

PROVIDER SELECTION

Purpose: The purpose of this section is to identify how providers are selected for specific monitoring strategies. Various sources of data are used throughout the implementation of the Quality Assurance System. The monitoring component of the system is risk-based. Risk assessment is the identification of any event/factor that could have a negative impact on a federal program. Providers are ranked on performance indicators and operational risk factors are assessed by using a Risk Matrix. The results of the Risk Assessment process are used to determine the appropriate monitoring strategy(ies) to be implemented.

DATA REVIEW

The compliance and level of performance of services delivered by each provider requires continuous monitoring. Data is a key accountability tool used to measure past and present performance. The review of various sources of data is an integral part of the activities which will support the appropriate monitoring strategy for selected service providers. Following are some of the data sources that may be used to assess provider's performance:

- Grant Application including Assurances
- Workforce Education staff interviews
- Project Disbursement Report (DOE 399) for Career and Technical Education Programs
- Project Amendment Request(s)
- Auditor General Audit Reports
- Community Based Organizations' (CBO) Audit Reports
- Consolidated Annual Report (CAR) - Career and Technical Education
- Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program (FETPIP)
- Workforce Development Information System (WDIS)

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Performance Outcomes

Providers are ranked on the level of achievement on performance indicators specific to the programs of Career and Technical Education and the data available. If the summary data requires the application of values and/or weights, the Quality Assurance Team may consult with the appropriate Workforce Education staff.

Career and Technical Education

Section 113 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 establishes and supports the development of a state and local accountability system that will assess the effectiveness of the state and local funding recipients in achieving progress in career and technical education (CTE). State-developed performance measures must consist of the core indicators listed below, any additional valid and reliable indicators that the state determines, and the "state adjusted levels of performance" for the indicators, with input from local recipients and must be included in the State Plan. These levels of performance must be expressed in percentage or numerical form and require continual improvement in the performance of CTE students. The State Plan for Florida was submitted to the U.S. Secretary of Education on March 28, 2008.

The Division of Workforce Education will negotiate State Adjusted Levels of Performance for each core indicator with the United States Department of Education (USDOE) Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) for the first, third, and fifth years. Local recipients must accept the state negotiated levels of performance or negotiate with the state for new levels for each of the core indicators.

Each state must submit a report to the Secretary each year regarding the state's progress in achieving its performance levels, including the performance of special populations. The State must identify and quantify gaps in performance between groups of students, and describe the progress of these students. The State report is a compilation of reports sent to the State by local recipients.

Perkins IV Secondary

- Student attainment of challenging academic content and achievement standards, as adopted by the state under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and measured by the state determined proficient levels on the academic assessments under ESEA.
- Student attainment of Career and Technical Education (CTE) skill proficiencies, including student achievement on technical assessments which are aligned with industry-recognized standards, if available and appropriate.
- Student rates of attainment of a secondary school diploma.
- Student rates of attainment of a GED, or other state-recognized equivalent (including recognized alternate standards for individuals with disabilities).
- Student rates of attainment of a proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary diploma (if such credential is offered by the state).
- Student graduation rates as described in ESEA.
- Student placement in postsecondary education or advanced training, military service, or in employment.
- Student participation in and completion of CTE programs that lead to nontraditional fields.

Perkins IV Postsecondary

- 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.
- Student attainment of an industry-recognized credential, a certificate, or a degree.
- Student retention in postsecondary education or transfer to a baccalaureate degree program.
- Student placement in military service or apprenticeship programs or placement or retention in employment, including placement in high-skill, high-wage or high-demand occupations or professions.
- Student participation in and completion of CTE programs in nontraditional fields.

LEADERSHIP CONTRACTS

Contracts that promote and support the providers of Career and Technical Education to enhance student performance will be monitored. Once targeted districts are identified for onsite monitoring, such support contracts may be included in scheduled activities. Should additional protocols be developed specific to these agencies, such protocols would be distributed prior to any monitoring activity. Alternative schedules may also be implemented. Such contracts include but are not limited to Leadership Grants including, but not limited to Associations, Career and Technical Student Organizations (CTSO's) and Regional Training Centers.

Workforce Education
Leadership Performance Data Review
Date:

AGENDA

I. Introductions

II. Quality Assurance System – Risk Assessment

III. Performance Data Review

- A. Outcome: Identify the lowest performing agencies relative to the performance indicators.
- B. Data to be reviewed: *(include date/period covered when appropriate)*
Career and Technical Education

IV. Review and Discussion

- 1. What are the key performance indicators?
- 2. Identify tiers.
- 3. What are the 15-20 lowest performing agencies?
- 4. Are there any extenuating circumstances applicable to any of these agencies?
- 5. Are there any concerns with the agencies' data collecting / reporting system?

V. Identification of agencies and recommendations for monitoring strategies.
Using the data, identify and discuss performance tiers, rating tiers and potential monitoring strategies.

VI. Summary

VII. Next Steps – Operational Risk Factors – Monitoring Team
Critical Factors – Program Managers

VIII. Participants: