

WEDDAC Minutes
February 26-27, 2009
Tallahassee, FL

Submitted by: Frances Tamayo, Recorder

WEDDAC meeting called to order on Thursday, February 26 at 1:00 by Charles Tacot, WEDDAC Chair. Bruce Harrington went over the days agenda.. He made special reference to the SCNS handout project update– Feb. 2009 – most of the information has already been published and was just handed out as a reference. Other items distributed included a Post Test LCP handout, which would be discussed later by Joan, an IPEDS handout, October 2008 minutes, and a SharePoint, which will be used to access meeting handouts, agendas, and announcements.

Bruce reviewed the statewide course numbering system and pointed out that there were no course numbers for Apprenticeships or CWE. Thirty-two long programs were divided into smaller programs to facilitate completions. There were discussions on whether we would still be able to record multi-credit for PSAV programs with new programs numbers – an issue comes up when courses earn the same OCP title, but are assigned different OCP's, when part of a similar program – an example of where this will happen is with Automotive Technician (old program)/Automotive Technician I or II. Another issue is that course numbers are the same for multiple programs. Courses that earned more than one OCP have been corrected. A suggestion was made to report all of the courses before awarding the OCP. Frameworks are currently available on DOE's website, however they are in draft format until approved by the state board of education in March. Continuing students can be enrolled in both the old or new programs during 2009-10. This is the schools' choice, however it must be a transparent transition to students that they are now enrolling in courses, which part of the total hours for a

program. Comments were made that the Board of Nursing did not agree with the course divisions. Please e-mail Beth Ladden in regards to these types of issues. Other discussions included dual enrolled students not being able to complete a course within one secondary semester of the year. What would the dual enrollment equivalency be? Post Secondary classes are multi-credit? A High School student could not be enrolled in a course that they previously completed for credit during the prior semester. New courses and grades will be reflected on the new electronic transcript.

Laverne Mckenzie did a presentation and provided handouts on Transcripts. As of July 2009, this is mandatory. Districts will use the FASTER Website for sending transcripts. There was discussion on the valid formats for technical centers. Formats include: Change summary, update summary, and student information format. This means that there will be a change in the ways both courses and grades are reported. Discussions transpired on transcripts in regards to what are districts responsible for including when sending the transcripts to other districts. Are we just responsible for providing information pertaining to what was earned at our school/district or are we supposed to report data that was transmitted to us from prior districts? The consensus was that we would only transmit data that originated from our school district. The other issue discussed was the students GPA. How could this score be accurate if it did not include all postsecondary information? What classes are included in the GPA, especially when grades of Pass/Fail are given. Tara Goodman will get more information on this. FASTER will send what we give them.

Judith Thompson discussed the IPEDS handouts. The handouts were provided to generate discussion in comparing numbers that we reported to IPEDS and what Judith

would have reported with Survey W. Possible reasons for data discrepancies that she had come up with are: including apprenticeship, duplicate headcounts, CWE, GED prep, etc. Judith requested that we review the data she provided and she would like us to get back with her with an explanation for variance. She did note that IPEDS is date specific and the surveys are windows of time. FLDOE wants to be able to provide this for us and save us the time. Judith will provide us with the record format this coming week, she will send us students, full time and part time, race, ethnicity, 1st time flag, and transfers-in. We will need to compare this information, and figure out where there is a discrepancy.

Tara Goodman spoke to us about how the NRS tables will begin to be used differently than they have in the past due to issues that came up with the federal audit they were going through. Data obtained from NRS tables will be used to monitor grant performance and could ultimately effect grant funding. As with other states and federal dollars, this is the direction that FLDOE is moving. In the absence of a mid-year grant report, documentation for performance will be extremely important. Even though this is considered a hold-harmless year, with competition for the grants it is very likely that past performance on grants will be looked at carefully. This is still a work in progress and not all the formulas are complete. The RFP's for these grants should be available soon.

Tara also discussed the data element that will give us the ability to accept multiple goals. Discussion included: whether we needed to report academic goal or whether it could be assumed, how is the USDOE defining primary and secondary goals, does it matter which goal considered primary or secondary, and how is retention/placement tied to performance. Discussions noted that table 5 allows multiple goals. Changes will have

to be worked out in the NRS business rules. We may be able to assume an academic goal. Tara will follow up on the definitions immediately following this meeting.

Recommendation of the group was to default academic goal. Tara will follow through with group recommendation and get documentation out to us soon.

The 3rd FEFP calculation included industry certification for the first time. The deadline for updating this information was February 27, 2008. The funds for industry certification are calculated as follows: Weighted FTE X District Cost Differential X the base student allocation. DOE wants us to report the industry certification when earned, which means that DOE will have to maintain a multi-year industry file, as the certification needs to be tied to a course that the student was taking. Career academies will be matched to graduates. Tara asked for direction from group on whether we wanted her to allow a prior year flag with industry certification – this could be done by adding a data element to survey 5 or through a supplemental file. We did not reach a consensus – either way would be fine with the group.

Bruce discussed an issue that they had found with data regarding Adult High School and the number of LCP's that could be earned and received some feedback from the group. DOE will move forward, they just wanted a feel of what would be considered within a normal range. They will take another look at it and determine what program the student is in to see if the data seems more logical.

Bruce reviewed the WDIS calendar, p11 – Survey S opens June 8, and has a required load date of July 2. Note that Mid Survey reports will not be accurate. The reports will be resent on July 15. Everything we have sent up should be in on this report. July 20th begins the update window – survey W updates can be added during this

window. This should be used for updates only. August 3rd the survey is closed. Surveys F and W can be updated during survey S. DOE will try to get out Survey W results as soon as it closes. Bruce requested that we please double-check our data.

DOE is considering having a certification process for the data, requiring someone from the districts to sign off acknowledging correctness of the data. This may not be implemented for several years, but is being considered.

Tara Goodman spoke to the group about the budget situation. The president's stimulus budget is being reviewed to fill the gap in the budget. She spoke about the governor's veto of the districts workforce budget cuts. There was a new session beginning on Tuesday, but as of that day she had not heard anything about further cuts for the current year. For 2009-10, normally by the end of the 3rd or 4th session, which is around April 25, we should have an idea of where the budgets for next school year will stand. By the end of March we should know the positions of the House and Senate regarding the budget issues. The performance calculation has been sent out for review. Completion data will be completed at a later date.

Minutes from October were reviewed and approved with one modification on page 3 to read Beth Gladden not Ladden.

Proposal was made to cut down on travel for WEDDAC meetings. Proposal was to do the first day as a ½ day, with the second day being a whole day meeting. Survey will be sent out. This schedule may not be adjusted for April meeting. This did seem to be agreeable to many in the group with movement of meetings throughout the state.

WDIS instructional hours definition will have to be re-written according to new business rules for course reporting. Dual enrollment hours will be based on actual class hours. Ideas for reporting hours: when enrollment spans 2 surveys – what should we do?

- Suggestion was made to report maximum hours, which would be specified by DOE.
- Tara's suggestions were to report hours paid for when the student enrolled – the 2nd survey would show zero hours, being careful not to over report instructional hours, they could put in place a flag which would be valid for continuing student only or prorate hours from one survey to another
- Report hours only up to the survey end date – Tara stressed the importance of knowing when the students are presently enrolled.

Discussion arose about whether instructional hours would still be reported if the student were refunded fees after the class begins. Tara pointed out that we have to have a mechanism in place that will prevent over reporting of instructional hours. DOE is not concerned with payments. This is more of an auditing concern. DOE needs to know what the instructional hours are. Discussion about the difference in courses and programs was that courses have a specific beginning and ending date. A student could be taking 3 courses and earning 3 OCP's at one time. The school would have to split the day out to be able to report it all. If we have a student who is faster and completes the course in 90 hours but the framework shows that it requires 150, we would need to withdraw them and enroll them in another course, but if we want to be paid for the 150, we would have to leave him in that course until the hours are completed. They could not be reported all at once. Reporting more than one course would over inflate hour. DOE

did not require a standard way to schedule the courses. We need to be careful not to confuse completion versus course hours, as they are not always equal to an OCP. The issue seems to be as follows:

- what can be reported when it takes a student longer to take a course
- what should be reported?

Hours will be reported by course – every record will have a Program/Course/Hours.

Hours will be reported by course not program. DOE wants scheduled hours. Bruce noted that DOE needs to review the process of reporting instructional hours in light of the program to course conversion. In contrast to this year, course information will be reported before a student earns an OCP. Bruce suggested moving this information from the completion format back to the course record. The statewide course numbering would be entered in the course record; however they will need a flag to indicate if a student earned an industry certification while not enrolled in a course. For CWE and apprenticeship, we would report the program number as the course number. Suggestion was that the completion format could become the industry certification. The completion format would no longer contain the program and course.

Additional discussion on hours – existing course format is on page 21 or 24 of handout. They could put a flag for course-in-process for hours. Grade would be added. A question arose as to why grade was added. Bruce could not remember why this was added in that section. Prorating of instructional hours without over inflation is the concern. Redefine enrollment from the time of enrollment to the end of last day of course, survey, or until they complete. What happens if student completes early or takes longer to complete? What happens if the student registers then leaves? No one seemed

to want actual attendance hours. Suggestion was made for courses that overlap surveys – add flag over 25% to limit hours. It was apparent that we needed various scenarios to clear up this discussion. Barbara, Jim and Lee volunteered to come up with scenarios some of which were discussed, which would be sent to Bruce and Tara. Charles will review them also. Tara and Bruce will then get back to the group with as to how DOE wants these situations to be handled by the districts. Charles suggested having the scenarios ready by next week to be reviewed.

Bruce discussed when to report an OCP when it takes more than one course to earn that OCP. OCP's are currently reported when earned, which means they have met the competencies. Next year, the OCP would mean that all courses were completed to earn that OCP. In the future, DOE may put in an edit to clarify that this is what happened. Bruce suggested for now to report the OCP when the last course for the OCP has been completed. Competencies do not have to be taught in sequential order. Scheduling is up to the district. The OCP for multiple courses should not be reported until all classes are complete. Per statutory requirement, it needs to be transparent to the student that they are enrolling in courses.

Joan reviewed handouts, which were provided to us the previous day. Corrections made to sheet 1 included the following:

- 3rd column should read NO LCP/PT N
- 3rd column from left should read LCP/PT Y

On the financial aid worksheet, Joan had found out from colleges that if the school did not have VPI, there could be adult education students in PSAV programs on financial aid. The Exit date student count worksheet was based on exit dates that the schools reported.

Next worksheet on Adult records in adult HS program with LCP's earned greater than 10, was a concern as Joan thought that over 10 in a year was high, but apparently that was normal. Therefore, we did not need to be concerned with this one. The next several pages were drafts taken from 0708 data, which would be used for performance calculations. Tara has asked for us to review and let her know if we saw any errors, before she runs the calculations.

Question was asked to Joan that if a student retakes a class, would the district receive FTE again? Her response was yes because the student is paying. A student can take a class twice before having to pay out-of-state fees. Barbara requested that Joan make Tara aware of this. We were only requesting additional hours to allow students to complete specific competencies be allowed, not for a student to retake an entire program.

Bruce discussed NRS for distance learning students. We need to make Post test are proctored (must be). Can we assume the tests are proctored or does Bruce need to add a flag? Does the GED count as post-test? Bruce said to enter as yes and we will adjust if necessary. Questions about which AGE records are counted for NRS – are adult HS and GED counted? Bruce will need to check into.

New race and ethnicity codes will be added to student demographics. In 09/10, districts we will be required to provide both. Students are allowed to choose multiple categories for race plus indicate whether or not they are Hispanic. In 10/11, only the new race and ethnicity codes will be used.

To help with data questions, WDIS records will show a last updated date. WDIS additional hours will need to be sent to DOE via a supplemental file.

Bruce will be contacting some of us regarding adult education edits, as some districts were allowed to send adult education records using incorrect cost reporting codes.

Bruce had question about how districts were handling grade level changes during the year. An edit/exception was showing up for grade level 30 when the grade level was changed from 9-12 to 30 during the school year, because grade level 30 was not allowed for High School dual enrolled. This is OK if changed during the year. Bruce would like to leave exception in place. One district had a situation where they an edit for grade 30/31, which is not allowed for GED, actually comes up as an exception. Bruce will look into further.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00