Evan: All right, good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to all of you who are joining on the webinar. And welcome to all our folks here in Denver. For those of you joining on the webinar, sorry cuz [INAUDIBLE] we’re having a great conference so far. This is our first live webinar that we’re doing from the conference.

I'm Evan Rosenberg from Department of Labor. And I'm gonna talk a little bit about where we are on our performance and reporting for the Youth CareerConnect Program. All right, and my clicker does work, awesome. So for those of you who have attended this session before or in the past, the first few slides will look familiar to you.

I like to make sure we're all on an even playing field for those of you who are either new to YCC or new to our annual grantees meeting. On the first slide, I always like to talk about the importance of performance accountability. And then I’ll talk a little bit about our performance measures and our targets for them.

It's kinda the stuff, so I apologize for those of you who have seen that already. Wanna make sure everyone's on the same page. And then from there, I’ll go into our data snapshot through March of 2017. We don't have the data yet for the April through June quarter. So it's one quarter shy of three full years. So unfortunately, we're already three-quarters of the way through our grant program. It's kinda sad to think about, but also exciting at the same time to see how our young people are progressing through the program. All right, so importance of performance and reporting, threefold.

First and foremost, we really believe that the data is for you all as program operators to run your program. And for those of you who are familiar with our data, you know we collect a lot of it. We have 15 different performance measures, which is a lot more than we usually have in most programs.

But we do that for a reason, to give you all tools to help you see how well you're doing. Where the holes are, where you can improve, and give you real-time feedback on the program. So that's first and foremost, it's for you, for decision-making, continuous improvement. Secondly, it's for us, the Department of Labor, to help oversee these grants. As we all know, taxpayer dollars fund them. And it's our job at the Department of Labor to make sure that you all are doing a good job spending your grant money. And we need data to help us figure that out. We also need to go out, visit you, and [INAUDIBLE], come out and see how you're doing in the real world.

And that, combined with the data, to really help us see what's going on. And then lastly, it's to demonstrate success to our stakeholders. We all believe in these programs. We've seen firsthand the importance of them when we've gone out on our ELOs yesterday and today. And so we wanna make the case to stakeholders and funders that these programs should be funded. Whether that's us at the Department of Labor making a case for that. Whether it's you all in your local communities. We believe that the data will help you tell a story in your communities to help raise the funds and sustain this great model that we've created.

Evan: All right, so I'm not gonna go into great detail on what the performance measures are. But I did wanna make sure people saw them. So we have the ultimate goal for the program, which is to ensure that all of our completers complete all of the following. Graduate from high school with a high school diploma. Obtain a degree or an industry-recognized credential in an H-1B industry and have earned college credit towards a degree in their selected H-1B industry. And then lastly, move into a positive placement. Which could either be employment, post-secondary education, further occupational skills training. And I think it's a good idea to revisit the overall goals of the program, now that we have people graduating and completing the program right now. If you're running a three-year model or if you're a four-year model, they'll complete next spring.

To really think about, are we seeing all three of those things happen in our completers. And we have two sets of measures. We have short-term measures, which are the ones we've had lots of data on over the course of the program, that tell us how we're doing in real time.
And then we have long-term measures that we don't have a lot of data yet. But depending on what type of model you are, if you're a two or a three-year model, we do have some long-term data on how you're doing. And so we're starting to get some of that data. And over the course of the fourth year, we'll get lots more of that long-term data. I should also say, if you have any questions about anything I talk about, feel free to raise your hand and jump in. I don't wanna be the only talking this afternoon. So if there's anything you don't understand, or you need me to elaborate on, or you wanna jump in and offer your perspective, please feel free to do that. So target setting, each of the 15 measures have a target. Some of them are national targets that we set at the beginning of the grant, working with the Department of Education. Others are specific to your program model. And so you have your own target based on the type of program model you're running.

Evan: So here are ten short-term measures. And it kinda follows the progression of an individual in the program. So we have enrollment rate, mentoring rate, which is one of the important services that we focus on in our program. We have a couple measures around attendance and attendance rate and the chronic absence rate. We have a yearly program retention rate, which measures the retention in the program from one year to the next. So this past year, we measured how many people were in the program in year two and continued in the program in year three. [INAUDIBLE] a good indication of whether it's a solid program or not. And internship placement rate, that's another one of our important services that we're really focused on. Which is why we spent a good portion of yesterday and today taking you around Denver, showing you all kinds of great internships. And I gotta say, I was really impressed with the internship opportunities I saw both yesterday and today. We have an internship completion rate, making sure that those who start internships complete them. A work readiness indicator, for that one, we have an employer evaluation tool. And hopefully, you all are aware of this and are doing it. Where for anyone who does an internship, we want the employer to evaluate that intern at the end of their internship opportunity. Just the same way that we all get evaluated in our jobs. We feel like it's a good thing to get young people used to that process that your employers can evaluate you and tell you how well you're doing. And so we developed an employer evaluation tool or a work readiness tool for you to use. And it essentially measures whether an individual is considered work ready by the employer at the end of their internship. Just a quick show of hands, how many people are using that work readiness tool for their internships? Kinda what I expected, so if you're not, we can make sure and send that out so you have the tool. And make sure, for all your internships, to use that work readiness tool and tell your employers that they should be using that tool to evaluate their interns. Yes, absolutely.

Speaker 2: On some of the other webinars and conference calls very early on, you mentioned at the site, if they have their own work readiness indicator, that that would be acceptable. Is that still the case?

Evan: That's still the case. If you have your own intern evaluation tool that you wanna use with your employers, by all means, you can do that. I'd say the two criteria we wanna make sure are in place are, one, it's an employer-driven tool where it's the employer Evaluating the work readiness of the intern, and two, that you are using what you're able to experience and able to somehow determine whether or not that individual is work ready since it's a work readiness indicator. But as long as the employer's, the one leading it, it determines whether someone's work readiness it's fine to use their own tool, but if you don't have one, definitely use ours. All right, and then the last two short-term measures around post-secondary attainment. So measuring the percentage of participants who are getting some type of post-secondary credit during their time in
the YCC program, and then the second piece of it is the average number of credits they're attaining for those who are attaining credit, and for this one, what I've talked about in the past is, we all know that some colleges and universities might accept this course as credit but others might not. Some might accept a four on the AP exam for this, others might accept three, and we all know that you can't figure out immediately on the spot is this gonna count as college credit. So what we ask you to do is, if it's anything that could result in college credit, if any of your local colleges or universities that is acceptable then you can count that. So any questions about the short-term measures? All right, so let's talk about the long-term measures. First one is final program retention rate, which is exactly what it sounds like. It's how many people were in the program all the way through, and completed it, and were retained throughout. The second one is a placement rate.

I talked about the three types of placements, either unsubsidized employment, post-secondary education, or some type of further occupational skills training. Hopefully all of our high school graduates are going into one of those three things, and that's what our placement rate measures. High school diploma attainment rate, pretty self-explanatory. Credential attainment rate, similar, but attaining some type of industry recognized credential other than the high school diploma or equivalency, and then the last one, which is a little bit redundant. I can blame the Department of Education on this one, for some reason they really wanted a combined indicator that combines the first two.

So, we did that, so it's the diploma and credential attainment rate, it's the percentage of participants that obtained both during their stay in the program. All right, any questions so far? And Angela, do we have a chat feature where people can ask questions? Any questions in the chat room? For those of you listening via webinar, if you have questions, feel free to enter them in the chat. All right, so let's talk about the interesting stuff. Where are we now, so far? Again, this is through the end of March of this year. So enrollment, we are doing really, really well with enrollment. Great job, you can feel good about that. You can see that we're at over 21,500 participants enrolled nationally, and we are, believe it or not, almost at our goal for the four years of the program at this point, not even three full years through. So I don't have any concerns nationally around enrollment. In terms of participants enrolled in year three compared to the goal, we have over 7,000 enrolled just in this program year, year three, compared to a goal of a little over 6,000. So we're at a 114% enrollment rate for this program year, which exceeds the national goal, and in terms of grantees, 22 of our 24 grantees are doing well in enrollment, and we have no concerns about them.

We have two grantees that are under 80% enrollment. I'm guessing you all know who you are, and hopefully have strategies to address that as we move into year four. Now let's talk about participants who receive program services. So, this is an area where we obviously expect all of our participants to participate in program services. We have whole list of program services in our participant tracking system, or PTS, as we refer to it, and so we would expect every participant to participate in our program service, and this isn't unique for our program. It's pretty much any program I've ever been associated with. We always see that there are some individuals entered into our reporting system who don't have services associated with them, which we obviously don't wanna see, because anyone in our program should be receiving services, but I like to show you this number, and ask you to look at it for your own program. 94% of our participants receive services. We wanna make sure that number's 100%, because like I talked about, anyone in the program should of course be receiving services. But there are 20,287 out of the 21,543 that I talked about that don't have any services entered into the PTS for them. So that's, I don't know, roughly a little less than 1,300 participants, that we need to figure out why there aren't services. So, I have a few to do's for you, when you leave here, as it relates to performance and data, that I'll talk about over the next half hour or so, and this is one of them. Look at your data, look at that number of participants who have received services compared to overall people enrolled, and try and figure out why those would be different, and if they're individuals that don't have services, if it's because you haven't entered them, or is it somebody you
thought was gonna enroll in the program, but it turned out they never did, but you had put their information in as an enrollee.

So that's something we should definitely get cleaned up. Any questions about that? Makes sense to everybody? Great, and then another thing I look at is exiters. It's a good indication of how our program is doing in terms of keeping participants enrolled. So at this point in the program you could be an exiter for two reasons.

One, kinda the good kind, you successfully completed the program. So those of you running two year, maybe three year models, you'll have some successful completers who have exited the program, and that's wonderful. But then there's a second kind of exiter which is someone who leaves the program before completing it, and we all know that's gonna happen.

We don't expect you ever to have a 100% completion rate. Participants start the program, realize it's not for them. Participants move out of the area. Lots of understandable and acceptable reasons, but we like to look at that number of exiters and make sure we don't see half the country has exited the program already, and so where that number is right now is 14.5% of participants have exited the program, and when you subtract out the successful completers it's 11.1%, which to me is pretty good indicator of, we're retaining about 89% of our students in the program.

So that means you all are running good programs, and people wanna continue on it, so that's great. All right, let's talk about attendance. So we measure attendance rates, and we're doing really well there, 96% attendance rate for year three, and about 95% program to date. We had a goal of 90%, so we're easily exceeding that, doing really well.

The other piece of attendance that we measure is chronic absence rate, which is the percentage of participants who miss, I can't remember how many days, we have a set percentage, maybe 20% of the days or something like that? Sorry, I should know this, but I don't. But it's basically the participants who are chronically absent, missing too much school, and for that we're not doing too badly.

We have almost an 11% chronic absence rate for year three, and our goal was to keep it at 10% or under, so we're just off of that. Program to date, a little over over 12%. So not quite achieving the goal, but we're pretty close. [BLANK AUDIO]

Evan: All right, so lets look at some of the enrollment data.

On your sheets you probably can't read that all that well. I can't. It's making me feel old. I used to be able to read really little print and, the last couple of years that skill is waning, so I'm gonna look over here. So enrollment rate, the numbers you see at the top is how we're doing in year three.

So I talked about before, our enrollment rate for year three is 114%. You can see year two, we were at 120% enrollment for our goal in year two. And then program to date, we're probably about 116% of where we should be on enrollment so it's doing great there.

Participation rate, that was one I talked about where we want it to be 100%. It's at 94% and it's kind of the same place it's been last year. And then you see the exiters, you see that number is increasing. But obviously as the program goes along it will increase cuz we get more successful completers and a few more people dropping out of the program.

Attendance rate, you can see how we're doing across the years, our attendance rate in year three is better than it's ever been. So that's great to see. And the chronic absent rate has remained fairly steady. All right, so let's talk about demographics. Who's in our program? A little but more male than female.

But pretty close. In terms of race, White is at 54%, Hispanic/Latino 44%, African Americans 22%. Asian, 5. American India, Alaska Native, 2%. More than one race, 2%. So, pretty diverse program, we saw that a little bit in Denver. And same thing we see nationally, so we like to see that.

We want to see good diversity. Some other demographics, we talked a little while ago about participants with IEPs who were in internships. We have well under 7% that report having a disability. Low income, we're at 42% which is great, normally with programs we operate at the Department of Labor we really focus on low income, underserved populations, with the Career
Connect program we didn't have that requirement on these grants but we did try and encourage it and emphasize it to give low income people opportunity through these programs. And almost half of our participants are low income so we're really pleased to see that. We have over 11% who are limited English proficient. Homeless and runaway, 1%. Pregnant or parenting, a very small number, just 0.3%. And then foster youth, 0.2% In terms of grade level, you can see, and this is where they start the program.

As you all know, or hopefully know, the latest you can enroll in the YCC program is 11th grade, cuz we wanted to make sure that every model gave at least two years for a student to participate in high school. So you can see that more of our programs than not have a 9-12 model where students enroll in 9th grade.

It's almost half the country has participants enrolling in 9th grade which is great because then they get four full years of this opportunity. 23% start in 10th grade, and 29% in 11th grade.

Evan: All right, service information, that might be a little bit small to see from the back of the room, or even on your paper.

That one I can sort of read. We talked about that 94% number. It needs to be 100% for service participation. The most common service that you all are providing is not [INAUDIBLE], it's career and academic counseling. That's something we would expect almost all participants would be a part of, an that's at 81%.

Coming in second, very closely behind, is those who participate in industry specific YCC courses. That's at 75%. And just a reminder, that is a requirement of the grant where we want to at least one industry specific YCC course for a participant. Maybe it doesn't happen until later in high school for some of the participants and they're not doing it in 9th grade but at some point we definitely want them to do that.

And then going down the list a little bit further 47% in work experience. That could include job shadowing and more of the lighter work experience things. And we'll talk about internships in a minute which is another type of work experience. Employer provided services, employers coming into the high schools and talking about what they do, things like that, 34%.

Leadership development, 37%. Supportive services 33%, mentoring 27%, I'll talk more about that in a few moments. Community service 18%, internship 13%. I'll also elaborate on that in a little bit.

And we have, this is a great number, we have 2,759 professional development activities that have occurred nationally in the Youth Career Connect program, which we typically talk about all of our services to the students, but it's also very important to make sure that we're providing teachers and other professionals with development opportunities for this and you all have done a great job on that, so we're happy to see that.

Any questions so far?

Evan: All right.

Evan: Lost my place on my little sheet here.

Angela: I just wanted to make an announcement that we will post the slides on the community practice after the conference. So you don't, you'll have bigger ones to look at later, so they will be posted.

Evan: Thanks, Angela. All right, so service comparison overtime. And this is programmed to date data. Meaning that first bar is where we are at the end of year one, the second bar is the end of year two, and the third bar is the end of year three. And you can see that they're all going in the right direction, which is good.

You can see some of the larger jumps in the services provided, like industry specific YCC courses, that second one, went from slightly over 60 to 75%. Work experience is another pretty big jump,
which was good to see. Mentoring was a pretty big jump from year two to year three which is good
to see and you can see when we compare mentoring to the goal, the goal is that purple bar.
We're above it for program to date but for individual program year nationally we're not quite there.
And then internships which I'll talk about in a minute you can see the comparison between the green
bar and purple bar, the third and fourth bars there. We're still far below our goal for internships but
hopefully that's gonna, that is currently being turned around this summer, Denver's a good example
of that.
Where I think they said they had almost 300 participants in summer internships, something like that.
So hopefully lots of internships going on around the summer. All right, let's talk about more of the
measures. Yearly program retention. So nationally we're at 70% for this compared to a year three
goal of 85%.
So we are not achieving our goal. This is one of those things where it's a few grantees that I think
aren't entering the data that are bringing down our data nationally. So we have nine grantees who
are achieving the goal out of our 24 grantees. That means we have 15 who are not.
But three in particular are below 30%. And based on the exit data we all know that nine-tenths of
our participants are still in the program. So there's a disconnect between this number and that
number and I think the disconnect is due to the fact that data's not being entered on some sites and
I'll take you back to my very first slide where I talked about the importance of performance
accountability.
Gave you three really good reasons why this data is important and we want the data to be accurate.
And particularly we're in a new administration where our new administration is asking us about all
our programs and wants to see the data on them. And we want to show the true accurate picture of
how well you're doing.
And so this is a good example of a measure I don't think accurately reflects how well we're doing and
that impacts all of us. So it's really important to make sure that this data is accurate, and this is a
really simple measure to do data wise in the PTS.
It's just one field, which is participation date in the year three participation date, year four
participation date. And it's just one field in the PTS, and even you'll see this bullet point here is we
implemented a group entry feature for retention. Start going into year three where instead have to
go into each individual screen in the PTF and put in the date you could do it as a group.
So every single participant in your program you could check off that they are still participating in
the third year of the program and do it all in one shot. So we were thinking that would make it really
easy on you all, because we recognize that for some of the larger programs like Denver, and LA, and
New York City, going into hundreds and hundreds of records and doing that was pretty tedious.
But now it's pretty simple to do. So this is another one of your homework assignments is go back,
look at your yearly program retention for year three. Make sure it's what it's supposed to be and if
it's not go back and enter the data. You can always go back and enter the data.
And then when the new quarterly report comes out, it will reflect old data that you even entered
previously. So it's never too late to fix your data, that's one of my messages here. Questions about
that?

Evan: Everybody know what I'm referring to with that [INAUDIBLE] and how to do it, you know how
it all works?
Yeah.

Speaker 4: Is there a simple way to pull up students who have blank participation data for year 3?

Evan: That's a good question. So we have an export feature in the PTF, and I am not an expert in the
export feature. I don't know, where's Gene, if she happens to know.
There you are, do you know in the export feature if that is possible to figure out?
Gene: Yeah, I can double check. But if you export your data into Excel you can create a table and pull up that particular data item and identify what YCC ID is attached to I don't have that.

Gene: So, there's a group data data entry field which Evan mentioned. So, we can provide you guidance on how to actually do that, but what you do is, you go into the system and you select all the students you want and you enter a single date and that's attached to each of those students.

Evan: And hopefully everyone knows this, but for those of you who don't, we have a PTS users group and we have a users group call monthly. And we could put this on our next monthly users group call just to make sure everybody knows how to do that with the export feature.

[BLANK AUDIO]

Evan: Or, yeah, right, send an email to YTC if you want to join the users group. And, if you want an answer to exactly how to do it, you can also email YTC, and, we can help you figuring out that export feature as well. Were there other questions about that, I thought I saw one other hand, no?

Evan: All right, mentoring rate. So this is one we talked about a lot last year, one of the services we really wanna focus on. We know this can be a difficult one for a variety of reasons. We're doing better in it, the nationally in year three 18%, roughly, of participants participated in mentoring compared to a goal of 21%.
So pretty close to our national goal, which is good to see, much better than in year two. And again, this is really dependent on the model. This is a good example of one of those targets that was very model dependent and we let you all tell us what your mentoring goal was in your proposals. And then we even went back and gave you a second opportunity in year one to refine your mentoring rate if didn't quite understand what you were getting into mentoring, and a lot of people took us up on that. So hopefully your targets are realistic, and some people didn't build the mentoring component until year 3 or year 4.
And so if you're one of those grants you might not be expected to have mentoring yet because it wasn't part of you model until later and that's fine. But for others you had mentoring built in early and some are doing well, some are not. So programs to date through year three, we have 25% of participants participating in mentoring, which is great.
It's increasing each year, rates have increased both program year to date and program date. And then, almost half of our grantees are meeting their year three mentoring goals. 11 out of 24, which is up from 6 out of 24 in year 2, so that's great. I'm hearing voices.
All right, questions about mentoring.

Evan: Internships. Internships, really important part of the program. One of the things that makes the YCC Program unique is, not all school districts across the country give opportunities for internships and work based learning. At the Department of Labor we feel that it's a critical component of all of the youth programs we operate.
There's data out there that shows that people who participate in internships and work experience have higher graduation rates, better connections to the labor force down the road. Just thinking about my own personal experience, having summer jobs in high school. And no matter what they were, they would teach you the value of work and responsibility, and there's just so much good stuff that comes out of internships.
I think that was reinforced a lot yesterday and today. So can't emphasize the importance of internships. Again, this is another one we know it can be difficult developing those employer relationships. A lot of times employers haven't worked with schools in the past. Joe from Denver talked about that's critical is making sure employers understand that schools want to work with them and why it's important and why it's important for the employers.
They're building their future workforce. We saw great examples of that in Denver. So now the bad news which is internships where we are right now 4.5% of participants were in internships in year 3 compared to our goal of almost 27%. Now keep in mind that a big caveat comes with this, which is we all know in schools, your internship model is a lot of times gonna be a summer internship. And those summer internships are probably starting in May or June, and we don't have that data yet. So our data is through March of 2017. So if a lot of you are operating internships solely in the summer and they started on that April through June quarter. They're not gonna be picked up in this number even though they're part of your year three data.

So just a sense, an honest sense, how many, raise your hand if you're doing lots of summer internships this summer that just haven't shown up in the data yet. So a fair amount, which is good. I'll definitely be eager to look at that data when it comes in, in the middle of August and see our internship number jump.

But even given that, it's still lower than where we would expect it to be. As you can see, program to date nationally, we're at about 10%. There's still ways to go there and so far, no one is achieving their internship goal for year three. But again, we don't have a complete picture of the data in year three.

Every year when I do this presentation, I wish that I had the full year's data before talking to you cuz it's hard to really understand what's going on if you're missing that last quarter of data, particularly around the internship measure. So we definitely get that. When we look at that program to date data, 4 grantees are doing really well program to date, 3 grantees don't have any internships yet, although one doesn't have an internship goal until you're four so, obviously they wouldn't. The other two, theirs started in year three. So, I'm hoping for those two grantees, it's just that all their internships are in the fourth quarter of year three. You know who you are if you fall in that book. Hopefully, they really are in the fourth quarter or year three.

Good news on internships. Do you have a question?

Speaker 6: [INAUDIBLE] Impact, you're really only look at, if you think that summer is the biggest time, you're only looking at one year. Cuz in my mind our program started in September because we got a grant. We got a planning period until the end of August. So our year started September to the end of the year, so the following summer was really the first summer. This is the second summer, and you haven't really gotten our data yet. So I'm just encouraging you to think, you're gonna see a big jump, right?

Evan: Yes, and no.
So this is our third summer. But we do have two summers of data, but keep in mind that to further your argument, the majority of programs had a nine through 12 program model. And so we are talking ninth and tenth graders those first two years, and so they may not have had internships built in until the third summer.

So, we're really hoping to see the next bump in internships happening literally as we speak. And then at the end of the quarter, ending in June 30th of this year, when we get that deal, we'll see if they bump up

Evan: If we don't, you'll definitely hear about it from me in year four.
All right, so the good news on internships is those who are doing internships are completing them and they are work ready when they completed them. I talked a little while ago about our work readiness indicator and 97% of our participants who completed internships are attaining that work readiness indicator, so that's great to see.

Just spending another minute, aside from the kind of issues with what we talked about in terms of internships not happening until this summer. What other things are people experiencing, in terms of trying to develop internships. Are there any struggles you're having that other [INAUDIBLE] with? Does anyone want to share any insights you might have on internships?
Evan: No?

Evan: Anyone on the webinar?

Angela: You have a question about mentoring?

Evan: Okay, read our question for us Angela.

Angela: You review required hours for each student?

Evan: I can't cuz I don't recall it off the top of my head but we can certainly get that information for you.

I feel like we said we want a full year of mentoring, right? You guys should know this, you tell me.

Evan: Is that it, one hour per quarter, and for a full year, is that right? One hour per quarter and for a full year, thank you. All right, any last thoughts about internship, before we keep moving?

Evan: Okay, Post-Secondary Credit, this kind of potentially falls into that same characterization as internships, where perhaps we won't see this until later in the program. But I think I would have expected more of it occurring during year three than we've seen. So this is kind of a, it's a story of good news and bad news.

The good news is that, for our students who are taking college level courses and attaining credits, they are attaining lots of credits which is awesome to see. So you'll see that in that sub-bullet underneath the second bullet that our average number of credits is 12.9 per student for those who are achieving credits.

So that's, practically their first semester of college that they're already achieving, which is great, and it exceeds our goal of 11 credits per student. So that's awesome, but how many students are actually attaining credit? It varies widely across which is understandable because your program models are different. But one of the goals of the program, which we've talked about earlier, is that by the time someone completes the YCC program, we want every student to have taken at least one class that would result in college credit.

And so, right now 18% of our students have attained post-secondary credits. And granted, our ninth graders and maybe our tenth graders, we wouldn't expect to attain college credit yet. But by the time they get into eleventh and twelfth grade, we probably would expect some college credit. So that's, one of those other things is make sure you're recording that post-secondary credit when it occurs.

And then we have four grantees to have over 60% of their participants attaining post-secondary credit, and even one grantee with over 80% of assistance achieving post-secondary credit, which is awesome and shows you that it's possible to attain lots of credit. Some other good success stories, we have over 1,100 high school diplomas attained.

Again, this is very tied into your program model if you have a 9 through 12 program model, you probably don't have a lot of high school diplomas attained yet. And then over 1,300 participants that have obtained industry-recognized credentials which is great to see. And to that last [INAUDIBLE], that is an increase from 442 at the point in year two, so a huge increase in credentials from year two to year three.

Evan: Long-Term Performance Indicators, this is where I talked about at the beginning of the session, that for some of our programs we're starting to see long term performance data. For other programs who have the 9 through 12 models, we probably aren't getting that so much. So I only looked at the programs who would expect to have program completion and high school diploma attainment.
Not fair to measure someone who hasn't reached the point where they could've completed the program yet, or could've obtained their high school diploma. So where we are, 62% program completion rate, program to date. So this is only students. If you recall in the PTS, you have to put in an expected program completion date.

So, this is for only students who have an expected program completion date that has already occurred. So, of those students, 62% have successfully completed the program. I don't think that's an accurate number since we've all talked about, our exit rate is pretty low for the program. I'm thinking part of it is not entering in that program completion date in the PTS for those who have completed the program.

So for those of you who have students with expected completion dates that have already occurred, make sure to go back and enter those completion dates if they have successfully completed the program. And so that's half of you. We looked at the grantees and exactly 12 of the 24 grantees have participants with expected program completion dates that have already happened.

So, for you 12 grantees, you should make sure that you're entering that data. And how we're looking, we're looking pretty good. At this point nine of the 12 are above 70% and six are above 80%. And then you can see up there three grantees are very low based on expected program completion date. And I'm guessing it's most likely due to a lack of data. So here's the good news for you all. At some point over the next day I'm gonna tell you if you fall into that group of people and you need to fix your data. I'm not gonna stand up here and shame anybody and say this grantee has a 10% program completion rate, you need to fix it.

But I do want to talk to all the grantees that I see have issues with their data. I think for the most part, it's entering data into the PTS. I think some of it, is actual performance in needing to have internships and things like that. But I think the bulk of it is data entry, which is, again, why I showed you that slide at the beginning of the important into this data. We all know it's tedious work to enter the data into the PTS. But this is the reason why it's important is we wanna make sure that the data reflects accurately all the great things we're achieving. So we can show that to our stakeholders, show that to our community, make a case for our program.

So, I'll make sure everybody here finds out which of the measures they might be struggling with. So, my plan is at the [INAUDIBLE] is I can meet with a couple grantees and show them where they are. And, then everyone else, the very last session today is with coaches, where we have coaches sessions and I'm just going to kind of float around and go into those rooms and pull grantees aside for just a couple of minutes and show them the things they need to focus on if that sounds good to everybody. That work? Or I can just stand up here and announce it, but, I don't think that works quite as well.

Any questions so far? All right, high school diploma attainment rate, again I don't think this accurately reflects where we're at 59% based on those who have an expected high school attainment date that's already passed.

With 17 of the 24 grantees have participants who, based on the data you entered, had expected high school attainment dates already. And of those 17, 11 are doing pretty well, above 70%. Nine are above 80%. So, that leaves six that are below 70% and, two that are extremely low. Most likely due to lack of reporting. If that's something you need to fix then before you leave here today you'll find out if you're one of those grantees. And then credential attainment rate, we're at 40% program to date and we have four grantees doing really well that are above 55%.

All right, let's see how I'm doing on time, just where I want to be. So this is my last slide. So here is my guidance to you. For year four, I think I've probably said most of this stuff during the presentation. But number one, make sure to enter participation dates for both the coming year, year four, and for past years if you haven't done it.

That's what drives the yearly program retention date. That's what we just talked about, or Gene talked about, using the export feature to figure out who doesn't have a year three participation date. So make sure and go back to do that. The one thing we had a question, this is kind of a technical question, but I'll try and explain it so it makes sense, is I've talked a little bit about, for all your participants, you enter an expected cohort completion date, when they're gonna complete the
program.
And an expected high school diploma attainment date when you expect them to complete high
school. So if someone is enrolling in 9th grade then that date is four years out, when they finish 12th
grade, right. So we had a question of now that we're late into year three and moving into year four
in the program.
What do we do about those dates, if those dates are after the end of the DOL program? Are we
suppose to put it when our program ends or are we suppose to put it when their, you know, steady in
the program if they were going the full three years or four years.
However long your program model is. And the answer is, enter the date based on when they truly
would complete the program, and when they truly would attain their high school diploma. So even
though those days will be beyond the length of our DOL funded program, you should still enter those
dates into the PTS.
Because that way, when our program ends, well, like a bunch of people were supposed to have
graduated high school or completed the program, When they're still in 10th grade. Does that make
sense to everybody?

Evan: Technical point but its important one cuz it could really skew the data if we don't get that
right.
More guns for the coming year. Make sure to enter outcomes when they occur. We're finally getting
to the point where we'll have outcome data. So postsecondary credit attainment, I talked about that.
High school diploma attainment, program completion, entrance into postsecondary education, start
to collect that data, and then lastly, and again I have talked about this.
If you notice that your rates are lower than you would expect them to be, which is probably due to a
lack of data entry, so use that export feature, go back, figure out where the holes are. And, please fix
your data. So, that we accurately reflect as a program where we are.
We're all in this together. Our national data gets shared far and wide. And, we want to make sure it's
reflecting all the great work you're doing. So, I'm just going to quickly tell you that if you're a
grantee, come talk to me. So, the good news is that there are ten of you, ten grantees in this room,
who have no issues with any of their data, that I found.
And you don't have to spend any time with me today, which is great for you, and we're glad that
some are in that boat. So all I'm going to do is say the name of the grant if everybody is comfortable
with that. I'm not going to talk about where the issue is or anything.
I just want to make sure people know to find me before today is over. So listen for your grant name.
Ivy Tech, Manufacturing Renaissance, Buffalo, Galveston, Prince George's County, Upper Explorer
Land Iowa Westside in Omaha, Lawrence County, Los Angeles, New York City, Denver. See, even
Denver who's hosting us.
[LAUGH] Even if the coach talks to you. I truly, I want to personally talk to each of these 14 grants
about it. But Denver who is a great grantee, who we've all seen that in person. Hasn't entered their
data for some stuff. So don't feel bad about it, we just wanna fix it.
And then Toledo, Tucson, and [INAUDIBLE]. All right, any last questions before I bring Nan up? All
right, thank you. [APPLAUSE]
[SOUND]
[INAUDIBLE]

Nan: [NOISE]

Hi! Okay, so now you can read what I'm gonna say. [INAUDIBLE] How's that? Better? So take that
off, because, good, one of the lines was incorrect. I'm Nan Maxwell from Mathematical Policy
Research and with me is Jeanne Belotti, over there. And together we are directing the YCC Evaluation, and we met many of you over the years at these conferences. We’ve talked to you on the phone, we’ve seen you in person, some of you a lot of times, and it’s just so exciting to be here. I wanna start by emphasizing, like Evan did, the importance of the evaluation and getting data. And I’m listening to Evan talk about stakeholders and the interest in this. And I’m thinking, okay, if I was in the audience, I would be thinking, why is Nan gonna get up and talk to me about more data collection? Evan just spent an hour, maybe it wasn’t an hour, talking about all the data we’re collecting. Why is Mathematica here doing more?

The data in the PDFs are about participants. They show stakeholders, lots of stakeholders, the good work you’re doing and what you’re doing. They show what program participants do. There’s a second level to showing evidence about how successful the programs are. And that second level is okay. But what would those participants be doing, if there weren’t YCC, or programs like YCC? And the data that are in the PGF, the data on your participants, the wonderful things you’re doing, the wonderful things they’re doing. You can’t demonstrate that those are, because of the program unless you compare them to students that aren’t in there. And show what they would be doing without the program.

It’s a higher level of rigor. And that’s what this evaluation is doing. That’s what this evaluation will show. Gonna raise the level of rigor of evidence about the success of programs. In this case, YCC. And the program may not be called YCC in [INAUDIBLE], if the program may be called something else, and it’s something very similar.

And you want evidence of success, at a very rigorous level about what you’re doing. So, that you can go out, and continue the good work you’re doing. And that’s why it’s really, really important to piggyback on what Evan said. So, first of all I wanna give you all, guys, a huge thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you.

We couldn’t be doing this evaluation, we could not be providing evidence of what your program’s doing without you. You, guys, have been amazing, all of you, all 24 of you have completed a 2005 15 to your survey. All of you as of today have completed a 2017 survey. Late breaking news-

[NAN: Way to go guys. All of you have talked to us on the phone and told us about the program. All of you, despite what Evan says, have entered data into the PTF [LAUGH]. You've done that for us. Furthermore, 15 of you have hosted us on site visits. Some of you have hosted us on site visits multiple times. Some of you are very good friends with us at this point. You've hosted us so many times. Ten of you have worked very closely with us to randomly assign students into the YCC program and fill out what must have seemed like terminal paperwork that went with that. So, you've done a huge amount for us to further this evidence of this program, and I think you all deserve a round of applause. [APPLAUSE]

Nan: So, what am I gonna tell you about today? Today I’m gonna talk about and remind you about what the evaluation really is and its different components. A lot of you have heard this before, I’m not gonna spend a lot of time on it. Then I’m gonna talk about early results of the findings that we have from the implementation setting. Talked a lot about this in detail last year Evan's given you some data. But I want to put it at a very high level, and tell a little bit the story a little different way this time. The third thing I’m gonna do is talk about future evaluation activities, where we’re headed, what we’re gonna do and what more is coming in terms of data collection. Most of you will like that part a lot.

Nan: So, let’s start with the evaluation overview. As most of you know, there are three components to the evaluation.
There's really two big ones. We're doing what's called an implementation study and looking at what the programs are doing. But we're also doing an impact study, which is what I talked about before. The impact study actually compares what's happening, the outcomes from the program with the outcomes of what would have happened with a similar group of students. And it provides evidence of impact. The implementation study, which is what we're gonna be talking about today, really answers the question how are the activities and the services of YCC being implemented. The impact study, the two components, those components, the lottery-based study and the comparison group impact study.

Both components together will answer questions about, what is the effect of YCC on a wide variety of outcomes? Again, today we're gonna focus on the findings of early implementation. So, before I start, I'd like to talk about which grantees are involved in which components of these evaluations, and I'm talking about participation in terms of data collection.

And, if you talk about the impact study, it's really the impact study is only being on a sub-group of grantees. And the data collection for that we've got follow-up survey, and there are three different grantees participating in that. We have for the comparison group study, we have four different grantees participating in that. And then for the comparison group design we have up to 16 districts. Participating in that. For the implementation study, again, all grantees are providing us with information on the QPR, a quarterly progress report narrative. And for the PTF and as you all just heard for the grantee surveys.

We're getting information from all of you. Then we're doing site visits to ten different grantees. We also collected and use, we called the sign information forms of students in each different districts, or actually eight different grantees.

Nan: So, the focus of today's talk on implementation, what are the research questions? What are we doing when we look at implementation? First question is, what type of students does YCC serve? Evan's already talked about that. Break five I don't need to say more. You know what kind of students we're serving given what Evan said. So, last one about sustainability we don't have information yet. Because these are early findings from early implementation. So, sustainability we'll be getting a lot of that information from the 2017 grand peace survey and from our final round. Somehow we'll be talking about today. What I will be talking about today, questions.

Nan: So what data am I gonna use? What data do we use to report these things? QPR narratives and the PTS data are through the 2015, 2016 school year. The grantee survey is the 2015 survey. The ten site visits are from the ones we did spring 2016 and the baseline information forms were administered during the 2015 2016 school year.

So when I say we're talking about early implementation, I really mean, what was happening in the first year or year and a half of this program?

Nan: Let's answer the first question, how do YCC programs differ from other programs? And by other programs, most of this information is taken from the 2015 survey.

And we can see that the YCC program Differs from other programs, or what other programs students would take in each of the three core areas of YCC. In terms of preparing students for college and careers, most of those differences, when we looked at most of those differences, most of those differences fell into the category of Class based differences.

You can see where there is increased instruction in work readiness and in industry. There is coursework that articulates. It articulates more often than YCC, than in other programs. It articulates to two and four years programs, it articulates to Industry recognized credentials. And the other thing it does, the courses, they engage in more active learning pedagogies, such as problem-based learning, Project Lead The Way, and the type of pedagogies talked about [INAUDIBLE].
Nan: And the second area the YCC program differs from other programs that are existing is in connecting to career type employment. Most of these differences fall in the area of work based learning. Field trips, job shadowing, those are the two areas that really stand out as different with the other programs. There's some difference, but not as much difference, in the paid internships. Some difference, but not as much difference in the group mentoring. There's some difference but not a lot in some of the class-based stuff and and that is bringing speakers from the work to the school. And then the final component, offering academic and non academic support. We see two big differences. One is in building a small learning community. Three things that YCC programs do more than other programs that are YCC. Students take courses together with a teacher. They take courses together as a cohort. Teachers work with those two things. Teachers work with a small group of students. The third thing is YCC programs tend to have their own separate physical space, more so than other programs in the school. So that's the three main ways that they are different from other programs. Counseling happens outside of YCC. There's not a lot of differences there. What is different about YCC counseling seems to be, at least from the grantee survey, in the framing of it. It's the use of the individual development plan. It's the framework in which the counseling takes place. That's the difference between YCC and other programs. Our students participating in the program, Evan talked a lot about this. You know, I don't have a lot to add. You talked about the high attendance rate and the retention rate. The only thing I will add, and I think you said, what was it 96% attendance rate? I can give another statistic on the right there is closer to 91%. So it does look like again, Can't draw any conclusions for that, but it's a good sign.

Nan: What does professional development look like? Most frequent activities are project-based learning, incorporating an industry focus, building specific skills and collaborating and building partnerships. Community of practices. Challenges. There are a couple of challenges that we learned from the site visits with this. Most of these stem from time. A lot of competition for their time, so it’s a challenge. So what are the early successes? We've talked a lot about these but just to put them in, these are what we see mathematically as early success so far. Recruiting a diverse group of students. Establishing community partnerships, I talked a lot about that last year. Offering activities and services in all areas, and expanding those opportunities to students within the district. What challenges did you face? You guys know this better than us, but let me reiterate what challenges you face. I haven't talked about the first one. The services that require partnerships, mentoring, internships, dual enrollment. They require partner ships. They take time. And, Evan talked about. Not all programs have their students there yet. So, we hope to see that emerge. The second nature challenge is again, limited staff and capacity. Oftentimes staff are doing two or three jobs. You know that. You're stretched thin. YCC is afforded a great opportunity to hire more staff that your programs are going crazy. So you need that staff to look at the expanding students, to serve the expanding students. And finally the third challenge we uncovered in site visits It's just the rigor of the program has really been challenging for some students. And we want the rigor, the rigor is good. That's what our students need. And sites have been very, very good about finding ways to build that rigor. Such as offering extra tutoring, or offering our
honors part of YCC.

Nan: Future activities. Implementation study ultimately will do all the questions. Grantee surveys done, check. We'll do final round of site visits to those ten sites, and you guys will be entering data into your PTS like Evan said. Llottery-based impact study. Whole host of things we're going to be looking at there. Most of those will come from a follow up survey. You guys won't have to be involved, Mathematic will do it. We'll contact your students. You may hear students talking about it but, that's it. That will be done in the spring of 2018. We're also going to be looking at school records. School records will be accessed for all of the schools in that part of the study, as far as the comparison group impact. We'll be starting to talk to many of those to six in the fall to see how we can ease that burden on you of collecting school records.

Nan: And that's pretty much it. Any of us involved in this would be more than happy to talk to you. Unfortunately, Jessica and Gloria for the Department of Labor could not be here, nor could Peter. Jean and I are here and always happy to talk about the evaluation.

Nan: Questions? Same amount of time, so.

Nan: And thank you for all of that-
[APPLAUSE]

Nan: All those joining us on the webinar. [APPLAUSE]