



PACIFIC
Research & Evaluation, LLC

Employment Results Scorecard Continuous Improvement Plan

Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training
(TAACCCT) Grant – Round 4

Nevada Community College Consortium

Prepared by

Pacific Research and Evaluation, LLC

3507 SW Corbett Avenue

Portland, Oregon 97239

September 2018

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Methods	1
Workplan	2
Summary and Recommended Next Steps.....	6
Appendix A. Questionnaires	7
Appendix B. Practice Attempt to Pull Scorecard Data	10
Appendix C. Grant Project Director’s Report Following Practice Attempt to Pull Scorecard Data	15

Introduction

The Nevada Community College Consortium (NCCC) received funding through a Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College Career Training (TAACCCT) grant from the Department of Labor (DOL) in October 2014 as part of Round 4 of funding. The grant was utilized to create and enhance eight training programs at three colleges across Nevada: Great Basin College (GBC), Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC), and Western Nevada College (WNC). In addition to administering these training programs, the NCCC was tasked with working with their third-party evaluator, Pacific Research & Evaluation (PRE), to draft an Employment Results Scorecard Continuous Improvement Plan. Through an employment scorecard, colleges provide accessible, current labor market/workforce information and student job placement data to assist prospective and current students in selecting a program or pathway. The employment scorecard could present outcomes such as graduation rates, certifications earned, and industry recognized credentials earned through the program to further aid students in the selection process. College administrators could also use the data from the employment scorecard to make decisions about program offerings moving forward.

As part of the TAACCCT consortium grants, the initial requirement from DOL was to create an employment scorecard, but due to a variety of barriers identified by the labor agency, consortiums were given the option to instead explore a plan for developing an employment results scorecard. These findings could be used if consortium members determine it is feasible to develop an employment scorecard. Areas assessed—and of interest to DOL—included available data systems, options for obtaining and sharing data, plans for using data for continuous improvement purposes, and estimated costs.

Methods

As mentioned in the introduction, there were four areas of interest to DOL as it pertains to the employment scorecard: 1) a survey of data systems; 2) options for obtaining and sharing data; 3) a plan to use data for continuous improvement, and 4) an estimated cost. PRE aided the NCCC in compiling the information for the Scorecard Continuous improvement plan using the three data collection methods described below.

Questionnaires

Based on the interests of DOL, evaluators created questionnaires with the support of the Grant Project Director. These questionnaires were distributed via email to members of the consortium who could provide relevant knowledge for creating development plan for the employment scorecard. Those completing a questionnaire included the TAACCCT Institutional Research Analyst, representatives from the Institutional Research (IR) department at each college in the consortium, a representative at the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), and a representative from the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR). The participants were asked to complete the questionnaire and return the results back to the evaluator. The questionnaires are included in **Appendix A**.

Grant Project Director

In addition to addressing the questions of interest to DOL, the Grant Project Director pulled data to create an initial employment scorecard as a means to understand the process and determine the feasibility of

pulling this type of data in the future. The results of this pilot scorecard are provided in **Appendix B**. The Grant Project Director summarized the lessons learned from this experience to further guide the process of determining a plan for developing an employment scorecard. This summary is **Appendix C** and is referenced when relevant within the Proposed Workplan section of this report.

Notes from TAACCCT Round 3 Workplan

The Grant Project Director shared with evaluators notes compiled when consortium members addressed the scorecard for Round 3 of the TAACCCT grant. This information was compiled into a document that was shared with evaluators in June 2017. These findings and decisions are combined with the results of the data collection efforts and provided in the Proposed Workplan below.

Proposed Workplan

Survey of Data Systems

The survey of data systems included collecting information on existing practices, data systems availability, type of data available, barriers to sharing aggregate data publicly and other potential barriers, resources needed, and the possibility of aligning with other initiatives.

Existing Practices Used to Collect Data on Student Outcomes

During Round 4 of the TAACCCT grant, DETR was responsible for administering the employment outcome data. These data were available from a single source and were provided by DETR to NSHE. The job placement data included incumbent worker, obtained employment, retained employment, and wage increase. There is a one quarter lag time in receiving this information. After the data were obtained by DETR, grant IR staff entered it into G*STARS, which was paid for through TAACCCT funds and will expire at the conclusion of the grant. The G*STARS data system also contained other information for the grant such as student demographics, program completion, non-completion, certifications awarded, further education, retained, and college credits. Most of the G*STARS statistics for TAACCCT came from College PeopleSoft student records, student completed TAACCCT participant forms, industry certification records obtained by instructors, college credit/grade rosters, college enrollment rosters, and training rosters.

Since the potential implementation of an employment scorecard would occur after the grant, evaluators also explored the institutions' processes for obtaining student outcome data outside of the grant. Each college utilizes their IR Department staff to collect student data and prepare and disseminate reports. These data are collected from PeopleSoft records and student voluntary survey instruments. The surveys are utilized to obtain employment data since non-TAACCCT programs do not have access to outcomes through DETR. Further, within various programs and departments, they track small cohorts of students for accreditation purposes. TMCC also noted they use an in-house database called Career Link, which is their only method for tracking employment outcomes currently. Thus, consortium members are utilizing a number of sources to obtain data.

Data Systems Availability

A key piece of the scorecard development is understanding the data systems that are currently available to provide the desired outcome data. Notes from exploring a scorecard during Round 3 indicate that

consortium members are interested in a scorecard that provides completion rates, certificates/credentials obtained, post-training job placement, employment retention, wage placement and wage gains by industry, high priority occupations analysis, employment projects, labor market information, and labor turnover analysis. There are a number of systems available to collect and maintain this data, which are listed below:

NSHE data sources:

- IR Departments at each institution
- College PeopleSoft student data records
- NSHE data
- Nevada P-20 to Workforce Data System (NPWR)

TAACCCT grant data resources:

- G*STARS database (Although, this will be discontinued at the conclusion of the grant.)
- Round 4 comparison cohort report
- Burning Glass Labor Insight tool (Although, this will be discontinued at the conclusion of the grant.)

Nevada labor data:

- DETR Research and Analysis Bureau
- Nevada Labor Market Information
- Governor's Office of Economic Development
- Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation
- Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada

Federal labor data:

- U.S. Department of Labor

Credit vs. Non-Credit Data Attainment

The process for attaining data from students in credit-bearing programs versus non-credit programs is different. Data for credit-bearing programs is tracked in PeopleSoft at the colleges, while the non-credit student data are housed in a separate data warehouse and in a separate division at the colleges. One respondent added that they were unaware of any projects that collect employment data on non-credit students.

Barriers to Sharing Aggregate Data Publicly

Those who completed a questionnaire agreed that aggregate outcome data can be shared publicly except in cases where the aggregate data could easily be traced back to a specific individual such as in cases of a small data set. A sufficient sample size for sharing aggregate data is typically between five and 10, according to those questioned. This could potentially be a barrier when programs are small, which is sometimes the case for GBC as it is located in a rural community. One suggestion for avoiding this issue would be to aggregate two years of graduates.

Other Barriers

Participants responding to questionnaires discussed other potential barriers to the employment scorecard. One concern is that the nontraditional students “disappear and reappear” making it difficult to follow up with them to obtain certain information. Along these lines, relying on student self-report to obtain data can be difficult due to low response rates or inaccurate contact information. The process of collecting self-report outcomes from students can also be time-consuming. Additionally, students can be tracked when they transfer to a different institution within the state, but if they leave the state those students can no longer be tracked. Further, merging information from various sources in a meaningful manner could be an obstacle.

There are some restrictions to the UI wage data from DETR:

- DETR reports will indicate if wages were earned during the quarter the student started the TAACCCT training program and if wages were earned during the three quarters after the completion of the training program.
- Wages are reported for each quarter as a single dollar amount, but DETR cannot determine if the wages were full-time, part-time or for just a portion or all of the quarter involved.
- DETR cannot report or determine exactly what kind of job the participant has but can determine the industry.

Resources Needed

A couple of IR department representatives who completed questionnaires commented that they would likely require additional staffing should they provide data for an employment scorecard following the TAACCCT grant; however, one of these representatives suggested that once they had designed and implemented a process for final reporting of student employment outcome data, the IR Department may be able to sustain the project.

Alignment with Other Initiatives

The NCCC explored existing data sharing initiatives to determine whether there is a possibility to align with or join another effort. Representatives from DETR and the NCCC both confirmed that the only similar initiative is the NPWR. DETR is involved with this initiative with the NSHE. The report provides program completion information, the percentage of graduates employed for four quarters after completion, and average wages; however, there is a three-year delay in obtaining this information. The NPWR is also limited to certificate and degree completion and excludes accelerated program completion information and students who were not employed all four quarters after completion. The NPWR also cannot determine full-time versus part-time work and students may be reported more than once across job industries. Despite these barriers, one person from an IR Department suggested that this system “offers the most promise for this type of reporting, not only because it is already available but because it has the financial and staffing support for a statewide system, thereby cutting down on costs for individual institutions to do it on their own.” The IR representative added that a scorecard system would be “massive undertaking” to do in-house, and staffing would be an issue as it is currently insufficient. Conversely, a representative at the NSHE believed that building a report in NPWR could “get very expensive” due to the need to pay a consultant per programming hour to oversee the project. Therefore, the NSHE representative suggested it would be less expensive to do the work internally using Tableau.

Options for Obtaining and Sharing Data

To assess options for obtaining and sharing data, evaluators explored student consent protocols and the potential cost of obtaining student employment data from the state agency that administers unemployment insurance.

Options for Obtaining Data on Student Outcomes

The section above describes a variety of options for obtaining data on student outcomes that could be utilized for an employment scorecard. Consortium members would need to determine which sources are best for specific types of data and then decide a method for compiling data from multiple sources for an employment scorecard.

Student Consent Protocols

In order for DETR to obtain UI wage data for students in relevant programs, students need to consent to allowing their social security number to be used to collect this information. During the TAACCCT grant, participants consented to this by signing a release of information allowing the use of coded identification numbers that DETR utilized to pull wage data. Should a scorecard be adopted, this process would need to continue. However, students do not always consent to allowing their social security number to be used in this way, which can be a barrier. Thus, staff would need to meet with students and explain the importance of safe use of student information and the benefits to consenting. This extra step to gaining consent could potentially be time-consuming for college staff. Should DETR not be utilized to obtain UI wage data, the only way to obtain this employment outcome information is through student self-report, but the colleges would likely experience low response rates on these types of student surveys as that has been the case in the past.

Costs for Obtaining Data from State Agency that Administers Unemployment Insurance

Evaluators also explored the cost for obtaining data from the state agency that administers unemployment insurance. This state agency is DETR, and a representative from the agency noted in the questionnaire response that “assuming that the Scope of Work included in the existing grant did not change drastically, the cost of providing UI wage data to NSHE would go largely unchanged and would, therefore, hold mostly constant for future costs.” According to the NCCC, the cost of DETR pulling data each quarter is \$4,444.61. The DETR representative went on to explain that if there were requests for additional data, then a new, possibly higher quote would need to be provided and there would be a need to extend the contract. Thus, if the colleges are interested in creating an employment scorecard that includes information about programs from the TAACCCT Round 4 grant as well as programs outside of the grant, the cost of obtaining data from DETR for an employment scorecard would likely increase.

Plan to Use Data for Continuous Program Improvement

An employment scorecard has the potential to help consortium members monitor program performance at their institution for the purpose of improving current program offerings and determining new programs to add that would provide students with skills necessary to obtain employment. Consortium members would continuously review scorecard data in order to review program demand, program performance, and student job placement results following program completion. A data review would assist in aligning planned training to actual workforce needs and future industry projections. The scorecard data would assist with planning in the medical areas of study and Career and Technology Division training programs.

Measuring course offerings against workforce demand and student enrollment would allow for improved planning for outreach and recruitment. For example, presently at WNC, local industry demand for machinist/CNC operators is high and yet student enrollment in available accelerated training cohorts is very low. Adequate numbers of upcoming students are not interested to fill training openings and meet job placement demand. With the workforce demand remaining steady, efforts to educate prospective students regarding Machine Tool Technology as a successful pathway has become an increased priority. Focus would remain on currently offered program improvement, but also toward new program identification for expansion or replacement of programs determined no longer needed. Thus, an ongoing review of scorecard data would be utilized for continuous improvement purposes.

Estimated Cost

As mentioned previously, the cost of working with DETR to pull UI wage data would be approximately \$4,444.61 quarterly; however, if the colleges were interested in expanding the employment scorecard to include programs outside of the TAACCCT Round 4 grant, this cost would likely increase. In fact, when initially commencing work with DETR there was a one-time development cost of \$33,400. Changes to the type of data collected could result in the need to pay a development fee again. Further, the IR Departments may need the addition of one administrative faculty member for each involved college. This would cost approximately \$58,000 in salary and \$16,240 in fringe rate for each added staff member totaling to \$222,720 annually. An additional cost includes \$600 annually for Tableau software. According to the Grant Project Director in a summary of findings following a practice data pull, the ability to pull relevant data during the grant was dependent on grant funding. Thus, the likelihood of obtaining data for an employment scorecard would depend on available funding sources such as a new grant.

Summary and Recommended Next Steps

Following the conclusion of the TAACCCT grant, it may become more difficult to obtain certain student outcome data; however, there are a number of data systems available to collect information of interest to consortium members. Without DETR, IR Departments often rely on surveying students to obtain employment data though, which tend to have low response rates. NPWR provides employment information but the three-year lag time for this more limited data is not ideal. Thus, continuing to utilize DETR is likely the best option for an employment scorecard. Based on responses to the questionnaire, colleges would need additional funds to continue working with DETR. Consortium members should meet to discuss potential funding sources and to determine what programs to include in the scorecard as this would impact the cost of the project. Other decisions that should be made by members of the consortium include determining who would be responsible for reviewing the data for continuous improvement purposes, which systems would be used for which data and who would be responsible for compiling those different sources, and whether non-credit programs should be included in the employment scorecard.

Appendix A. Questionnaires

Questionnaire for TAACCCT Institutional Research Analyst

1. What progress has been made in creating the scorecard for Round 3?
 - What have you learned from this process?
 - Are you making the Round 3 scorecard just for the TAACCCT programs?
2. We want to document the process you are going through to obtain outcome data from each institution. Please discuss this process for GBC, TMCC, and WNC.
 - What are the barriers in obtaining outcome data from each institution?
 - Is the data available from a single source?
3. We also want to talk with someone from IR at each of the three institutions that are part of the consortium. Based on the questions we shared with you for those interviews, do you have suggestions for who we should speak with at each college?

Questionnaire for College IR Leads

1. What is the process at your institution for obtaining student outcome data? Is the outcome data available from a single source?
 - What barriers exist in obtaining student outcome data?
 - Is the process the same for obtaining data regardless of if it's for a credit program vs. a non-credit program?
2. The DOL is interested in providing potential students with other students' outcomes in programs, so students may make educated decisions on what program to enter. What would the cost be for creating a system and managing the ongoing availability of student outcome data available for the Round 4 TAACCCT programs (list them)?
 - Would you need to hire someone for this or do you have enough staffing?
3. Are you aware of barriers to sharing aggregate outcome data publicly?
 - How feasible would it be to obtain?
4. Does your IR Division currently have the ability to obtain student job placement data following program completion, independent from the TAACCCT grant funded data collection efforts?
 - If not, are you aware of plans for this data to be available in the near future?
 - How will student job placement data be collected by your college after the TAACCCT grants expire?
5. Do you have any other comments about sharing outcome data from your institution for the purpose of creating an employment results scorecard for the TAACCCT Round 4 programs?

Questionnaire for Nevada System of Higher Education

1. What is the process for NSHE to obtain student outcome data? Is the outcome data available from a single source?
 - What barriers exist in obtaining student outcome data?
 - Is the process the same for obtaining data regardless of if it's for a credit program vs. a non-credit program?
2. The DOL is interested in providing potential students with other students' outcomes in programs, so students may make educated decisions on what program to enter. What would the cost be for either creating a system and managing the ongoing availability of student outcome data available for the Round 4 TAACCCT programs, or for expanding the NPWR to make student outcome data available for Round 4 TAACCCT programs (see programs listed above in introduction)?
 - Would you need to hire someone for this or do you have enough staffing?
3. Are you aware of barriers to sharing aggregate outcome data publicly?
 - How feasible would it be to obtain aggregate outcome data?
4. Does NSHE currently have the ability to obtain student job placement data following program completion, independent from the TAACCCT grant funded data collection efforts?
 - If not, are you aware of plans for this data to be available in the near future?
 - How will student job placement data be collected after the TAACCCT grants expire?
 - Do you have a contact of someone at Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) who may be able to answer questions about extracting and sharing student employment data?
5. For NPWR reports, it is our understanding that results are from three years in the past. Are there plans in place to achieve more current reporting? If so, please explain.
 - a. Are there plans in place for expanding the data presented in NPWR reports? If so, please explain.
6. Do you have any other comments about sharing outcome data from your institution for the purpose of creating an employment results scorecard for the TAACCCT Round 4 programs?

Questionnaire for Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation

1. What is the current process for DETR to obtain student employment outcome data that is shared with the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE)? Is the outcome data available from a single source?
 - What barriers currently exist in obtaining student outcome data?
 - Is the process the same for obtaining data regardless of if it's for a credit program vs. a non-credit program?

2. The DOL is interested in NSHE sharing with potential students the employment outcomes listed below by program. How feasible is it to obtain aggregate employment outcome data for each of the outcomes listed below?
 - a. Employment rate of identified program completers by program
 - b. Employment retention rate of identified completers, one year following completion by program
 - c. Average earnings of identified completers, one year following completion by program
 - d. Average earnings of identified completers, two years following completion by program
 - e. Average earnings of identified completers, three years following completion by program
 - i. If the above data is not available for reporting, is there similar wage data that DETR is able to report on and share with NSHE?
 - ii. For each of these employment outcomes that DETR may track, what is the lag time for obtaining this data?
3. Are you aware of barriers to NSHE sharing aggregate employment outcome data publicly that is obtained from DETR records?
4. What would the cost be for DETR to provide the employment outcomes listed in question 2 for identified NSHE programs following the conclusion of the TAACCCT grant September 30, 2018?
 - a. Are there other existing or planned data sharing initiatives DETR is involved with in which NSHE could align with or join in support of the Employment Results Scorecard?
5. Do you have any other comments about sharing employment outcome data for the purpose of creating an employment results scorecard for the TAACCCT Round 4 programs?

Appendix B. Practice Attempt to Pull Scorecard Data

NCCC Scorecard TAACCCT Round 4					
Data Term: October 2014 through September 2018					
NCCC Partners: WNC, TMCC, GBC	WNC	TMCC	GBC	NCCC Total	
Total Number of TAACCCT Round 4 Participants	339	292	323	954	
Total # Completing Grant Program of Study	258	53	282	593	
% of Participants Completing Program of Study	76%	18%	87%	62%	
Total # of Participants Completing Credit Hours	339	292	323	954	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program	81	184	48	313	
Total # Completers who were Incumbent Workers	104	25	87	216	update needed
Total # Incumbent Workers Wage Gain Following Completion				0	
% Incumbent Workers Wage Gain Following Completion	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Total # Completers Employed Following Program Completion				0	update needed
% of Completers Employed Following Program Completion	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Total # Completers Employed who Retained Employment				0	
% of Completers Employed who Retained Employment	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
Total Number of Accelerated Welding Participants	69	N/A	N/A	69	
Total # Accelerated Welding Program Completers	54	N/A	N/A	54	
% of Acc. Welding Participants who Completed Program	78%	N/A	N/A	78%	
# Acc. Welding Employed Following Program Completion		N/A	N/A	0	update needed

NCCC Scorecard TAACCCT Round 4					
% Acc. Welding Employed Following Program Completion	0%	N/A	N/A	0%	update needed
# Acc. Welding Employed who Retained Employment		N/A	N/A	0	
% Acc. Welding Employed who Retained Employment	#DIV/0!	N/A	N/A	#DIV/0!	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program		N/A	N/A	0	update needed
Total Number of Accelerated Machine Tool Participants	30	N/A	N/A	30	update needed
Total # Accelerated Machine Tool Program Completers	16	N/A	N/A	16	
% of Acc. MTT Participants who Completed Program	53%	N/A	N/A	53%	
# Acc. MTT Employed Following Program Completion		N/A	N/A	0	update needed
% Acc. MTT Employed Following Program Completion	0%	N/A	N/A	0%	
# Acc. MTT Employed who Retained Employment		N/A	N/A	0	
% Acc. MTT Employed who Retained Employment	#DIV/0!	N/A	N/A	#DIV/0!	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program		N/A	N/A	0	update needed
Total Number of Certified Nursing Assistant Participants	230	N/A	291	521	
Total # Certified Nursing Assistant Program Completers	185	N/A	262	447	
% of CNA Participants who Completed Program	80%	N/A	90%	86%	

NCCC Scorecard TAACCCT Round 4					
# CNA Employed Following Program Completion		N/A		0	update needed
% CNA Employed Following Program Completion	0%	N/A	0%	0%	update needed
# CNA Employed who Retained Employment		N/A		0	
% CNA Employed who Retained Employment	#DIV/0!	N/A	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program		N/A		0	update needed
Total Number of Rural Nursing Participants	16	N/A	38	54	
Total # Rural Nursing Program Completers	6	N/A	9	15	
% of Rural Nursing Participants who Completed Program	38%	N/A	24%	28%	update needed
# Rural Nursing Employed Following Program Completion	N/A	N/A		#VALUE!	
% Rural Nursing Employed Following Program Completion	#VALUE!	N/A	0%	#VALUE!	update needed
# Rural Nursing Employed who Retained Employment		N/A		0	
% Rural Nursing Employed who Retained Employment	#VALUE!	N/A	#DIV/0!	#VALUE!	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program		N/A		0	update needed
Total Number of Diesel Program Participants	N/A	200	N/A	200	
Total # Diesel Program Completers	N/A	28	N/A	28	
% of Diesel Participants who Completed Program	N/A	14%	N/A	14%	

NCCC Scorecard TAACCCT Round 4					
# Diesel Employed Following Program Completion	N/A		N/A	0	update needed
% Diesel Employed Following Program Completion	N/A	0%	N/A	0%	update needed
# Diesel Employed who Retained Employment	N/A		N/A	0	
% Diesel Employed who Retained Employment	N/A	#DIV/0!	N/A	#DIV/0!	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program	N/A		N/A	0	update needed
Total Number of HVAC Program Participants	N/A	92	N/A	92	
Total # HVAC Program Completers	N/A	13	N/A	13	
% of HVAC Participants who Completed Program	N/A	14%	N/A	14%	update needed
# HVAC Employed Following Program Completion	N/A		N/A	0	
% HVAC Employed Following Program Completion	N/A	0%	N/A	0%	update needed
# HVAC Employed who Retained Employment	N/A		N/A	0	
% HVAC Employed who Retained Employment	N/A	#DIV/0!	N/A	#DIV/0!	
Total # Continuing Further Education after Program	N/A		N/A	0	update needed
Total Number of Welding Students Earning AAS Degree	6	N/A	N/A	6	
Total Number of Welding Students Earning Certificate (1 Yr)	2	N/A	N/A	2	
Total # of Acc. Welding Students Earning Skills Certificate	53	N/A	N/A	53	

NCCC Scorecard TAACCCT Round 4					
Total # of Acc. Welding Students Earning AWS Credential	49	N/A	N/A	49	
Total Number of MTT Students Earning AAS Degree	5	N/A	N/A	5	
Total Number of MTT Students Earning Certificate (1 Yr)	0	N/A	N/A	0	
Total # of Acc. MTT Students Earning Skills Certificate	15	N/A	N/A	15	
Total # of Acc. MTT Students Earning NIMS Credential	14	N/A	N/A	14	
Total # of TAACCCT CNA Students Earning Skills Certificate	190	N/A	268	458	
Total # of TAACCCT CNA Students Passing State Board Exam	82	N/A	137	219	
Total Number of Nursing Students Earning AS Degree	6	N/A	9	15	
Total Number of Diesel Program Students Earning AAS Degree	N/A	14	N/A	14	
Total # of Diesel Program Students Earning Certificate (1 Yr)	N/A	28	N/A	28	
Total # of TAACCCT Diesel Program Students Earning Skills Certificate	N/A	21	N/A	21	
Total Number of HVAC Students Earning AAS Degree	N/A	16	N/A	16	
Total # of HVAC Program Students Earning Certificate (1 Yr)	N/A	2	N/A	2	
Total # of TAACCCT HVAC Program Students Earning Skills Certificate	N/A	16	N/A	16	

Note: Exact data unavailable due to G*STARS reporting duplicate values for each year of grant

TMCC low completion rate is due to extended program length. Many students remained in the program at the end of the grant.

Appendix C. Grant Project Director's Report Following Practice Attempt to Pull Scorecard Data

Scorecard Improvement Plan

TAACCCT Director's Report 2018

(Attempt to complete a Scorecard at end of TAACCCT)

"Things Learned"

Forward: This report should be considered along with the attached (**Appendix B**) NCCC Draft Scorecard, representing data from the programs involved in the TAACCCT Round 4 Project (includes WNC, TMCC, & GBC)

Grant Project Director's Effort and Intent for this Report

Within the original award for TAACCCT Round 4 was a requirement for grantees to complete and issue a data Scorecard (**Appendix B**). Mid-term during the grant project, the U. S. Department of Labor (DOL) modified the Round 4 grant deliverable requirements, no longer requiring a Scorecard. The requirement was modified due to the DOL determining grantees would not be able to successfully complete the Scorecard. In its place, the DOL required grantees to complete a Scorecard Improvement Plan, documenting ongoing research and effort for grantees to achieve Scorecard reporting in the future.

For the NCCC during TAACCCT Round 4, Pacific Research and Evaluation (PRE) and the WNC Grant Project Director worked collaboratively completing the Scorecard Improvement Plan. This plan will be submitted to the DOL in September 2018. In one area to support this effort, the Grant Project Director conducted a data search and attempted to complete a Scorecard in June 2018 (**Appendix B**), following the end of the extended period of performance for program activities, for TAACCCT Round 4. The Director knew not all data would be available to complete the actual Scorecard at that time, but used the attempt as an exercise to identify ongoing areas within the data collection effort that still require work/improvement.

This report is a summary of the Director's findings and is prepared to support the ongoing study by the NCCC to improve Scorecard planning processes and data collection.

Summary of General Findings

1. The NCCC, during the TAACCCT Round 4 Project, has greatly improved the collection and focus of data supporting the involved training programs. This primarily only applies to the training programs at the three participant colleges that were funded with TAACCCT grant funding.
2. The improved ability to collect specific data under each individual training program, was dependent on grant funding, and will not be able to be sustained without grant funds. Specifically, the grant

funding paid for data collection staff and the G*STARS contracted database. Both of these resources will end September 30, 2018.

3. In the absence of TAACCCT grant funding, the colleges' primary data sources are each college's Institutional Research Department (IR). Each of these departments collect and report performance data; however, the data is more globally focused. IR data is representative of all students and does not currently specifically focus on the individual accelerated programs, nor industry credentials each of those programs offer.
4. Job placement data for students accepting employment following specific program completion, was dependent upon TAACCCT-funded staff and the grant funded contract with the Division of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR). Following the grant, neither of these resources will remain available. Job placement data without the DETR wage data contract is very limited, primarily collected from student voluntary surveys with low levels of participation.
5. WIOA requirements for Eligible Training Provider Lists (ETPL) will likely require colleges to invest additional funding in the future to secure job placement data. This will become more critical following the closure of the TAACCCT Project.
6. The focus of data required by the DOL for the TAACCCT Project, WIOA requirements, and the colleges' individual requirements do not match. This results in parallel efforts not intersecting to fulfill all data needs/requirements.

Summary of Data Findings Specific to Scorecard Example (Appendix B)

1. Percentage of participants completing program of study data is under-reported. The data is based upon comparing total number of participants entering the program during the TAACCCT period of performance to the number of participants who actually complete during the same performance period. This does not account for the number of students who are on track to successfully complete, but who will not complete until after the end of the grant period. With additional time to collect data, this data will become accurate, if reported on an annual basis, specific to participant numbers only compared to those students eligible to complete in the studied time frame.
2. Successful completion data for students enrolled in one-year or longer training programs is difficult to obtain, as most data collection efforts are annual. Relating enrollment data to completion data in separate years, requires specific and individualized data collection effort.
3. The attached data example includes data collection methods directed by DOL TAACCCT requirements. The DOL requires data yearly, not cumulative. Data specific to students involved in more than one-year time periods, repeats and is duplicative.
4. DOL TAACCCT reported data requirements report wage data annually, by DOL fiscal year, and is not broken down by program. Thus, reporting specifically by program is not readily available.
5. Reported college degrees earned data is collected program wide and is not broken out specifically for accelerated program students versus traditional program students. For example, all welding declared students are counted, not just declared Accelerated Welding Program students.
6. Continuing further education following program completion data is reported collectively for all programs at each college, not specific to each college's individual training programs.