



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Vocational and Adult Education  
Division of Academic and Technical Education

# State *Perkins* Accountability Congress Design Team Meeting 2

December 15, 2011

# Principles for Team Dialogue

- Share time and participate equally
- Contribute concisely and stay on topic
- Welcome and respect all opinions
- Listen for meaning
- Build on others' ideas; avoid immediate “but” or “no” responses
- Air concerns during the meeting, not after
- Support the team outside the team

# Meeting Objectives

- Respond to questions
- Identify issues related to state responsibilities for performance; OVAE will respond at the January meeting
- Develop of a list of terms, definitions, descriptions

# Questions from Meeting 1

**Sharon Miller, Director**

Division of Academic and Technical Education (DATE)  
Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE)

[sharon.miller@ed.gov](mailto:sharon.miller@ed.gov)

**John Haigh, Branch Chief**

DATE—Accountability and Performance Branch  
Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE)

[John.Haigh@ed.gov](mailto:John.Haigh@ed.gov)

# Question Themes

- Contextual
- Clarifying/defining terms
- Consortia
- Accountability

# Contextual

- What is open for discussion and what has already been decided?
- Will *Perkins V* have regulations (versus the nonregulatory guidance under *Perkins IV*)?
- What consideration is being given to state data collection capacity?
- Does the new approach to CTE participation address concerns around data consistency and comparability?
- What happens if *Perkins* is not reauthorized for several years and/or Congress does not adopt the competitive funding model? How can our work help to address the current needs for comparable data and make sure it is transferable?

# Clarifying/Defining Terms

- In the CTE definition, what is meant by the term enrolled? Would this be a participant, a concentrator, etc.?
- What are stackable credentials?
- Is STEM included under the CTE umbrella?
- How does Rigorous Programs of Study fit into the new model? Relation to "Career Preparation Program?"
- What is a work based learning opportunity?

# Consortia

- What is "consortium" in this context?
- Are consortia geographic or by field of study?
- Will all consortia be funded? Will there be criteria for determining which consortia get funding?
- How will state allocations be determined and how will disadvantaged students be addressed?
- If the consortia change, how does a state collect the data needed for accountability over time?

# Consortia (cont.)

- Will only CTE students who are part of the funded consortia be counted for accountability? Postsecondary students who return to education after a period away? How should students attending multiple institutions be treated?
- How are we going to incentivize the business community to participate in consortia in a meaningful way?
- Programs may change to meet labor market demand. If a program is not an articulated POS, will a consortium lose part of a grant because it responds to labor market needs?

# Consortia (cont.)

- Will the cap for administrative costs at the local level be revised?
- Is consideration being given to reduce or refine the list of required and permissive uses of *Perkins* funds?

# Accountability

- How would we account for state unemployment levels when reporting employment and earnings as indicators of program and/or student performance?
- Will wages and employment need to be related to the program of study?
- Employment data may be limited; information about occupation or hourly wages is not available. Some states do not allow the use of social security numbers.
- Will additional support/guidance be available to capture wage data for students who leave the state for employment? Is DOE pursuing access to the Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS) to measure employment and earnings across states?

# Accountability (cont.)

- What is the vision for the move to more competitive funding? Would this be to states, within states, or both?
- Will performance based funding be based on growth measures?
- How will performance based *Perkins* funding for high school programs lead to improved outcomes for recipients of veterans benefits or recipients of college financial aid?
- Is there consideration being given to increasing the state administration set aside to accommodate this additional responsibility?
- Performance and competition may not lead to equality, especially in rural areas with very limited funding. Will there be guidance for the states in this area?

# Participation Discussion

**John Haigh, Branch Chief**

DATE—Accountability and Performance Branch  
Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE)

[John.Haigh@ed.gov](mailto:John.Haigh@ed.gov)

# CTE Participation

An individual is considered a secondary, postsecondary, or adult career and technical education student (or: participant) when he or she enrolls in a career preparation program offered by a consortium that was selected by the state through the within-state competition for Perkins funding.

# CTE Participation (cont.)

- Student participation entails identifying and counting all students who participate in a “Career Preparation Program”
- Local data from funded consortia would be reported annually in a state’s CAR submission

# Career Preparation Programs

- Focus on a state-identified high-demand sector or occupational cluster
- Meet five requirements set forth in the OVAE blueprint
- Offered within approved consortia
- Meet a set of state-established approval criteria
- Meet a minimum program design threshold
- May employ various delivery models (e.g., POS, Career Academy)

# Minimum Program Design Threshold

- Consist of at least two structured, sequenced, and credited face-to-face or virtual learning opportunities
- Must offer at least 150 clock hours of instructional time
- Must be part of a consortia application and extend across the secondary and postsecondary level
- Must be funded—either fully or partially—with *Perkins* resources. Non-*Perkins* costs may be paid for using other federal, state, local, and private in-kind or cash matching resources

# Questions for Consideration

- Are different definitions of CTE participation needed at the secondary and postsecondary levels? If so, what should they be?
- At what point should students enrolled in an approved CTE sequence be reported? After completing the first course? A threshold level of coursework?
- Can a common definition of CTE participation be identified across states?
- Should students enrolled in non-approved CTE sequences within a funded agency be counted?

# Questions for Consideration (cont.)

- Should the accountability system differentiate students who transition from secondary to postsecondary education within a given sequence?
- How should reporting occur for students who enroll in a postsecondary program without completing the secondary component of the CTE program?
- What reporting challenges can you envision?
- Is federal regulatory language needed?

# Next Steps

- OVAE will continue to respond to questions raised during the first meeting of the Design Team
- Design Team members should submit additional questions via email to Amanda Richards ([arichards@mprinc.com](mailto:arichards@mprinc.com)) until the interactive website is launched

# Contact Information

## John Haigh

Performance & Accountability Branch Chief  
Division of Academic & Technical Education  
Office of Vocational & Adult Education

U.S. Department of Education  
550 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20202  
P: 202-245-7735

[John.Haigh@ed.gov](mailto:John.Haigh@ed.gov)

## Amanda Richards

Associate Director,  
Preparation for College and Career

MPR Associates, Inc.  
1618 SW First Avenue, Suite 300  
Portland, OR 97201  
P: 503-222-5467 x402  
F: 503-389-1570

[arichards@mprinc.com](mailto:arichards@mprinc.com)