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Background: ACP evaluators

- Contracted by DPI to conduct external evaluation of ACP, annually:

- **Pilot Year**
  - 2015-16

- **Pre-Implementation**
  - 2016-17

- **Full Implementation Year 1**
  - 2017-18

- **Full Implementation Year 2**
  - 2018-19

- **Full Implementation Year 3**
  - 2019-20
Background: ACP evaluation

• Mixed methods study combining:
  – Surveys
  – Interviews
  – Focus groups
  – Case studies
  – Observations
  – Student and school outputs
  – Student outcomes
2018-19 Key Findings

• More evidence underscores the value of “powerful practices”
  – Final projects
  – Job shadowing
  – Mock interviews
  – Resume building
  – One-on-one conferencing/advising
2018-19 Key Findings

• Districts are moving towards more widespread teacher participation and “schoolwide cultures of ACP”

• Initial outputs data showing evidence of gaps in participation
Participation gaps

• 2018-19 evaluation examined gaps across the many activities including:
  – Work-based learning
  – AP or IB course enrollment
  – Dual credit course enrollment
Participation Gaps: Work-Based Learning

Figure 1: Percentage of CTE Concentrators Participating in at least One Work-Based Learning Methodology by Race/Ethnicity, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Work-Based Learning

Figure 2: Percentage of CTE Concentrators Participating in at least One Work-Based Learning Methodology by Economic Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Work-Based Learning

Figure 3: Percentage of CTE Concentrators Participating in at least One Work-Based Learning Methodology by EL Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Work-Based Learning

Figure 4: Percentage of CTE Concentrators Participating in at least One Work-Based Learning Methodology by **Special Education Status**, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: AP/IB Courses

Figure 5: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in at least One AP or IB Course by Race/Ethnicity, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CWCS/Roster
Participation Gaps: AP/IB Courses

Figure 6: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in at least One AP or IB Course by Economic Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CWCS/Roster
Participation Gaps: AP/IB Courses

Figure 7: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in at least One AP or IB Course by EL Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CWCS/Roster
Participation Gaps: AP/IB Courses

Figure 8: Percentage of 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} Grade Students Participating in at least One AP or IB Course by \textbf{Special Education Status}, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CWCS/Roster
Participation Gaps: Dual Credit

Figure 9: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in University Dual Credit Courses by Race/Ethnicity, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Dual Credit

Figure 10: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in Technical College Dual Credit Courses by Race/Ethnicity, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Dual Credit

Figure 11: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in Dual Credit Courses by Economic Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Dual Credit

Figure 12: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in Dual Credit Courses by EL Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Participation Gaps: Dual Credit

Figure 13: Percentage of 11th and 12th Grade Students Participating in Dual Credit Courses by Special Education Status, 2014-15 through 2017-18

Source: CTEERS
Turn and talk / reflect

• Consider your own ACP program.
• Do you think there are participation gaps?
• How would you know?
• What evidence do you have or could you collect/consult?
Investigating Equity: Data Sources

Local data already collected
• Student demographics
• Student assessment
• Course participation
• Career education reporting
• Attendance
• Graduation rates
• Discipline
• Other

Additional Data
• Surveys
• Interviews
• Focus groups
• Student exit tickets
• Observations
• Other
Data Resources

• **ACP evaluation toolkit**
  – Local evaluation planning
  – WISEdash and WISEdash Secure
  – Sample survey items
  – Sample focus group items

• DPI Resource Inequity data tool
Digging deeper into equity

• **Examine distribution of resources** (staffing, funding, course offerings, instructional materials, and engagement with families);

• Compare school, district, and state data to see where your school and district stand relative to others;

• Ask some key questions to find patterns in the data; and

• Consider action steps to better align your resources with your goals.
Turn and talk / reflect

• What questions would you ask if you were doing an evaluation or analysis of your local ACP program?
Barriers – known and otherwise

• Awareness
• Family support
• Transportation
• Funding
• Entrance requirements
• Others you’re aware of?
Future research

• This year’s (2019-20) ACP evaluation case studies are focusing on equity.
• Focus groups and interviews further investigating barriers to participation
Questions or comments?

- Robin Worth (robin.worth@wisc.edu)
- Grant Sim (grant.sim@wisc.edu)
- http://wec.wceruw.org/