

# NSWG Call Summary

NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP

Office of Vocational and Adult Education  
Division of Academic and Technical Education  
Accountability and Performance Branch  
Perkins Collaborative Resource  
Network (PCRN) | <http://cte.ed.gov>

May 5, 2011

## 2010–11 NSWG Planning Team

### Secondary

#### Marv Johnson

Utah State Office of Education  
[marv.johnson@schools.utah.gov](mailto:marv.johnson@schools.utah.gov)  
801-538-7843

### Postsecondary

#### John Townsend

Tennessee Board of Regents  
[john.townsend@tbr.edu](mailto:john.townsend@tbr.edu)  
615-366-4428

### Tech Prep

#### Dennis Fiscus

Arizona Department of  
Education  
[dennis.fiscus@azed.gov](mailto:dennis.fiscus@azed.gov)  
602-542-5356

### CAR-EDFacts Sub-Group

#### Facilitator

#### Sharon Enright

Ohio Department of Education  
[sharon.enright@ode.state.oh.us](mailto:sharon.enright@ode.state.oh.us)  
614-644-6814

### OVAE Contact

#### Jay Savage

Office of Vocational & Adult  
Education  
[jay.savage@ed.gov](mailto:jay.savage@ed.gov)  
202-245-6612

### NSWG Call Host

#### Dennis Fiscus

Arizona Department of  
Education  
[dennis.fiscus@azed.gov](mailto:dennis.fiscus@azed.gov)  
602-542-5356

The May 5 meeting convened at 2:00 PM ET with a welcome from the host and an overview of the agenda.

## OVAE Updates | OVAE Staff

State FAUPL negotiations on state Perkins performance levels are concluding.

NSWG members should mark their calendars for the virtual DQI on June 7–8, which will consist of real-time webcast and webinar sessions. See [http://cte.ed.gov/Docs/dqi/2011\\_V-DQI\\_at\\_a\\_Glance\\_Final.pdf](http://cte.ed.gov/Docs/dqi/2011_V-DQI_at_a_Glance_Final.pdf) for an overview of the DQI.

John Haigh will be presenting at the upcoming NACTEI conference in Philadelphia, May 10–12.

OVAE recently completed a monitoring visit in Arizona and has an upcoming visit in Wisconsin, May 16–20.

As soon as OVAE determines FY12 Perkins state budget allocations they will notify state directors and post this information on PCRN.

## Negotiating local Perkins performance and implementing local improvement plans | Marv Johnson-UT (facilitator), Dwight Anstaett-OH, Helen Bootsma-AZ, Fidelis Ubadigbo-IA

Marv Johnson began the discussion with an overview of Perkins IV Section 123(b), which requires states to negotiate local targets and evaluate local performance in relation to core indicators. Local programs not meeting 90 percent of targets must develop a local improvement plan, and states must provide technical assistance to local programs not making progress. States can also take further action, such as directing the local use of Perkins funds and withholding Perkins funding, if local

programs: (1) do not implement an improvement plan, (2) fail to make improvements on any performance measure meeting less than the 90 percent level, or (3) do not meet 90 percent of targets for three consecutive years.

Representatives from three states, Ohio, Arizona, and Iowa, presented on their approaches to the implementation of the local improvement provisions in Section 123(b) of the Perkins Act.

Dwight Anstaett reported that the secondary and postsecondary processes are fundamentally similar in Ohio. He oversees a group of consultants providing technical assistance to CTE leadership at the secondary level. An important component of Ohio's ramped-up technical assistance has been informing local programs about data reporting periods and correcting reporting errors before the period closes. Many districts are not meeting 90 percent of their targets due to reporting problems related to inaccurate data.

In Ohio, a major goal is to have all sub-recipients meet the state-negotiated target levels. Sharon Enright assisted with the development of a system that considers local performance levels compared to the state targets. It includes a formula that determines the negotiated level of performance given those factors. The formula generates a target that sub-recipients usually accept. The website for details on Ohio's Perkins accountability system is: <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEPrimary.aspx?Page=2&TopicID=1751&TopicRelationID=1747>.

Referring to Ohio's Secondary Performance Improvement Policy, included with this month's call materials, Dwight said that Ohio follows Section 123(b) fairly literally. The state notifies local programs if they have not met 90 percent. They are expected to meet with stakeholders to develop a

performance improvement plan outlining specific activities to target the performance indicator(s) not met. The plans must consider disaggregated data.

There are three levels of potential sanctions. Level A Sanctions allow the state to withhold funding until the recipient completes an acceptable performance improvement plan. Under Level B Sanctions, the Department of Education may direct that all or a portion of Perkins funds be used for targeted activities designed to improve the indicators not being met. Finally, under Level C Sanctions, the Department may require that a portion or all of Perkins funding be used for directed activities design to improve the particular performance indicator(s) not being met. Ohio is hopeful it will not have to implement Level C Sanctions.

The performance improvement plan form has worked well. Ohio requires separate improvement plans for each indicator where the target is not met.

Helen Bootsma presented on Arizona's approach; many of the processes she described mirror those in Ohio. Programs may submit applications for local adjustments to state-negotiated performance targets, which are reviewed by a committee of practitioners. Thus far, all such local requests have been denied, and all districts in Arizona are using state-level performance targets.

Arizona holds a technical assistance session in the fall for districts with core indicator performance levels under 90 percent attainment. The state assists programs with examining disaggregated data and developing local improvement plans. They then conduct a mid-January follow-up meeting to discuss progress and make improvement plan adjustments. Arizona found it was able to reduce by half the number of districts under improvement plans by working closely with them on target areas. This year, they anticipate there will be some districts that have not met 90 percent of their targets for three consecutive years. These districts will receive notice that also includes information on an appeals process. Those districts that have reduced

their gap will have strong evidence at the appeal hearing.

Fidelis Ubadigbo presented on Iowa's approach. There is a performance-level team that reviews data. There are also 15 regional consultants who support the Iowa Department of Education's (IDE) Perkins accountability efforts. Once the CAR is submitted to OVAE, the fiscal team disaggregates data by secondary consortium and postsecondary institution. Each secondary CTE consortium or district receives the disaggregated data for each performance level. Iowa works with districts that did not meet 90 percent of performance targets to submit an action plan. Regional consultants review the plans, along with budgets and performance levels. The action plans go to the IDE accountability team for consultation with the regional CTE consultants who negotiate directly with local districts or secondary CTE consortia. Iowa does not have provisions for withholding local Perkins funds. Iowa negotiates targets with local programs based on their baseline.

Jay Savage, OVAE, asked whether states set higher targets if districts exceed state targets. In Iowa, states may choose to go above the state-negotiated target.

Jay also asked if states look at special population data for local programs that do meet the local target. Iowa confirmed it does look at this data and Ohio encourages local programs to do so on an ongoing basis.

### Open Space: Postsecondary CTE and "gainful employment" | Gabriela Borcoman-TX

Gabriela Borcoman asked if the NSWG was interested in receiving additional information from OVAE on the gainful employment regulations, which apply to public postsecondary CTE programs as well as for-profit programs. The regulations, originally posted in July 2010, will go into effect July 1, 2011. There are a lot of reporting requirements that require similar datasets as Per-

kins reporting. Under the gainful employment provisions, a postsecondary instructional program should lead to an occupation with a specific SOC code. How will the gainful employment regulations affect postsecondary CTE? Gabriela voiced her concern that it could lead to the elimination of a postsecondary CTE program if placement from the program does not meet the gainful employment criteria.

The Department of Education recently released a "Dear Colleague" letter and attachment, which Jim Schoelkopf will include in this month's call briefcase.

Jay Savage said that OVAE has not promulgated any guidance for states. The near-term reporting will require significant data collection beyond most states' capacities. He encouraged CTE offices to coordinate with postsecondary institutions to ensure linked data collection.

Jim Schoelkopf suggested this topic be included again in the June call agenda to gauge whether the NSWG is interested in forming a subgroup to discuss further the CTE implications of the gainful employment regulations.

## Meeting Wrap-up

In closing, Jim Schoelkopf reminded the group they can submit comments on the proposed regulations for the FERPA update until May 23. Further information on the update is available on the Data Quality Campaign website. The DQC website includes links to April 14 and April 28 events that present detailed information on the proposed FERPA revisions:

<http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/>.

The next call is scheduled for June 2 at 2 PM ET.

### **NEXT CALL:**

**June 2, 2011**

**2:00–3:00 PM ET**

### **Call Number:**

**888-751-0624**

**Access Code: 442772**