

**REPORT  
OF  
OHIO COLLEGE TECH PREP CONSORTIA  
ON-SITE REVIEWS  
JANUARY 2003 – APRIL 2005**

**SUBMITTED BY:**

**WILLIAM W. BURSON  
DECEMBER 2005**

**Contributors:  
Karen Blocher, Ph.D.  
Edmund Harper  
Jack Steinicke**

## CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Process	4
Executive Summary	5
I. Governance and Management	6
II. Curriculum and Professional Development	9
III. Marketing and Partnerships	12
IV. Transition to College	14
Addendum A Best Practices & Needs Improvement Recap by review and sub areas	16
Addendum B Best Practices Summary	21
Addendum C Needs Improvement Summary	22
Addendum D High/Low Best Practices Needs Improvement Comparison	23
Addendum E On-site Interview Questions	25

## INTRODUCTION

On-site reviews of Ohio's twenty-six College Tech Prep consortia (as of January 2003) were conducted between January 2003 and April 2005. The Ohio Board of Regents, in cooperation with the Ohio Department of Education, funded and provided over-sight for the three-year review process. The core evaluative process used was on-site visits to College Tech Prep Consortium sites with opportunities to interview all College Tech Prep participants including:

- Consortium directors/coordinators and their staff
- Consortium Governing Board members
- Post-secondary education administrators, instructors, admissions/guidance staff
- Secondary education administrators, technical and academic instructors and guidance counselors
- Business, industry, labor participants and representatives
- Secondary and post-secondary College Tech Prep students

The purpose of the reviews was to identify individual consortium operations that needed improvement, as well as identifying those areas of "exemplary/best practices" that could be shared with and replicated by other consortia throughout Ohio. It was explicit from the on-set that the reviews were to be part of a continuous quality improvement process for each consortium and not a comparison of College Tech Prep Consortia in Ohio. The dual quality improvement process included the consortium's required self-assessment along with the review teams recommendations derived from the on-site review.

The self-assessment and subsequent reviews were based on an evaluation instrument developed from a "consortium job profile" derived from a DACUM process involving a group of experienced, high performing directors. The instrument identified four specific areas to be reviewed, including:

- Governance and Management
- Curriculum and Professional Development
- Marketing and Partnerships
- Transition to College

Within the four specific areas listed above, a total of thirty-two core standards were developed and applied to each consortium during the review process. Each standard was identified within the consortium's self-assessment and the on-site review assessment report as being either:

- Fully Implemented
- Implementation Underway
- Implementation Planned
- Discussion Only
- No Action Taken

In addition, the on-site review/assessment and final written report evaluated each standard as being:

- Exemplary
- Meets the Standard
- Needs Improvement

This report will not identify specific consortium as to individual performance but will rather identify trends as well as high and low performance levels statewide.

## PROCESS

The on-site reviews were conducted by review teams ranging between five to ten members who were trained in the site review process. Site reviews were conducted over a two- to four-day period depending on the size of the consortium. Team members reviewed the consortium's self-assessment in preparation for the on-site review process. Team members also had the opportunity to identify specific areas of interest that might be evaluated during the on-site visit. Training sessions were conducted yearly in order to assist directors/coordinators and their staffs in the development of their self-assessment (notebook) and in preparation for the on-site review process.

Secondary and post-secondary College Tech Prep program site visits were conducted using two or more team members. Interviews were conducted using a uniform set of questions germane to the person/s or group being interviewed (see interview questions in appendix).

A total of thirty-three (33) individuals participated on the on-site review teams. Team membership consisted of:

- Paid consultants . . . . . 2
- Ohio Board of Regents staff members . . . . . 4
- Ohio Department of Education College  
Tech Prep representatives . . . . . 2
- College Tech Prep Technical Services Liaison . . . . . 1
- Active College Tech Prep Directors/Coordinators . . . . 21
- College Tech Prep Consortium staff . . . . . 3

With the exception of the two paid consultants, all team members participated in the on-site reviews on a volunteer basis in addition to their regular job duties. It is noteworthy that all but five current consortium directors/coordinators participated in one or more on-site teams. Nine directors/coordinators participated in at least one site visit per-year with two participating on six review teams. Over two hundred and fifty working days, many consisting of ten or more hours were devoted to the on-site reviews. Many hundreds of hours were devoted to the development of self-assessments, review preparations, travel and

the actual on-site reviews as well as report writing and report reviews/rewrites by team members.

Each of the twenty-six (26) reviews was conducted by a different group of team members. Only the team leader participated in all twenty-six reviews. It is noteworthy that with the diverse and rotating team membership, there was remarkable consistency in Core Standard Evaluations by the different teams. However, it should be noted that there were a few exceptions where a Core Standard Evaluation was influenced by the individual team member's perceptions and/or the team's interpretation of the core standard's "measure" and "sources". It was also occasionally difficult to uniformly apply and evaluate a standard to every consortium given the range of consortium size from a small consortium with less than one hundred College Tech Prep students to a large consortium with two thousand or more College Tech Prep secondary and post-secondary students.

In addition, the evaluation of a few core standards was influenced to a small degree by changing state procedures during the three year review time period. The make-up of the on-site teams, which included members with a wide range of experiences and background with College Tech Prep, was invaluable to the on-site review process and added validity to subsequent team assessments and recommendations. It is important to note that 36% of the twenty-six on-site teams were made up of active consortium directors/coordinators.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Over the three years that on-site reviews were conducted at Ohio's College Tech Prep consortia there was one recurring theme identified by the on-site review team. The Tech Prep consortia have been a major force in bringing the secondary and post-secondary institutions together. These partnerships have led to the development and delivery of College Tech Prep 2 + 2 programming across the state. Many unique, innovative and productive programs have been designed and implemented including joint delivery of secondary programs, articulation, scholarships and earned college credit programs, etc. It is interesting to note that of all the consortia that had achieved a 50% or higher college transition rate prior to the on-site review, each one had developed an innovative student college program including one or more of the previously mentioned programs.

However, the following are systemic issues that need to be addressed to promote the continued growth and improvement of College Tech Prep statewide:

1. Inadequate collection and use of data (including student tracking data throughout the 2+2 process).
2. Uneven effectiveness of consortium Governing Boards.
3. Variation in consortium curriculum development and delivery process.
4. Limited implementation of College Tech Prep program reviews.

5. Lack of common knowledge about College Tech Prep except within key stakeholders.

These systemic issues could be in part due to the lack of a clear statewide enforced definition of what College Tech Prep is and what the process and outcomes of a consortium should be. This lack of a clear statewide definition of a College Tech Prep program and a College Tech Prep student appears to have, at least in part, resulted in consortia being structured, operating and having differing objectives throughout the state.

Each of the four major review areas will be discussed below. Each area subcategories are given with their numerical ratings and a general summary of areas of effectiveness and those needing improvement.

## I. Governance and Management

The administration of each consortium was reviewed/evaluated using eleven different core standards. Sub-areas included:

- Strategic Planning Process
- Staffing
- Governance and Decision Making
- Data Collection and Evaluation
- Operating Budget
- Financial Management

**Strategic Planning** varies widely statewide with some consortia that establish specific strategic planning sessions/workshops to develop goals and objectives resulting in set strategies and targets. Others rely solely on the director to develop and implement strategic planning (multi-year plan).

Three (3) Standards:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	2
Needs Improvement . . . . .	14
Meets the Standard . . . . .	62

**Staffing** varies depending on the size of the consortium. The majority of Ohio’s consortia employ full-time directors/coordinators, however several employ part-time directors/coordinators and staff. Individual consortia have been creative in successfully using part-time directors/coordinators and other staff to provide and support excellent College Tech Prep programming within their consortium area. It was identified that four consortium directors/coordinators also had non-College Tech Prep duties and responsibilities within the partnering college. Also noteworthy is that of the required seven consortium follow-ups, a follow-up review was determined to be needed in each of the consortium whose director had additional college job duties and responsibilities. Whereas, of the four other identified part-time directors/coordinators (no college responsibilities) only one consortium required a follow-up.

All directors/coordinators are employed under the employment guidelines of their fiscal agent. There are varying degrees of control by the fiscal agents over the College Tech Prep directors/coordinators and staff regarding employment and evaluation.

The ability and effectiveness of the directors/coordinators appears to be essential to the successful operation and growth of the individual consortium. The review teams repeatedly identified the leadership skills and abilities of a consortium's director/coordinator as what "drove" the effectiveness and productivity of the consortium.

It should be noted that a very small number of consortia appear to be overstaffed as related to total budget staff costs. However, most consortia operate effectively and efficiently with a minimum staff.

One (1) Standard:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	1
Needs Improvement . . . . .	4
Meets the Standard . . . . .	21

**Governance and decision-making** is normally a function of the Governing Board (Steering Committee/Board of Directors). All consortia now have approved by-laws that establish governance and related operating policies and procedures. The influence and control of the "Governing Body" on the consortium varies widely statewide; from strong, efficient and effective decision-making boards to a "rubber stamp" advisory type committee.

The most effective and progressive governing bodies are those made-up of equal partnerships between secondary and post-secondary educators and business/industry/labor representatives. A "key" to effective governing boards appears to be the strong and active involvement of business/industry/labor partners. In some situations, a disproportional amount of control and influence is exerted on the consortium and Governing Body by the post-secondary (fiscal agent) partner. This control by one partner may have a tendency to impede effective partnerships and consortium success. The structure and effectiveness of the governance system is unquestionably directly related to the success and growth of a consortium. Noteworthy is that 39% of the state's consortia need to improve their governance structure while only 19% were identified as having an exemplary practice in this critical component.

Three (3) Standards:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	10
Needs Improvement . . . . .	14
Meets the Standard . . . . .	54

**Data collection and evaluation** was identified as the predominate weakness among the College Tech Prep consortia statewide. Fourteen (14) consortia were identified as deficient in their data collection. Seventeen (17) were identified as “needing improvement” in the use of data to evaluate their consortium’s effectiveness. There is a serious problem statewide when 54% of the state’s consortia have not developed an adequate system to collect data and 65% do not use data to make decisions and effectively evaluate performance. The state, in cooperation with the current twenty-three consortia, should make it a priority to change this statewide problem. Proposed Perkins Legislation includes greater accountability measures and Ohio should be positioned to respond to Federal data requests.

It should be noted that three (3) consortia were recognized for exemplary practices in the collection of data while only one of these was also identified for exemplary work in their use of data. It is interesting as well, that one consortium was identified for exemplary data collection but conversely identified as needing improvement in the use of data to evaluate the consortium.

Only 19% of the State’s consortia were identified as both “meeting the standard” or “exemplary” in the collection and use of data. In conjunction with the collection and use of data, a strong correlation exists with the core standard **tracking student progress through the 4-year College Tech Prep program** (located within curriculum development). Fourteen consortia were identified as needing improvement and five cautioned in this area. This indicated that 73% of Ohio’s College Tech Prep consortia need to work more effectively in the collection and use of the data relating to student progress.

Two (2) Standards:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	5
Needs Improvement . . . . .	31 (2 caution)
Meets the Standard . . . . .	16

**Operating budgets** are normally developed by the director and/or their staff and subsequently evaluated and approved by the consortium’s governing body. In a relatively few cases the governing body was identified as being directly involved in the development, approval and implementation of the consortium’s budget.

Several consortia have been successful in securing various grants in addition to State/Federal Tech Prep operating grants. Additional funding is garnered by many consortia through member contributions, cash matches, business/industry contributions, scholarships and other innovative fund raising initiatives. All

consortia receive some form of “in-kind” support from the partnering post-secondary (fiscal agent) institution. In many cases the support is substantial.

Two (2) Standards:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	5
Needs Improvement . . . . .	2
Meets the Standard . . . . .	45

**The financial management system** for all twenty-six consortia follows the fiscal agent’s policies and procedures and was in compliance with state guidelines, law and regulations. No real problems were identified statewide in this area. It should be noted that many consortium maintain an internal financial management system which is regularly checked against the fiscal agent system.

One (1) Standard:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	1
Needs Improvement . . . . .	1
Meets the Standard . . . . .	24

## **II. Curriculum and Professional Development**

Curriculum and professional development was evaluated using ten different core standards. Sub-areas include:

- Program Application Process
- Local Pathway Development
- Instructional Needs
- Program Review Evaluation
- Contextual Learning and Technology
- Professional Involvement

The **Program Application Process** was identified as being uniform throughout the state. The Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education processes and procedures are established and clear for consortia to follow in starting new College Tech Prep programming. It is noteworthy that several consortia have developed and implemented innovative delivery systems at both the secondary and post-secondary levels.

One (1) Standard:

Exemplary Practices . . . . .	2
Needs Improvement. . . . .	3
Meets the Standard . . . . .	21

**Local Pathway Development** varies widely statewide among consortia from strong consortium leadership to secondary faculty being left entirely on their own

to develop their program. The important tools of inter-discipline, inter-level faculty teams are well-developed and functional within some consortium but non-existent in others. It is important to note that 35% of Ohio's College Tech Prep consortia were identified as needing to improve the interaction of faculty among their secondary and post-secondary partners, while only 4% were identified as having a "best practice" in the development of these teams.

Articulation agreements have been developed by all Ohio's College Tech Prep consortia with post-secondary institutions within and outside their identified geographic service area. However, there is a wide difference in the agreements and processes for secondary students to earn college credit. These differences range from students who are enrolled in college courses for credit while a high school College Tech Prep student to students that must repeat the specific college course taken as a high school student after enrolling in college. It is critical to note that 27% of Ohio's consortia were identified as needing to improve their articulation process and/or agreements. It is unquestionable that viable, valid, and well publicized articulation agreements combined with college credit is a major factor in students choosing to enroll in a College Tech Prep program as well as essential to the development and delivery of College Tech Prep itself.

Three (3) Standards:

Best Practices . . . . .	6
Needs Improvement . . . . .	24
Meets the Standard . . . . .	48

**Instructional Needs** and/or resources in College Tech Prep programs throughout the state are being adequately met, with all twenty-six consortia meeting the standard in this area. It should be noted that there is a wide and varied application of consortia that provide equipment funding to their educational partners. Several consortia provide large amounts of program equipment to their partners while some provide little or none. However, most consortia provide funding for program "start-up" and related equipment. There is no evidence that shows a correlation between whether equipment is provided or not provided and the ultimate success of the individual program at the local level. Conversely there is no question that qualified well-trained instructors are the "key" to the success of local College Tech Prep programs. Many consortia are involved in every way possible to assure each College Tech Prep classroom has the most qualified instructor/s possible. However, consortia directors/staff appear to be fully aware of the autonomous nature of the educational institutions they work with and the limitations in this area.

One (1) Standard:

Best Practice . . . . .	0
Needs Improvement . . . . .	0
Meets the Standard . . . . .	26

**Program Review/Evaluation** includes both student tracking and individual program review. These are both critical areas for consortia statewide and for local program improvement. Fifty-four percent of the state's consortia have been identified as needing to improve the tracking of their College Tech Prep students throughout the four-year process. In addition, 50% have been evaluated as not "meeting the standard" in conducting program reviews. This issue as previously identified is directly linked with the need for many consortia to develop better systems to collect and use data. The on-site review teams evaluated only one consortium in each of these two areas as being "exemplary" or a "best practice"

Two (2) Standards:

Best Practice . . . . .	2
Needs Improvement . . . . .	27
Meets the Standard . . . . .	23

**Contextual Learning and Technology** is very well-developed among the state's College Tech Prep consortia with over 92% of the state's consortia either meeting the standard or exemplary in providing professional development activities. Important to note as well, is that there is a great deal of cooperation and collaboration between consortia in the design of joint professional development initiatives and activities. Consortia across the state join with member schools and other related initiatives such as High School That Work to develop and provide professional development activities, workshops and individual training for College Tech Prep instructors and other stakeholders.

Most consortia have done good work in developing business and industry relationships with some resulting in teacher externship sites. However, 19% were identified as needing to improve in this area. It must be noted that the individual consortium are at the "mercy" of the business/industry "climate" and the number of businesses in their geographical area as it relates to how many externship sites can be developed.

Two (2) Standards:

Best Practices . . . . .	6
Needs Improvement. . . . .	7
Meets the Standard . . . . .	39

**Professional Involvement** by the College Tech Prep consortium directors/coordinators and staff meet the standards as established by the evaluation instrument with only one consortium being identified as needing to provide more activities for their staff.

One (1) Standard:

Best Practice . . . . .	0
Needs Improvement . . . . .	1
Meets the Standard . . . . .	25

### III. Marketing Tech Prep and Partnerships:

The marketing of Tech Prep by Ohio's consortia was reviewed/evaluated using ten different core standards. Sub-areas include:

- Marketing and Student Recruitment
- Career Exploration
- Under-Represented and Non-Traditional Populations
- Collaboration and Work-Based Learning

**Marketing and Student Recruitment** is a function in which the majority of consortia are actively involved. Nearly 20% of the consortia are doing exemplary work in disseminating College Tech Prep information to prospective students as well as parents, employers and the community. However, it appears that even with a wide variety of consortium activities and initiatives designed to market College Tech Prep, there is a dearth of understanding about College Tech Prep outside of involved stakeholders.

The processes used to identify qualified students to enter a secondary College Tech Prep program are wide and diverse statewide. Several consortia have established requirements, guidelines and procedures for all students enrolling in a College Tech Prep secondary program whereas others give complete discretion on enrollment guidelines to member schools. In these cases, some schools establish minimum requirements for student program entry while others have no program entry or exit requirements or procedures for identifying a College Tech Prep student. Therefore the identification of College Tech Prep students can vary widely within the same consortium, not to mention from consortia to consortia. It should be noted that there is no statewide system in place to identify qualified College Tech Prep students. While the state determines an approved College Tech Prep program, the local consortium determines entrance and/or exit requirements. This, along with the type of consortium curriculum development processes, could explain the variation in the operational definition of College Tech Prep from consortia to consortia.

Only one consortium was identified as having an exemplary system for enrolling students while one out of four consortia were evaluated by on-site review teams as needing improvement in this area. Additionally, 35% of the state's consortia were evaluated as deficient in having a process for identifying how effectively they are communicating the Tech Prep message to target audiences. These indicators appear to be directly related to the 65% of the state's consortia that need to improve their use of data and 50% of the consortia that need a system to track their students throughout their four-year College Tech Prep experience. The collection and use of data appears to impact many areas of consortium operations.

Four (4) Standards:

Best Practices . . . . .	6
Needs Improvement . . . . .	23
Meets the Standard . . . . .	75

**Career Education** throughout the state is being handled very well by the College Tech Prep consortia. Only one consortium was identified as needing to improve their career exploration activities whereas three consortia were doing exemplary work in involving and informing students in the pre-high school grades about College Tech Prep. It was also observed that most of the state's consortia have linked or worked with the career development liaisons in their geographical area to develop and conduct career education initiatives and activities. These linkages are an effective and fiscally sound method of providing College Tech Prep career education throughout the state.

One (1) Standard:

Best Practices . . . . .	3
Needs Improvement . . . . .	1
Meets the Standard . . . . .	22

**Under-Represented and Non-Traditional Populations** are specifically identified, encouraged and assisted in enrolling in a College Tech Prep program by all of the state's College Tech Prep consortia. Minority students were identified in programs within all twenty-six (26) consortia. Furthermore, non-traditional students were observed participating in a wide variety of College Tech Prep programming. Important to identify, as well, is the fact that a great many College Tech Prep students across the spectrum with economic barriers are assisted in attending college through College Tech Prep specific scholarships. In addition, several other programs include articulated credit, earned on-transcript college credit for secondary students and generous two-year scholarships provided by participating post-secondary institutions. These opportunities vary widely from consortia to consortia.

While noting the above progress, minority enrollments remain low in College Tech Prep programs.

Two (2) Standards:

Best Practices . . . . .	1
Needs Improvement . . . . .	1
Meets the Standard . . . . .	50

**Collaboration and Worked-Based Learning** Consortia throughout the state have excelled in developing collaborative activities that support and strengthen workforce development and offer school reform initiatives. This is evidenced by the fact that 20% of the consortia were identified with best practices in the performance area and the remaining 80% as meeting the standard or above.

Student work-based experiences were identified in nearly 100% of the medical College Tech Prep programs. In addition, other work-based experiences were identified as being available across most program areas, ranging from student summer internships to job-placement experiences.

Two (2) Standards:

Best Practices . . . . .	6
Needs Improvement . . . . .	5
Meets the Standard . . . . .	41

#### **IV. Assist with College Transition Activities**

**College Transition Strategies** have been employed to various levels of success by all of Ohio's consortia. An interesting dichotomy exist in the state in that 31% of the consortia were identified by on-site review teams as doing exemplary work in assisting their college Tech Prep students in transitioning to college, while 23% were evaluated as needing to improve their activities and/or initiatives. A primary objective of College Tech Prep is to provide for a minimum 2 + 2 educational program for all students enrolled in College Tech Prep. However, it was identified that in many consortia the transition rates remain low or below the state standard of a 66% transition rate. This appears to be attributable to several factors including the type of College Tech Prep program, program entry and exit requirements, geographical area, student's individual family college history, emphasis by program instructor on the college portion of the program; as well as articulation and earned college credit possibilities, available financial assistance and the level of guidance and assistance provided to the individual student in transitioning to college. As previously stated, 27% or more than one in four consortia, were identified as needing to improve their articulation agreements and transition processes. This certainly must, to some degree, impact individual consortia college transition rates.

During the three-year on-site review process only one consortium was identified as having reached the state standard transition rate of 66% in one or more of the three years prior to their review. However it is important to note that during the same period 42% of all consortia achieved a 50% or higher transition levels for one or more years. Furthermore, 74% of the state's consortia showed an increase in transition rates within the same period of time.

It was apparent that many consortia have done extensive work in developing systems that assist students in transitioning to college. However, the ultimate goal of all of Ohio's consortia has been identified as transitioning at least 66% of College Tech Prep secondary students to college. Data indicates that during the review period, 26% of Ohio's consortia did not have an increase in transition rates. Furthermore, several consortia remained well below the state standard of 66%. It is recommended that any future consortia reviews give equal weight to the transitioning, college persistence and success (graduation, certificate, etc.) factors as is given to the secondary College Tech Prep programs.

The relationships built between Ohio's College Tech Prep consortia and Ohio's two- and four-year colleges have been instrumental in the development and implementation of unique and innovative college programming. This innovative programming appears to be influential in increasing the number of College Tech Prep students transitioning to college.

One (1) Standard:

Best Practice . . . . .	8
Needs Improvement . . . . .	6
Meets the Standard . . . . .	12

The state's best practices are available at:

<http://www.techprepohio.org/staff/bestpractices/display.afp>

**Conclusions:**

- I. The characteristics of an effective College Tech Prep consortium include:
  - Viable and equally representative governing body.
  - Effective and progressive leadership from the consortium director/coordinator with College Tech Prep responsibilities only.
  - The effective collection and use of data.
  - A system/process that provides for student linkage to the partnering college/s through programming and multiple forms of transitioning assistance.
  - Well-developed and consistent curriculum and delivery.
  - Effective system/process for student identification and program review.
  
- II. With the expected accountability measures in the proposed Perkins Legislation data collection and evaluation will be an on-going process. These on-site visits were both a learning process as well as a review process. Information gleaned from the site visits has been invaluable in providing a continuous improvement process. It is recommended that the on-site visit and review should be on-going.
  
- III. Several College Tech Prep Consortia have excelled in the development of a process whereby students have expanded opportunities to participate in college programs while still in high school. This has led to increased options for them to continue their college education which would not have been available otherwise.

**Addendum A**

**BEST PRACTICES AND NEEDS IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY**  
By review area and sub-area

**REVIEW AREA:**

**ADMINISTER THE CONSORTIUM**

<b>Strategic Planning Process</b>	
Total Standards	3
Best Practices	2
Needs Improvement	14
Meets the Standard	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>78</b>

<b>Staffing</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	1
Needs Improvement	4
Meets the Standard	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Governance and Decision Making</b>	
Total Standards	3
Best Practices	10
Needs Improvement	14
Meets the Standard	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>78</b>

<b>Data Collection and Evaluation</b>	
Total Standards	2
Best Practices	5
Needs Improvement	31 (2 caution)
Meets the Standard	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

## MANAGE CONSORTIUM FUNDING

<b>Operating Budgets</b>	
Total Standards	2
Best Practices	5
Needs Improvement	2
Meets the Standard	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

<b>Financial Management System</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	1
Needs Improvement	1
Meets the Standard	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

## COORDINATE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND ASSIST WITH PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

<b>Program Application Process</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	2
Needs Improvement	3
Meets the Standard	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Local Pathway Development</b>	
Total Standards	3
Best Practices	6
Needs Improvement	24
Meets the Standard	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>

**COORDINATE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND ASSIST WITH PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION (continued)**

<b>Instructional Needs</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	0
Needs Improvement	0
Meets the Standard	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Program Review/ Evaluation</b>	
Total Standards	2
Best Practices	2
Needs Improvement	27
Meets the Standard	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

**COORDINATE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Contextual Learning and Technology</b>	
Total Standards	2
Best Practices	6
Needs Improvement	7
Meets the Standard	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

<b>Professional Involvement</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	0
Needs Improvement	1
Meets the Standard	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

## MARKET TECH PREP

<b>Marketing and Student Recruitment</b>	
Total Standards	4
Best Practices	6
Needs Improvement	23
Meets the Standard	75
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>

<b>Career Education</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	3
Needs Improvement	1
Meets the Standard	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Under-represented and Non-traditional Populations</b>	
Total Standards	2
Best Practices	1
Needs Improvement	1
Meets the Standard	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

## BUILD PARTNERSHIPS

<b>Collaboration and Work-based Learning</b>	
Total Standards	2
Best Practices	6
Needs Improvement	5
Meets the Standard	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

## ASSIST WITH COLLEGE TRANSITION ACTIVITIES

<b>College Transition Strategies</b>	
Total Standards	1
Best Practices	8
Needs Improvement	6
Meets the Standard	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

**Addendum B**

**BEST PRACTICES SUMMARY**

**Total Identified Best Practices . . . . .59**

Government and Management	24
Curriculum and Professional Development	11
Marketing and Partnerships	16
Transition to College	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>

Best Practices:     High . . . . . 7  
                           Low . . . . . 0 \*

\* 5 Consortia identified 0  
    9 Consortia identified 1

Number of Consortia	Total Best Practices Identified
1	7
2	6
2	5
3	4
1	3
3	2
9	1
5	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>

**Average Best Practices per Consortium           2.3**

\*Total Standards Evaluated:     32

**Addendum C**

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY**

**Total Identified Needs Improvement . . . . . 166**

Government and Management	66
Curriculum and Professional Development	62
Marketing and Partnerships	30
Transition to College	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>

**Needs Improvement: High . . . . .14**  
**Low . . . . . 2**

Number of Consortia	Total Needs Improvement Identified
1	14
2	13
1	12
2	10
1	9
4	7
3	6
3	5
1	4
4	3
4	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>

**Average Needs Improvement per Consortium 6.3**

\* Total Standards Evaluated: 32

## Addendum D

### HIGH/LOW BEST PRACTICE – NEEDS IMPROVEMENT COMPARISON\*

Standard	Consortia with Best Practice	Consortia Needing Improvement
<b>Strategic Planning</b>		
Governing Board develops multi-year strategic plan	0	2
Staff Provides Leadership to Implement	2	2
Governing Board Evaluates Plan (Uses Performance Data)	0	10
<b>Administer Consortium</b>		
Governance Structure	5	10
System to Collect Performance Data	3	12
Use Performance Data to Evaluate	1	17
<b>Curriculum Development</b>		
Curriculum is current	3	9
Faculty Teams	1	9
Written Articulation Agreements	1	7
Tracks students through four year process	1	13
Conducts Program Reviews	1	14
<b>Professional Development</b>		
Educators Participate in Professional Development	4	2
Increased Number of Business/ Industry sites (externships)	2	5
<b>Marketing</b>		
System to disseminate Information to Students	3	4
Disseminates Information to parents/community	2	4
System to Identify Qualified Students	1	6
Process to Assess how well Tech Prep Message is Communicated	0	9

\* Only Compares Standards with High or Low Count. Does not include all standards.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Consortia with Best Practice</b>	<b>Consortia Needing Improvement</b>
<b>Partnerships</b>		
Collaborative Activities – Workforce School Reform	5	0
Student Work-based Experiences	1	5
<b>Transition to College</b>		
System to Ensure Student's Transition to College	8	6
<b>Total</b>	59	146