

TECHNICAL REVIEW, ASSISTANCE, AND COMPLIANCE  
**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

---

Compliance is determined through a review of evidence contained in district documents, State documents, and onsite evidence.

## Definitions

**District Documents** – The district must provide these documents. Desk Review Documents must be uploaded to GEMS prior to the visit. Do NOT submit duplicate documents. These required documents must be submitted; optional documents should be submitted only if they provide evidence of compliance.

\***Please note:** any district documents that contain information subject to privacy laws must be encrypted prior to uploading. Alternatively, the information can be provided onsite.

**State Documents** – MDE/OCTE has these documents. Do NOT submit them.

**Onsite Evidence** – Onsite documents, hard copy or electronic, that contain information subject to privacy laws. Onsite evidence also includes notes generated by interviews with data staff and administrators.

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D01 PERKINS QUALITY DATA**

CPI data collected and reported was complete and accurate.

**Citation(s):** P § 113(b)(4)(C)(i); P § 204(e)(1); 34 CFR 76.700 (EDGAR)

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D01-1</b> In Compliance: 1S1 Reading/Language Arts achievement data collected was complete and accurate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student UIC reported correctly.</li> <li>2. Student Exit Status reported correctly.</li> </ol> <p><b>D01-2</b> In Compliance: Valid MME Reading (1S1) scores were found for at least 95% of CTE concentrators in each CEPD in the Region.</p> <p><b>D01-3</b> In Compliance: 1S2 Mathematics achievement data collected was complete and accurate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student UIC reported correctly.</li> <li>2. Student Exit Status reported correctly.</li> </ol> <p><b>D01-4</b> In Compliance: Valid MME Math (1S2) scores were found for at least 95% of CTE concentrators in each CEPD in the Region.</p> <p><b>D01-5</b> In Compliance: Technical Skill Assessments (2S1) were administered to at least 80% of eligible students in each CIP Code in each building (each program).</p> <p><b>D01-6</b> In Compliance: Data used to determine student high school completion (3S1) status was accurately reported.</p> <p><b>D01-7</b> In Compliance: Data used to determine student graduation (4S1) status was accurately reported.</p> <p><b>D01-8</b> In Compliance: Data used to determine student placement (5S1) in industry or continuing education was accurately reported on the Follow-up Survey. (Proxy % &lt;30% for CEPD, Response rate &gt;80% for CEPD, no building reports late.)</p> <p><b>D01-9</b> In Compliance: Data used to determine enrollment (6S1) of students in programs nontraditional for their gender was accurately reported. (Accurate gender reported in MSDS)</p> <p><b>D01-10</b> In Compliance: Data used to determine completion (6S2) status of students in programs nontraditional for their gender was accurately reported. (Accurate gender and program completion status)</p>	<p><b>Region/CEPD/District Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide validation of student scores for the following Certifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Certiport: Autodesk Revit; IC3</li> <li>◦ Emergency Medical Technician (EMT)</li> <li>◦ CompTia</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>State Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTE Michigan Merit Exam (MME) Report</li> <li>• 2S1 TRAC Assessment Report</li> <li>• Segment Q and Assessment Report</li> <li>• CEPI GAD File notes/report</li> <li>• Follow-up summary of response rates, proxy rates, non-respondent and verification studies, and report timeliness (Follow-up Response Rates Report under TRAC Reports in CTEIS)</li> <li>• MSDS report (gender inaccurate)</li> <li>• Instructional design report (Matches instructional design in Navigator—PSNs identified by the OCTE)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No completers (Program Enrollment and Completion Report shows no completers in one or more selected PSNs)</li> </ul>

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D02 ACCURATE CORE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DATA**

Eligible recipient annually prepared and submitted disaggregate data on 1S1 Academic attainment/Reading, 1S2 Academic attainment/Math, 2S1 Technical Skill attainment, 3S1 High School Completion, 4S1 High School Graduation, 5S1 Placement, 6S1 Participation in CTE programs leading to nontraditional fields, and 6S2 Completion of CTE programs leading to nontraditional fields for the categories of students described in ESEA.

**Citation(s):** P § 113(b)(4)(C)(i, ii); P § 204 (e)(1); Michigan School State Aid Act § 94a-4)(d,e) & (6)(b); 2CFR Part 200 § 200.38 (UG); 34 CFR 76.722 (EDGAR)

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D02-1</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that students in the following Special Populations categories were accurately reported: students with disabilities, limited English proficiency, and migrant. (Note: The category "Economically Disadvantaged" is excluded since students may be identified through direct certification by the state, rather than identified by district).</p> <p><b>D02-2</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that students in the following Special Populations categories were accurately reported: single parents; displaced homemakers.</p> <p><b>D02-3</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that concentrators were accurately identified.</p>	<p><b>Region/CEPD/District Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional design reports for PSNs identified by OCTE</li> <li>• *District’s Special Populations list (Not from CTEIS) for PSNs identified by the OCTE</li> <li>• *Teacher Class Lists (Not from CTEIS) for PSNs identified by the OCTE – include teacher’s name, segments taught, and student grades for the class. (Note: provide class lists for <b>each</b> semester.)</li> </ul> <p><b>State Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTEIS Special Populations list</li> <li>• CTEIS Segment Report</li> <li>• Instructional Design Report</li> <li>• X0107 for PSNs selected by OCTE program consultants</li> <li>• Program Enrollment and Completion Report (no completers)</li> </ul>

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D03 CPI REPORT REVIEW AND AVAILABILITY**

Career and technical education activities of eligible recipients were evaluated annually (using the local adjusted levels of performance) and an improvement plan was developed and implemented, if recipient failed to meet at least 90 percent of local adjusted level of performance.

Reports of CPIs are made available to the public through a variety of formats, including electronically through the internet.

**Citation(s):** P § 123(b)(1, 2); P § 113(4)(C)(v); P § 113(c)(5)(A); P § 113(b)(4)(C)(v); 34 CFR 76.700 (EDGAR); 34 CFR 76.722 (EDGAR)

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D03-1</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that Core Performance Indicator Reports were reviewed with the following CTE staff: instructional, administrative, counselors, and special populations coordinators.</p> <p><b>D03-2</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that the Region made the Perkins Core Performance Indicators Reports available to the public in a variety of ways, including through the internet.</p>	<p><b>Region/CEPD/District Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendas, minutes, or other evidence that CPIs were <b>reviewed</b></li> <li>• Agenda, minutes, or other evidence that CPIs were reviewed <b>and used</b> for Regional Improvement Plan (RIP)</li> <li>• Web addresses and other evidence of public availability of CPIs</li> </ul>

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D04 ADDED COST QUALITY DATA**

The CEPD/district has submitted complete and accurate data utilized for the calculation of Added Cost funds.

**Citation(s):** Michigan Schools State Aid Act § 61a1

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D04-1</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that the CEPD/district(s) submitted complete and accurate student data (course sections, grades) utilized for the calculation of Added Cost funds.</p> <p><b>D04-2</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that the CEPD/district(s) submitted complete and accurate course segments to determine participants, concentrators and completers for the calculation of Added Cost funds.</p>	<p><b>Region/CEPD/District Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Design Reports</li> <li>• *Teacher Class Lists (Not from CTEIS) alphabetized by students’ last names, for PSNs identified by the OCTE – include teacher’s name, segments taught, and student grades for the class. (Note: Provide class lists for <b>each</b> semester.)</li> </ul> <p><b>State Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X0107</li> <li>• Building Class Student List Report</li> </ul>

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D05 CTE PLACEMENT DATA (Follow-Up Survey)**

OCTE establishes performance goals pertaining to CTE program-related placement and districts analyze program placement data to evaluate the effectiveness of CTE programs.

**Citation(s):** P § 113(b)(1), (b)(2)(A)(V); P § 203(e)(1)(B)(i); P § 204(e)(1); 34 CFR 76.7000 (EDGAR)

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D05-1</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that students continued in education or employment in program-<b>RELATED</b> jobs or training. (Comment if not less than 10% of the state – Not a Finding).</p> <p><b>D05-2</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that districts <u>reviewed and analyzed</u> <b>TOTAL</b> follow-up placement data to determine the effectiveness of the CTE program by district, program, and building.</p> <p><b>D05-3</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that districts <u>reviewed and analyzed</u> <b>RELATED</b> follow-up placement data to determine the effectiveness of the CTE program by district, program, and building.</p> <p><b>D05-4</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that districts <u>shared</u> <b>TOTAL</b> follow-up placement data with their CTE instructional staff.</p> <p><b>D05-5</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that districts <u>shared</u> <b>RELATED</b> follow-up placement data with their CTE instructional staff.</p> <p><b>D05-6</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that districts <u>used</u> <b>TOTAL</b> Follow-up placement results to <u>improve programs</u>.</p> <p><b>D05-7</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that districts <u>used</u> <b>RELATED</b> follow-up placement results to <u>improve programs</u>.</p>	<p><b>Region/CEPD/District Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendas, minutes, spreadsheets, reports, or other evidence that TOTAL follow-up placement data were reviewed and used for program improvement</li> <li>• Agendas, minutes spreadsheets, reports, or other evidence that RELATED follow-up placement data were reviewed and used for program improvement</li> <li>• Agendas, minutes, or other evidence that TOTAL follow-up placement data was shared with CTE instructional staff</li> <li>• Agendas, minutes, or other evidence that RELATED follow-up placement data was shared with CTE instructional staff</li> <li>• Minutes, written reports, or other evidence that TOTAL follow-up placement results were used for program improvement. Documents or interviews that demonstrate that decisions were made and actions were taken based on placement data. For example, meeting minutes or notes showing discussion about modifying curriculum due to low placement rate; documents of discussion about closing programs with low placement rates; adding work-based learning to improve placement; providing additional job placement assistance to students based on low placement rates.</li> <li>• Minutes, written reports, or other evidence that RELATED follow-up placement results were used for program improvement. Documents or interviews that demonstrate that decisions were made and actions were taken based on placement data. For example, meeting minutes or notes showing discussion about modifying curriculum due to low placement rate; documents of discussion about closing programs with low placement rates; adding work-based learning to improve placement; providing additional job placement assistance to students based on low placement rates.</li> </ul> <p><b>State Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow-up Report (X0610)</li> </ul>

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D06 DATA SECURITY**

District collects, stores, and reports CTE student-level data in a manner that maintains student privacy in compliance with all state and federal laws including FERPA.

**Citation(s):** Michigan School State Aid Act § 94a(1)(d); P § 5; P § 113(b)(4)(C)(iv) & (c)(4); 34 CFR 76.740 (EDGAR); CFR 34 Subtitle A § 5.b (FERPA); CFR 34 Subtitle A § 99.35 (FERPA)

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D06-1</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that district(s) maintained appropriate controls over student information, including technical procedures that ensure only authorized and intended parties have access to data.</p> <p><b>D06-2</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that district(s) had policies and procedures to ensure that information about individual students was disclosed only to authorized persons.</p> <p><b>D06-3</b> In Compliance: Evidence demonstrated that district policies and procedures concerning confidentiality and data security were shared with staff with access to confidential student information.</p>	<p><b>Region/CEPD/District Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures for data security and student and personnel confidentiality</li> <li>• Agendas, minutes, or other forms of evidence to demonstrate that policies and procedures were shared with staff who handle confidential, secure information</li> </ul>

**DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**D07 PREVIOUS MONITORING REVIEW**

All noncompliance findings from the previous TRAC monitoring review have been successfully resolved.

Compliance Criteria	Documents
<p><b>D07-1</b> In Compliance: The previous monitoring report contained data noncompliance findings that were addressed in the approved compliance plan. The current data review shows the previous noncompliance findings have been corrected and are not repeat findings.</p> <p><b>REPEAT FINDINGS:</b> Repeat TRAC non-compliance findings may result in targeted technical assistance, regional attendance at a targeted technical assistance meeting with OCTE or may result in a targeted visit during the next school year.</p>	<p><b>State Documents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior monitoring report</li> <li>• Prior compliance plan</li> </ul>