

Meeting Notes: AEBG Data and Accountability Committee
WestEd Sacramento Office, Capital Room
10/31/2017; 10:00 am to 2:00 pm

The Data and Accountability considered 3 topics related to next steps identified in the Measuring Our Success data and accountability report to the legislature submitted as a result of the AEBG field team process that took place from May to July 2017. These included:

- An update on meetings to develop the NRS/CB21 ESL and basic skills crosswalk and the impact of AB705 relating to student placement and multiple measures.
- A discussion to provide guidance for the implementation of the supplemental data report described in the Measuring Our Success report.
- A presentation and discussion by CASAS regarding supplemental data collection and implementation of a student survey pilot project for WIOA Title II grantees.

In addition to the above items the committee also discussed the role and structure of the data and accountability committee moving forward and discussed changes to the timeline for the development of the next round of 3 year plans for AEBG consortia.

NRS/CB21 Crosswalk: Kathy Booth presented an update on the progress of the three committees cross-walking the NRS educational functioning levels with the CB21 rubric for levels below transfer. The ESL, English, and math committees have each met once, and have identified challenges with previous crosswalk efforts, gaps and alignment issues between the NRS EFLs and CB21, and areas where CB21 may need additional development to support the development and implementation of the crosswalks.

It was identified that while it is unlikely that can be a clear 1:1 alignment of CB21 with the NRS rubric, that understanding and mapping the skills in each rubric with each other should be a boost to local conversations about curriculum alignment, student placement, and multiple measures implementation for adult education students. Additionally, the implementation of the new NRS standards, AB705 which changes guidance to colleges around student placement and multiple measures, and changes in the Common Assessment Initiative (CAI) are changing the environment for measuring student progress in ESL and basic skills, student placement, and developmental education pathways and course sequences. This means both the development and implementation of the crosswalks will need to adapt to absorb these changes to provide the best guidance to the field.

Discussion centered on several key topics. That AB705 presents an opportunity to deepen local multiple measures conversations that can be informed by the crosswalk, and that AEBG should embrace the opportunity to inform the implementation of AB705 based on the ongoing work related to basic skills and multiple measures for adult education students. This is particularly important as HS transcript evaluation is much less relevant for adult education students due to the lack of readily available transcripts for many AE students and how long ago adults may have attended high school. To support this work, the three crosswalk committees have 1 year appointments in order to continue to move the work forward in the coming year.

DAC Committee: A question was posed about whether DAC would continue in its current form or if the new AEBG policy committee would supplant it. On the one hand it was expressed that

the existing committee had developed deep working relationships and a shared body of knowledge related to the implementation of the new data and accountability metrics and systems that would be difficult for a new group to take on. However the existing committee was created through an abbreviated process that didn't allow full consideration of everyone who might be interested in volunteering for state level work. Neil identified that most of the DAC participants had applied for the policy committee(s). The consensus seemed to be that the committee would continue, but perhaps in slightly modified form based on the applicant pool. The AEBG office promised to provide guidance soon on the next iteration of the committee so that the work being done on the data and accountability system could continue without interruption, including monitoring the ongoing crosswalk committees, the implementation of the supplemental report, and other projects.

The Supplemental Report: One of the action items in the Measuring our Success legislative report was the creation of a "secondary" or "supplemental" report that would conduct additional analysis of adult education student data and effective practices in the field that the primary data and effectiveness report to the legislature would not cover. There was considerable discussion regarding the intent and purpose of the report, including whether or not it could be called a 'research' report, however multiple themes emerged related to the report:

- That there were two broad themes for the kinds of analysis that could be performed related to the report: 1) to analyze the AEBG data set to ask questions not addressed in the primary report to the legislature; and 2. To do deeper analysis on emerging and effective program models such as immigrant integration or integrated education and training.
- That it was important not to confuse the 'report' with the analytical or research process that would inform what is shared with the field and the legislature through the report and that the primary purpose of the supplemental analysis was analyze additional issues and ask questions in more depth that could inform practice and planning for local consortia or lead to capturing additional metrics in the future.

For example, the group expressed a strong interest in knowing more about what happens to students with between 1 and 12 contact hours of instruction and services. Analyzing outcomes for these students could reveal important outcomes to share with the field in the supplemental report, or that the data varies greatly by consortium leading to greater investigation of what is happening in consortia that are showing strong outcomes for low contact hour students, or that the data is not compelling or cannot be captured in a way to build a data set that can serve any useful purpose. In the last case, the data may never actually make it into the report or it may just further solidify that more positive outcomes occur based on a certain threshold of enrollment.

Additional discussion related to the supplemental report included:

- That the research process informing the report could serve as an important testing ground for metrics that could be included in the larger AEBG metrics or reporting in the future such as outcomes for students with less than 12 contact hours or other analysis of students in for credit programs. In this sense it allows the field to be self-reflective by asking questions in a safe way to inform practice in the field.
- That the questions that the process takes on and the actual report prioritize questions and information that is useful for consortia in the development of their local priorities and plans (3 year or 1 year). For example, highlighting local data outcomes and strategies

related to immigrant integration could incentivize consortia to look more closely at implementation of this model and stimulate or inform local planning efforts.

Some concerns were raised about whether consortia should be informed in advance about collecting additional data for the supplemental report. It was clarified that in most cases the research process will rely on deeper analysis of existing data sets or would focus on consortia who are already doing the work related to effective practices and building off the data they have already collecting to document their work. No additional guidance to the field would be required for this process.

After the above discussion the committee made four recommendations for 2017/2018. These included:

- Additional analysis of how AE students are being served in for credit programs and how credit coursework is being developed or leveraged for AE pathways.
- An analysis of outcomes for reportable individuals with between 1 and 12 contact hours of instruction or services,
- An analysis of outcomes and implementation strategies related to immigrant integration,
- An analysis of integrated education and training strategies with an emphasis on outcomes and strategies related to particularly strong implementation of IET strategies including better definition of IET and best or effective practices.

The group voted on and approved these four topics for 2017-18. It was agreed that the DAC, in whatever future modified form that takes, would be the group that selects topics and monitors at a higher level the process related to research, analysis, and production of the report.

Next steps are for WestEd and CASAS meet to discuss the four topics, develop methodologies for research and analysis and a timeline for completion of the work for each topic. The expectation would bring that back to the DAC at the next meeting for further discussion.

Supplemental Data Gathering and Student Surveys: CASAS made a presentation on NRS requirements for supplemental employment and wage data collection and a proposal for piloting a student survey process this year to collect student wage and employment data from students who do not have SSN's for matching against the EDD wage file. The four key elements of the pilot include:

- 6-7 WIOA funded agencies including community colleges will be participating in the pilot
- TOPSpro Enterprise (TE) will generate the list of students who exited in the first quarter (missing SSN)
- Agencies will survey students and enter survey results in TE
- CASAS is currently designing and developing the report and the survey data entry tool together with CDE and the pilot agencies

Part of the analysis will be to learn about the capacity needs related to performing survey's like this to understand how much labor it takes to administer the surveys to inform future funding and capacity needs for consortia.

3 Year Plans: It was discussed that currently the AEBG office plans to announce that the next round of 3 year plans will be due in June 2019 rather than in 2018. A significant part of the rationale is to give consortia more time to focus on the planning, implementation, and evaluation of their key strategies for change without the pressure of developing another plan. It was

recommended that it would be helpful to provide a list of key questions or check list that would help them evaluate their current plan and provide direction for their next 3 year plan. This would address needed modifications and key priorities for the new plan. This would also provide more time for consortia to use data not just to determine local need, but to begin the study of what's effective. That is, not only just exploring local industry needs, job market trends, changing demographics etc, but to look at member's programs and outcomes in order to scale up what's effective and better evaluate what's not.

It was stressed that this 'pause' was not a pause in the work, but should allow consortia to deepen their work on using their data and assessment of local or regional needs get clear on their priority strategies and begin implementation. Thus, it creates a space for building conversations about multiple measures or doing guided exploration of consortium data to inform their change agenda. It was recommended that there be technical assistance (TAP) provided to help consortia really use their data for planning and prioritizing, perhaps beginning in Spring when the first full data set is available to consortia in the LaunchBoard. Estimation was that the AEBG office would be making an announcement very soon about the shift to 2019 for the 3 year plans.

Next meeting date: A next meeting date was not set. A doodle poll will go out for the next meeting as soon as the AEBG office makes an announcement regarding the future composition of the committee.