Those in attendance: Dan Shepard, Jan Kiehne, Dina Rabuck, Irene Koffink, Charlotte Ellis, J.P. Beaudoin, Duke Albanese, and Sarah Linet

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 and after a review of the agenda the representatives from the assembled states shared brief updates from their departments. Representatives told of common struggles with data requests and the political realities constraining their work. They also continued to update the group on their progress creating state longitudinal data systems and reaching beyond their departments to include data from other state agencies. Representatives spoke about on-going conversations around tracking proficiency/mastery/and competency-based progression and lessons learned from SBAC/PARCC administration. Several states noted that they will be transitioning away from SBAC/PARCC this year and spoke about what they will be administering instead.

Duke Albanese and J.P. Beaudoin led the group in a discussion of recent requests for the data that the team collects. They shared that they will always reach out to any state involved in a specific data request and that J.P. will work to get some more details about the nature of any and all requests. The conversation then moved to National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) data with a focus on the limitations of NSC data. Duke also shared some details about the 2015 Data Report press release and process for publicizing the release of the report.

After the update about last year’s report, the group transitioned to a review of the business rules that will be captured in the 2016 Procedural Guidebook. J.P. specifically focused the group on the calculation of three named cohorts (the high school freshman cohort – the denominator for indicator 1 and 2, the high school graduation cohort, and the first time college freshman cohort). The definitions with drafts of the team’s edits are below (changes are in red):

2.1.18 - Data Element: Adjusted High School Freshman Cohort (AHSFC) - The unduplicated number of students enrolled for the first-time in high school (grade 9) anytime during the academic year adjusted for transfers in and out (new enrollment/existing enrollment).

2.1.19 Data Element: High School Graduation Cohort (HSGC) – The unduplicated number of students that graduate with a standard diploma (as defined by each state) in the identified year from high schools, including those graduates completing high school in more than four (4) years regardless of their freshman cohort. Meaning, the HSGC contains high school graduates that earned a standard diploma from zero (0) to five (5) years ago from a public high school in the state.
2.1.20 Data Element: First-time College Freshman Cohort (FFC) – The unduplicated number of students enrolled for the first-time in post-secondary education by the fall enrollment window (October 15).

The group recessed for lunch at 12:16 and reconvened at 12:57 PM.

2.1.20 Data Element: First-time College Freshman Cohorts (FCFC) – The unduplicated number of students enrolled (must be after the graduation date) for the first-time in college by the fall enrollment window (October 15) that earned a standard diploma from zero (0) to five (5) years ago from a public high school in the state.

The review of the named cohorts surfaced a question about the way states are currently reporting college persistence. States wanted to know why they are currently being asked to report on persistence at 2- and 4-year colleges separately. J.P. recommended that we bring the question to the full group at our next meeting.

The 2016 Data Report will be the first year where we will be able to report on college completion. The group reviewed the sections of the draft Procedural Guidebook focused on completion and debated the merits (and viability) of reporting based on 2-year and 4-year college completion individually versus as one metric. J.P. will conduct some additional research and will include this question as an agenda item at our next meeting.

Before ending the meeting, the team edited the Submission Dates and Timeline document and preliminarily approved the draft (see attached document). There was collective agreement to move the next meeting to February 2016 if at all possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Linet