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

Rebecca Moyer
rmoyer@rti.org

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) call was held on September 13, 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) facilitated the following announcements:

1) Consolidated Annual Report (CAR) Training Sessions

Sharon Head reminded everyone that CAR training sessions will be held on September 24 (10–11am ET) and September 26 (1–2pm ET). Attendance at both is not necessary because each training covers the same content. Sharon will send an email next week with another reminder. Further information and connection information for these trainings can be found on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) website. Please contact Sharon (Sharon.Head@ed.gov) with any questions.

What Do We Do Next?: Listening Session on Section 113 of the *Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act* | Sharon Miller and John Haigh (OCTAE)

John Haigh introduced the call's primary topic: issues related to Section 113 of the *Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act* (*Perkins V*) to help the NSWG community chart a course for new legislation.

2) How will states implement the new career and technical education (CTE) concentrator definition in their *Perkins* accountability systems? How long will it take to transition their data system to accommodate the new definition?

A representative from Montana asked about the criteria that should be used to determine the courses, such as course length (quarter versus semester) or the number of credits awarded. Sharon responded that course selection will be determined at the state level.

Sharon shared one of two interpretations she has heard regarding the new concentrator definition: a concentrator must have taken at least two courses in a single program area. She asked whether states' data systems have the capacity to report on such students. She also asked states reporting on a different number of courses to describe what a transition to reporting on two courses would involve and how long the process would take.

Arizona reports on program sequences (usually two courses) but its system allows for more courses to be added if a program is longer. New Jersey's shortest course sequence is three, but the state identifies students as concentrators when they complete the second course. In Montana students currently reach CTE concentrator status after three courses, which school districts report in the data system using a checkbox.

In New Mexico, concentrators are students who have completed three courses in a career cluster. The state anticipates that reporting on three courses in a program of study would cause its number of concentrators to drop substantially, but the drop for two courses would be smaller. A representative from New Mexico asked whether the *Perkins IV* and *Perkins V* counts will be compared. The District of Columbia also uses a

three-course threshold. It has rerun data using a two-course threshold and found that concentrator data points will change across all performance indicators.

Sharon asked whether states anticipate major changes to their data systems to accommodate the change to two courses. North Carolina currently uses a four-course sequence and expects that it would take about six months to update the data system and adjust calculations to collect data on students taking two courses.

Representatives from Iowa and Oklahoma asked if a ninth-grade student who takes two CTE courses during freshman year and no additional CTE courses would still be counted as a CTE concentrator in subsequent years. A representative from Iowa also suggested that using a cohort model for data collection might make collecting the new data easier. A representative from Pennsylvania shared that the student would be in its denominator in Pennsylvania state, leading to a higher denominator and a lower numerator for their performance indicators. Sharon noted the importance of this issue and the need for further discussion.

Another topic for further consideration and discussion is a representative from the District of Columbia's question about how students who are defined as concentrators in multiple clusters should be counted, since the lower course number threshold makes concentrators in multiple clusters more likely.

John asked the group to share their concerns regarding the definition of a postsecondary concentrator. A representative from Iowa reported no concerns due to the recent shift to collecting data by cohort, the similarity between the new definition and the state's prior definition, and the state's robust community college data collection system. California also does not anticipate problems with the new definition.

In New Mexico, some community colleges have four-year programs, which can make it difficult to determine whether a student is a concentrator, especially in education-related fields.

3) **To what extent can states already gather data on the two new special population categories: 1) youth who are in, or have aged out of, the foster care system and 2) youth with a parent who is on active military duty. If states do not already collect this data, what will be their approach to doing so?**

Arizona collects data on students in the foster care system, but not on students with parents in the military, and will need support to collect this data. Iowa collects data on military families but not on students who are in or who have aged out of the foster care system. North Carolina currently does not collect data for either of these special populations.

New Mexico has started discussing data on these special populations with its Department of Children, Youth, and Families and will need guidance on how to handle issues of student and family privacy.

John asked a representative from Iowa to share the approach to collecting data on military families. Iowa began collecting data about two years ago by asking, via the student records information system, the yes or no question: "Are any of the student's parents or guardians serving on active military duty or a national guard duty at the time of submission?" The District of Columbia has a similar question that is answered at the time of registration but does not update this information from year to year, which may be difficult to do.

New Jersey, Maryland, and Iowa collect information about military families and foster students under the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (*ESSA)* and representatives from these states suggested that other states connect with their accountability departments to see if these data are already being collected. John asked whether states know if a parent has left the military while the student is still in school. In all three of these states, the information is updated annually.

A representative from Ohio asked whether military or foster care data are collected on the Federal Application for Student Financial Aid (FASFA) form at the postsecondary level. A representative from

New Mexico has checked with its financial aid specialist and confirmed that these data are collected on the FASFA.

A representative from Montana shared that foster students are entitled to a variety of different services in the pre-K–12 system (free lunch, transportation, etc.) and that information about students in foster care is shared with service providers. Montana collects information on students in foster care, homeless students, and military connection in its student information system. The state representative asked if the special population "migrant" has been eliminated from the new legislation. Sharon answered that OCTAE will look into the status of the "migrant" subpopulation for the secondary and postsecondary levels for further discussion.

Sharon clarified that each of the core performance indicators under paragraph 2 of the law must be disaggregated by the subgroups of students in military-connected families and foster care. In response to a question from a representative from Wisconsin, Sharon also clarified that secondary-level data are for youth who are still in the foster care system, and at the postsecondary level, the data would be for students who have aged out. The military status indicator looks at students who have parents who are active-duty members of the military at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

4) **To what extent do states collect data on any of the program quality indicators? If states do not already collect this data, what might be their approaches for doing so?**

John shared the list of eligible program quality indicators: postsecondary credential, postsecondary credits (including dual/concurrent enrollment), work-based learning, and an "optional other measure." He then asked states to weigh in on the indicators they plan to use, whether they plan to use multiple indicators, and whether the data needed for these indicators are already collected. If the data are already collected, John

asked states to describe their data collection process.

Iowa will use the postsecondary credit indicator because it already has robust longitudinal data for this indicator. This indicator is less feasible for Arizona because of struggles to get secondary school teachers certified to teach at the community college level; thus, they will likely use a different indicator.

Maryland plans to use both the attainment of a postsecondary credential and postsecondary credits as program quality indicators. The District of Columbia also plans to use two: work-based learning and postsecondary credits attained through dual enrollment.

Colorado does not currently collect data for these indicators and will need to figure out how to match data sources as well as data collection processes. In New Jersey, students in dual enrollment courses typically pay to earn postsecondary credits. The state is unsure whether the indicator can remain as "have the potential to earn" postsecondary credit or whether the indicator needs to be based on credits earned.

Arizona will probably use an "other" indicator— a technical skills assessment it developed. Montana will use the percentage of CTE students graduating from high school that participated in work-based learning. Iowa also has the capacity to use work-based learning as a postsecondary readiness indicator but would need time to prepare the data for reporting because data collection for this indicator began recently.

New Jersey has been collecting work-based learning indicator data but noted that schools have not been clear on what needs to be counted and is unsure of the data's usability.

North Carolina already collects data on the attainment of industry-recognized credentials and will continue to use this data in reporting.

The District of Columbia would be interested in a call outlining options for "other" indicators to gain a cross-country perspective.

5) How might states use the optional program quality indicator in their *Perkins V* accountability systems?

New Jersey has just started collecting data on industry-recognized credentials and a representative from the state asked about the correct way to account for concentrators who earn more than one industry-recognized credential. Sharon explained that all indicators should still be measured by percentage of concentrators; if a concentrator earns multiple industry-recognized credentials, they should just be counted once so that the indicator measures the proportion of students who have earned at least one industry-recognized credential.

6) How will states gather baseline data to establish their state-determined performance levels?

A representative from the District of Columbia asked about the effect of *Perkins V* on current improvement plans and whether states will have the opportunity to adjust their performance levels. Sharon responded that the levels, definitions, and indicators are different enough under *Perkins V* that all states will have a "restart" that will allow them to establish a new baseline and set new levels with no restrictions.

A representative from Maryland brought up that it had heard baselines could be reset, but not below current levels. Sharon explained that states have the freedom to set their performance baselines without restrictions but that there is a restriction for baseline measurements for "maintenance of effort," which cannot be less than previous baselines. She also noted that OCTAE is open to discussing this issue if someone finds something different in the law.

Sharon observed that there are similarities between some of the *Perkins IV* measures and new *Perkins V* measures and asked whether states had calculated new baselines for state-determined performance levels and, if so, whether states anticipate any difficulties in determining baselines for some measures. Maryland is concerned about academic attainment since the

state is implementing a new statewide assessment in 2019–20 that has not been identified yet. Similar concerns were expressed by representatives from Iowa and New Jersey. Arizona also anticipates that setting a baseline for this measure may be challenging because districts choose from among 10 different assessments, which makes it hard to standardize across the state.

Montana has experienced challenges in meeting performance levels for its 1S1 and 1S2 indicators since switching from the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium assessment to the ACT for statewide assessment, despite having lowered its performance indicator levels.

Sharon noted that most of the issues shared concerned *ESSA* rather than *Perkins* measures.

7) What are states thoughts about how they will submit data disaggregated by programs, programs of study, or career clusters? Do states already gather this data? How long will it take to transition their data systems to accommodate this collection?

A representative from the District of Columbia noted that small cell sizes when disaggregating data at the program level might hinder the ability to report these data and asked whether it would be possible to submit data disaggregated at the career cluster level. Sharon responded that reporting at the cluster level is only permitted if reporting by program or program of study is not feasible.

Iowa has reported data by program but not by program of study in the past. A representative from New Jersey observed that the large number of programs makes reporting at that level a large undertaking and, as a result prefers reporting by clusters.

Representatives from Colorado, New Mexico, and Wisconsin shared that they report data disaggregated by cluster, and Pennsylvania, by program and program of study based on Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes. Sharon asked the representative from Pennsylvania whether the CIP codes could be

aggregated at the career cluster level. The representative from Pennsylvania responded that the state has developed crosswalks for these programs and career clusters.

Colorado cannot currently report data by program of study.

Sharon noted that states' responses suggest that reporting data disaggregated by career cluster would be more manageable than disaggregating by program or program of study.

A representative from Iowa asked about the timeline for accountability reporting. Sharon responded that they hope to give as much flexibility as possible during the transition year. She said that OCTAE will be able to provide more detailed timelines, in the next few weeks, that outline expectations.

8) How should we use our time together at the February 2019 *Perkins* Data Quality Institute (DQI)? What items should be on the agenda?

Following are topics that were shared by NSWG members as topics of interest for the upcoming DQI:

- Setting state baselines and collecting and running baseline data
- Definition of "concentrator" across states— what is being included or excluded and why?
- How Peace Corps data will be collected in the placement data for postsecondary
- Where to find disaggregated data for the new subgroups
- Types of systems states use for data collection
- How states are collecting work-based learning data
- Collecting data on students who are homeless or in foster care

The 2019 DQI will be held February 12–13, 2019, in Washington, DC, at the Department of Education's Lyndon Baines Johnson building.

Closing Remarks | Rebecca Moyer

To conclude the call, Rebecca Moyer asked OCTAE for additional updates. Allison thanked everyone for joining the NSWG call and asked

people to send any additional questions, concerns, or ideas for DQI presentation session topics to Rebecca (rmoyer@rti.org), Allison (Allison.hill@ed.gov), or the CTE Portal (cte@ed.gov).

Allison also thanked the 2018–19 NSWG planning team for its help brainstorming discussion topics: Charisse Childers (Arkansas), Paula Nissen (Iowa), Vera Brown (Kansas), Valerie Felder (Michigan), Rick Schmidt (New Mexico), Paula Marschner (North Dakota), Kevin Springman (Pennsylvania), and Maria Swygert (South Carolina).

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

The next NSWG call date is TBD.

NEXT CALL: TBD