion. The U.S. Department of Education interprets "within 1 year of completion" to have the plain meaning of those words: the student would be counted if

obtaining the credential in the 1 year following completion of the program.

on the state-determined level of performance value for "All Students," not by career cluster.

John asked Joe Murphy from NCES to comment on whether states have noted difficulties in reporting on the secondary indicators 1S1 (four-year graduation rate) and 1S2 (extended graduation rate). Joe responded that this has not been a problem because it has been a requirement through legislation for six to eight years. He noted that states asked for the extended graduation rate option so they could account for all student graduates, but not all states use it; about 25 states report a five-year graduation rate and another 20 report a six-year rate. For purposes of *Perkins V* reporting, states will report their four-year graduation rate and choose whether they want to report an extended graduation rate and what type (five-year, six-year, etc.).

Pat Thieben of Iowa wanted to know how or why states would collect data on postsecondary students in the foster care system when the majority are over 18 years old. Sharon answered that this indicator reflects language that is in the law. She suggested states read the *Perkins V* definition in the CAR Guide of who is included in the two-part definition, which is a student who is in or who has aged out of the foster care system. States will have to determine for themselves how these definitions will apply to them. Sharon suggests that states then provide a formal comment back to OCTAE. She later recommended a similar process for reviewing the definition for students with parents on active duty military service.

Another NSWG member asked for the definition of "postsecondary credential" and whether all third-party credentials will count the same. Sharon responded that there is a definition in the legislation of "recognized postsecondary credential," and this will be included in the CAR Guide, but states will have to identify what counts as an industry-recognized credential for their state. States will have the flexibility to define this for themselves in their four-year plan. John offered that the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act*

(WIOA) may also provide a helpful definition since there is now greater coordination between *WIOA* and *Perkins V*.

Ann Westrich of Wisconsin asked how career clusters data should be reported—whether states should report total enrollment or completion data. Sharon responded that states will report cluster-level data on CTE participants, meaning any student who takes one CTE course, and CTE concentrators, which are students who have taken 12 or more credits in CTE.

Another member asked about access to examples of data collection forms (similar to the postsecondary forms shown on the PowerPoint presentation from the call) for secondary-level indicator data. Sharon responded that examples will be available as a part of the CAR Guide that should be released soon.

John asked Joe to share key takeaways from past CAR training sessions and guidance for reporting postsecondary data through the ESS. Joe shared that the most important takeaway is the need for communication between parties submitting data into the system. States should let the ED*Facts* coordinators know about their deadlines, and ED*Facts* coordinators will share theirs. Second, ED*Facts* coordinators should be aware of and understand the data that will be submitted. The most effective states are those in which someone who can not only input the data but also understand them at a larger level works with the ED*Facts* coordinator. Joe stressed that the relationships between state data providers and the ED*Facts* coordinators are essential.

John asked states whether they anticipate any pushback from their postsecondary data departments regarding submitting data into the ESS rather than the CAR. Sharon added that she is interested in hearing from states about how they think this will work in their states.

Connie Beene from Kansas asked if the postsecondary departments would have access to the ESS of if they would need to submit their data to secondary departments with access to the ESS.

Joe responded that states can establish their own process for submitting data to the ED*Facts* coordinator, but the ED*Facts* team within each state are the ones who have access to the ESS. The ED*Facts* coordinators have people on their team who submit data and can provide guidance and prepare data for submission. If states are unaware of who their ED*Facts* coordinator is, they can contact the ED*Facts* Partner Support Center by calling 877-457-3336 or emailing EDEN-Submission-System@ed.gov. Postsecondary data departments do not necessarily have access to the ESS now, but that may change in the next few years should this process continue. John suggested some training at the state level might be beneficial to help people understand the process and requirements so data can be submitted in the best way possible. Connie responded that she collects and submits the postsecondary data through the CAR portal and thinks the process works well as is for Kansas. Joe said that the process for submitting data through the ESS would be similar in terms of formatting.

Wendy Morton of Utah asked if postsecondary data submission into the ESS would continue to be due in mid-December. Joe responded that the data submission deadline is technically December 31, but people were asked to submit their data earlier so the data could be populated into the CAR portal by 5pm on December 31. The ESS deadlines would be similar. Sharon Head of OCTAE added that the lead time needed for data submissions helps states to find and correct any errors in their CAR data before the December 31 deadline. It takes between 24 and 48 hours for submitted data to be populated into the CAR, so anyone turning their data in on December 31 would technically not meet the December 31 deadline. Data submitted by mid-December allows them to be checked and revised as needed prior to the deadline.

Kelly Worthington of NCES shared that the ED*Facts* package will be released for public comment in November with the new data represented in it. States can provide formal comments relating to what they would need for CAR data submission, including preferred data file submission dates. John added that states can go in to the ESS system and look at *Perkins V* indicators and test out the system between now and 2021.

A member asked what the benefit would be to submit postsecondary data through the ESS rather than the Web portal and if there was a problem this was solving. Sharon responded that the goal is to minimize burden on states by having them submit all their data (secondary and postsecondary) in one place. It will also reduce burden for ED by reducing the number of systems that collect similar data. Additionally, ED believes that having one person from each state submit data will help to increase the data quality, validity, and reliability.

Julie Tyznik of Wisconsin commented that postsecondary data collection through the ESS would not reduce burden on the states because sending data to the ED*Facts* coordinator for input and uploading adds an extra step and increases the potential for human error. Melvin D'Souza of Delaware agreed with this concern. Joe responded that this comment sounded like a workflow issue and ED hopes to get to a point where they can address these issues across states and provide guidance. ED wants to get the information it needs while also keeping the burden on states as low as possible.

Melvin asked if states could still have the option to have one person submit postsecondary-level data though the CAR portal. Sharon said that ED will consider that option and is taking notes. She encouraged states to submit formal comments on the CAR Guide as well.

Shinlan Liu of New Jersey commented that she is the person responsible for collecting and analyzing secondary and postsecondary data for her state and has had issues with formatting secondary data for submission through the ESS. Sometimes multiple versions are required to fix formatting errors, and she finds this process more burdensome than the process to submit postsecondary data through the CAR portal. She would like to retain the option to submit data using

the CAR portal. Joe responded that New Jersey has a great ED*Facts* department and suggested she get in touch with them regarding validation and formatting errors.

Jill Kroll of Michigan asked if ED intends to include secondary enrollment data in the ESS or through the CAR portal, as it is done now. Sharon responded that all data—both enrollment and performance data—would be submitted through the ESS. The narrative and the budget would continue to be submitted through the CAR portal. Jill added that submitting data through the ESS is double the work because all data must be calculated prior to putting them in the ED*Facts* file format to check against the state-calculated values. She suggested updating the ED*Facts* file format to one that is more common.

Randy Dean of Georgia commented that Georgia's Department of Education is against the idea of submitting postsecondary data through the ESS as it is less efficient. The state prefers to continue submitting through the CAR portal.

Maria Swygert of South Carolina asked OCTAE to clarify when postsecondary data would need to be submitted through the ESS. Sharon responded that the first year in which information would be submitted through the ESS would be in 2020.

Christy Hendricks and DJ QuirinMai of Montana shared that their state has separate agencies for secondary and postsecondary data. DJ is concerned that she would be responsible for the data provided to her by the postsecondary team and would not be comfortable with this. Joe responded that Montana should provide a formal comment to this effect on the ED*Facts* guide when it is available for comment in November.

Monieca West of Arkansas thought it would be more efficient to upload all the data (narrative, budget, enrollment, and performance data) in one place, rather than across two separate systems. Representatives from Idaho, South Carolina, and Georgia agreed.

Patrick Bell of Nevada shared that the state frequently has to correct errors when submitting

secondary-level data through the ESS and prefers submitting postsecondary data through the CAR portal, where it has more control.

Sharon and Joe reiterated that states can provide formal comments on the CAR and ED*Facts* guides and that ED is required to provide a rationale in response to all comments.

Sharon concluded the discussion by thanking the ED*Facts* team at NCES for its collaboration and partnership with OCTAE in this process. She also thanked call attendees for their input and assured states that OCTAE is listening. OCTAE will make sure everyone has links to the Federal Register notices for the CAR and ED*Facts* guides so they can provide formal comment.

Closing Remarks | Allison Hill (OCTAE) and Rebecca Moyer (RTI International)

To conclude the call, Allison thanked the presenters from OCTAE and NCES for their time and reminded everyone to provide formal comments on the *Perkins V*, CAR, and ED*Facts* guidance documents.

Allison turned the call back to Rebecca Moyer who noted that any questions or concerns shared via the chat would be sent to OCTAE for answers.

The next NSWG call date is to be decided.

NEXT CALL:
TBD