

# 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](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 14, from 2:00 to 3:00 pm EDT.

### OCTAE Updates | DATE Staff

Dr. Sharon Miller, director of the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE), Division of Adult and Technical Education (DATE) shared the following announcements:

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

The CAR reporting window will open on October 23, slightly later than previous years due to a paperwork reduction act requirement to reduce state reporting burden. Because of this, states will not be required to report on the following areas: 1) within the narrative report, the area for technical assistance, 2) information in local programs that were not meeting performance levels, and 3) correctional institutions.

The CAR training will proceed as scheduled on September 25 and 27. More information on these trainings can be found on the Perkins Collaborative Resource Network (PCRN) (<http://cte.ed.gov>). Online tutorials are also available on the PCRN and states should reach out to their Regional Accountability Specialists (RASs) with questions.

The annual notification about the CAR is scheduled to be sent out on September 15 to ensure dissemination of all the necessary information and to make sure states have their personal identification numbers.

The CAR reporting window, once activated, will remain open until December 31.

Any remaining questions about the CAR process should be directed toward the PCRN or Sharon Head ([sharon.head@ed.gov](mailto:sharon.head@ed.gov)).

### Your Input Needed: Agenda for the November Data Quality Institute (DQI) | Olivia Rice (RTI International)

Steve Klein introduced Olivia Rice, Research Education Analyst at RTI International, who is coordinating the planning for this year's DQI. Olivia provided an overview of the event and solicited feedback on DQI presentations and topics.

#### 2017 Data Quality Institute

The 2017 DQI will be held November 16–17 at the Maritime Institute in Linthicum, Maryland, the same location as previous years. This year's theme will be "cross-state collaboration to improve career and technical education performance accountability." With reauthorization of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)* on the horizon, but without a fixed launch date, the DQI has been planned to address both possible reauthorization issues and standard accountability topics. There will be time to network, converse, and engage with colleagues from other states. The gathering will be organized around three strands: 1) data regulation and policy, 2) data collection and analytics, and 3) data-driven change. Registration is now open at <http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/data-quality-institute>.

#### Agenda

Olivia reviewed the draft agenda posted on the PCRN (<http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/data-quality-institute>). This year's DQI will feature sessions similar in format to popular sessions from past years, including Speed Dating, collaboration roundtables, and strand-focused breakout sessions.

Olivia posed three questions to NSWG participants:

1. Are there specific topics/challenges/innovations you would like to see covered during these sessions?
2. Is there a topic that is not generally represented by a session?
3. Do you have local representatives that may be willing to discuss the data collection and analysis from the local-level perspective?

Call participants responded with the following questions and/or comments:

**Q:** In the future, could the DQI be moved outside the CAR submission period?

**A:** *That is great feedback, and we will take this into consideration in next year's planning.*

**Q:** While there isn't legislation yet, there is a proposal indicating that some new indicators may be up to states to decide, such as work-based learning. Will there be an opportunity for states to discuss what they are considering?

**A:** *We do have a work-based learning session planned at the DQI, but this session could be modified to include consideration of other potential indicators.*

**Q:** Will there be any support or sessions around how to give detailed and appropriate feedback to districts while making sure that we are still complying with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines?

**A:** *Great reminder! Dale King will be presenting on privacy and FERPA laws, and we will be collecting specific FERPA questions, topics, or challenges from registrants to help Dale plan his session content.*

For any further questions related to the DQI, please contact Olivia at [onix@rti.org](mailto:onix@rti.org) or visit the DQI webpage on the PCRN:

<http://cte.ed.gov/accountability/data-quality-institute>.

## Reauthorization Preparation: State Plan Development Strategies for Accountability | John Haigh and José Figueroa (OCTAE), Connie Beene (Kansas Board of Regents), Pat Thieben (Iowa Department of Education), Marie Barry (New Jersey Department of Education)

### OCTAE Advice

Steve transitioned the call to a discussion entitled Reauthorization Preparation: State Plan Development Strategies for Accountability. Given that reauthorization will occur, states may wish to begin their process planning to ensure they are ready to move forward when the legislation is approved. To begin the conversation, Steve introduced John Haigh and José Figueroa from OCTAE to offer their insights on State Plan development. José began by offering his advice for successful State Plans: succinctly address State Plan questions; use available resources (the PCRN web page and online tutorials on conducting Final Agreed Upon Performance Level negotiations and contacting DATE staff with a proposed target; submit a complete attestation form (including the state CTE director's signature and date) after negotiations; and be aware that amendments and revisions to State Plans can be submitted at any time during the life of the law (as it currently is written), not just the April submission period. The most successful State Plans that John and José have reviewed include highlighted and tracked changes in a Word document (not a pdf) and an executive summary that outlines and synthesizes all changes being made.

John and José's advice to new state CTE directors embarking on their first State Plan is to use resources effectively, including the PCRN, contacting DATE staff such as RASs and Program Administration Liaisons (PALs), and to submit the State Plan as early as possible. John and José can also answer questions. Please contact them at [John.Haigh@ed.gov](mailto:John.Haigh@ed.gov) and [Jose.Figueroa@ed.gov](mailto:Jose.Figueroa@ed.gov).

### State Advice

Steve thanked John and José and introduced Rebecca Moyer to facilitate feedback from three state staff members who participated in the 2006 *Perkins IV* State Plan process. Each representative had three questions:

1. What do you plan to do to ensure accountability plan development goes smoothly?
2. Where do you anticipate running into problems during the State Plan creation process?
3. What advice do you have for new state directors and their staff?

Rebecca then introduced Connie Beene, Senior Director of Adult & Career Education at the Kansas Board of Regents, who offered wisdom around the process Kansas will use during the upcoming State Plan process. Connie shared that, based on previous experience, Kansas will prioritize the following activities when creating its accountability plan: convene all stakeholders in multiple locations; gather input from local and statewide employment entities; conduct a needs assessment; develop data collection processes to measure academic attainment; and develop processes to measure and evaluate funded activities.

Connie anticipates Kansas will be challenged by a lack of input or buy-in from stakeholders, difficulty in helping institutions understand the importance and value of advisory boards, and knowledge gaps. She also believes the state will face continued struggles with special and nontraditional population accountability, issues of median wage being lower than other states, and the effects of local economic conditions on performance.

Connie's advice to new state directors is to develop internal processes to support reauthorization discussions; develop relationships with other state directors and staff as well as with OCTAE contacts; review the State Plan process and documents from 2006; and begin scaffolding strong relationships and collaborative practices with secondary/postsecondary counterparts.

Rebecca thanked Connie and introduced Pat Thieben, Administrative Consultant at the Iowa Department of Education. Pat also believes gathering and planning several meetings with stakeholders is essential to the accountability planning process and that once there is a plan in place, that plan and accompanying information should be disseminated to institutions across the state as early as possible. To help with its data collection and tracking process, Iowa has shifted to a cohort-based reporting system that will produce better data. While this system has been put into place in 2017 under the 2006 legislation, Pat anticipates that the system can be modified to work well with new legislative requirements.

Based on her experience, Pat believes Iowa will need to provide better communication and training around new methodologies and requirements in data collection and that reporting this data could be challenging. Advance planning will include meeting with system programmers to keep them updated on the new requirements. Her advice to new state directors is to provide professional development early and often and understand that some of that training may need to be personalized.

After thanking Pat, Rebecca introduced the final presenter, Marie Barry, Acting Deputy Chief Academic Officer/Postsecondary Readiness and Partnerships at the New Jersey Department of Education. Marie's plan in New Jersey to ensure that the accountability plan development process goes smoothly involves many facets: create an internal core state team to review language and have a clear understanding of required performance measures and make a preliminary plan; use discussions and feedback gained at the DQI to inform plan decisions; ensure a thorough understanding of current data and current or possible data collection methods and sources to support measuring performance indicators; identify key stakeholders and solicit input; hold focused discussion groups for each indicator for secondary and postsecondary levels; and provide time for iterations of discussions.

Some identified challenges to the State Plan development process include communicating decisions and calculations around definitions to staff at different educational levels (secondary vs. postsecondary). Additionally, there will need to be discussions around new performance measures to assuage the fears of local schools and colleges. Marie noted that consensus on some issues may never be reached, but nonetheless, a final decision must be made by the state CTE director.

Marie's advice to new state directors is to work with internal and stakeholder teams and make sure that the stakeholders involved are appropriate and understand the data. She also suggests reviewing data sources for new indicators to ensure that measurements will be valid and reliable. Other suggestions included accessing data from existing statewide collections systems, developing clear and exact indicator definitions, and participating in multistate discussions to ask questions and learn about different approaches.

A short Q&A session followed:

**Q:** How do you handle buy-in for accountability? How do you ensure accountability measures are adequately rigorous despite resistance from locals?

**A:** *Connie: In Kansas, that would be similar to what is happening already. We have begun doing a lot of training on core indicators, process, and what it means at the faculty level. Once there is a broader knowledge base, there is much more buy-in around performance levels.*

*Marie: When setting targets, if you are able to set benchmarks and baseline data, you'll have good data to show why you are setting this benchmark. If the targets seem unreasonable, work with your RAS to discuss modifications.*

*Pat: Make sure everyone is involved up front so they have the understanding of what is required.*

**Q:** The current version of *Perkins* has a three-year cohort measurement period; do you know if this is going to be the same going forward?

**A:** *Sharon, OCTAE: That is a state decision. There isn't a specific requirement for cohort reporting in the legislation, so we aren't sure at this point what that will look like.*

For any further questions, NSWG members can send an email to any of the presenters:

1. Connie Beene: [cbeene@ksbor.org](mailto:cbeene@ksbor.org)
2. Pat Thieben: [pat.thieben@iowa.gov](mailto:pat.thieben@iowa.gov)
3. Marie Barry: [marie.barry@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:marie.barry@doe.state.nj.us)

### Closing Remarks | Rebecca Moyer

Rebecca thanked the presenters and participants and reminded everyone that registration for the DQI is open on the PCRN.

The next call is scheduled for December 7, 2017.

### NEXT CALL:

December 7, 2017