NSWG Call Summary

NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP

April 7, 2011

2010–11 NSWG Planning Team

Secondary
Marv Johnson
Utah State Office of Education
marv.johnson@schools.utah.gov
801-538-7843

Postsecondary
John Townsend
Tennessee Board of Regents
john.townsend@tbr.edu
615-366-4428

Tech Prep
Dennis Fiscus
Arizona Department of Education
dennis.fiscus@azed.gov
602-542-5356

CAR-ED*Facts* Sub-Group Facilitator
Sharon Enright
Ohio Department of Education
sharon.enright@ode.state.oh.us
614-644-6814

OVAE Contact
Jay Savage
Office of Vocational & Adult Education
jay.savage@ed.gov
202-245-6612

NSWG Call Host
Dennis Fiscus
Arizona Department of Education
dennis.fiscus@azed.gov
602-542-5356

The April 7 meeting convened at 2:00 PM EST with a welcome from the host and an overview of the agenda.

DQI Update | Jim Schoelkopf

The live event portion of the virtual DQI will be held June 7–8. June 7 will feature a series of panel webcasts focusing on SLDS implementation, SLDS collaboration with CTE data, and using CTE data for program improvement. Lyndsay Pinkus, Director of National and Federal Policy Initiatives with the Data Quality Campaign (DQC), will join Tate Gould, SLDS Grant Program Officer with the U.S. Department of Education, to offer national perspectives on SLDS. Other webcast panels will focus on links with SLDS, ensuring data access and analysis, and capacity building for the use of data in making CTE program improvement decisions. Each topic will have a panel presentation with opportunities for audience participation.

The DQC has announced an April 28 webinar on the Department of Education's proposed FERPA requirements, which are currently open for comment. The DQC's national webcast, "Maximizing the Power of Education Data While Protecting the Privacy, Security, and Confidentiality of Student Information" will be recorded, archived, and available for viewing following the April 28 event.

The DQC will also offer a webinar on April 14 on the "Initial Analysis of Proposed FERPA Regulations" provided by Steve Winnick, EducationCounsel LLC. The webinar will offer an initial analysis of the proposed regulations, including the extent to which they provide clarity to states on both using data for continuous improvement and protecting the privacy, security, and confidentiality of student-level data.

OVAE Updates | OVAE Staff

John Haigh thanked the states that have developed modules for the DQI. Given the focus of the DQI, he recommended referencing the DQC website to determine state SLDS contacts. http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/

A Department of Education document, "Safeguarding Student Privacy," has also been added to the briefcase for this month's call.

Tech Prep | Dennis Fiscus

Dennis' discussion focused on Perkins IV performance measures, the evaluation requirements for the Rigorous Programs of Study (RPOS) Grant Project, and the similarities to Tech Prep measurement indicators. Dennis presented this information in the context of how states can begin preparing for potential measuring indicators in the next Perkins reauthorization. The April NSWG briefcase includes several documents related to Tech Prep and RPOS: the Tech Prep Indicators of Performance Definitions, the POS Framework describing the 10 framework elements, and the RPOS grant evaluation requirements.

There are two Tech Prep indicators that are unlikely to be included, based on Dennis' speculation, in a future reauthorization: 1STP3[1] and1STP4.[2]

John Haigh and Scott Hess provided additional information from OVAE. A difference between Tech Prep Section 203 and Basic Grant Section 113 is the Section 113 requirement for measuring technical skill attainment. As required in Section

---

[1] 1STP3 = Number of secondary Tech Prep students who complete a State or industry-recognized certification or licensure.
[2] 1STP4 = Number of secondary Tech Prep students who successfully complete, as a secondary school student, courses that award postsecondary credit at the secondary level.

113, secondary students are measured in the attainment of technical skills and whether these technical skills are aligned with industry-recognized standards (i.e., assessments). Technical skill assessment is also one of the 10 POS framework elements released by OVAE. Secondary students can receive postsecondary credit during high school through a POS but there is no performance indicator in Section 113 for measuring the earning of postsecondary credit while a secondary student.

Referring to the Tech Prep Indicator Data, 33 states reported Tech Prep data in 2008–09. Approximately 30 percent of students enrolled in postsecondary education, increasing to 45.5 percent in 2009–10. In 2008–09, 60 percent entered employment related to their field of study after graduation (as reported by 23 states). Secondary enrollment figures dropped from 1.2 million in 2008–09 to 800,000 in 2009–10. Secondary enrollment dropped generally for a number of reasons, including poor student planning and improved data collection. The Tech Prep enrollment drop was the largest because of states consolidating Tech Prep with their state's Basic Perkins Grant.

Student performance indicator definitions will need to be more consistent in the future for the reporting of comparable data. There is discussion around the desire to work with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). This possible collaboration might help in collecting data on 1STP1[3] and 1STP2,[4] especially for students who transfer out of state.

Representatives from OVAE said consistency across states is a priority for the Obama administration. There is a desire to have more consistency around indicators. The goal is for SLDS and Eden/EDFacts to align so that states do not have to duplicate reporting on RPOS students and CTE generally.

[3]1STP1 = Number of secondary Tech Prep students who enroll in postsecondary education.
[4]1STP2 = Number of secondary Tech Prep students who enroll in postsecondary education in the same field or major as the secondaryeducation tech prep students were enrolled at the secondary level.

Dennis F. (Arizona), Gabriela Borcoman (Texas), and Sharon Enright (Ohio) spoke about approaches to Tech Prep accountability in their states. Arizona has had success with the secondary measures and addressing FERPA issues with the use of a secure website. The state department of education collects secondary data, designating students as Tech Prep or non-Tech Prep. There is no state identifier, but they use student information in a secure manner. They are able to track about 80 percent of students from secondary to postsecondary. For 1STP1, they have to wait until students are enrolled for a full year. The Perkins grants for community colleges require reporting all data on articulation and Perkins. Dennis also shared that Arizona has defined postsecondary remedial math as college math courses below the 100-level.

In Texas, state postsecondary data staff work with the appropriate agencies to collect secondary, postsecondary, and unemployment insurance wage records. Secondary social security numbers are matched to postsecondary records. Tech Prep students are identified based on course coding. The course code follows students from secondary to postsecondary. There are some obstacles with the technicalities of coding due to staff turnover. Postsecondary institutions verify the paperwork from secondary schools. There has been discussion about adding Tech Prep information to high school transcripts.

Ohio has been working to implement a Tech Prep accountability system for the past three years. They are committed to collecting the necessary data in two existing, separate state longitudinal data systems (SLDSs). One challenge has been identifying higher education students enrolled in Tech Prep programs. This data is currently entered manually into the higher education SLDS, but they are working on a data integration project. In the next two to three years, Ohio will be able to follow students into postsecondary education via the linked systems. Ohio currently does not have identifying student information in the P-12 SLDS so is

unable, at the state level, to use the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

Dennis mentioned that another challenge with the NSC is that some postsecondary institutions do not participate and share their institutional information, which makes NSC records matching with that institution impossible.

He said a number of states are working on the integration of the secondary and postsecondary data systems. It is important for CTE staff to participate in SLDS discussions so Tech Prep and CTE accountability issues are considered.

May 5 Call Topic Preparation: Negotiating Local Perkins Performance and Implementing Local Improvement Plans | Marv Johnson, UT

There is a requirement in Perkins IV, section 123b, that states negotiate targets with local programs. If programs do not make substantial progress, there is an expectation that states provide technical assistance, require formal improvement plans, and possibly withhold funding if a program does not meet targets for three consecutive years. Perkins IV implementation is at the stage where states may need to intervene with local grantees who are not meeting their negotiated performance targets.

Marv proposed a discussion around targets, technical assistance for insufficient progress, and whether states anticipate withholding funds. Ohio, Iowa, and Arizona will share information or resources. If other states are interested in sharing information on this topic during the May call, please e-mail Jim or Marv.

The May call will also include an "open space" discussion around "gainful employment" and post-secondary accountability.

Meeting Wrap-up

The next call is scheduled for May 5 at 2 PM EST.

NEXT CALL:

May 5, 2011

2:00–3:00 PM EST

Call Number:

888-751-0624

Access Code: 442772