

## **I. State Administration [Section 121]**

### **A. Sole State Agency and Governance Structure**

The Arizona Department of Education administers the state Perkins allocation and processes LEA Basic Grant applications. Since the 2002 legislative dissolution of the State Community College Board of Arizona, the responsibilities for postsecondary performance measures and accountability transferred to the Arizona Department of Education. However, no state funding has supported the new responsibilities to date. The Arizona Department of Administration approved adding employee positions to oversee these postsecondary responsibilities in December of 2002. New postsecondary positions were filled from September 2003 until fall 2004 when both were vacated by incumbents who chose to leave the Department of Education for higher paying positions. While two of the postsecondary positions have been vacant for varying amounts of time during 2005, leadership has been provided using a team of state education agency (SEA) staff to accomplish needed responsibilities.

### **B. Organization of Vocational and Technical Education Programs**

Arizona secondary CTE uses labor market information to prioritize Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs and to accurately reflect occupations in demand in the state. The cross-walk linking the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) 2000 Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) with Department of Labor Standard Occupation Codes (SOC) was used to link SOC with CIP codes. The list also reflects occupations that require technical and academic rigor that span training into postsecondary studies. Only postsecondary programs that reasonably align to the secondary Priority CTE Program List are eligible for Perkins funding.

The Arizona State Board of Education directs that CTE:

- Utilize a “Priority CTE Program List” as a means of distributing limited funds to schools based upon program enrollment.
- Utilize Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) Labor Market Information and/or best available data sources to systematically identify potential new and emerging CTE programs.
- Use (DES) Labor Market (10 year forecast) Information to determine Average Job Openings. In the event that DES does not have forecast information, alternative data sources should be utilized.
- Use the following formula to rank CTE programs on the priority list:
  - Average Job Openings
  - + O\*Net Academic Score above 300
  - + Average Wages
  - + O\*Net Technical Score
- Insure the Priority CTE Program List is updated every two years.

State funding is allocated based on this ranking to encourage offering of these particular programs. Programs that no longer provide a reasonable wage are dropped from this priority list and new programs are added, based on job demand and wage criteria.

Arizona community colleges and universities worked together to foster the transfer of students between state institutions by developing the Arizona State System for Information on Student Transfer (ASSIST), a relational database containing enrollment and degree information on students attending Arizona's universities and ten public community college districts. Arizona's public postsecondary institutions have adopted a general education curriculum that, if completed at the community college, fulfills general education requirements for the State universities. The transfer model identifies specific curricular pathways for the student to follow.

Arizona students are able to earn community college credit through Tech Prep articulated programs. Tech Prep articulation agreements secure college credit for high school students in one of two forms; articulated credit, placed on the student's transcripts once they transfer to the community college following high school; or dual or concurrent credit where the high school student earns credit for community college courses taken while still in high school. However, the state faces some challenges in that area. Legislative investigations surround the counting of a student, for the same course, in three or more state funding streams: secondary high school ADM, CTE State Block Grant, Joint Technological Education District ADM, and community college FTSE. Because of ongoing legislative pressure surrounding dual credit agreements (including possible reduction in state funding for some dual enrollment services), not all colleges offer immediately transcripted credit (dual or concurrent credit) to high school students.

Arizona has not developed statewide articulations between secondary and postsecondary because Local Education Agencies (LEAs) maintain local control. Arizona Department of Education has developed standards for each secondary program area and audits districts on the maintenance of accurate student records, including documentation of standards attained. However, each entity has the discretion to develop individual courses to meet the needs of their local community and student body. Arizona's community colleges are able to exercise independent discretion over their programs and as yet have not entered into statewide articulation agreements.

The Arizona Board of Regents, which oversees the State's three universities, will consider Career and Technical Education secondary credits in their delegated admission process beginning in 2006. This is a significant recognition of the increased rigor present in the new curriculum frameworks.

In the Adaptation/Adoption Curriculum Framework Process, Arizona consistently has 1-3 members of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) design team representing postsecondary programs that closely align with the identified CTE program. All design teams review the appropriate National Cluster information and/or national skill standards and incorporate both the foundation skills common to all clusters and the pathways supported by state labor data and projected job openings. Arizona distributes secondary performance results to LEAs by career cluster upon request through the CTE on-line system.

## **II. State Leadership Activities [Section 124]**

### **A. Required Uses of Funds**

Secondary and postsecondary administrations have created new accountability systems in response to Perkins III. All secondary required activities have been in support of the new definitions, formulas, Performance Measures, improved data quality, new reporting systems for performance results, defining program quality, new measurement approaches, using performance data for program improvement initiatives, and the creation of an improved CTE delivery system. Secondary student-level reporting is now required for most performance measures.

Postsecondary state leadership is focused on improving reporting processes, improving data quality, refining institutional planning for program improvement, and monitoring projects. Use of Performance Measures will continue to be central to the program improvement process. Aggregate data is still the basis of Perkins reporting, with student-level data a goal for the future.

- **An Assessment of Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs that are funded**

### **Secondary**

- To improve data quality in 2005, the SEA continued *Proactive Technical Assistance*, an on-site SEA staff visit prior to the July 1 reporting deadline. This new process allows a more focused strategy aimed at specific improvements in districts with historical data quality problems. 50 districts were targeted for Proactive Technical Assistance, down from 52 in 2004. Districts were selected based upon their 2004 and 2005 data anomalies, their error rates from the previous year, and/or their turnover in local CTE administration.
- There were 1,425 programs that were participating in enrollment and performance reporting: 291 programs failed one or more essential elements of an approved programs by the end of 2005:

- 195 were missing the required “zero” concentrator or zero placement reports when no student records are submitted. The “zero” reports satisfy the performance reporting requirement. Of these, 121 programs were new in 2005 and the district “forgot” to add them to their annual reporting. The SEA created an electronic reminder that reduced the number of districts in this condition by more than one-half since 2004.
    - 50 were of insufficient size per state requirements.
    - 50 failed to submit the required advanced notification to participate in CTE funding after reporting no 2004 CTE enrollment and failing the sufficient size requirement last year.
    - 16 failed to offer the coherent sequence of courses.
- The SEA created a new report that informs state staff and LEAs when required LEA course enrollment, program enrollment, concentrator, and placement reports submitted by CTE programs throughout the year do not align with their Basic Grant list of courses and programs.
- Programs failing one or more essential elements of an approved program may formally apply for a one-year exemption from the requirement in order to use the time to satisfy the requirement by the next annual reporting cycle. The request must be accompanied by compelling evidence and/or the extenuating circumstance that justifies granting the request.
- For 2003-2004 there were 28 programs (29% of all exemptions granted in FY 2005) given a “provisional” exemption, requiring collaborative evidence-based objective(s) written by program and project staff. If the program did not meet the collaborative objective(s) during the 2005 year the program became inactive (unapproved). Twelve of these provisional exemptions (43%) became unapproved programs at the end of FY 2005. Sixteen (57%) were continued as provisional exemptions at the end of FY 2005 for FY 2006.
- For 2004-2005 there were seven exemption requests submitted by districts after receiving their 2004 performance at-risk program notices prior to the end of the FY 2005 year. This compares with 98 in the previous year.
  - 3 were approved (43%).
  - 2 (28%) was given a “provisional” exemption, requiring collaborative evidence-based objective(s) written by program and project staff. If the program does not meet the collaborative objective(s) during the 2006 year the program will become inactive.
  - 2 were later determined to be unnecessary when compared to 2005 program performance.
- 96 additional exemption requests came in after the end of the 2005 year requesting exemptions from conditions arising out of either the program’s 2004 results or 2005 enrollment and reporting. One-hundred and twenty-one programs, new in 2005 to CTE accountability reporting, were granted

automatic exemptions for failing to file their “zero” concentrators and/or placement reports, and the SEA entered their missing reports for them. These programs were not required to submit a formal exemption request. As of December 20, 2005, seven exemption requests (7%) were pending further investigation. For the remainder

- 48 (51%) were approved
- 19 (20%) were given a “provisional” exemption, requiring collaborative evidence-based objective(s) written by program and project staff. If the program does not meet the collaborative objective(s) during the 2005 year the program will become inactive
- 16 (17%) were determined to be no longer necessary
- 5 (5%) were not approved

To summarize the state’s 103 formal 2005 exemption requests this year (excluding the 121 new programs not required to file formal requests):

- 7 % are pending further investigation;
- 47% were approved,
- 18% were given a “provisional” exemption,
- 16% were determined to no longer be necessary, and
- 5% were not approved.

#### **Postsecondary Assessment of Vocational/Technical Programs –**

- Beginning in June of 2005, members of the ADE Postsecondary Team began monitoring 13 of the 20 Arizona community colleges on-site for the first time. The goal of conducting the process on-site was to verify the quality of data being submitted to the ADE, set the stage for improvement of the types of data submitted by the LEAs in the future, and assist the ADE in determining where the strengths and weakness exist in each college’s collection and reporting method so that future technical assistance can be provided. Colleges were selected primarily on data and programmatic questions that were raised during the Team’s first year of operation.
- Overall, all colleges showed supporting documentation for the expenditure of Perkins dollars. At some colleges where inappropriate expenditures were made, either the dollars were returned to the ADE or a written report was made to the college explaining (1) how they were to rectify the situation, and (2) informing them no further inappropriate expenditures will be allowed in the future. Where insufficient information was provided to support a goal(s) attainment, corrective action was documented in a follow up letter.
- The SEA called all the individual college institutional research departments together in June to discuss and implement ways to improve data quality. An outgrowth of this meeting was that colleges were given specific objectives to insert into their FY2006 grant application in order to better assess each college’s achievement of future performance measures. New tables and comparison of

performance measure results have been created by the ADE to better assess programs being funded.

- Based on the monitoring activity, further work needs to be done to have all college's evaluate their occupational programs on their core indicators, on an annual basis. This topic is going to be addressed this winter by letter to each college's occupational dean.

Shown on page 7 are the comparative results of the postsecondary performance measures during the last two years:

**Table 1. Comparison of 2004 and 2005 Data Showing Improvement in the Completeness of College Reporting**

**Basic Grant Performance Measures Results**

PM	2004-2005					2003-2004					% +/-
	Numerator	Denominator	State-	Site	Performance Level Met/Not Met	Numerator	Denominator	State-	Site	Performance Level Met/Not Met	
			Negotiated Performance Level	Performance Level Achieved				Negotiated Performance Level	Performance Level Achieved		
1P1	15,224	17,577	80.00%	86.61%	Met	14,505	15,760	69.00%	92.04%	Met	-5.42%
1P2	15,054	17,577	85.00%	85.65%	Met	14,945	15,760	73.00%	94.83%	Met	-9.18%
2P1	7,283	17,577	25.00%	41.43%	Met	7,416	15,760	20.00%	47.06%	Met	-5.62%
3P1	4,448	7,471	63.66%	59.54%	Not Met	1,659	5,077	62.66%	32.68%	Not Met	26.86%
3P2	3,490	4,835	62.16%	72.18%	Met	1,155	1,659	61.66%	69.62%	Met	2.56%
4P1	15,861	69,121	23.01%	22.95%	Not Met	10,828	54,089	22.51%	20.02%	Not Met	2.93%
4P2	3,818	15,745	20.00%	24.25%	Met	2,613	14,569	13.50%	17.94%	Met	6.31%

**Tech Prep Performance Measures Results**

PM	2004-2005					2003-2004					% +/-
	Numerator	Denominator	State-	Site	Performance Level Met/Not Met	Numerator	Denominator	State-	Site	Performance Level Met/Not Met	
			Negotiated Performance Level	Performance Level Achieved				Negotiated Performance Level	Performance Level Achieved		
1P1	1,436	1,613	80.00%	89.03%	Met	1,104	1,176	69.00%	93.88%	Met	-4.85%
1P2	1,423	1,613	85.00%	88.22%	Met	1,116	1,176	73.00%	94.90%	Met	-6.68%
2P1	502	1,613	25.00%	31.12%	Met	345	1,176	20.00%	29.34%	Met	1.79%
3P1	239	387	63.66%	61.76%	Not Met	41	100	62.66%	41.00%	Not Met	20.76%
3P2	183	240	62.16%	76.25%	Met	34	41	61.66%	82.93%	Met	-6.68%
4P1	838	3,993	23.01%	20.99%	Not Met	426	1,958	22.51%	21.76%	Not Met	-0.77%
4P2	153	833	20.00%	18.37%	Not Met	96	420	13.50%	22.86%	Met	-4.49%

- Even though Performance Measures 3P1 and 4P1 did not meet the state negotiated level of performance for 2004-05, there was improvement made by Arizona's community colleges on both measures. Postsecondary placement (3P1) shows a substantial improvement of 26.86% of stop outs found and placed as compared to the previous year. Performance Measure 4P1 shows only a slight gain of 2.93% in nontraditional student participation in career and technical programs.
- Another item of note is that the number of vocational program adult learners used to calculate the results for performance measures 1P1-4P2 increased across the board. It is the impression of the ADE staff that an important component for realizing this increase in numbers is due to the increased emphasis placed on improving college results as outlined in the OVAE Action Plan submitted in November.

Continued attention will be given to improving data quality for performance measures 3P1 and 4P1, in addition to 1P1 and 1P2, where achievement levels of colleges statewide dropped with the standardization of data reporting definitions among the colleges.

- **Developing, Improving, Or Expanding The Use Of Technology In Vocational And Technical Education**

**Secondary** – Under Perkins III, the Arizona Department of Education initiated statewide electronic Performance Measures data collection (LEA to SEA) and Performance Measures reporting systems (SEA to LEA). 8% or 42 of the 505 professional development activities in the reporting year focused on utilizing the on-line statewide performance measures system and on-line technical assistance. Professional development activities oriented to state-of-the-art technology for CTE program instructional areas comprised 3% (14 of 505) in 2005, down from 5% in 2004 (23 of 426). An additional project for Arizona business teachers is an on-line professional development project which focuses on relevant web cast access to statewide databases, instructional strategies, and industry and educational experts.

The final ten Arizona CTE curriculum frameworks have been upgraded/reviewed in 2005 finishing the process begun in 2003 to increase the relevance and rigor of the academic and technical skill standards using the national career clusters and standards. As a continued program improvement strategy, all CTE programs will be transitioning to a merged list of technical standards/measurement criteria supporting the new Arizona CTE Delivery System. Project team members from industry and education will be participating in determining appropriate technical standards to be included in the merged lists of standards. In addition, 13 CTE programs will also be reviewed and upgraded by this team during the merging process to ensure continued improvement and alignment to current industry needs.

**Table 2. Curriculum Review Schedule**

Level III Programs Completed	CIP Number	Date of completion	Date of upgrade/review process (PASS)	Targeted date for transitioning to merged program standards
Automotive Technologies	47.0600	9/30/2002	06/2004	1/15/2006*
Information Technology	15.1200	6/1/2002	06/2004	1/15/2006*
Business Management and Administrative Services	52.0200	6/1/2002	06/2004	4/15/2006*
Hospitality Management	52.0900	1/15/2003	06/2004	3/15/2006*
Allied Health Services	51.0800	1/30/2003	06/2005	2/15/2006
Construction Technologies	46.0400	6/1/2003	06/2005	4/15/2006
Financial Services	52.0800	2/1/2003	06/2005	1/15/2006
Graphic Communications	10.0300	6/1//2003	06/2005	2/15/2006
Law, Public Safety, & Security	43.0100	1/30/2003	06/2005	5/15/2006
Marketing, Management, and Entrepreneurship	52.1800	2/15/2003	06/2005	5/15/2006
Welding Technology	48.0500	10/30/2002		5/15/2006*
Education Professions	13.1500	5/15/2003		4/15/2006*
Electronic Technology	15.0300	6/1/2003		3/15/2006*
Design and Merchandising	52.1900	1/15/2004		2/15/2006*
Drafting/Design Technology	15.1300	1/15/2004		2/15/2006*
Radio/Television Technology	10.0200	2/15/2004		5/15/2006*
Accounting and Related Services	52.0300	4/1/2004		3/15/2006*
Early Childhood Education	13.1200	4/15/2004		4/15/2006*
Woodworking	48.0700	5/1/2004		5/15/2006*
Fire Science	43.0200	9/15/2004		5/15/2006
Nursing Services	51.1600	11/15/2004		1/15/2006
Cosmetology	12.0400	3/1/2005		4/15/2006
Culinary Arts	12.0500	3/15/2005		6/15/2006
Agricultural Business Management – Agriscience (merging Agriscience, Horticulture, and Renewable Natural Resources)	01.0300	5/15/2005		Completed 7/2005
<b>Industrial Manufacturing (new and emerging program)</b>	15.0600	6/15/2005		Completed 7/2005

**Postsecondary** – The Arizona Department of Education utilized a new online data collection system this year. Developed by Arizona Western College, the web-based system was originally designed to resolve problems with tracking Tech Prep students. The enhanced capacity of this system enables Perkins data collection for all Arizona community colleges.

Based on the basic grant objectives and site visits made to the colleges during the past year, the purchase and expansion of technology continues to grow throughout the state's community colleges. For example, in the Maricopa Community College district, the county residents passed a \$951 million dollar capital improvement bond in November of 2004. While the vast majority of the bond will be used to renovate and build new facilities, including occupational facilities, throughout the district, 10% of the bond will be used to purchase and install computing, data, telecommunications and media equipment systems in the district. 7.4% will be used specifically to purchase new equipment and upgrade existing equipment to support occupational education and workforce development training needs in the district.

At Yavapai College, the college is expanding its distance learning program amongst the five separate campuses. Considering that Yavapai County covers over 8,000 square miles of land, the college has found it more efficient to broadcast interactive student classroom presentations from one location rather than incur the expense of replicating the classes individually throughout the county.

The same holds true for Northland Pioneer College (NPC). At NPC, the college is purchasing disability equipment so that instructors can access the resource database at one of its campuses from any of the other four campuses. The equipment purchases are expected to save the college 15%-20% in travel and staffing costs.

Examples of postsecondary initiatives to further high technology fields in CTE education in Arizona follow:

- The Battelle Memorial Institute was commissioned by Maricopa Community Colleges in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Commerce, Pima Community College, Yavapai College and the Flinn Foundation to assess State specific needs for bioscience and high-tech manufacturing workforce development. The high-tech manufacturing final report is due to be published January 2006.
- Northland Pioneer College has developed the new Associate of Applied Science degree in Power Plant Fundamentals program in response to the need for highly qualified high tech employees for area power plants.
- Pima Community College, in partnership with the University of Arizona and the Raytheon Corporation, has introduced the Raytheon Scholars program. The program, a combination of rigorous course work and internships with

Raytheon, is designed to encourage more high school students to choose the engineering field.

- IDEAL – Integrated Data to Enhance Arizona’s Learning), a single location for all Arizona stakeholders to access educational data, resources, and services. This first phase includes ASSET membership for all Arizona public and charter schools. ASSET (Arizona School Services through Educational Technology) offers engaging online professional development, and a 4,000 plus streaming video library and other resources that support student learning.

- **Professional Development Programs**

**Secondary and Postsecondary** – The SEA contracted services to deliver 505 professional development activities: 326 state-leadership sponsored workshops and 179 activities for AzCRN and nontraditional training and employment. Many activities serve multiple purposes. For reporting purposes only, the SEA records the primary purpose identified as most important by staff. Staff identify the primary purpose at the time the activity is proposed for funding. The workshop percentages allocated to these required and permissible activities are listed in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Professional Development Workshop Allocations**

<b>Required Activities</b>	2005 (N=505)	2004 (N=426)	2003 (N=255)
Accurate, Timely, and Reliable Reporting	8%	9%	14%
Training To Use State-Of-The-Art Technology	3%	5%	8%
Keeping Educators Current (coherent sequence, state competencies, new curricula, certification, etc.)	23%	17%	58%
Building Partnerships	5%	5%	6%
Expansion of the Use of Technology	2%	6%	5%
Academic Integration	4%	1%	2%
Nontraditional Training and Employment	27%	29%	2%
Supporting Special Populations & Aligning with other Education Programs (IDEA, WIA, etc.)	4%	2%	4%
Improving Parental and Community Involvement	4%	<1%	1%
<b>Permissible Activities</b>			
Career Guidance and Counseling (e.g. RealGame, AzCRN, AzCIS)	9%	13%	10%
Linkages between Secondary and Postsecondary	3%	5%	4%
Curriculum Improvement and Development	2%	2%	4%
CTE Student Organizations (recruiting special populations)	2%	<1%	2%
Training in All Aspects of an Industry	2%	1%	1%
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	2%	2%	1%

The data indicates a steady increase in professional development activities over the past three years from 255 in 2003, 426 in 2004, and 505 in 2005. The 505 reported workshops include the activities sponsored through our Section 118 grant. The number of educators participating in state-leadership events sponsored with our three university partnerships increases from 1,036 in 2004 to 1,914 in 2005. The number of educators participating in Section 118 grant sponsored events in 2005 was 2,406 and in non-traditional training and employment the number of participants was 2,891. The Annual summer conference, which is a collaborative partnership consisting of AZ Department of Education Tech Prep, ACTE AZ, ACOVA, AZCRN, AZCIS, had 1276 participants in July of 2005 which is a slight increase from 2004 of 1,249. The total number of duplicated educators participating in professional development was 4,320. There is now a postsecondary series of activities, continuing the expanded offerings begun in 2004.

Arizona continues to offer CTE professional industry externship experiences and highly structured business and industry tours to help teachers maintain relevant work-based classroom instruction and student learning. Educator participants must demonstrate a direct benefit for students enrolled in local CTE courses.

- 43 applicants applied and participated in externships with 33 completers.
- 134 applicants applied participated and completed tour experiences.
- Total number of relevant CTE professional experiences with industry partnerships was 177 with 174 CTE educators.

Some examples of postsecondary professional development events are as follows: Blackboard Course Management System Training, Computer Information Systems-Red Hat Linux training, numerous Cisco and Microsoft conferences, creating unified curricular formats with surrounding secondary institutions, numerous nursing and health care conferences and trainings to keep up with the colleges overall increases in student enrollments.

- **Support for Vocational and Technical Education Programs That Improve the Academic and Vocational and Technical Skills of Students ... Through the Integration of Academics with Vocational and Technical Education**

Arizona uses the State Academic Standards and Assessment System, measuring reading, writing and math as separate measures, using mathematics results internally for state purposes only at this time. Arizona has added mathematics as an additional measure for 2006.

New curriculum review and assessment adoption procedures are complete for these areas, with the last curricula completed in 2005. (See Table 1.) Over 25% of all professional development activities in 2005 were devoted to the activities introducing teachers to the new CTE curriculum standards containing increased relevance to the Arizona academic standards, instructional strategies for academic integration, and resources for enhancing reinforcement of academic standards through CTE contextual instruction.

Science academic standards are now aligned with all of the CTE curriculum standards, although they are not yet part of the state's academic assessment tests. Arizona now uses the Arizona academic crosswalks developed by the International Center for Leadership in Education to validate and prioritize the CTE academic integration content and professional development activities to promote effective integration.

- **Providing Preparation For Nontraditional Training And Employment**

**Secondary** – Arizona met both 4S1 and 4S2 for the first time. 32% of all 2005 professional development activities were aligned to career guidance and nontraditional training and employment. For example, one school district, using the services of the set-aside contract, offered eight recruitment classes discussing non-traditional careers with 480 high school students. The school's 2005 nontraditional enrollment increased to 37% from 29% in 2004.

Arizona designates all but nine of its 30 CTE programs as non-traditional (NT) in 2005. Per the revised State Plan negotiations of 2004, Arizona no longer includes its AIS program in the nontraditional calculations. AIS, the Heating Ventilation and Air conditioning (HVAC) program, and the Heavy Equipment programs will no longer be included in CTE for 2006.

Table 4 ranks the 21 nontraditional programs by 2005 enrollment in order of their size, calculating the amount of change in enrollment and percent of NT enrollment since 2004. Table 5 ranks the 21 nontraditional programs by 2005 nontraditional completers in order of their size, calculating the amount of percent change of NT completers since 2004. Eight of Arizona's nontraditional CTE programs met the 4S1 and 4S2 2005 adjusted levels of performance, the same programs that met the expected level of performance in 2004. All other programs, except one that went down one-half of one per cent, increased their percentage of nontraditional enrollments in 2005.

**Table 4. Arizona 2005 CTE Programs with Nontraditional Enrollments**

<b>NT Gender</b>	<b>CIP</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b>2005 NT Gender Enroll</b>	<b>2004 NT Gender Enroll</b>	<b>Total 2005 Program Enrollment</b>	<b>Total 2004 Program Enrollment</b>	<b>Enrollment Change Since 2004</b>	<b>2005 % of NT Enrollment</b>	<b>2004 % of NT Enrollment</b>	<b>% Change Since 2004</b>
Female	100300	Graphic Communications	3154	3172	5738	5934	-196	54.97%	53.45%	1.51%
Female	521800	Marketing, Management and Entrepreneurship	2691	3055	5311	5768	-457	50.67%	52.96%	-2.30%
Female	010300	Agriscience	997	974	2552	2505	47	39.07%	38.88%	0.19%
Female	470600	Automotive Technologies	785	708	6981	6542	439	11.24%	10.82%	0.42%
Male	131200	Early Childhood Professions	727	558	6100	5630	470	11.92%	9.91%	2.01%
Female	100200	Radio/Television Technology	705	634	1933	1977	-44	36.47%	32.07%	4.40%
Female	510800	Allied Health Services	600	399	805	520	285	74.53%	76.73%	-2.20%
Female	151300	Drafting/Design Technology	592	598	3343	3278	65	17.71%	18.24%	-0.53%
Female	460400	Construction Technologies	333	308	2981	2996	-15	11.17%	10.28%	0.89%
Female	430100	Law, Public Safety and Security	285	204	659	504	155	43.25%	40.48%	2.77%
Female	480500	Welding Technology	230	174	2891	2494	397	7.96%	6.98%	0.98%
Male	511600	Nursing Services	184	171	1256	1279	-23	14.65%	13.37%	1.28%
Female	480700	Woodworking	183	149	1481	1538	-57	12.36%	9.69%	2.67%
Male	521900	Design and Merchandising	160	107	2396	1843	553	6.68%	5.81%	0.87%
Female	030200	Renewable Natural Resources	94	143	250	402	-152	37.60%	35.57%	2.03%
Female	010600	Horticulture	92	86	209	318	-109	44.02%	27.04%	16.98%
Female	430200	Fire Science	76	49	429	357	72	17.72%	13.73%	3.99%
Female	150300	Electronic Technology	65	82	675	1066	-391	9.63%	7.69%	1.94%
Male	120400	Cosmetology	12	9	579	566	13	2.07%	1.59%	0.48%
Female	490200	Heavy Equipment	4	6	28	44	-16	14.29%	13.64%	0.65%
Female	460300	Electrical and Power Transmission Tech	2	2	45	46	-1	4.44%	4.35%	0.10%
Female	470200	Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning	0	0	0	6	-6	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Table 5. Arizona 2005 CTE Programs with Nontraditional Completers**

NT Gender	CIP	Program Name	2005 NT Completers	2005 Program Completers	2004 NT Completers	2004 Program Completers	Change Since 2004	2005 % of NT Completers	2004 % of NT Completers	Change Since 2004
Female	521800	Marketing, Management and Entrepreneurship	615	949	558	1025	-76	64.81%	54.44%	10.37%
Female	100300	Graphic Communications	507	943	394	683	260	53.76%	57.69%	-3.92%
Female	010300	Agriscience	258	528	185	369	159	48.86%	50.14%	-1.27%
Female	100200	Radio/Television Technology	155	511	135	458	53	30.33%	29.48%	0.86%
Female	510800	Allied Health Services	151	200	87	113	87	75.50%	76.99%	-1.49%
Female	151300	Drafting/Design Technology	123	751	84	569	182	16.38%	14.76%	1.62%
Female	470600	Automotive Technologies	110	1368	84	1003	365	8.04%	8.37%	-0.33%
Female	430100	Law, Public Safety and Security	82	195	40	106	89	42.05%	37.74%	4.32%
Male	511600	Nursing Services	69	655	55	433	222	10.53%	12.70%	-2.17%
Male	131200	Early Childhood Professions	66	846	61	844	2	7.80%	7.23%	0.57%
Female	460400	Construction Technologies	47	590	39	329	261	7.97%	11.85%	-3.89%
Female	480500	Welding Technology	41	585	22	325	260	7.01%	6.77%	0.24%
Male	521900	Design and Merchandising	28	390	14	175	215	7.18%	8.00%	-0.82%
Female	030200	Renewable Natural Resources	25	46	12	23	23	54.35%	52.17%	2.17%
Female	480700	Woodworking	22	219	11	152	67	10.05%	7.24%	2.81%
Female	430200	Fire Science	19	109	5	53	56	17.43%	9.43%	8.00%
Female	010600	Horticulture	13	31	2	3	28	41.94%	66.67%	-24.73%
Male	120400	Cosmetology	9	287	0	156	131	3.14%	0.00%	3.14%
Female	150300	Electronic Technology	7	126	6	149	-23	5.56%	4.03%	1.53%
Female	490200	Heavy Equipment	3	14	0	9	5	21.43%	0.00%	21.43%
Female	460300	Electrical and Power	0	19	1	5	14	0.00%	20.00%	-20.00%
Female	470200	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning	0	12	0	4	8	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

LEA programs that failed to achieve the state adjusted level of performance for 4S1 and 4S2 for the second year were designated with a “Program in Review” (PIR) status for 2005. Annually, such programs are required to select and implement (in their next Basic Grant) one or more state-directed objectives under Goal 7 Nontraditional Training in their LEA Basic Grant. The SEA, in collaboration with its three university partners, uses five state-directed objectives from which an LEA could choose one or more evidence-based improvement strategies:

- Investigate and identify root causes preventing local recruitment and retention;
- Develop and implement an action plan to overcome local root causes;
- Implement AzCRN, which includes tools and resources to provide nontraditional career exploration, career guidance and support to minority cohorts, recruitment and retention strategies;
- Involve and educate parents in a Parents As Partners program;
- Collaborate with community based organizations including businesses; and/or

LEAs could also draft their own objective and submit it for approval.

**Postsecondary** – Arizona exceeded the state negotiated performance level for 4P2 by 4.25% during fiscal year 2005; Arizona just missed meeting the negotiated level for 4P1 by .06%, even though Arizona increased its overall performance level by 2.93% from the previous year.

Examples of activities at colleges aimed at addressing nontraditional training and employment included the following: Developing a program to provide a pathway for paramedics to transition into a nursing career, utilizing the college’s counselors to target students for nontraditional careers, utilizing the college’s new Speakers’ Bureau to encourage business and industry leaders to promote nontraditional careers for students, efforts directed to increase non-traditional student enrollment in select programs, college participation in the Arizona Women’s Expo which highlights non-traditional careers, and participation in a Women in Technology conference.

- **Supporting Partnerships To Enable Students to Achieve State Academic Standards and Vocational and Technical Skills**

**Secondary** – The SEA launched IDEAL (Integrated Data to Enhance Arizona’s Learning), a single location for all Arizona stakeholders to access educational data, resources, and services. This initiative, fully aligned with the US Department of Education’s 2004 National Education Technology Plan, emphasizes strong leadership, the use of digital content, and the integration of data systems to allow for effective and efficient collection of information. IDEAL represents the commitment and dedication of the Arizona Department of Education, Arizona State University, and ASSET to offer online resources that support high quality teaching and that provide an engaging, technology-rich learning environment for all Arizona students.

Arizona CTE conference programs nearly always include one or more sessions on building successful partnerships. Venues include the State CTE conference, state and regional program

area conferences, new teacher conferences, and national conferences held in Arizona. During the 2005 year, 5% of the professional development workshops focused on building partnerships, which mirrors the percentage from last year with an increase of five additional workshops on building partnerships. An additional 16 workshops focused on linkages between secondary and postsecondary in 2005. Arizona is disseminating its Work-Based Learning Resource Guide, helping provide guidance on developing business partnerships and conducted a research project on improvement the cooperative education courses to align to national best practices.

**Postsecondary**—Examples of postsecondary partnerships aimed at enabling students to meet the academic and technical skills necessary to successfully enter the industry are as follows: Mesa Community College participates in a Caterpillar Corp. partnership with Empire Machinery and Glendale Community College participates in a partnership with automotive manufacturers such as Toyota to train students for the company. GateWay Community College partners with Banner Health Systems to train students for the nursing field, and the manufacturing program works with companies such as the Future Fabricating Company to train students to be National Institute for Metalworking Skills (NIMS) certified.

- **Serving Individuals In State Correctional Institutions**

**Secondary and Postsecondary** - Arizona distributes 1% of its state secondary Perkins allocation to state corrections institutions serving youth, using the local Basic Grant application. The correctional LEA is exempt from SEA Performance Measures, but has developed its own set of population-appropriate performance measures and complies with the required services for special populations. Outcomes are monitored using the evaluation criteria specified for each goal in the grant application. Emphasis since FY 2001 has centered on employability readiness certification.

For the 2005 school year the agency served over 1054 students, slightly more than in 2004; all 1054 received training in OSHA Safety and Health, WorkKeys Skills and/or occupational training in one of four programs, business, culinary, hospitality and facility maintenance.

The culinary program at the female facility is partnered with Rio Salado Community College's program. Of the 1054, 281 attained a GED; over 100 returned to public high schools upon release from facility. Fifty-one students obtained a job or entered vocational training classes (down from previous year) upon release. Over 100 were referred to vocational rehabilitation for continued training after their release. Juvenile Corrections agency has developed a Workforce Development component to enhance the Vocational Program (secure care) and provide a continuum for youth (soft skills to job placement).

- **Support for Programs for Special Populations that Lead to High Skill, High Wage Careers**

Through Perkins, Arizona CTE has historically led the way in its advocacy and attention to special populations through the state-mandated Individual Vocational Education Plan (IVEP) required for each CTE special population's student who needs special services to succeed, to enable that student to be successful in achieving the most rigorous outcomes possible for that

individual. In situations where special populations do not appear to be making progress, state directed objectives must be included in the district's Perkins local plan/application. An example of a state-directed objective addressing achievement of special populations is, "The district will insure special education students are enrolled in CTE courses and programs that are aligned with their Individual Education Plan (IEP), postsecondary goals, and transition plans."

Arizona utilizes Perkins funding to promote, develop and assist secondary and postsecondary programs to prepare all individuals, including special populations, for high skill, high wage jobs in several ways. Arizona does target workshops that address identification of special populations and meeting the needs of special populations, identifying appropriate strategies for assessment of special populations students enrolled in career preparation programs, and partnerships that provide a unity of support for students with barriers to achievement and learning. Samples include *CTE/SPed Partnership – Meeting the Vocational Needs of Students with Disabilities*, *Applied Behavioral Analysis Strategies*, *Career Development Credentialing and CTE Planning for Special Populations*, and *Empowering Students for Positive Change*. Four Per cent (4%) of all 2005 professional development activities were primarily aimed at improved identification of, and services to, special populations in need of supplemental services to succeed.

Arizona does not separate student preparation sessions for high skill high wage careers to target special populations versus non-special populations. Arizona's CTE programs are prioritized and ranked, based on Perkins-funded research, determining which program training does indeed lead to high skill, high wage jobs. Then state funding is allocated based on this ranking to encourage offering of these particular programs. Programs that no longer provide a reasonable wage are dropped from this priority list and new programs are added, based on job demand and wage criteria.

Career preparation sessions offered annually apply to recruiting, retaining, and succeeding with all students. In a spirit of equity and equal access, the career preparation and CTE program workshops address the needs, learning styles, teaching styles, etc. as they apply to the wider population of students. Samples include *Preparing Students for Employment in High-Tech Bioscience Industry*, *Implementing Achievable Healthcare Career Competencies, Assessments, Credentialing in Healthcare Careers*, and *What Makes Successful Schools Successful for All Students*, offered at the annual CTE conference in July.

## **B. Permissible Activities [Section 124]**

**Secondary** - Career guidance and academic counseling programs comprise 9% of all 2005 professional development activities. An additional 3% of activities promote postsecondary and secondary linkages, while 2% of the professional development activities supported curriculum improvement and 2% Family and Consumer Sciences (FACS) programs.

**Postsecondary** - Permissible activities by colleges include support of work-related experience, technical support, student organization support in career and technical areas, updating equipment, and programs for helping CTE students find employment.

**C. Distribution of Funds and Local Plan for Vocational and Technical Education Programs [Sections 131 and 134]**

The state's 2005 eligible recipients consist of,

- 117 secondary (Basic Grant) local eligible agencies,
- 1 area vocational and technical education agency (Basic Grant) ,
- 9 postsecondary colleges (Basic Grant), and
- 11 Tech Prep Consortia (Tech Prep).

### III. Accountability [Section 113] -

#### A. State's Overall Performance Results and Program Improvement Strategies

**Secondary:** Arizona's secondary exceeded negotiated performance levels for all sub indicators. Arizona CTE has devoted considerable resources to improving academic and technical relevance of the CTE curriculum over the past three years, with additional supporting efforts to enhance CTE teacher reinforcement of academic and technical standards within the context of CTE instructional delivery. An Arizona graduation requirement for students to master the academic standards does not begin until 2006, and has already been compromised to allow students who do not pass to receive diplomas. Arizona continues to promote the increase in rigor and technical relevance as it moves toward state-endorsed technical assessments. The state awards incentive dollars for concentrator placements related to the students' high school CTE program. Arizona re-negotiated the non-traditional calculation formula in 2004 to exclude AIS, the large business program no longer included in CTE by 2006.

**Postsecondary** - Arizona's postsecondary exceeded negotiated performance levels for Core Indicators 1P1, 1P2, 2P1, 3P2, and 4P2. Based upon the findings of the 2005 OVAE monitoring, there are significant data quality issues to resolve before these results can be considered an accurate picture of Arizona's postsecondary performance.

While Arizona did not meet the negotiated performance measure for Core Indicator 3P1, it improved by 26.86% over 2004. The marked improvement was partially due to improved, more complete data reporting and a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) established between the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) and several of the colleges around the state, resulting in some IU labor reporting. An additional factor in the improvement was the implementation of a postsecondary placement and retention survey as an additional measurement approach. These improvements can be considered a direct result of the leverage created by the OVAE monitoring findings.

**B. State's Performance Results for Special Populations and Program Improvement Strategies**

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations;
<p>1S1 Academic Attainment writing</p>	<p>62.61%</p>	<p>71.81%</p>	<p>Individuals with Disabilities (28.79%), Other Barriers (61.32%), and Limited English Proficient (56.01%) did not meet the measure. All three groups have improved performance since 2004.</p>
<p><b>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</b>            Arizona CTE has devoted considerable resources to improving academic and technical relevance of the CTE curriculum over the past three years, with additional supporting efforts to enhance CTE teacher reinforcement of academic and technical standards within the context of CTE instructional delivery.</p> <p><b>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</b>            In Arizona, the requirement to pass all the State’s academic assessments does not begin until FY2006 after having been delayed for three years; currently this requirement has been compromised with a formula that allows students who do not pass still to receive their 2006 diplomas using a grade-equivalency formula.</p> <p>There are substantial parent and student groups who do not value the academic standards tests or the results.            In Arizona, a small percentage of students with disabilities are now able to “test out of grade” under No Child Left Behind (NCLB).</p>			

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations;
1S2 Skill Attainment	60.50%	66.08%	All groups exceed the measure.
<p><b>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</b>  The State has worked consistently toward improved data quality. State has invested considerable resources in creating more technically-relevant CTE curriculum standards and moving toward state-endorsed technical assessments. At this time, however, most completers are still documented with teachers' attainment checksheets.</p>			
Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations;
2S1 Completion	95.31%	97.57%	Single Parents (93.75%) and Other Educational Barriers (94.81%) did not meet the measure.
<p><b>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</b>  The State does not use a cohort measurement aligned to NCLB yet, which could require negotiating lower performance levels in the future. Arizona has a significant drop out rate, but electronically linking CTE concentrator data to the State's student leaver codes is not yet automated. This makes it possible for districts to overlook concentrators who leave before graduation.</p> <p><b>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</b>  Both groups are extremely close to meeting the measure, but reflect a small portion of the cohorts who leave without graduating. Since the level is set so high, there is less mathematical opportunity to show improvement.</p>			

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
3S1 Placement	57.38 %	68.36%	All groups exceed using this measurement approach.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>The state awards incentive dollars for concentrator placements related to the students' high school CTE program. State verifies documentation is on file at the LEA, but does not yet validate reported placement data.</p>			
Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
4S1 Participate Non-trad	24.47%	26.38%	Individuals with Disabilities (14.94%), Economically Disadvantaged (21.74%), Single Parents (23.53%), Other Barriers (24.02%), and Limited English Proficient (21.32%) did not meet the measure. However, all five groups have improved performance since 2004.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Arizona re-negotiated the non-traditional calculation formula in 2004 to exclude the large business program no longer included in CTE by 2006. Arizona has used the Section 118 grant and other resources to help programs, schools, and districts recruit and retain nontraditional students.</p> <p><b><i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Arizona has a significant share of ethnic and religious communities for which gender equity is not a community value. As a result, Arizona promotes improvement plans and technical assistance for districts that do not meet the NT participation measure, but imposes no sanctions on programs.</p>			

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
4S2 Skill Proficiency Non-trad	21.37%	25.67%	Individual with Disabilities (14.63%), Economically Disadvantaged (20.41%), Other Barriers (20.72%), and Limited English Proficient (20.69%) did not meet the measure. However, all four groups have improved performance since 2004.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Arizona re-negotiated the non-traditional calculation formula in 2004 to exclude the large business program no longer included in CTE by 2006. Arizona has used the Section 118 grant and other resources to help programs, schools, and districts recruit and retain nontraditional students.</p> <p><b><i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Arizona has a significant share of ethnic and religious communities for which gender equity is not a community value. As a result, Arizona promotes improvement plans and technical assistance for districts that do not meet the NT participation measure, but imposes no sanctions on programs.</p>			
Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
4S2 Skill Proficiency Non-trad	21.37%	25.67%	Individual with Disabilities (14.63%), Economically Disadvantaged (20.41%), Other Barriers (20.72%), and Limited English Proficient (20.69%) did not meet the measure. All four groups have improved performance since 2004, however.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Arizona re-negotiated the non-traditional calculation formula in 2004 to exclude the large business program no longer included in CTE by 2006. Arizona has used the Section 118 grant and other resources to help programs, schools, and districts recruit and retain nontraditional students.</p>			

***Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level***

*Arizona has a significant share of ethnic and religious communities for which gender equity is not a community value. As a result, Arizona promotes improvement plans and technical assistance for districts that do not meet the NT participation measure, but imposes no sanctions on programs.*

<b>Core Sub-Indicator</b>	<b>Negotiated Level</b>	<b>State Performance for all Concentrators</b>	<b>Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b>
Additional Measure 1S1 Reading	60.48%	64.12%	Individuals with Disabilities (27.19%), Single Parents (59.16%), Economically Disadvantaged (59.16%), Single Parents (51.85%), Other Barriers (43.27%), and LEP (43.54%).

***Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level***

Arizona CTE has devoted considerable resources to improving academic and technical relevance of the CTE curriculum over the past three years, with additional supporting efforts to enhance CTE teacher reinforcement of academic and technical standards within the context of CTE instructional delivery.

***Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level***

In Arizona, the requirement to pass all the State’s academic assessments does not begin until FY2006 after having been delayed for three years; currently this requirement has been compromised with a formula that allows students who do not pass still to receive their 2006 diplomas using a grade-equivalency formula.

There are substantial parent and student groups who do not value the academic standards tests or the results.

In Arizona, a small percentage of students with disabilities are now able to “test out of grade” under No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations;
1P1 Academic Attainment	80.00%	86.61%	Displaced Homemakers (77.78%) did not meet the measure.
<p><b>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</b> The measurement approach and definitions make it easy.</p> <p><i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i> With only 9 total self-identified students in the category, it is too small to draw a definitive conclusion.</p>			

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations;
1P2 Skill Attainment	85.00%	85.65%	American Indian/Alaskan Native (77.10%), Asian/Pacific Islander (82.19%), Black, non-Hispanic (82.00%), and Hispanic (81.79%) did not meet the measure. Individuals with Disabilities (82.94%), Economically Disadvantaged (80.92%), Single Parents (74.01%), and Limited English Proficient (76.99%) did not meet the measure.
<p><b>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</b> Per the 2005 OVAE monitoring findings, this may reflect a data quality issue rather than low performance. Previous oversight by the Community College State Board did not address fiscal and programmatic compliance. Data quality efforts for postsecondary reporting have been hampered by the transition of responsibilities to the SEA and the inability to retain postsecondary staff employed within the SEA through competitive compensation.</p>			

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations;
3P1 Placement	63.66%	59.54%	Only Hispanic (65.62%) and Nontraditional Enrollees (65.57%) met the measure.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b>  Per the 2005 OVAE monitoring findings, this may reflect a data quality issue rather than low performance.</p> <p><b><i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b>  Previous oversight by the Community College State Board did not address fiscal and programmatic compliance. Data quality efforts for postsecondary reporting have been hampered by the transition of responsibilities to the SEA and the inability to retain postsecondary staff employed within the SEA through competitive compensation.</p>			
Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
3P2 Retention	62.16%	72.18%	Single Parents (47.50%) and Limited English Proficient (61.70%) did not meet the measure.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b>  Previous oversight by the Community College State Board did not address fiscal and programmatic compliance. Data quality efforts for postsecondary reporting have been hampered by the transition of responsibilities to the SEA and the inability to retain postsecondary staff employed within the SEA through competitive compensation.</p>			

Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
4P1 Participate Non-trad	23.01%	22.95%	Males (20.51%), Hispanic (21.58%), Economically Disadvantaged (22.44%), Single Parents (20.23%), Displaced Homemakers (11.54%), Limited English Proficient (19.15%), and Tech Prep (20.99%) did not meet the measure.
<p><b><i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Previous oversight by the Community College State Board did not address fiscal and programmatic compliance. Data quality efforts for postsecondary reporting have been hampered by the transition of responsibilities to the SEA and the inability to retain postsecondary staff employed within the SEA through competitive compensation.</p>			
Core Sub-Indicator	Negotiated Level	State Performance for all Concentrators	Performance for Special Populations; <i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i>
4P2 Completion Non-trad	20.00%	24.25%	Only Limited English Proficient (17.74%) and Tech Prep (18.37%) did not meet the measure.
<p><b><i>Reasons for State Performance Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Per the 2005 OVAE monitoring findings, this may reflect a data quality issue rather than low performance.</p> <p><b><i>Reasons for Groups Not Meeting Negotiated Level</i></b></p> <p>Previous oversight by the Community College State Board did not address fiscal and programmatic compliance. Data quality efforts for postsecondary reporting have been hampered by the transition of responsibilities to the SEA and the inability to retain postsecondary staff employed within the SEA through competitive compensation.</p>			

### C. Definitions

- **Secondary and Postsecondary Vocational participant** – A student who enrolled in at least one vocational-technical education course.

- **Vocational concentrator**

**Secondary:** A student who achieves two transcribed Carnegie units/credits in a single CTE program is a concentrator. One unit/credit must be in a Level III course.

**Postsecondary:** student enrolled in the State threshold level of vocational education:

- A minimum of seven vocational credit hours in the same vocational area prefix;
  - A minimum of one state-designated course in English or math, technical/business English, technical math, integrated academic/occupational course at or above the 100 level, or demonstrated proficiency by assessment;
  - Both of the above must be obtained within the five previous years including the reporting period.
- **Vocational completer:**

**Secondary:** a concentrator who passes the state-adopted technical assessment(s) or, in the absence of a state technical assessment, a concentrator who passes at least 80% of the total program competencies and is documented as attaining at least 80% of the Career Preparation Level III program competencies in an approved CTE program.

**Postsecondary:** a student in an occupational education program who has:

- Attained the “State Threshold Level of Vocational Education,” and
  - Received a postsecondary degree, certificate, or credential, including industry-certified certificate or credential and stopped program participation during the reporting year, or
  - Successfully completed 18 credit hours with a grade of “C” or better within a vocational career cluster within 5 years and stopped program participation during the reporting year.
- **Tech-Prep student:** The Tech Prep secondary student is anyone enrolled in a Tech Prep program as identified by the local Tech Prep Consortium Director as having a written articulation agreement on file showing non-redundant curricular flow with a college, whether or not the student earns college credit.

## D. Measurement Approaches

Core Sub-Indicator	Measurement Definition	Measurement Approach
1S1 Secondary Academic Attainment	<p><b>Numerator</b> - Number of CTE program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year, that meet or exceed all the state writing standards, as assessed by the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) test.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of CTE program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year, and take the writing standard, as assessed by the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) test.</p>	1
1S2 Secondary Technical Attainment	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year that pass a state-adopted proficiency assessment or in the absence of such an assessment, have documented attainment of at least 80% of the occupational Level III program competencies.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year.</p>	4
1S2 Secondary Technical Attainment	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year that pass a state-adopted proficiency assessment or in the absence of such an assessment, have documented attainment of at least 80% of the occupational Level III program competencies.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year.</p>	4
2S2 (optional) Sec Completion & Certification	<p>Numerator:</p> <p>Denominator:</p>	2S2 (optional)
3S1 Secondary Placement	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of program completers who graduated in the previous year and were placed in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service or employment in the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of program completers who graduated last year.</p>	1
4S1 Secondary Nontraditional Participation	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of non-traditional male and non-traditional female students enrolled in non-traditional Level III VTE courses in the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of students enrolled in the non-traditional Level III_VTE courses in the reporting year.</p>	1

<p>4S2 Secondary Nontraditional Completion</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of non-trad program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year that pass a state-adopted proficiency assessment or in the absence of such an assessment, have documented attainment of at least 80% of the occupational Level III program competencies.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of students completing a non-traditional VTE program in the reporting year.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Additional Measure  For 1S1 Academic Attainment</p>	<p><b>Numerator</b> - Number of CTE program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year, that meet or exceed all the state reading standards, as assessed by the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) test.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of CTE program concentrators who leave secondary education in the reporting year, and take the reading standard, as assessed by the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) test.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>1P1 Post-Secondary Academic Attainment</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who (1) achieve the state defined threshold level of course taking; (2) attain a "C" or better in all state designated academic courses; and (3) have stopped program participation in the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who (1) achieve the state defined threshold level of course taking; and (2) stopped program participation in the reporting year.</p>	<p>5  6</p>
<p>1P2 Post-Secondary Technical Attainment</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who (1) achieve the state-defined threshold level of course taking; (2) have met program-defined and industry-validated occupational skills standards in all occupational courses with a "C" or better; and (3) have stopped program participation in the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number vocational program adult learners who (1) achieve the state defined threshold level of course taking and (2) have stopped program participation in the reporting year.</p>	<p>5  6</p>
<p>2P1 Post-Secondary Degree Credential</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who (1) earned 18 credits within a program cluster and left postsecondary education in the reporting year, or (2) received a postsecondary degree, certificate, or credential and left the postsecondary program in the reporting year</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who achieved the state-defined threshold level and leave a postsecondary program in the reporting year.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>3P1 Post-Secondary Placement</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who: (1) completed a program in the previous reporting year; and (2) were placed in further postsecondary education, <u>advanced training</u>, employment, and/or military service three months after stopping participation in the program.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who <u>completed a program in the previous reporting year.</u> (The numerator from 2P1 the previous year.)</p>	<p>1, 3</p>
<p>3P2 Post-Secondary Retention</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who: (1) completed a program in the <u>previous</u> reporting year; and (2) were placed in further postsecondary education, <u>advanced training</u>, employment, and/or military service three months after stopping participation in the program and (3) <u>remained in that placement for an additional six months.</u></p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of vocational program adult learners who completed a postsecondary program in the <u>previous</u> reporting year <u>and</u> were placed three months after stopping participation in the program.</p>	<p>3P2 Post-Secondary Retention</p>
<p>4P1 Post-Secondary Nontraditional Participation</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of males in female dominated <u>occupational programs</u> and number of females in male dominated <u>occupational programs</u> participating in non-traditional programs in the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of adult learners who participated in non-traditional programs in the reporting year.</p>	<p>4P1 Post-Secondary Nontraditional Participation</p>
<p>4P2 Post-Secondary Nontraditional Completion</p>	<p><b>Numerator:</b> Number of males in female dominated <u>occupational programs</u> and number of females in male dominated <u>occupational programs</u> completing non-traditional programs in the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of adult learners who completed non-traditional programs in the reporting year.</p>	<p>1</p>

## **E. Improvement Strategies (Perkins Accountability Data)**

### **Secondary:**

- All LEAs and SEA CTE program specialists continue to receive training on performance-based decisions, improving data quality, and Arizona's new reporting of Performance Measures results. SEA specialists and LEA personnel were offered 42 workshops this year in accessing and using new performance reports.
- Arizona now has two state strategies for improving data quality: proactive technical assistance before the reporting deadline and data quality reviews after the reporting deadline.
- Arizona expects to provide on-site proactive technical assistance visits to every district before the July 1 2006 performance measures reporting deadline.
- Increased emphasis will be given to insuring users are aware of the electronic on-line feature that(1) identifies the absence of CTE program student records and (2) prompts for either the entry of the missing records or the filing of a "zero" report indicating there are no records in this reporting year.
- Arizona re-wrote the user manuals for electronic reporting of enrollment and performance measures data, providing screen shots and detailed step-by-step instructions for all on-line and text file submissions. All manuals are available on the CTE web site and print publications were given to all LEAs.
- Arizona will have at least one industry-validated, state-endorsed technical assessment available in 2006 to measure the Arizona workplace skill standards common to all programs; these standards are derived from the national core cluster foundation skills.
- Arizona will have at least one additional one industry-validated, state-endorsed technical assessment available to programs in Auto Technology, Construction Technology, and Culinary Arts.
- Arizona will implement the automated verification of concentrator leaver codes with the State's Student Accountability Information System (SAIS).
- Two of the State's largest districts have state-directed Basic Grant objectives to report required special populations enrollment and performance data or face ineligibility for future funding.
- Arizona is beta-testing on-line reporting of articulated enrollment reporting when the program's coherent sequence is shared between two or more schools. This reporting will electronically record the school responsible for the accountability reporting.
- The State's on-line Program Profile Table, which lists Active programs participating in annual accountability reporting, will be modified to include (1) the identification of the CTE program options approved for each school, and (2) the articulated coherent sequences shared between schools.
- The on-line enrollment and performance measures system has been modified to allow LEAs to "practice" accountability reporting using a "sample school"

identity. This is offered to LEAs who anticipate applying for CTE funding in the next annual cycle.

- The SEA still faces the challenge of electronically sharing information on Basic Grant objectives and Basic Grant narrative reports. The SEA still needs to be able to evaluate the cumulative *impact* of the objectives related to specific research-based state improvement strategies. At this time it is not possible to capture the cohort of programs that are all using the same strategy. It is a struggle to change from local projects evaluating their objectives as successful by merely documenting the completion of an activity or counting the number of units delivered.
- The Career and Technical Education Division (CTE) annually imports data from other ADE Divisions, avoiding potential data entry errors.
- CTE annually collects Tech Prep program articulation information from Arizona Tech Prep Consortia Directors and physically reviews the agreements housed at the consortia offices
- Through continuous improvement, the internal electronic enrollment system has been programmed to search for errors in the data:

Enrollment verification reports return data to the districts identifying:

- Invalid district or school numbers
- Invalid course numbers
- Teacher certification reporting errors or issues
- Errors in totaling sub-population columns
- Course has minutes outside the normal range

New internal reports now search the current enrollment data for:

- Schools that submit year-end program enrollment data (unduplicated) with no supporting course enrollment
- Schools that submit no year-end program enrollment data to match their course enrollment
- Active programs that have not submitted enrollment
- Inactive programs with unexpected data submitted in error
- New programs that fail to submit expected data during the year

This allows earlier intervention with the data errors, since previously these errors were identified during the summer funding reports.

Additional errors are identified annually prior to the state funding notification, which uses annual average enrollment calculations.

- Programs with insufficient size
- Programs that only report work experience
- Programs that do not appear to offer the program's coherent sequence of courses

Through continuous improvement, the performance measures system has been programmed to search for errors in the data:

- Duplicate student records from the same school can be identified as “state” records with information for the student’s participation in a different CTE program
- Required fields must be completed or the record will not load
- Required fields must conform to expected data type or the field will not load
- Prompts have been provided to search and remind users to enter either concentrator records or zero reports when no information has been received from the CTE program
- Prompts have been provided to search and remind users to enter either placement records or zero reports when no information has been received from the CTE program

New internal reports now search the current performance measures data for:

- Active programs that have not submitted concentrator information
- Active programs that have not submitted placement information
- Inactive programs with unexpected performance data submitted in error. Only in certain circumstances does Arizona allow concentrators and/or placements to be reported following notification of a program closure.
- Duplicate concentrator records submitted from different schools for the same student

New internal error reports have been created that link enrollment and performance data together in anticipation of granting program approval and eligibility for funding.

- Active programs are checked to see if they have all the necessary elements needed to remain eligible including:
  - Sufficient size
  - Sequence of courses
  - Concentrator information
  - Placement information
  - October enrollment submitted to School Finance
  - Course enrollment
  - Program enrollment

Postsecondary: Discussions continue with Institutional Research, Occupational Deans, and other designated postsecondary administrators regarding compliance, monitoring, data quality, and annual evaluations in a continuous effort to address the postsecondary findings of the 2005 OVAE monitoring visit.

#### **IV. Monitoring Follow-up**

**Secondary:** Suggested improvement strategies adopted include:

- State policy and procedures cited from state and federal statutes are now included in published documents.
- Tech Prep funding allocation formula now contains a performance component.
- The state is more closely aligning accountability data to the local application through state-directed objectives, with a greater number of projects having state-directed objectives written jointly with programmatic and accountability staff in consultation with LEAs.
- The SEA is sharing all 2005 concentrator records with state colleges to assist in the identification of postsecondary special populations, the identification of postsecondary Tech Prep students, and the verification of secondary placement information.
- Arizona has increased negotiated targets by adopted the rolling three-year averages as the methodology for setting levels.

## V. Monitoring Follow-up

### Postsecondary

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Tech Prep Programs: "In some instances, tech-prep data at the postsecondary level is missing. This raises serious questions as to whether performance data for the state is in fact "complete, accurate and reliable." The absence of tech-prep data at specific community colleges raise the question of completeness for tech-prep data in the Consolidated Annual Report (CAR)."	On-Site Monitoring Visit Report of March 14, 2005	(1) Update AZ Postsecondary Guidelines for Perkins (Institutional Research Manual)	(1) Draft June, 2005; Final July 2005	Dennis Fiscus, Marilee Johnson, Amy Scott		(1) E-mailed to IR offices on 08/01/05	(1) Institutional Research Manual - Final July 2005 version (Example A)
		(2) Hold a statewide Tech Prep - Institutional Research (IR) Institute	(2) June 23, 2005			(2) Held June 23, 2005 at Maricopa Community College District Offices	(2) Agenda and surveys from IR Institute (Example B)
		(3) Share all concentrator records between secondary and postsecondary so postsecondary can access a student's secondary Tech Prep identification	(3) September 2, 2005			(3) ADE secondary CTE student data download CD sent to IR staff via Federal Express on 09/01/05	(3) Copies of memo to IR staff on how to use the enclosed CD and the Federal Express air bills attached and copy of the distributed CD (Example C)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Tech Prep Programs (continued)		(4) Review Tech Prep Project application form, approval process, and allocation formula	(4) June, 2005			(4) June 1, 2005	(4) FY2006 Tech Prep RFP (Example D)
		(5) Attend DQI conference	(5) June 2005			(5) Attended June 14-16, 2005	(5) Registration materials for DQI Conference (Example E)
		(6) Change college IR practice of looking at current concentrator list to looking at a list of concentrators from the past five years	(6) September 2005			(6) August 1, 2005	(6) Institutional Research Manual - Final July 2005 version (Example A)
		(7) All postsecondary Basic Grant recipients have objectives for placement	(7) October 1, 2005			(7) October 1, 2005	(7) Basic Grant for each college (Example F)
		(8) All postsecondary institutions to add a Tech Prep flag in student data	(8) November 1, 2005				(8) 2004 Consolidated Annual Report (Example G)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Special Populations: “A review of the state’s performance data indicates that special population’s data for FY 2004 is missing from most of the state’s core indicators at the postsecondary level. The lack of meaningful data for special populations raises serious questions as to whether performance data for the state is in fact, “complete, accurate and reliable.”	On-Site Monitoring Visit Report of March 14, 2005	(1) Hold a statewide Tech Prep - Institutional Research (IR) Institute	(1) June 23, 2005	Tom Bartz, Karlene Darby		(1) Workshops have been and will continue to be conducted with appropriate postsecondary staff to increase awareness of this issue and brainstorm to suggest all possible strategies to remedy this situation.	(1) Agenda and surveys from IR Institute (Example B)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Special Populations (continued)		(2) Share all concentrator records between secondary and postsecondary	(2) September 1, 2005			(2) State-developed objectives have been created and included in the postsecondary Perkins applications for 06 specifying outcomes related to special population's students and data, and targeting special population's expenditures to appropriate outcomes.	(2) Basic Grant objectives sent to each college (Example J)

Finding	Source of Finding	State Improvement Actions	Target Dates	State Contact	Notes	Completed	Product
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Special Populations (continued)		(3) Begin on-site monitoring visits for Perkins community college projects				(3) Perkins Basic Grant postsecondary liaison has been conducting and will continue to conduct targeted monitoring with the postsecondary institutions on all special populations issues in order to bring awareness to and suggest specific strategies for each community college for resolving this issue.	

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Special Populations (continued)		(4) Attend DQI conference				(4) To assist the postsecondary applicants in identifying special populations with disabilities who transition from secondary CTE programs, a data identifier will be attached to those students' names so that postsecondary institutions can more productively follow up in identification of and assistance with these students tied to appropriate Perkins expenditures	

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Special Populations (continued)		(5) Set up a new Postsecondary Mailbox within the ADE email system to accept and respond to IR/PS Accountability questions from the community colleges				(5) Created mailbox on 08/01/05 – mailbox address in manual sent to IR staff on 08/01/05	(5) E-mail from ADE MIS staff member confirming the completion of the mailbox setup and steps to include it in the Postsecondary ADE staff members' MS Outlook (Example H)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Finding Accountability: "In the state's CAR for program year 2004, data for 3P1 and 3P2 were incomplete; specifically the employment and military data were missing for each of the two indicators. For some colleges, the education data was also missing, resulting in no data reported for the two indicators."	On-Site Monitoring Visit Report of March 14, 2005	(1) Update AZ Postsecondary Guidelines for Perkins	(1) July 1, 2005	Tom Bartz, Dennis Fiscus, Amy Scott		(1) August 1, 2005	(1) Institutional Research Manual - Final July 2005 version (Example A)
		(2) Hold a statewide Tech Prep - Institutional Research (IR) Institute	(2) June 23, 2005			(2) Held on June 23, 2005	(2) Agenda and surveys from IR Institute (Example B)
		(3) share all secondary concentrator records with postsecondary projects	(3) October 1, 2005			(3) ADE secondary CTE student data download CD sent to IR staff via Federal Express on 09/01/05	(3) Copies of memo to IR staff on how to use the enclosed CD and the Federal Express air bills attached and copy of the distributed CD (Example C)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Accountability (continued)		(4) Change measurement approach to include state-developed college-administered surveys					
		(5) Create state-developed college-administered survey form				(5) Survey distributed to IR staff on July 28, 2005	(5) Postsecondary Placement and Retention Survey (Example I)
		(6) Attend DQI conference				(6) Attended June 14-16, 2005	(6) Registration materials for DQI Conference (Example E)
		(7) Require all community college projects to have improvement objectives for 3P1 and 3P2	(7) October 1, 2005 and January 1, 2006		(7) Periodic calls by BG contacts to ADE regarding placement survey and DES Data	(7) ADE e-mailed improvement objectives for FY06 to all colleges during week of July 25th	(7) Basic Grant objectives sent to each college (Example J)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Accountability (continued)		(8) Contract for statewide postsecondary data compilation services using at least one national database for locating students placed out-of-state	(8) August 1, 2005	Del Dawley, Dennis Fiscus, Amy Scott		(8) August 1, 2005	(8) Page from Arizona Western College FY2006 RFP denoting contract (Example K)
		(9) Establish 2005 sufficient improvement percentages for colleges with 2004 zero performance	(9) Tiered completion dates of October 1, 2005, January 1, 2006 and October 1, 2006		(9) -- June 23, 2005 - IR Staff meeting -- July 19, 2005 - Occupational Dean meeting -- Week of July 25, 2005		(9) Basic Grant objectives sent to each college (Example J)
		(10) Inform colleges of the consequences for failing to show 2005 sufficient improvement	(10) January 1, 2006		(10) -- June 23, 2005 - IR Staff meeting -- July 19, 2005, Occupational Dean meeting	(10) June 23, 2005 and July 19, 2005	(10) "Importance of Collecting Perkins Basic Grant Data" statement (Example L)

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Source of Finding</b>	<b>State Improvement Actions</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>	<b>State Contact</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Product</b>
Area or issue identified as needing improvement/action	On site visit, state documentation, other	What activities/steps the State has identified it will do to address the findings	Anticipated completion of activity/steps identified	Individual(s) at the State level to work with State Liaison	Record of conversations/communications relative to action/progress	Date Completed	Documentation that supports the completion of the Action
Failure to identify college Tech Prep students	On-Site Monitoring Visit Report of March 14, 2005	Tech Prep - Institutional Research (IR) Institute to discuss AZ Perkins Institutional Research Guide and arrive at consensus on state data measures, operational definitions, and data quality.	(1) June 23, 2005	Tom Bartz, Dennis Fiscus, Marilee Johnson		Internal state discussion completed July 2005	Requests to revise AZ FAUPL measurement approaches and definitions (Example M)
Failure to identify college students with disabilities	On-Site Monitoring Visit Report of March 14, 2005	Share concentrator records between secondary and postsecondary so postsecondary can access a student's secondary special populations identification				ADE secondary CTE student data download CD sent to IR staff via Federal Express on 09/01/05	Copies of memo to IR staff on how to use the enclosed CD and the Federal Express air bills attached and copy of the distributed CD (Example C)
Failure to identify Placed/Retained students	On-Site Monitoring Visit Report of March 14, 2005	State-developed, college-administered survey and/or DES data				Survey distributed to IR staff on July 28, 2005	Postsecondary Placement and Retention Survey (Example I)

## **VI. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Incentive Grant Award Results**

No Arizona award granted.