

## OCTAE-DATE Liaisons

### Allison Hill

[allison.hill@ed.gov](mailto:allison.hill@ed.gov)

### John Haigh

[john.haigh@ed.gov](mailto:john.haigh@ed.gov)

## Host

### Steve Klein

[sklein@rti.org](mailto:sklein@rti.org)

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) call was held on September 8, from 2:00 to 3:00 PM EDT.

## OCTAE Updates | DATE staff

Allison Hill, liaison for the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) – Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE) introduced DATE staff, who shared the following announcements:

### 1) Consolidated Annual Report (CAR) Database Updates

Sharon Head thanked everyone who helped with beta testing the CAR database. She reported that, due to state input, DATE identified several items that needed to be addressed. She also announced that training sessions for the CAR database will be held on September 27 and 29. More information can be found on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) website: <http://cte.ed.gov/calendar/upcoming-events>.

### 2) Data Quality Institute (DQI)

Jay Savage announced that the annual DQI is scheduled for October 27–28, 2016, and will be held at the Conference Center at the Maritime Institute in Linthicum Heights, Maryland (near Baltimore). Registration is now open on the PCRN website ([http://cte.ed.gov/dqi\\_register](http://cte.ed.gov/dqi_register)), and the agenda will be posted soon.

### 3) Thank you to the NSWG Planning Team

Allison thanked the volunteer members of the NSWG Planning Team at the secondary level (Katie Graham - Nebraska; Bobby Sanborn - Tennessee; Luke Rhine - Delaware) and at the postsecondary level (Bob Witchger - North Carolina; Mike Tinsley - Tennessee).

## 2016–17 Call Topics | Steve Klein

Steve Klein reviewed topics that will be covered during this year's NSWG calls. The November call will feature popular topics from the DQI and promising state practices and policies for collecting placement data from postsecondary students transferring within or between states. The February call will feature strategies for collecting and using data on special population students and assessing students' career readiness. May's call will focus on career pathways and innovative state practices for collecting data. Topics may be adjusted, as necessary. The agenda is available on the PCRN website: <http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/next-steps-work-group>.

## Reauthorization Status | Sharon Miller

Sharon began by giving background on the reauthorization of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)*, as contained in House Resolution (H.R.) 5587, which passed out of the House committees earlier this year. Highlights include the following:

1. Greater state autonomy over career and technical education programs (CTE), and new limitations on the Secretary's authority.
2. Increased state flexibility on the use of federal funds.
3. Improved alignment between performance standards contained in the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* and the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)*.
4. Emphasis on tailoring CTE programs to the economic needs of local communities and expanding access for underserved populations.
5. A new competitive grant program to fund innovative strategies for improving CTE.
6. An authorization level of \$1.1 billion in FY 2017, which is comparable to current funding levels, with marginal increases over time.

7. New definitions of CTE concentrator, participant, work-based (WBL) learning, and programs of study, and recognition of postsecondary credentials.
8. Definitional alignment with accountability and program design provisions contained within *WIOA* and *ESSA*.
9. Updated definition of “special populations” to include homeless individuals and those who have aged out of foster care, as well as youth with a parent actively serving in the armed forces.
10. Continued options for states to submit a combined or single state plan.
11. A reduction in the time period covered by state plans from six to four years, and expansion of the stakeholder groups that states must consult when developing their plans.
12. Continuation of existing formulas used to allocate resources to secondary and postsecondary CTE providers.
13. Provisions for states to use reserve funds for state leadership activities, such as to award incentive grants to recipients based on the meeting performance indicators.
14. Required and optional indicators of performance to be documented and publicly reported.
15. Permission for states to set their own performance targets so long as they are “sufficiently ambitious to allow for meaningful evaluation of program quality.”

### **Accountability: Populations and Indicators | John Haigh and Lekesha Campbell (Division of Adult Education and Literacy)**

The definitional change of a CTE concentrator at the secondary level poses interesting challenges to how data will be collected for accountability purposes. The new concentrator label applies to a student who has completed three or more CTE courses (a.k.a., explorer) in any program or program of study or at least two courses in a single CTE program or program of study (a.k.a., investor).

John Haigh reviewed the new accountability indicators to be used by eligible providers to assess student and program outcomes. At the secondary level, these indicators are graduation rate, academic attainment, employment or

postsecondary education placement, nontraditional participation, and program quality (measured through credential attainment, postsecondary credits earned, or WBL participation). At the postsecondary level, the new indicators include employment, median earnings, postsecondary credential completion, and nontraditional participation.

John then showed matrices outlining the changes to the secondary and postsecondary reporting and accountability indicators from the current *Perkins IV* legislation and how they relate to the Administration’s reauthorization blueprint, *ESSA*, and H.R. 5587. Lekesha Campbell supplied additional information on the relationship between these indicators and the *WIOA* legislation. The matrices can be accessed at <http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/next-steps-work-group>.

### **Potential Implications of Reauthorization | Steve Voytek (AdvanceCTE), Alisha Hyslop (Association for Career and Technical Education)**

Alisha Hyslop provided an update on the current status of H.R. 5587, which is scheduled for a House vote the week of September 12. She also reviewed the definition of a CTE concentrator and its implications for identifying CTE measurement populations, data collection, and measurement.

Steve discussed the implications of the new concentrator definition at the secondary level for populations and indicators. He shared that the measurement populations would likely increase and that there will be a need to create new indicators for some measures and nontraditional programs. He also thought it possible that student performance levels may be diminished due to the two-tiered concentrator definition.

Alisha addressed implications of the changes made during reauthorization at the postsecondary level. While the concentrator definition may not change, it may be difficult to collect data on the updated measures and transition to the new quarterly reporting structure. There will also need

to be more options for identifying and counting nontraditional students.

## Questions & Answers

*Q: What is meant by WBL?*

A: WBL is a suggested measure of secondary program quality. It is defined in the bill as “sustained interactions with industry or community professionals in real workplace settings, to the extent practicable, or simulated environments at an educational institution that foster in-depth, first-hand engagement with the tasks required of a given career field, that are aligned to curriculum and instruction.”

*Q: What is meant by “type of cohort”?*

A: The only reference to “cohort” refers to the “4-year cohort graduation rate” at the secondary level, which was the standard reporting measure for graduation rates under the *No Child Left Behind Act* and is more explicitly defined under *ESSA*. It is calculated each year using a formula given to states.

*Q: How can wage records be used to identify unsubsidized employees?*

A: The term comes directly from *WIOA* and is meant to distinguish vocational rehabilitation programs and programs that provide subsidized employment through the federal program itself. Guidance on how to use records has not yet been released.

*Q: Are there any major differences between the upcoming Senate mark-up of Perkins and the version that is in the House?*

A: The Senate is working on its proposal but has not made any of the language public. It is very close to a final product. While it is difficult to predict what the key differences might be, it is likely that there will only be some superficial changes.

*Q: Will there be a discussion at this year’s DQI on how to measure the new indicators, or will it be too soon?*

A: Although there will be topics addressing measurement, the population issue won’t feature prominently if legislation is not passed by the time of the conference.

*Q: What is the proposed implementation time frame?*

A: In previous years, states had a transition period before they were required to collect and report data. Information on the implementation period has not yet been determined.

## Closing Remarks | Allison Hill

Allison ended the call thanking participants for joining and giving a short reminder to register for the DQI. The next call is scheduled for 2:00 to 3:00 pm EST on November 10, 2016.

## NEXT CALL:

November 10, 2016