**Collaborative Norms**

- Stay muted when not speaking.
- Turn your camera on when speaking, if preferred.
- Use the hand-raise feature to gain the attention of the presenter.
- Be an active participant.

**MS Teams Tools**

- Turn camera on/off
- Turn microphone on/off
- View participant list
- Use the hand-raise feature
- View and use the chat
DQI 2021
Supporting the Use of Data in CLNAs

Session 1:
Data Driven Decision Making
10/12/21 2-3:30pm ET

Session 2:
Using Labor Force Data
10/14/21 2-3pm ET

Session 3:
Equity Gap Analysis
10/19/21 2-3pm ET

Perkins 101
10/5/21 2-4pm ET

Connect Session
10/7/21 2-3pm ET
Data-Driven Decision Making

Participants will learn about supports and resources that states provide to local districts on data analysis and data-driven decision making.

Supporting the Use of Data in CLNAs
Adam Flynn-Tabloff
Chief, PAAB

Training
Elizabeth Bennett (MA)
Lawrence DeSalvatore (MA)
Andrew Martin (MA)
Jennifer Appleyard (MA)

Guidance and Resources
Debbie Wieland (TX)
Assistant Director of CTE
Dr. Lacy Freeman (TX)
College, Career, and Military Preparation

Sharing Data with Providers
Jennell Ives (OR)
Director,
Secondary/Postsecondary Transitions, Team Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

Office of Career, Technical, & Adult Education
Supporting the Use of Data in CLNAs

Adam Flynn-Tabloff
Chief, Program Administration and Accountability Branch (PAAB)
Comprehensive Local Needs Assessments (CLNAs)

Section 134(c)(1-2) of Perkins V

To be eligible to receive financial assistance, an eligible recipient shall -

(A) conduct a comprehensive local needs assessment (CLNA) related to career and technical education and include the results of the needs assessment in the local application submitted for funding; and

(B) not less than once every 2 years, update such CLNA
Supporting the Use of Data in CLNAs

What support or resources do states provide to local districts on data analysis and data-driven decision making?

What strategies are states employing to support local staff in using labor market data to analyze alignment with CTE programs?

What tools and assistance do states provide to district staff on conducting equity gap analysis?
Data-Driven Decision Making

What support or resources do states provide to local districts on data analysis and data-driven decision making?

What training opportunities support local providers in accessing and using CTE data?

What tools and resources are used when analyzing data and identifying local needs?

What reports or dashboards are available to use in identifying program challenges, needs, and goals?
Data-Driven Decision Making Training

- **Annual Conferences**
  - Focused on Policies/Practices

- **Monthly CTE Data Office Hours**

- **Annual Training**
  - on Analyzing & Interpreting CTE Data
Perkins V: Data-Driven Decision Making

Office for College, Career, and Technical Education
Annual Training on Analyzing and Interpreting CTE Program and Student Data
Data-Driven Decision Making

• Elizabeth L. Bennett, Associate Commissioner of College, Career and Technical Education
• Larry DeSalvatore, CCTE Liaison
• Andrew Martin, Education Data Analyst
• Jennifer Appleyard, CVTE Data and Development Specialist
Data-Driven Decision Making

• Start with ‘Why’
• Collaboration across Offices
• Perkins Cycle
• Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment
• CVTE Reports
• Engaging the Field
• What’s on the Horizon
Goal: prepare all students for success in life
In collaboration –

• Resource Allocation Strategy and Planning

• Education Data Services

• College, Career, and Technical Education
Perkins V Implementation in 2021

**Winter 2021:** Core Indicators will be calculated.

**Winter**
Performance on Core indicators Released (Dec – CAR complete)
[ASSESS PROGRESS]

**Spring**
Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment [REFLECTION]

**Summer**
Application (Sept)
[ACTION]

**Fall**
Performance Levels (Oct LEA propose. Nov DESE accept/decline)
[TARGET-SETTING]

**Fall 2021:** Districts/institutions/collaboratives may propose Locally Determined Performance Levels (LDPLs).

See Perkins V website for more.

CCTE reviews and accepts/does not accept institution’s proposed LDPLs.

[Start here]
**Spring 2021:**
Districts/institutions/collaboratives can refer to CLNA for self-reflection & improvement and to update the CLNA.

CLNA does not need to be submitted, but rather kept on file at each site, for review during Monitoring and for strategic development.

**Summer 2021:** Districts/institutions/collaboratives work on the FY22 Application which draws on CLNA.
Perkins V Implementation in 2022

Calendar Year
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Winter 2022: Core Indicators will be calculated.

Winter
Performance on Core indicators Released
(Dec – CAR complete)
[ASSESS PROGRESS]

Spring
Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment
Improvement Plans (Feb)
[REFLECTION]

Summer
Application (Sept)
[ACTION]

Fall
Performance Levels
(Oct LEA propose, Nov DESE accept/decline)
[TARGET-SETTING]

[Start here]
Spring 2022:
Districts/institutions/collaboratives can refer to CLNA for self-reflection & improvement. Districts/institutions/collaboratives are required to update & modify CLNA.

Districts/institutions/collaboratives will complete Improvement Plans for any indicator/population group below 90% of target from 2021 CAR.

CLNA does not need to be submitted, but rather kept on file at each site, for review during Monitoring and for strategic development.

Summer 2022: Districts/institutions/collaboratives work on the FY23 Application which draws on CLNA.
Perkins V

Perkins V Manual

The federal Perkins Act is designed to develop more fully the academic knowledge and technical and employability skills of secondary and postsecondary education students who elect to enroll in career and technical education programs. Perkins V recognizes, in a way that previous iterations of Perkins legislation did not, the value and importance of in-depth, continual programmatic self-examination to improve programs and benefit students.

Both Chapter 74-approved vocational technical education programs and Non-Chapter 74 career and technical education programs meet the federal Perkins Act definition of career and technical education and are considered Perkins programs.

This Perkins V Manual addresses the requirements identified in Perkins V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>What do I need to know?</th>
<th>What do I need to do?</th>
<th>What else?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Essentials</td>
<td>Introduction to Perkins</td>
<td>Review material from Perkins V Implementation Workshops in Feb 2020</td>
<td>For districts new to Perkins programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perkins V includes initiatives to increase access, close achievement gaps, and increase students' exposure to nontraditional careers.</td>
<td>Recipients receiving Perkins V funds are required to conduct a Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment and update it at least every two years. See the Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment Guide and Worksheet.</td>
<td>To stay up to date on Perkins V and other CTE news, sign up for the CTE e-newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Programs</td>
<td>Under Perkins V, districts progress toward implementation of equal access to high-quality career and technical education courses and programs of study for all students.</td>
<td>Refer to disaggregation, culturally responsive practices, gender equity and population groups &amp; special populations defined in Perkins V.</td>
<td>See resources from across DESE — English Learner Education and ELE Blueprint, Special Education Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perkins V Resources – and How They Fit Together

- Perkins Core Indicators & Targets
  - Accountability system
  - Disaggregated for student population groups
  - Use for reflection & improvement

- Size, Scope & Quality Perkins Checklist
  - Essential components of programs

- Grant Application
  - Refers to needs assessment
  - Budget

- Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment
  - Guide & Worksheet
  - Six key areas
  - Consultation with stakeholders
If you were to place yourself on a product/process continuum, where would that be?
The CLNA is a process document.
Yes, there will be a product that you create, but the value of the CLNA is the process.

This process is one that institutions with high quality career and technical programs are already doing in some fashion;

and that’s not an accident—these institutions have high quality programs because they ask good, pointed questions about their programs, produce honest answers, and remain focused on improvement.
Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment

Massachusetts Guide for Conducting a Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment

The federal Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V) requires that funding recipients undertake a Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) at least every two years. This document serves as a guide to that process.

April 2020

CLNA Components

Part I: Performance on Core Indicators

How are our students performing? What improvements can we make to ensure we support all students?

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V) asks all applicants to collect, report, and analyze student outcome data to inform program improvements that benefit students.

In this section, applicants, using core indicators, determine overall progress in achieving targets, progress for subpopulations of students, and progress by specific CTE program.

Comparisons can include:

- Members of special populations vs. non-member students or all students;
- Comparisons by gender, race/ethnicity; and
- Comparisons across the CTE programs offered.

Your institution’s analysis should attempt to answer the following questions:

- When looking at all students, for which indicator(s) does our school meet/exceed targets, and for which indicator(s) does our school not meet targets?
- When looking at student population groups, for which indicators do we meet targets, and for which indicator(s) does our school not meet targets?
- For each indicator, where are the biggest performance gaps?
- Which programs show the highest outcomes, overall and by subpopulation?

CLNA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Needs</th>
<th>Data Used to Identify the Need</th>
<th>Stakeholders who are/are not consulted</th>
<th>Potential Root Causes for Each Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I: How are all students performing on the Perkins Core Indicators? What improvements can be made to ensure support for all students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II: How well are programs aligned with state, regional, and local workforce and career needs? What programmatic changes would lead to closer alignment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III: Are programs of sufficient size, scope, and quality to meet all students’ needs? How can we do better?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Enrollment and Follow-up Reports

CVTE Enrollment by Gender/Ethnicity
CVTE Enrollment by Race
CVTE Enrollment by Special Population
CVTE Nontraditional Enrollment by Gender by Race/Ethnicity
CVTE Nontraditional Enrollment by Gender in Special Population
CVTE Follow-up Survey Results

SIMS Period: Oct 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CVTE Type</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Total Enrolled</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State CVTE Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63660</td>
<td>5792</td>
<td>2764</td>
<td>16121</td>
<td>36449</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State CVTE Chapter 74 Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52623</td>
<td>4353</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>12955</td>
<td>31379</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State CVTE Non-Chapter 74 Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11037</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C74 480510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Manufacturing Technology</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C74 010201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Mechanics</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C74 010599</td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perkins V Definition

The percentage of CVTE concentrators who graduate high school, as measured by the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

- **Numerator**: Number of concentrators who graduated in the district 4-year adjusted cohort one year prior.
- **Denominator**: Number of concentrators included in the district 4-year adjusted cohort one year prior.

Select Perkins V Performance Year:

- **Year 1 (2019-2020)**

![View Report Button]

### Perkins V Performance Year 1 (2019-2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Students in the Numerator</th>
<th>Number of Students in the Denominator</th>
<th>State-Determined Performance Level (Target)</th>
<th>Local Actual Performance Level</th>
<th>Target vs. Actual</th>
<th>Met 90% Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>98.69%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>98.14%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>98.31%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement with Field –

• 2019-2020 School Year:
  o February 2020: Statewide Perkins Implementation Workshops
  o Shifted communications during lockdown – regular meetings with field & via newsletter
  o Summer 2020: professional development in virtual summer trainings

• 2020-2021 School Year:
  o Regular communications continued (meetings with field & via newsletter)
  o Webinars: data collection, using enrollment, using indicators, performance levels
  o Spring 2021: postsecondary webinars and technical assistance
What’s on the Horizon –

• 2021-2022 School Year:
  o Regular communications continued (meetings with field & via newsletter)
  o Improvement Plans
Data-Driven Decision Making
Tools and Resources

Data-Related Questions & Instructions

Guidance on Identifying Measurable Outcomes and Benchmarks

Guidebook for Conducting Regional Needs Assessments

Data Analysis Matrices, Templates, and Visualization Tools
Data Driven Decision Making

Guidance & Resources

Texas Education Agency
Texas Guidance and Resources Agenda

- Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) Guidebook and Professional Development
- CTE Indicator Auto-coding and Data Set
- State CLNA Review Process
- Lessons Learned
CLNA Guidebook and Professional Development
Perkins V CLNA & Local Application Timeline

- **December 2019-January 2020**
  - Regional Training on CLNA

- **February – March 2020**
  - CLNA Special Collection 5600 Opens
  - District Baseline Data Available

- **April-May 2020**
  - Regional Training on new Local Application for Funds
  - Perkins ADC Opens 5/15
  - CLNA Deadline 5/1
  - CLNA Approvals 5/31

- **June-August 2020**
  - Local Application Opens 6/2
  - Deadline 9/3
Overview of the Needs Assessment Process

Phase 1: Stakeholder Engagement
Phase 2: Understanding the CLNA
Phase 3: Collect and Analyze Data
Phase 4: Set Priorities
Phase 5: Relationship to the Local Application
Phase 1: Stakeholder Engagement

Perkins V requires consultation with a variety of stakeholders to complete the CLNA

- LEA CTE representatives
- Postsecondary CTE representatives
- Local workforce boards/business & industry representatives
- Parents and students
- Representatives of special populations, agencies serving out-of-school youth, homeless children, and at-risk youth
- Representatives of Indian Tribes, where applicable
Phase 2: Understanding the CLNA

Conduct thorough training addressing the six sections below:

- Student Performance
- Labor Market Alignment
- Programs of Study
- Improving Equity & Access
- Recruitment, Retention, & Training of CTE Educators
- Summary
Phase 3: Collect and Analyze Data

• Baseline data for the Perkins V core indicators of performance was provided by the TEA.

• LEA data was also important to include in the evaluation process.
Phase 4: Set Priorities

The advisory committee decided which actions would have the greatest impact:

- Closing performance gaps for special populations
- Improving program size, scope, and quality and insuring labor market alignment
- Improving program quality
- Ensuring LEAs have high quality educators
- Removing barriers that limit access and success
Phase 5: Connecting the CLNA and the Local Application

- The CLNA identified needs of students and industry.
- The local application provided an opportunity to address needs and improve CTE programs.
CLNA, Local Application, and Required Use of Funds

Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA)

Local Application

- CLNA results
- POS funding
- Career exploration, guidance, and counseling
- Improved academic and technical skills
- Special population and non-traditional fields
- Work-based learning opportunities
- Postsecondary credit
- Recruitment, retention, and training
- Performance gaps

Required Local Uses of Funds

- Provide career exploration and development activities
- Provide professional development
- Provide skills necessary to pursue high-skill, high-wage, and in-demand careers
- Support integration of academic skills
- Implementation of programs that improve student achievement
- Evaluation of the activities carried out with funds

Student performance
Labor market alignment
Programs of study evaluation
Recruitment, retention, and training of CTE
Improving access and equity
Summary
CLNA Data Set
# CTE Data Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perkins IV</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Perkins V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Self-Reported through PEIMS Using Locally Developed Programs of Study</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Auto-Calculated Using Existing Certified PEIMS Course Completion Records and Statewide or approved Regional Programs of Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Problems**
  - Greater District Workload
  - Based on Student Intent
  - Not Equitable Across the State

- **Benefits**
  - District Workload Reduction
  - Based on Course Completion
  - Comparable Across Districts
In 2020-2021 TEA began calculating CTE indicators

- Replaced district self-reported CTE indicator data
- Created new set of codes
- Used existing course completion data
- Created look-up tables and logic
- Used indicators in state accountability and federal Perkins reporting
What are the Benefits of CTE Auto-coding?

Workload reduction

- Reduced local staff time (local course completion documentation, student plans, course enrollment information)
- Shifted work from estimating CTE indicators to verifying CTE course completion data

Equitable calculations

- Created uniformity for coding student status within districts and the state

Portability

- Followed students that transferred within the state
What are the new CTE Indicator codes?

- **Not CTE**: A student who never enrolled or who did not complete any high-school CTE Course.
- **CTE Participants**: A student completing EITHER: only one CTE course for any number of credits, OR more than one course for less than two credits*
- **CTE Explorers**: A student completing two or more high school CTE courses for a total of two or more credits defined by 19 TAC Chapter 126 (C), 127 (B) or 130 and not a participant, concentrator or completer*
- **CTE Concentrators**: A student completing and passing at least two or more 19 TAC Chapter 126 (C), 127 (B) or 130 CTE courses for a total of at least two credits within the same program of study and not a completer.
- **CTE Completers**: A student completing and passing three or more 19 TAC Chapter 126 (C), 127 (B) or 130 CTE courses for a total of at least four credits within a program of study, including one level three or level four course from within the same program of study.

* Participant and Explorer coded students do not have to pass high-school CTE courses or receive credit.
CLNA Data Visualization
Resources Provided to School Districts

Student Performance Report

Labor Market Information

State and Regional

CLNA Guidebook

Disaggregated data for each core indicator of performance

- Gender
- Race and Ethnicity
- Special Population
- Career Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CTE Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S1</td>
<td>Four-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Statewide: 97% District: 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S1</td>
<td>Academic Proficiency in Reading/Language Art</td>
<td>Statewide: 58% District: 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S2</td>
<td>Academic Proficiency in Mathematics</td>
<td>Statewide: 47% District: 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S3</td>
<td>Academic Proficiency in Science</td>
<td>Statewide: 60% District: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S1</td>
<td>Post-Program Placement</td>
<td>Statewide: 71% District: 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4S1</td>
<td>Non-Traditional Program Concentration</td>
<td>Statewide: 50% District: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5S1</td>
<td>Program Quality – Attained Recognized</td>
<td>Statewide: 8% District: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5S4</td>
<td>Program Quality – CTE Completer</td>
<td>Statewide: 32% District: 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1S1: Graduation Rate (2017-18 cohort)

97.02%
Of CTE Learners (Concentrators + Completers) graduated in four years

78.60%
Of Non-CTE Learners (Explorers, Participants, Not CTE) graduated in four years
2S1: Academic Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts, by Cluster (2017-18 cohort)

CTE Learner Baseline 58.13%

Non-CTE Learner Baseline 50.63%

- Transportation: -24%
- Architecture & Construction: -22%
- Hospitality & Tourism: -13%
- Agriculture: -10%
- Human Services: -6%
- Law & Public Safety: -6%
- Manufacturing: -4%
- Education & Training: -4%
- Business, Marketing, & Finance: -1%
- Arts, AV Technology: 1%
- Information Technology: 5%
- Health Science: 10%
- STEM: 15%
2S1: Academic Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts (2017-18 cohort)

58.13% Of CTE Learners met or exceeded standard on the English I and English II EOC exam

50.63% Of Non-CTE Learners met or exceeded standard on the English I and English II EOC exam
CLNA State Staff Review Process
Members of SSAs complete four sections of the CLNA:
- Part 1 - Applicant Designation
- Part 2 - Student Performance
- Part 4 - Programs of Study (Size, Scope, and Quality)
- Part 7 - Summary

Fiscal agents complete three sections of the CLNA:
- Part 3 - Labor Market Alignment
- Part 5 - Recruitment, Retention, and Training of CTE Educators
- Part 6 - Improving Equity and Access

Independents complete all seven sections
- An evaluation rubric was used for norming on reviews
- 954 CLNAs were reviewed
- Each TEA CTE staff member reviewed CLNAs for the regions that the staff member supports
- A TEA CTE staff member provided an email response to every CLNA submission

## CLNA Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLNA Document</th>
<th>Part Title</th>
<th>Unacceptable Response</th>
<th>Acceptable Response</th>
<th>Exemplary Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: Applicant Designation</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>No selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Student Performance</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>Indicators not being met not identified</td>
<td>Some indicators not being met are identified</td>
<td>All indicators not being met are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>No explanation for differences in performance of CTE Learners with non-CTE Learners on accountability indicators is provided</td>
<td>Explanation for differences in performance of CTE Learners with non-CTE Learners on accountability indicators is provided</td>
<td>Explanation for differences in performance of CTE Learners with non-CTE Learners on accountability indicators is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>No differences in any special populations in the CTE program with the performance of all CTE Learners at the LEA level is provided</td>
<td>Differences in some special populations in the CTE program with the performance of all CTE Learners at the LEA level is provided</td>
<td>Differences in all special populations in the CTE program with the performance of all CTE Learners at the LEA level is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: Labor Market Alignment</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>No description for how CTE Learners from different genders, races, and ethnicities are performing in the CTE programs at the LEA level is provided</td>
<td>Description addressing how some of the CTE Learners from different genders, races, and ethnicities are performing in the CTE programs at the LEA level is provided</td>
<td>Thorough description addressing how CTE Learners from different genders, races, and ethnicities are performing in the CTE programs at the LEA level is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>List of the top career clusters with occupations that meet the state and/or regional definition of “in-demand” and “high-wage” is not provided or is not aligned to the labor market data</td>
<td>The list provided contains the career clusters with occupations that meet the state and/or regional definition of “in-demand” and “high-wage” when compared to the labor market data.</td>
<td>List of the top career clusters with occupations that meet the state and/or regional definition of “in-demand” and “high-wage” is aligned with the labor market data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>No explanation is provided</td>
<td>Description of the alignment between the CTE Learners and the occupations identified in part 3 line 1 is provided.</td>
<td>Thorough description of the alignment between the CTE Learners and the occupations identified in part 3 line 1 is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>No gaps are identified</td>
<td>Identification of any gaps between high-wage/in-demand occupations and CTE program offerings is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLNA Process Reflections

**Successes**

- Delivered CLNA training at state CTE conference
- Divided work geographically to share responsibilities across agency staff
- Assigned the SSA fiscal agent to review SSA members’ CLNAs
- Provided direct feedback for improvement to LEAs

**Opportunities**

- Create easier access to Perkins Data
- Make the CLNA evaluation rubric a fill-in document
- Access to LEA and regional data for CLNA reviewers
Contact Information

Debbie Wieland
Assistant Director of CTE
Texas Education Agency
debbie.Wieland@tea.texas.gov

Lacy Freeman
CTE Program Coordinator
Texas Education Agency
lacy.freeman@tea.texas.gov
Data-Driven Decision Making
Sharing Data with Providers

Excel Spreadsheets with Performance by Subgroup

Data Dashboards - Enrollment & Performance

Traffic-Light Reports
Oregon Data:
Reporting, Receiving, Understanding and Using
Oregon’s CTE State Plan Priorities

- Career Connected Learning
- Data Literacy and Accountability
- Educator Recruitment and Retention
- Flexible Learning Systems
- Equity and Civil Rights
- High Quality Programs of Study
How to share back data to drive improvement?

Everyone is Busy: How do we provide meaningful feedback that is quick to digest?

Data experts may not be available: Not every grant recipient has capacity.
Simple High Level Data Report

Perkins Traffic Light 90% Reports

• Reports for each grant recipient
• Easy to read reports
• Show all Perkins performance metrics
• Identify those below 90% level
• Identify those met 90% level
• Identify those met or exceeded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Recipients (By Region)</th>
<th>151 Reading Attainment</th>
<th>152 Mathematics Attainment</th>
<th>251 Technical Skill Attainment</th>
<th>351 High School Completion</th>
<th>451 High School Graduation (4 Yr Cohort)</th>
<th>551 Secondary Placement</th>
<th>651 Secondary Nontraditional Participation</th>
<th>652 Secondary Nontraditional Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Target</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>78.50%</td>
<td>88.50%</td>
<td>86.50%</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Levels</td>
<td>81.81%</td>
<td>59.16%</td>
<td>85.18%</td>
<td>92.70%</td>
<td>94.80%</td>
<td>55.93%</td>
<td>34.69%</td>
<td>29.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Levels</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>43.20%</td>
<td>70.65%</td>
<td>79.65%</td>
<td>77.85%</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
<td>20.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met or exceeded performance target</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met 90% level, but did not meet performance target</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 90% level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton SD 4BJ</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>71.38</td>
<td>92.94</td>
<td>93.78</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>22.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Point SD 6</td>
<td>90.67</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa Community College</td>
<td>79.30</td>
<td>52.74</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>91.29</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>36.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas ESD</td>
<td>84.04</td>
<td>59.08</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>94.03</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>61.04</td>
<td>29.57</td>
<td>20.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop Community College</td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>70.37</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>93.07</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Douglas SD 40</td>
<td>85.68</td>
<td>65.43</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>94.41</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>37.96</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County SD 4</td>
<td>79.89</td>
<td>59.26</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>87.79</td>
<td>89.16</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>36.87</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas ESD</td>
<td>80.89</td>
<td>54.14</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>93.63</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>43.77</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham-Barlow SD 10J</td>
<td>77.32</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>94.31</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>59.73</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston SD 8</td>
<td>83.40</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>90.11</td>
<td>92.93</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Desert ESD</td>
<td>76.10</td>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>52.18</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>28.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro SD 1J</td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>62.04</td>
<td>80.82</td>
<td>94.26</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterMountain ESD</td>
<td>77.90</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td>38.93</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane ESD</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>60.18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>93.61</td>
<td>94.46</td>
<td>53.19</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>28.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Recipients (By Region)</td>
<td>1S1 Reading Attainment</td>
<td>1S2 Mathematics Attainment</td>
<td>2S1 Technical Skill Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Target</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>78.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Levels</td>
<td>81.81%</td>
<td>59.16%</td>
<td>85.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Levels</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>43.20%</td>
<td>70.65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Met or exceeded performance target**
- **Met 90% level, but did not meet performance target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1S1 Reading</th>
<th>1S2 Mathematics</th>
<th>2S1 Technical</th>
<th>90% Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton SD 48J</td>
<td>87.33%</td>
<td>71.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Point SD 6</td>
<td>90.67%</td>
<td>72.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa Community College</td>
<td>79.30%</td>
<td>52.74%</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas ESD</td>
<td>84.04%</td>
<td>59.08%</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop Community College</td>
<td>82.26%</td>
<td>46.77%</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Douglas SD 40</td>
<td>85.68%</td>
<td>65.43%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hidden Truth: Reality behind the Averages

Magritte: Double Secret
## Postsecondary Oregon Traffic Light Report

### Oregon Community Colleges: Program Year 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical Skill Attainment</th>
<th>Academic Skill Attainment</th>
<th>Credential, Certificate, Degree Completion</th>
<th>Student Retention or Transfer</th>
<th>Student Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Target (SAP)</td>
<td>96.50%</td>
<td>92.75%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Level of Performance Target</td>
<td>86.85%</td>
<td>83.48%</td>
<td>50.40%</td>
<td>67.05%</td>
<td>69.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Statewide Performance</td>
<td>90.86%</td>
<td>89.98%</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
<td>87.90%</td>
<td>68.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>90.86</td>
<td>9352</td>
<td>10393</td>
<td>89.98</td>
<td>8805</td>
<td>14941</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>8020</td>
<td>9124</td>
<td>87.90</td>
<td>5004</td>
<td>5004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>4652</td>
<td>5054</td>
<td>92.05</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>7044</td>
<td>66.84</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td>5073</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>90.89</td>
<td>4539</td>
<td>5162</td>
<td>87.93</td>
<td>3979</td>
<td>7993</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>3443</td>
<td>3920</td>
<td>87.83</td>
<td>2318</td>
<td>2318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Gender</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93.89</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>88.44</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86.84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>93.92</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>61.64</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>80.27</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>90.28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91.75</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>87.48</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56.64</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>87.35</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>5941</td>
<td>6547</td>
<td>90.74</td>
<td>5866</td>
<td>9826</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>5128</td>
<td>5816</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>89.56</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>90.38</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>84.20</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals With Disabilities (ADA)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85.19</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>89.11</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>58.77</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>90.19</td>
<td>5079</td>
<td>5712</td>
<td>88.92</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>7716</td>
<td>60.46</td>
<td>4186</td>
<td>4749</td>
<td>88.14</td>
<td>2974</td>
<td>2974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>89.78</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>57.90</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>88.77</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontraditional Enrollees</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88.31</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>88.82</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>58.92</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>88.01</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Postsecondary Oregon Traffic Light Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical Skill Attainment</th>
<th>Academic Skill Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1P1</td>
<td>1P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Target (SAPL)</td>
<td>96.50%</td>
<td>92.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Level of Performance Target</td>
<td><strong>86.85%</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.48%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Statewide Performance</td>
<td>90.86%</td>
<td>89.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerator</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>9352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominator</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.98%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gender</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>4539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Gender</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>9352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominator</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.98%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>5941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>9352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominator</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.98%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE) PARTICIPATION EXPLORER

ANNUAL PARTICIPATION

COHORT PARTICIPATION

EQUITY EXPLORATION

DIRECTIONS
Select the school year, entity, agency (district, region/consortium, or state), student group, and learning area below to start exploring. The figures and tables will update based on your selections.

LEGEND: Highest participation category reached (at the end of the selected school year)
Student group
- Did not have an IEP in HS
- Had an IEP in HS

Percentage of CTE participants who were retained to concentrator status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All areas combined</th>
<th>Did not have an IEP in HS (+0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag, Food and Natural Resource Systems</td>
<td>Did not have an IEP in HS (+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Information and Communications</td>
<td>Did not have an IEP in HS (+10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>Did not have an IEP in HS (+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Did not have an IEP in HS (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Did not have an IEP in HS (+0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Engineering Systems</td>
<td>Did not have an IEP in HS (+0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of participants in cohort who concentrated

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80%
Oregon Data Resources

Postsecondary Perkins Traffic Light Reports
Secondary Perkins Reports
Oregon Secondary CTE Data Dashboard
CTE Data Landing Page
Oregon’s CTE Policy Guidebook
Data Literacy & Accountability - What’s Next?

- **Create a reporting system and Tableau report** for statewide performance on the college and career readiness measure.
- Track disaggregated data; **identify trends** in equitable access, participation, and outcomes for historically underserved students.
- Plan professional development targeted towards **identifying local continuous improvement goals**.
- **Gather input from CTE decision makers and stakeholders** to identify potential improvements in data accessibility and usefulness.
- Develop up-to-date and on-demand **resources related to data reporting**.
- Publish an **annual data reporting schedule**.
Questions?

Please enter your questions into the chat or use the hand-raise feature.
1. Click on the Jamboard link in the Chat.
2. Post a sticky-note (with your State name) in response to the question:

What practice, policy, or procedure shared today are you most excited about? How might you envision it positively impacting the CLNA development process in your State?

Click on the sticky note icon
Enter information and click “Save”
Session 2:
Using Labor Force Data
10/14/21 2-3:00pm ET