

Education National Performance Measures

Small group responses from September 14, 2010

1. If your sub-grantees/sites were required to opt in to Education National Performance Measures next year, what would be the benefits to the state/National programs?

- (3) Funding priorities. It would get funded – priority. Fundraising! Look – we have proof!
- (3) Consistent data. Actual outputs and outcomes by all these programs would reach the national level (currently “met”/“not met”). More consistent data.
- (3) Greater consistency among programs/site. Help focus energy of programs. As a national program, it simplifies what we have to do when working in multiple states, a “godsend”.
- (3) Demonstrate collective impact. Impact easy to show. Easier to show impact. Impact more measurable.
- (3) Greater accountability for national direct sites. Uniform expectation, help with clarity, more detailed info. on sites.
- Focus resources on sites that need more support.
- Comparative data – determine solutions, streamline.
- Will help those who struggle with developing performance measures - just use them!
- Face and content validity easier because they’re using cookie cutter PM’s.

2. What are the challenges in moving forward with Education National Performance Measures?

- (6) Collecting data. Access to data. Legal roadblocks at the district level. Timelines for gathering info. in-school and after-school programs are both effective in maintaining attendance and succeeding in school. It is very difficult for community after-school programs to collect in-school attendance and/or academic achievement (standardized test) result from school districts, especially if there is no pre-existing relationships. Getting the data from community based education organizations.
- (4) Training and Buy-in. Need to provide field with training on how to talk to schools and districts about testing and testing options. What are the options? Capacity is an issue for us. Need to educate/train program about the measure (members, POs, sites). Where’s the school district in these? We need to make decisions with schools.
- (3) Attribution. How to attribute change to AmeriCorps versus other variables. Challenged by inconsistent logic within the measures and attribution. For example, graduation rates and attendance rates are a result of gains by teachers and programs...told that standardized test measure teacher given gains. Issues of attribution are important...what is the purpose of this – attribution or student learning?

- (2) Baseline data. What baseline info is available and how should it look? Difficult to get baseline on transient populations.
- (2) Fit and missing focus area. There are groups these [education NPMs] aren't applicable for (i.e. adult learners). Programs may select a NPM that really is secondary to your program because of fit.
- Not every program in portfolio is using PM so our work has doubled in terms of reporting right now.
- We already have useful national measures; if these aren't aligned with the national measures, this will be a challenge.
- Not every program can purchase valid instruments.
- Privacy laws make data collection difficult.
- States have different data.
- There are local and state tools already in existence. So measurement instrument and nomenclature vary for programs – confusing.
- Another new process to learn and interfacing with eGrants.
- Political capital required to gain access is more than what we might have.
- Capacity – IRBs take a lot of staff time.
- Eliminate effective programs unless work is broadened.
- Perception of loss of local control.
- Outcomes seem more focused on school-based program than mentoring program.
- PM should be outcome based.
- Can't there be a measure that is based solely on data that can be collected by the program itself?

3. What ideas do you have to overcome those challenges? What strategies might you use? What support might be needed?

- (4) T/TA. Conference calls, face-to-face meetings. Info. on website. CNCS should help roll-out training session if tutorials are not sufficient.
- (3) CNCS assistance/partnership. CNCS could help with political capital to create buy-in. Can CNCS partner with DOE to assist in data collection? Spend political capital to gain access to the data.
- (2) Need up-front buy-in. Buy-in up-front from LEAs. Helpful to set out programs' expectation with schools up-front.
- How to integrate prevention programs using risk factors at the appropriate level (not over use to include everyone)
- Align grantee awards to those who can deliver and/or invest heavily in building capacity of grantees and their sites.
- Use sampling.
- Focus sites.
- Measure what you want; report on required ones.
- Help programs get rid of low performing sites.
- Come up with more appropriate outcomes for mentoring programs.

