

## AEBG CTE Assessment Committee Meeting Notes

**Present: Stephanie Lewis, Kate Alder, Teresa Matos, Frank Gerdeman, Steven Thompson, Andrew Carter, Adrienne Ann Mullen, John Brauer, Bill Bettencourt, Rocky Bettar**

### Adult Education Block Grant CTE Assessment Committee

July 11, 2017 Meeting Notes

At the second meeting of the Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) CTE Assessment Committee Meeting, the group began by reviewing the timeline for the “AEBG Data, Accountability, and Assessment Planning Process” and reviewed recommendations made by the AEBG Data & Accountability Committee and discussed the following topics;

- Reporting Processes and Tools,
- Program and Population Definitions
- Postsecondary Credential Completion
- Occupational Skills Gain
- Transition to Postsecondary Education
- Other CTE Program Metrics

### Timeline for Deliverables

The group reviewed the timeline for deliverables for the field team process including the August 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for the report to the legislature. It was shared that CDE and the CO have a draft version of the legislative report in hand for review and that the full draft would be shared with the committees later in July. The white paper for the CTE meeting includes excerpts from the draft report, particularly the recommendations on program definitions and CTE related reporting metrics. A full draft data element dictionary has also been developed which will inform guidance to the field which will be inform TA sessions for consortia in late August and September.

On another note, Participants shared that there were data hierarchy issues related to TE that were impacting outcomes displayed by CASAS in data tables shared with consortia. These have been shared with Neil and Jay. The AEBG Field team process, data definitions, and accompanying data element dictionary should clarify what boxes in TE should be used for reporting and how that will impact the display of data in the TE data tables and the Launchboard, however that guidance will not be available in time for the 16/17 end of year data report.

### Data Reporting Systems

The committee reviewed the Data and Accountability Committee recommendations to use the college MIS system for reporting of adult education data in 2018/19 and that MIS and CCC Apply will be retrofitted in 2017/18 to align the college reporting systems with TE and Adult Education reporting. This will provide the colleges time in the coming year to make changes to their local data systems and data collection processes to collect information on all the AE student, program, and outcome metrics. The overall structure of the yearly data reporting process, system(s), data

matching between K12 AE, College MIS, HS Equivalency data sets, and the EDD Wage File, data integration in the LaunchBoard Adult Education data tab, and reporting process to the legislature was shared in a flow chart for review and comment.

Related to the flow chart, it was noted that the match between student enrollment data and HS equivalency testing service data occurs in October to meet the timelines for WIOA II reporting. The Data and Accountability has recommended expanding this match for the entire AEBG student data set or doing a secondary data match once all the data is compiled in the Launchboard. A college practitioner noted that it was important to sort out the logistics of K12 AE practitioners accessing the Launchboard once the AE data tab goes live. Another question regarded what would happen to consortia using third party data platforms integrating data locally and if they could report directly from those platforms into the system.

College participants reported they are able, if necessary, to continue to report into TE quarterly for one more year while the changes were made to MIS and CCC Apply for implementation in 18/19. It was shared by one of the participants related to this that it was possible the Data and Accountability funding would be extended one additional year so that colleges and adult schools could continue to use this funding to support the staffing time for reporting into TE for the additional year.

Related to quarterly reporting into TE, however the question was raised as to why student enrollment and outcome reporting needed to be quarterly. Participants reported that in the past under WIOA they were required to only report financial data quarterly and that student data was traditionally reported annually. Additionally, under AEBG, student data was initially reported biannually on January 31<sup>st</sup> and July 31<sup>st</sup>. It was proposed that perhaps AEBG could return to this reporting cycle rather than quarterly as was done in the past. Additionally, it was expressed that student journeys don't even fit neatly into yearly reporting cycles so reporting of outcomes quarterly didn't seem meaningful. In relationship to this comment it was noted that we wouldn't really have a fuller understanding of longer term student journeys until we had accumulated multiple years of data, but that the LaunchBoard could support that. Bi annual reporting would at least better align the reporting cycles to the semester scheduling system used by colleges and reduce the reporting load on consortia. WestEd will raise these questions with State leadership and the DAC committee and provide a response to the CTE committee by email. *Note: Quarterly reporting for WIA/WIOA Title II has been required since 2003/2004 so it appears this is likely the driver for AEBG quarterly reporting.*

A separate question was raised about services provided by CBO's to AE participants who may not be enrolled or not yet enrolled at a K12 AE school or community college noncredit program. The definition of students for reporting implies that they are enrolled in K12 AE or college noncredit programs when there are consortia outsourcing some services to CBO's and other providers. It was recommended that language be crafted to specify that all students served by consortia, including by CBO's under contract with consortia, are reportable and that either the K12 AE school or college members are the responsible parties for reporting of students served by third party providers. *A number of CBO's, jails, parole agencies, and libraries are WIOA II funded and are required to report through TE already, so this may need additional exploration by the AEBG office.*

## “Secondary” Data Report

The Data and Accountability Committee recommendation was shared to create an annual secondary data report that would use population flags to analyze how AE students are being served in for credit programs and to do a more detailed analysis of emerging and effective practices in adult education such as IET models embedded in for credit programs, immigrant immersion, or a deeper analysis of how AE programs are impacting outcomes on a more localized or regional basis.

College practitioners identified that particularly for colleges that had little noncredit programming it was good to have a place to tell the story of how AE students in some places are being served by for credit programs and to inform how credit programs could be tracked or counted as part of the larger AE denominator in the future. It was identified that it should not be called a ‘secondary’ data report because that implied that 1) the report was intended to make up for data insufficiencies in the primary report to the legislature; or that 2) the information contained in the report was less important when in fact many of the emergent or effective practices analyzed in the report may be very important for understanding the future directions of AE in California.

## AE Populations and Programs

The revised definition of the student reporting universe was shared with the committee. This definition now only includes K12 AE and community college noncredit students in the 7 AB104 program areas. This was aligned with the CTE committee recommendation from the last meeting and supported by the group.

The group questioned why it was called the AEBG target population and not just the Adult Education target population. The group identified that because AEBG is a funding source, it creates confusion among practitioners about why we are also collecting outcomes on students served by college apportionment, Perkins, WIOA Title I, WIOA Title II and other resources. If the purpose of reporting is to measure the impact of the multiple funding sources used by K12 AE and community college noncredit programs to serve students then the state shouldn’t use a reference to a funding source as the descriptor for the reporting universe. This better represents the integrated work of the two systems, the kinds of braiding identified in the legislation, and the broader intent of AB86.

The group reviewed the description of the 4 primary AE program areas – ABE, ASE, ESL/ELCivics, and Short Term CTE. There were no comments or revisions to those descriptions. The committee also reviewed the additional program areas which will be reported using population flags (AWD, Adults entering/reentering the workforce) and programs which can be flagged but which are clearly related to CTE (preapprenticeship), that represent other service delivery models (IET), or are tied to student goals (child success). These definitions were aligned to the recommendations of the CTE committee at the last meeting and supported by the group. *It was noted in responses to these notes*

*that for WIOA II IET is considered a sub-category or ESL and would likely be considered to be a sub-category of ABE as well in the future.*

## Postsecondary Completion

The committee reviewed different basic criteria for postsecondary credentials including training programs eligible for listing on the ETPL, Perkins, programs accreditable as postsecondary under Federal Student Aid Title IV, and certificates for community colleges. Central to this discussion was the gainful employment and direct relationship to employment in an identified occupation. Then the group reviewed the current draft definition of completion crafted for the legislative paper and approved by the Data and Accountability Committee. They also discussed the distinction between completion of a post-secondary credential and attainment of an occupational skills gain that came out the last CTE committee meeting and was tentatively approved by the DAC presuming that the CTE committee would provide further clarification of how to best define an occupational skills gain.

Questions were raised about the 48 contact hour requirement related to noncredit college programs when the requirement for a CDCP certificate was already 48 instructional hours. When it was pointed out that 48 hours was the standard for Strong Workforce completion in noncredit it was agreed to leave the 48 hour reference in the general definition of a completion. It was recommended that the general definition be accompanied by a bulleted list of types of completion which would qualify including the ETPL, Perkins, Title IV, and CDCP/noncredit instructional hour criteria identified above. The bulleted list would also include the exclusion of workforce preparation or occupational safety certificates to remove that language from the basic definition.

## Occupational Skills Gain

While the CTE committee strongly supports a separate metric for occupational skills gain it was very difficult to arrive at a concise definition that the group could agree on. A major question was whether course completion is relevant to this metric as well as different practitioner definitions of course or class. For community college practitioners, a course is based on multiple class sessions and multiple courses together constitute a program. K12 AE schools primarily use the term class and from the discussion a class could be a single meeting or a longer-term class with multiple sessions and often with an open entry open exit option.

The group reviewed specific elements of the reportable WIOA Measurable Skills Gains for guidance and two of the bullets clearly create the necessary space for the definition of such a data element for AE. Several elements emerged in the discussion:

- That it involves a clearly defined competency valued and validated by employers through an advisory committee or board,
- That it includes an assessment through a knowledge based exam, project, portfolio, or demonstration of mastery,
- That it represents a milestone that increases the employability of the participant (but would not be tracked for employment until exit)

- That workforce preparation and occupational safety certificates should count for an occupational skills gain.

By the end it was generally agreed that course completion was not a pre-requisite for occupational skills gains as a student could master and demonstrate a skill or competency or complete a milestone but not complete the course.

There were questions from one practitioner whether the ability to assess the competency should be a prerequisite for a skills gain. The examples they used were very short single class workforce readiness courses they offer as one of a larger series of courses available to the community. The group did not resolve exactly how to treat these shorter classes, but the larger group favored making an assessment of skills or competencies part of the criteria. The form of this assessment would be determined by the instructor of the course.

The group reviewed the WIOA MSG's criteria multiple times in the discussion, and one recommendation was to simply use the last two allowable MSG criteria as the definition, perhaps with some clear examples of or clarifying language. At the end, the group agreed to have the WestEd team draw from the feedback of the group to develop a draft definition and circulate that back to the group by email for further feedback.

There is a milestone flag in TE that can be used for noting an occupational skills gain, however, it was noted that it would be important to clarify to the field that this is a CTE specific indicator so that basic skills instructors check this when one of their students attains a new level or say transitions from ABE to ASE.

### Transition to Postsecondary

The committee reviewed the draft transition to postsecondary definition developed by the DAC and incorporated into the current drafts of the legislative paper. The two main questions about the current definition were regarding 1) the exclusion of college for credit developmental education courses from the postsecondary definition; and 2) that there is no provision that allows counting of a student who begins in a K12 AE CTE program and then enrolls in a college advanced CTE program.

Regarding the exclusion of for credit college developmental education courses, there was clarification of what that exactly means in the context of community college and the rationale for the exclusion. The group generally supported the conclusion that a key goal of AB86, the LAO's 2012 report and AB104 was an increase in the number of students moving into 'college level' coursework in this case defined as transfer level. This definition is especially relevant with the move towards Associate Degrees for Transfer in the community college system where developmental education or basic skills course are much more rarely used as degree applicable courses for AA or AS degrees.

The exclusion of transition from K12 AE or noncredit CTE to advanced for credit CTE as a postsecondary transition was discussed as an outcome of the inclusion of K12 AE school CTE programs as postsecondary programs. Many K12 adult schools are accredited Postsecondary Vocational Institutions for Federal Student Aid and their students access Pell funding to cover the

cost of those programs. Given that reality, it made sense to include K12 adult school CTE students as students in postsecondary programs.

Counting students who transition from one type of CTE program into a more advanced CTE program as a postsecondary transition would mean deciding which CTE programs would be counted as postsecondary and which would not, which seemed impractical to the committee. For the purposes of the committee, and aligned to the recommendations of the Data and Accountability Committee, all CTE programs are considered postsecondary for this metric.

It was recognized that this meant there would be edge cases such as a student who completes a CNA program at a K12 Adult school and then enters into a registered nursing program not counting as a postsecondary completion even though the nursing program includes exponentially more college level content and advanced science that a CNA does not. However, students who go on to complete more advanced programs would be counted for another postsecondary credential completion. *In the review of these notes, two practitioners commented they believe that students transferring from a K12 AE CTE program or coursework that is not accreditable under Title IV into a for credit program that these should be counted for a postsecondary transition.*

## Other Programs

The CTE committee briefly discussed the criteria for capturing preapprenticeship, IET's, adults entering or reentering the workforce, and workforce preparation. Of these preapprenticeship included the most discussion. The committee identified that the requirement for a formal agreement with a registered apprenticeship program was not well understood and need to be highlighted to the field. It was identified that the plan was to include the entire DOL WIOA quality measures for preapprenticeship in guidance to the field.

IET was also discussed. It was agreed that integrated education and training was a specific program model that involved concurrent enrollment and instruction, contextualization of foundational (basic skills) content to a career or occupation and had a specific occupational focus. The committee did not feel that this should be captured through a student happening to be enrolled in basic skills and CTE at the same time since it would not capture the necessary level of intentionality needed to build and offer these programs.

One suggestion was to flag the student as IET student rather than flag IET programs. This is similar to the Career Advancement Academies special population flag that was developed by the community colleges for tracking CAA students rather than creating a special program flag. It was generally recognized that the implementation of IET in Adult Education was a work in progress and that there needed to be experimentation both in the design of these programs and in better data methods for flagging and tracking these programs. There was disagreement about the viability of this approach since a student could leave the IET program but still carry the IET identifier.