
The meeting was called to order at 9:38 AM, and the agenda was reviewed. It was explained that J.P. Beaudoin of Research in Action, was unable to fly out of New Orleans due to tornado warnings. However, J.P. would be participating in the day’s discussions via conference call.

Introductions were made and the agenda moved to a roundtable sharing of data highlights from the respective states. Topics included Connecticut’s new vendor for their SLDS and warehouse and the state’s efforts to build a system that captures teacher-student courses, handles data agreements across state agencies through a data board; Maine’s pending launch of a school district report card, A-F, as part of the governor’s education agenda, data updates for adult education and teacher certification, and continued efforts to integrate information systems across the ME DOE; in Vermont, changes in staffing continue with the department taking on agency status and the commissioner becoming a secretary in the governor’s cabinet and the high profile, heavy emphasis on education in the governor’s state of the state address including a focus on early college – state is out to bid on data warehouse; Rhode Island’s SLDS has been maturing with close work with labor and higher education and the state has signed a contract to have an electronic transcript; New Hampshire reported its new network system is in development, reshaping relationships across the state as topical communities are formed and engaged, allowing for the exchange of expertise with a lot of focus on the educator evaluation system – the state is also waiting to hear from the Feds on its ESEA waiver request and is working with post-secondary partners on a match system for sharing rich information on college enrolled students while also sponsoring a large statewide data gathering of local, state, and higher education educators.

The slate of business for the day was modified so that J.P. Beaudoin of Research in Action, acting as NESSC Data Coordinator, could walk the group through some important issues related to data collection this winter and spring. J.P. joined via conference call. First, the Data Team analyzed the NESSC 2012-13 Metrics. Submissions, and Timelines approved on November 15, 2012. One important modification was to note that through conversations with the National Student Clearinghouse – J.P. with LaTonya Page, NESSC’s contact at the NSC -- the notion of a common data window for requesting post-secondary data, identified in November by the Data Team as a possible best practice, was pursued.

Significantly, all five states comprising the NESSC have now requested their post-secondary data during this recommended common two-week window. This first time alignment across states -- anywhere in the nation -- strengthens further NESSC’s efforts to ensure maximum comparability of data.
An issue focused on the use of high school codes was aired with a lengthy conversation ensuing. It was agreed that J.P. Beaudoin would follow-up with a series of questions posed to staff at the National Student Clearinghouse in Virginia.

The meeting’s agenda moved to a review of outstanding issues regarding the NESSC Metrics Procedural Guidebook, the business rules for collecting and reporting data, that received preliminary approval in November. First discussed was the issue of whether to go with a single Asian/Pacific Islander sub-group or to breakdown the populations further. After discussion, it was decided that the federal guidelines would be the NESSC approach commencing with this year’s, 2012-2013 Technical Report.

Next up for discussion was whether post-secondary enrollment should be reported using a 9th grade cohort or be based on graduating students. The group recommended staying with the nationally accepted graduating seniors methodology. On another matter, college persistence, it was agreed to breakout students in 2-year and 4-year college degree programs with enrollment in the 3rd semester the common persistence measure.

At this juncture in the meeting, J.P. Beaudoin reported that he now had sufficient clarification to revise and finalize the Procedural Guidebook, which will lead data specialists in the respective SEAs as they complete their NESSC data submissions. It was agreed that the revised guide would be out to the states as soon as possible.

Lunch - 12:15 – 12:55 PM.

Business turned to the college readiness indicators work with Mike Grady of the Annenberg Institute at Brown joined Amy Johnson, Assistant Director of the Center for Education Policy, Applied Research, and Evaluation at the University of Southern Maine in leading the report and update. They shared the latest regarding their work in Rhode Island and in Maine. Discussion then moved to some options for securing needed funding for the development of tools for schools based on further work with promising college readiness indicators. The conversation centered on the research and implications for policy that seem to have strong potential for the work of NESSC. To this point, unpacking the potential of the preliminary NESSC college indicators has been most revealing including the trajectory of high school GPA, as well as uncovering some tools and lessons learned from districts whose performance is unpredictably strong. Next steps include the refinement of an evolving Prospectus to be presented to funders for planning and hosting of a gathering of researchers on the matter of college readiness indicators followed by a convening of policy makers looking to application of what we are learning, especially to inform practice, policy modification, and tools for secondary schools.
A postponed report and update, from early in the agenda, of NESSC activities and events was presented. Matters of revised high school transcripts and the NESSC Collegiate Endorsement, as well as the upcoming NESSC High School Redesign Conference highlighted the report.

Burning Issues, a regular agenda item, comprised the final business of the day. Topics discussed included academic tenacity/perseverance as an indicator for college success; data use and data quality; the future of the NESSC Data Team; student and staff feedback regarding teacher evaluation; across agency resource sharing; and multi-year National Student Clearinghouse contracts for states.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Duke Albanese
NESSC METRICS
Submissions and Timelines

2012-2013
ADOPTED By Data Team
February 26, 2013

• Data Submission Timelines and Process Discussed, Modified, and Adopted by NESSC Team: November 15, 2012.

• Data Tables – Revised as Necessary by Research in Action, Inc. and Sent to SEA Data Teams; Preliminary Posting on NESSC Site of the NESSC Metrics Procedural Guidebook: By January 1, 2013.

• Post-secondary Data Requests to National Student Clearinghouse Completed by All 5 NESSC States Using Common February Window.

• Finalization of the NESSC Metrics Procedural Guidebook; Data Submission Process Reviewed and Adopted at NESSC Data Team Meeting: February 26, 2013.


• Data Review and Refinements Completed by Research in Action in Collaboration With Each SEA: By June 10, 2013

• Research in Action Publishes and Distributes to the Nellie Mae Education Foundation and to NESSC the 2012-2013 Technical Report and the NESSC Metrics Procedural Guidebook: By July 31, 2013