

# OVAE

## Next Steps Work Group Conference Call

February 5, 2008

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 February meeting convened at 2:00 PM EST with a welcome from Jim Schoelkopf, NSWG call host, and a brief overview of the agenda.

### OVAE UPDATES

**Guidance for State Plan Revisions**—John Haigh indicated a memo will be prepared and sent to State CTE Directors regarding performance negotiations and state plan revisions. Revisions to state plans are due April 20, 2009. Currently, there is a delay in U.S. Department of Education processing of official communications because of the transition to the new administration. A question was asked regarding when 2009-2010 Perkins state allocation would be available. John H. did not have a specific date, but indicated - 2009-2010 Perkins allocations would be announced within the next few months.

### TECHNICAL SKILL SUB-GROUP

Sharon E. gave an update of the work being done by the Technical Skills Sub-Group and a report of the sub-group's - January 26 conference call. The sub-group conference call reinforced the Perkins definition for technical skills", recognized challenges such as development and administration - cost of assessments and data collection, implementation differences for secondary and postsecondary sectors, - and the assessment of "true" technical skills, not "soft" skills. A written summary of the January 26 Technical Skill - Sub-Group call is an attachment with this summary. -

#### 2008-2009 NSWG Co-Chairs

Secondary:

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

Postsecondary:

- **Kathy Wilkins**, Montana University System  
[kwilkins@montana.edu](mailto:kwilkins@montana.edu)  
406-444-0313

Tech Prep:

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

### PEER COLLABORATIVE RESOURCE NETWORK (PCRN) SUB-GROUP

Kathy W. was not on the call to give a status report. Jim S. reported the completion of the PCRN survey summary and the survey information is being shared with the technology contractor hosting the PCRN website. It seems the work of the sub-group is completed. Jim S. will confirm with Kathy W. if it is time to sunset the PCRN Sub-Group.

### RACE/ETHNICITY SUB-GROUP

Jim S. announced the formation of a new sub-group to address issues raised regarding the difference in transition timing to the 1997 race and ethnicity standards between secondary and postsecondary sectors. The formation of this sub-group was recommended during the January 2009 NSWG call.

Specifically, EDEN/EDFacts (<http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>) has a 2010-2011 implementation year for K-12, but IPEDS has a different implementation timeline which requires full implementation for the 2011-2012 year (<http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/reic/resource.asp>); ([http://www.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/submit\\_data/changes0809.asp](http://www.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/submit_data/changes0809.asp)). Given the recent CAR submission, states could only make a single state selection for the race/ethnicity standards used. Since secondary and postsecondary CTE in some states will be on different implementation timelines for the 1997 race/ethnicity standards, recommendations will be considered by the sub-group for options.

The Race/Ethnicity Sub-Group will be facilitated by Chuck Wiseley, California ([cwiseley@cccco.edu](mailto:cwiseley@cccco.edu)). Chuck W. has been in communication with the self-selected members of the sub-group and they are scheduling their first conference call. There will be a status report during the March NSWG call. If there are NSWG participants interested in joining this sub-group, please contact either Jim S. or Chuck W.

## TECH PREP

Dennis F. was unable to join the call; however, Sharon E. gave an update for Dennis. There has been growing interest in having a discussion on the Tech Prep performance indicators. During the March NSWG call, there will be a discussion on Tech Prep indicators of performance, and call planners want to gather input prior to that call.

Planners would like to know the priority Tech Prep issues at the State and local levels.

What questions have arisen?

What is working?

What are the major challenges and roadblocks?

Which TP Indicators of Performance are not yet crystal clear?

Please submit your Tech Prep questions or issues to Jim S. ([jschoelkopf@mprinc.com](mailto:jschoelkopf@mprinc.com)) or Dennis Fiscus ([dennis.fiscus@azed.gov](mailto:dennis.fiscus@azed.gov)) by February 27, 2009.

A Tech Prep Sub-Group is being created to discuss in detail issues and topics surrounding Tech Prep accountability and will report regularly to the larger NSWG. Dennis F. will facilitate a yet-to-be-formed Tech Prep Sub-Group. If there are NSWG participants interested in participating on the Tech Prep Sub-Group, please indicate your interest by contacting either Jim S. ([jschoelkopf@mprinc.com](mailto:jschoelkopf@mprinc.com)) or Dennis Fiscus ([dennis.fiscus@azed.gov](mailto:dennis.fiscus@azed.gov)).

## NEGOTIATING PERFORMANCE LEVELS

The negotiation of Perkins IV performance levels has taken on added dimensions with the required alignment with academic and technical standards for selected performance indicators. Some NSWG participants asked for a conversation regarding strategies for negotiating performance levels when there will be updating and revisions to academic and technical skill standards and their related assessments. The discussion focused on three parts:

1. - General information from OVAE on the next round of performance negotiations, for school years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.
2. - More focused discussion on performance level negotiations for indicators that involve exams or assessments (1S1 and 1S2; and 2S1, 1P1, and 1A1).
  - ✓ 1S1 and 1S2—these are based on a single exam, the state's NCLB exam. If major changes in the exam (e.g. dropping one exam and begin using a completely different exam), negotiating new performance levels, or renegotiating previously negotiated levels. Often the performance level for a new exam will be lower than the performance level for the old exam. Student performance on new exams is often lower than on exams that have been in place a while.
  - ✓ 2S1, 1P1 and 1A1—these are based on a larger number of technical skill assessments, not a single assessment. Annually, states can be expected to add new assessments and often drop older assessments. Due to the annual cycle of adding and dropping of assessments, it is hard to annually increase performance levels in a consistent manner.

3. - Renegotiating performance levels for the current year (2008-2009)—states may want to renegotiate ASAP. What is the process?

The discussion seemed to center on the psychometric evidence that indicates a reduction of student performance when there is a new assessment introduced for measurement. The new assessment can be a result of revisions to the content standards being measured or the introduction of new test items. This circumstance could be especially acute as states scale up their technical skill assessment systems. The discussion seemed to resonate with those that have had more experience with state-wide technical assessment systems.

During the discussion, John H. shared OVAE discussions on the utility of a growth model. He also reminded call participants of their ability to renegotiate performance levels through the annual state plan update. States often announce to locals at least one year in advance of changes to standards and/or assessments.

It was recommended this topic be transferred to the Technical Skill Assessment Sub-Group for further discussion. This circumstance should be considered as the sub-group considered recommendations for OVAE.

For renegotiation of current year performance levels, OVAE staff responded by having the state contact their Regional Accountability Specialist (RAS) immediately if they desire renegotiation of 2008-2009 performance levels.

## **OTHER QUESTIONS**

*What is the current status of the technical assessment clearinghouse and item bank?*

There was no firm status update, but an understanding by some OVAE staff of a RFP being developed to address a technical skill assessment clearinghouse.

## **NEXT CALL**

**March 5, 2009; 2:00-3:00 PM ET**

Call Number: 866-390-5250 -

Call ID: 5707853 -

Submitted by: -  
Jim Schoelkopf, MPR Associates -  
[jschoelkopf@mprinc.com](mailto:jschoelkopf@mprinc.com) -  
503-963-3759