

NEXT STEPS WORK GROUP CONFERENCE CALL

April 2, 2009 | 2:00 – 3:00 P.M. (ET)

MEETING SUMMARY

The Next Steps Work Group (NSWG) is a voluntary information-sharing network comprised primarily of state and Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff to dialog topics of common interest related to Carl D. Perkins Act compliance and data reporting. NSWG summaries attempt to capture many of the questions and comments, and are not intended to be the definitive source for specific OVAE policy.

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

OVAE UPDATES

Preparations for Upcoming Performance Negotiations— John H. described some of the parameters surrounding the upcoming state negotiations. States will have the opportunity to renegotiate their performance levels along with changes to the measurement definitions. If a state chooses to renegotiate their measurement definitions, and the definitions vary from the non-regulatory guidance, a justification for the change will be requested that assures validity and reliability of the suggested definition for the performance measure.

John H. also explained the rationale for the growth model which would seek 100% attainment of appropriate performance measures over a 10-year period. This is the model adopted by OVAE; however, if a state wishes to suggest an alternative growth model, this can occur during negotiations.

December 7, 8, and 9, 2009 were announced as tentative dates for the next Data Quality Institute (DQI). The DQI will be held in Washington DC.

There was a question asking on “new” FERPA regulations and what could OVAE provide regarding changes. Rather than a detailed response, the following link is provided with the December 2008 FERPA information. There is access to several documents from the web page link below.

Dear Colleague Letter about Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) Final Regulations:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/hottopics/ht12-17-08.html>

RACE & ETHNICITY SUB-GROUP

Chuck Wiseley, CA, sub-group facilitator, had nothing new to report since our last NSWG call. The recommendations of the sub-group were given to OVAE, but no definitive response has been given by OVAE.

OPEN SPACE: *Questions from the Field*

The March call generated some follow up questions from a number of states. The April meeting included time for follow up questions from the field.

2008-2009 NSWG Co-Chairs

Secondary:

- **Sharon Enright**, Ohio Department of Education
sharon.enright@ode.state.oh.us | 614-644-6814

Postsecondary:

- **Kathy Wilkins**, Montana University System
kwilkins@montana.edu | 406-444-0313

Tech Prep:

- **Dennis Fiscus**, Arizona Department of Education
dennis.fiscus@azed.gov | 602-542-5356

OVAE Contact:

- **John Haigh**, Office of Vocational & Adult Education
John.haigh@ed.gov | 202-245-7735

“We would like some guidance to what qualifies as a state or industry-recognized certificate or license for Tech Prep indicators 1STP3 and 2PTP2? Specifically, does the WorkKeys Career Readiness Certificate qualify?” *Discussion: Ultimately, it is a state decision if WorkKeys Career Readiness Certificate is considered a state or industry-recognized certificate. Some state voices didn’t consider WorkKeys Career Readiness Certificate an industry-recognized certificate as intended by the measure. It was suggested the state’s 2S1 and 1P1 measurement approach, once approved by OVAE, could be used as for 1STP3 and 2PTP2.*

What other states participating in the conference call are submitting CTE data for EDEN and how have the reconciled the differences between the file specifications for EDEN and the guidelines for data submitted for the CAR? *Discussion: Several participants shared how they are approaching the alignment of CTE data with EDEN. It was also suggested this be a topic for the December 2009 DQI. NSWG participants are encouraged to offer any input they have on EDEN and CTE to: Jill Kroll, Education Research Consultant, Michigan Department of Education at KrollJ1@Michigan.gov.*

TECHNICAL SKILL ASSESSMENT SUB-GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

Prior to the call, the “Recommendations to OVAE Regarding Technical Skill Assessment for Postsecondary Level” was sent to the NSWG distribution list. Gabriela Borcoman, Texas, provided background on the sub-group discussions leading to the recommendations. It was stressed these are recommendations and the final decision will be made by OVAE.

A lengthy discussion occurred that surfaced diverse opinions on the inclusion of GPA as a recommended approach for reporting technical skill attainment. Compelling justification was provided supporting inclusion of GPA in the recommendations; and, equally compelling justification was provided for the exclusion of GPA in the recommendations. There was an expressed sense of urgency because of the upcoming state negotiations on Perkins IV performance measures. The outcome of OVAE’s action on the recommendations may impact what and how the states choose to negotiate. Some call participants wanted to see an equally explicit set of recommendations for the secondary level. Sub-group members committed to include both secondary and postsecondary in the recommendations sent to OVAE.

The next step will advance the recommendations to OVAE as soon as they can be prepared. John H. indicated OVAE would consider the recommendations as soon as OVAE processes will allow and notify states of their decision. It was clear during the call that participants are seeking guidance from OVAE on defining and defending validity and reliability criteria for 2S1 and 1P1 performance measures.

[Update to April 2 NSWG Call](#)

On Friday, April 10 during the NASDCTEc Spring Meeting, OVAE offered a verbal response to the Technical Skill Assessment Sub-Group recommendations. OVAE’s response, given by Sharon Miller, is rooted in the March 2007 non-regulatory guidance which provided the following note:

Note for Indicator 2S1 & 1P1: The Department recognizes that a State may not have technical skill assessments that are aligned with industry-recognized standards in every CTE program area and for every CTE concentrator. OVAE expects that each State will identify, in Part A, Section VI (Accountability and Evaluation) of its new Perkins IV State plan, the program areas for which the State has technical skill assessments, the estimated percentage of students who will be reported in the State’s calculation for CTE concentrators who took assessments, and the State’s plan and timeframe for increasing the coverage of programs and students reported in this indicator to cover all CTE concentrators and all program areas in the future.

CORRECTION to March 2009 NSWG Call Summary

There is a sentence in the March NSWG call summary that says, “Section 113 data reporting calls for Tech Prep student performance data as a sub-group of CTE concentrators” (this is correct). “This is a requirement for all states whether they merged their Title II Tech Prep funding with their Title I Basic Grant funding or not” (this part is incorrect).

States that have consolidated all of their Tech Prep funds are *not* required to submit any data (enrollment, performance on the Sec. 113(b) indicators, or performance on the 203(e) indicators of performance). Once a state consolidates all of its Title II (Tech Prep education funds), it must add those funds in with its Title I funds and use the combined funds for programs under Title I. Therefore, technically speaking, the state no longer has tech prep programs on which to gather and report data. [Sharon Miller, OVAE]

Sharon Miller indicated that no additional guidance would be issued from OVAE regarding measurement approaches for 2S1 (secondary technical skills attainment) and 1P1 (postsecondary technical skills attainment). Sharon further indicated that the Department hopes that states will continue to use--or make a new request to use--technical skills assessments as their measurement approach for 2S1 and 1P1. However, consistent with the original March 12, 2007, State plan guidance, if a State opts to change its measurement approach from technical skills assessments to another approach, the state would have to justify how the new approach was valid and reliable.

NEXT CALL

May 7, 2009; 2:00-3:00 PM ET

Call Number: 866-390-5250

Call ID: 5707853

Submitted by:

Jim Schoelkopf, MPR Associates

jschoelkopf@mprinc.com

503-963-3759