

**PERKINS IV STATE PLAN HEARING**  
**January 8, 2008**

The Public Hearing was conducted through the Division of Professional-Technical Education website and over the distance learning system at the following sites:

<b>Region I - Coeur d'Alene</b> CALs Conference Room	<b>Region II - Lewiston</b> Lewis-Clark State College
<b>Region III - Boise</b> University of Idaho, Boise Water Center	<b>Region IV - Twin Falls</b> University of Idaho, Twin Falls Evergreen Center
<b>Region V - Pocatello</b> Idaho State University	<b>Region VI - Idaho Falls</b> University of Idaho, Idaho Falls Center

The Division of Professional-Technical Education had staff located at each of the published locations. Participants were provided an opportunity to make comments over the distance learning system and by email through the Division of Professional-Technical Education website. Comment cards were available at each site. Comments were made both orally and in writing.

**Division of Professional-Technical Education Website**

1. VI.A.6, paragraph two

For purposes of Perkins IV funds, charter schools approved by the school district board of trustees are considered to be the same as all other schools within the school district. Charter schools operating approved professional-technical education programs that have been designated as LEAs by the Idaho Charter Schools Commission will qualify for separate allocations. Currently Idaho does not have any charter LEAs that operate approved professional-technical education programs.

In other areas of federal funding, charter schools approved by the districts are required to indicate how the money will flow through to the charter schools. I believe this would be a beneficial addition to this paragraph because it removes any ambiguity and forces all districts and charters to come to some form of an agreement in regards to this money. Before this policy was enacted there were multiple disagreements and misunderstandings in this matter. For example, for Title 6B money, the district sponsored charter has an agreement with the district that the money will flow through to the charter as per special education student population. Then the district writes the district sponsored charter a check for that amount of money.

Response: Charter schools approved by school district board of trustees are considered to be the same as all other schools (sites) within the district. Perkins IV does not require school districts to allocate funds to all sites. Therefore, districts are not required to allocate Perkins IV funds to charter schools approved by the school district board of trustees.



2. I wonder how the state skills test that we used in Utah when I left five years ago would measure up to the required Perkins test.

Response: We would have to look at the test to determine if it met the criteria.

3. Is Lone Pin right or is it Lone Pine?

Response: The name of the consortium is Long-Pin.

### **Region I Comments:**

1. What is the purpose of this hearing where the plan has already been written? Will the plan change after this?

Response: The public hearings are conducted to provide an opportunity for interested organizations and groups to present their views and make recommendations regarding the State plan. The recommendations will be considered and changes made as appropriate.

2. Who created the plan and what input was given from various regions?

Response: The State Plan was developed by the Division of Professional-Technical Education in consultation with academic and career and technical education teachers, faculty, and administrators; career guidance and academic counselors; eligible recipients; charter school authorizers and organizers consistent with State law; parents and students; institutions of higher education; the State tech prep coordinator and representatives of tech prep consortia (if applicable); entities participating in activities described in section 111 of Public Law 105-220; interested community members (including parents and community organizations); representatives of special populations; representatives of business and industry (including representatives of small business); and representatives of labor organizations in the State. Each region of the state was represented during the plan development process.

3. Any plans to reduce or simplify the paperwork for receiving funding from Perkins?

Response: No. The Local Plans, Annual Applications and Performance Measures are required by the Act and include information specified in the law.

4. Will there be input from stakeholders for the special populations?

Response: Representatives of special populations were included in the plan development process.

5. RE: articulation agreements and the 5 year plan deadline. What is being done to help secondary institutions articulate with the local postsecondary institutions? Are we looking at statewide articulation agreements or region by region?

Response: The Division of Professional-Technical Education reserved \$420,000 to fund regional Advanced Learning Partnerships to further the tech prep efforts started under Perkins III. The purpose of the Advanced Learning Partnerships is to promote and support linkages between secondary and postsecondary professional-technical education programs; improve academic integration; facilitate the transition to baccalaureate degree programs; and to develop local and statewide articulation agreements. Articulation agreements may be statewide or within a region.

### **Region II Comments:**

1. What will be the process to get a technical assessment approved by the State that has been locally developed?

Response: The state is in the process of completing a survey of technical assessments that are currently being used by state approved professional-technical programs. Once this survey is complete, these assessments will be reviewed to determine if they meet the criteria established in Title I, Section 113 (b). A list of state approved technical assessments will be developed following the review. For programs that do not have a state approved assessment on the list, or desire to use a technical assessment that is not on the list, an application for a state approved technical assessment will need to be submitted. The criteria in Title I, Section 113 (b) will be used to review the application and, if approved, it will be added to the state approved technical assessment list.

2. Page 36 and 37, extensions of conversations from deans meetings. Clarification of terms on page 36 and 37 on what "gold" means.

Response: "Gold" is a term that has been used by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) during the past year to refer to technical skill assessments that meet or exceed the criteria established in Title I, Section 113 (b). The terms "silver" and "bronze" in reference to technical assessments is no longer being used by OVAE. All core indicators of performance are required to be valid and reliable. The reference relative to the technical assessment is given below:

*"Student attainment of challenging career and technical skill proficiencies, including student achievement on technical assessments, that are aligned with industry-recognized standards, if available and appropriate." (Title I, Section 113(b)(2)(A-B).*

## Region V Comments:

1. Funding issues with bigger pieces of equipment at high school, e.g. will funding for equipment be expanded or stay the same?

Response: School districts have the ability to target Perkins IV funds to allowable activities based on local need. Equipment can be purchased as part of program improvement.

2. In columns 5 and 6 is the L70 and L71 for 1P1, 2P1, and 3P1, high percentages for 1 and 2, but 3 seems low. How did we come to these levels? Were they negotiated?

Response: All of the performance levels for the core indicators are negotiated with OVAE. The core indicator for 2P1 is essentially unchanged from the previous Perkins legislation and we have a history of performance on this indicator. The core indicators 1P1 (technical assessment) and 3P1 (Student Retention and Transfer) are very much different from the previous Perkins legislation and therefore we do not have a history of performance. Efforts were made to obtain data in establishing the performance levels for the first two years. The performance levels can then be renegotiated with OVAE.

3. We, particularly counselors and advisors, need better definition for the professional development eligible for Perkins funds.

Response: Professional development activities funded with Perkins IV funds must be high quality, sustained and intensive. The Division of Professional-Technical Education website has an example of a professional development plan that could be used to demonstrate that activities are high quality, sustained and intensive.

4. Will there be some evaluation/data collection with regard to recruitment and retention of counselors, teachers and coordinators? (p 17, 4A)

Response: No.

5. Regarding postsecondary measure 1P1 on page 55, what is the state approved technical skill assessment? (need clarification on what that means)

Response: Each state approved PTE "program of study" (secondary and postsecondary) would need to determine an appropriate technical skill assessment that meets or exceeds the criteria established in Title I, Section 113 (b). The state is in the process of completing a survey of technical assessments that are currently being used by state approved professional-technical programs. Once this survey is complete, these assessments will be reviewed to determine if they meet the criteria established in Title I, Section 113 (b). A list of state approved technical assessments will be developed following the review. For programs that do not have a state approved assessment on the list, or desire to use a technical assessment that is not on the list, an application for a state approved technical assessment will need to be submitted.

6. Related to the above question, clarify the same for secondary as well.

Response: Each state approved PTE “program of study” (secondary and postsecondary) would need to determine an appropriate technical skill assessment that meets or exceeds the criteria established in Title I, Section 113 (b). The state is in the process of completing a survey of technical assessments that are currently being used by state approved professional-technical programs. Once this survey is complete, these assessments will be reviewed to determine if they meet the criteria established in Title I, Section 113 (b). A list of state approved technical assessments will be developed following the review. For programs that do not have a state approved assessment on the list, or desire to use a technical assessment that is not on the list, an application for a state approved technical assessment will need to be submitted.

7. What happens after the Division of Professional-Technical Education responds to the questions? Will the plan be reposted if there are any revisions?

Response: The responses will be posted to the Division of Professional-Technical Education website. The final plan will be posted to the webpage when it is has been approved by the State Board for Professional-Technical Education.

8. RE: secondary performance measures with FAPL. When were the performance measures negotiated? How were they negotiated? When will they be negotiated again?

Response: The performance levels were negotiated by the state with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE). Core indicators 1S1, 1S2 and 4S1 are identical to the indicators used by the State Department of Education for the federal No Child Left Behind legislation. The performance levels we negotiated for these Perkins core indicators are the same as the Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) levels used by the Idaho State Department of Education.

For core indicators that changed very little, the performance levels were negotiated using a history of prior performance. It was more challenging for those core indicators that are very much different from the previous Perkins legislation and therefore we did not have a history of performance. Efforts were made to obtain data in establishing the performance levels for the first two years. The performance levels can then be renegotiated with OVAE.

9. Per 6S1, page 54. The measure defines the numerator and denominator. What is the difference? It sounds like the definitions are the same.

Response: The **denominator** is the total number of students enrolled in a program identified as a “nontraditional” program. Example: Cosmetology is a nontraditional program for males. The denominator would be the total unduplicated student enrollment in the cosmetology program. The **numerator** is the total number of nontraditional students enrolled in the program identified as nontraditional. Using this example, this would be the number of males enrolled in the cosmetology program.