  

# California Workforce PathwaysJoint Advisory CommitteeMay 14, 2021Agenda Item 3

Posted by the California Department of Education

## Subject

Career Technical Education Data Report and Timeline in Meeting the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant and the Kindergarten through Grade Twelve Strong Workforce Program Data Metrics, Pursuant to California *Education Code* Sections 53071 and 88828.

## Type of Action

Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This agenda item presents the 2018–19 data metrics on Career Technical Education (CTE) participants and CTE completers across different state and federal-funded CTE programs. This agenda item also provides status updates on further data metrics for 2018–19, and the analyzing strategy deployed to ensure continuity of CTE data analysis and reporting requirements across all state and federal programs.

## Recommendation

This is an information item only; there is no recommendation at this time.

## Brief History of Key Issues

The Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) was originally established by the Budget Act of 2015 with a one-time investment of $900 million to cover a three-year span, and acted as a bridge for local educational agencies (LEAs) to support CTE programs until the Local Control Funding Formula was fully funded.

In the 2018 Budget Act, the CTEIG and the Kindergarten through Grade Twelve Strong Workforce Program (K–12 SWP) were each allocated $150 million in ongoing funds. An additional $13.5 million was provided to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) annually to establish technical assistance providers and workforce pathway coordinators in support of both state initiatives. The CTEIG and the K–12 SWP are administered by the CDE and the CCCCO, respectively.

The California Workforce Pathways Joint Advisory Committee (CWPJAC), per California *Education Code (EC)* sections 53071 and 88828, has the responsibility for making recommendations regarding the use of metrics for the CTEIG and the K–12 SWP to the Department of Finance, the Governor, and appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature regarding whether:

1. The data metrics remain the most appropriate metrics to measure and evaluate program outcomes for both new and renewal applicants.
2. Other metrics should be included.

These recommendations are due by November 30 each year.

The availability of CTE data has historically been restricted to course and program data, with some outcome data, but no follow up data once a CTE completer graduated from high school. Therefore, CTE data collection between 2015 and 2018 was sparse, and was based on a mixed approach that utilized data from California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) to obtain CTE participation and completer information, and a separate survey template to obtain post-high school follow up data for CTE completers. As a result, CTE data was limited when CTEIG was introduced in 2015, as well as when the K–12 SWP began in 2018. Hence, the starting point of any consistent CTE data collection, while far from ideal, was the 2020 data collection period (data collected a year in arrears) of the academic year (AY) 2018–19, and it is this data that is being used to create the data report (see below).

## The CTEIG and K–12 SWP Data Metrics Reporting Updates

### CTE Data Reports

The CWPJAC members requested that the CDE and CCCCO staff present quantitative and qualitative data regarding the implementation of the CTEIG and K–12 SWP. The CDE staff have compiled a summary CTE data report on the useable 2018–19 CTE data metrics for the CTEIG and the K–12 SWP programs, as well as the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V).

The following data reports will be presented:

### CTE participant[[1]](#footnote-1) and completer[[2]](#footnote-2) counts, graduation rate, and percentage of those meeting University of California (UC)/California State University (CSU) requirements broken out by CTEIG, K–12 SWP, and Perkins V grant recipients, where the grants are differentiated at the LEA level by the County-District-School (CDS) codes (Attachment 2).

### 2018–19 CTEIG and K–12 SWP (First Year Reporting) Data Metrics Reporting

During the January CWPJAC meeting, a cursory review of the 2018–19 data was provided and included the reporting for the number of pupils completing one CTE course (Indicator 1A) and the number of pupils who complete at least 300 hours of course sequence in an industry pathway, and the capstone course with a C- or better (Indicator 1B).

Attachment 1 provides the data metrics for the CTEIG and K–12 SWP Programs. This agenda item displays the data previously presented for Metric 1 in greater context, alongside the data for two of the four indicators for Metric 2. Specifically, for Metric 2, data are presented for an unduplicated aggregate count of pupils in the adjusted cohort for the graduating class, where an LEA has identified a pupil as having completed one CTE course during the four-year cohort period (Indicator 2A), and an unduplicated aggregate count of pupils in the adjusted cohort for the graduating class, where an LEA has identified a pupil as having completed at least one CTE pathway within the last four years (Indicator 2B). At the present time, the data for these indicators are the only data available for the 2018–19 AY cohort, given data integrity questions for the other metrics and related indicators that were collected through a separate survey, outside of CALPADS.

Based on the CTE Statewide Summary provided (Attachment 2), the 2018–19 AY’s statewide graduation rate increases from 84.4 percent to 96.5 percent when comparing all students to CTE completers, respectively. Moreover, the graduation rate increases approximately 20 percent when comparing non-CTE students to CTE completers. The observed increase in positive graduation rate outcomes for CTE completers compared to non-CTE students remains constant across all three primary CTE funding programs (CTEIG, K–12 SWP, and Perkins).

Below are preliminary percentages for the CTE participants and completers graduation rates (Indicators 2A and 2B), along with preliminary percentages of those graduates meeting UC/CSU requirements:

### Table 1. Preliminary Percentage Graduation Rate and Preliminary Percentage of Graduates Meeting UC/CSU Requirements

| **Student Population** | **Percentage Graduation Rate** | **Percentage of Graduates Meeting UC/CSU Requirements** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All Students in the Cohort** (all students including those who are in CTE and those who are not) | 84.4 | 50.5 |
| **CTEIG CTE Participants** | 88.0 | 46.1 |
| **CTEIG CTE Completers** | 97.0 | 51.8 |
| **K–12 SWP CTE Participants** | 87.0 | 47.3 |
| **K–12 SWP CTE Completers** | 96.6 | 53.1 |
| **Perkins CTE Participants**  | 88.9 | 46.6 |
| **Perkins CTE Completers**  | 97.1 | 52.1 |

The graduation rate percentages displayed above for Indicators 2A and 2B were used to determine the percentage of those graduates who met the UC/CSU requirements, and were derived from the same universal counts reported for Indicators 1A and 1B, as shown below:

### Table 2. Universal Counts Reported for Indicators 1A and 1B

| **Student Population** | **Number of Students** | **Number of Graduates** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All California Students in the Cohort** | 495,182 | 417,756 |
| **All California Non-CTE Students** | 126,233 | 93,921 |
| **All California CTE Participants** | 295,700 | 253,120 |
| **All California CTE Completers** | 73,249 | 70,715 |
| **CTEIG Non-CTE Students** | 100,662 | 76,769 |
| **CTEIG CTE Participants** | 264,358 | 232,592 |
| **CTEIG CTE Completers** | 70,722 | 68,592 |
| **K–12 SWP Non-CTE Students** | 70,378 | 53,286 |
| **K–12 SWP CTE Participants** | 181,454 | 157,902 |
| **K–12 SWP CTE Completers** | 45,880 | 44,310 |
| **Perkins Non-CTE Students** | 94,013 | 76,163 |
| **Perkins CTE Participants** | 259,811 | 231,001 |
| **Perkins CTE Completers** | 69,647 | 67,628 |

### Outstanding 2018–19 CTE Program Metrics 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 and Indicators 1C,1D, 2C, and 2D

To ensure efficiency and continuity across all reporting, we continue to strategize on how best to analyze Indicators 1C, 1D, 2C, and 2D. The CDE is currently working to consolidate the logic of these indicators into a single two-course measurement rather than re-defining the two-course component of these indicators for various data requests from multiple stakeholders. Below are the outstanding indicators from the 2018–19 AY requiring greater clarification:

**Metric 1:** The number of pupils completing CTE coursework.

* ***Indicator 1C:*** The number of pupils completing two CTE courses (March 2021).
* ***Indicator 1D:*** The number of pupils completing more than two CTE courses but does not reach a CTE Completer status as defined above during the four-year cohort period (March 2021).

**Metric 2*:*** The high school graduation rate.

* + ***Indicator 2C:*** An unduplicated aggregate count of pupils in the adjusted cohort for the graduating class, where the LEA has identified the pupil as having completed two CTE courses during the four-year cohort period (May 2021).
	+ ***Indicator 2D:*** An unduplicated aggregate count of pupils in the adjusted cohort for the graduating class, where the LEA has identified the pupil as having completed more than two CTE courses but does not reach a CTE Completer status as defined above during the four-year cohort period (May 2021).

Defining “two CTE courses” in the context of these indicators has significant implications as to what exactly is to be analyzed in the 2021 (2019–20 AY) data collection. Specifically, the CDE can present the data in a general way, meaning the completion of any “two CTE courses.” This analysis is fairly straightforward and Metrics 1C, 1D, 2C, and 2D can be provided for the 2018–19 AY and future years.

Data to populate Metrics 3–6 and their corresponding indicators are currently unavailable for the 2018–19 AY. The CDE anticipates being able to present Metrics
4–6 from the 2018–19 AY during the September 2021 CWPJAC meeting, and will continue to provide the CWPJAC with updates as to if, and when, more data are available. Further consideration and discussion of these metrics is needed to appropriately analyze the data; specifically, Indicators 3A and 3B of Metric 3 relate to the Smarter Balanced Grade 11 English Language Arts and Mathematics assessment results. See **Metric 3** – The number of pupils meeting academic and career-readiness standards as defined in the CCI associated with the California School Dashboard – broken down into four indicators below:

* + ***Indicator 3A:*** The number of pupils meeting a score of Level 2 “Standard Nearly Met” on the Smarter Balanced Grade 11 English Language Arts assessment.
	+ ***Indicator 3B:*** The number of pupils meeting a score of Level 2 “Standard Nearly Met” on the Smarter Balanced Grade 11 Mathematics assessment.
	+ ***Indicator 3C:*** The number of CTE Completers as defined in the CCI associated with the California School Dashboard.
	+ ***Indicator 3D:*** The number of pupils completing college coursework as defined in the CCI associated with the California School Dashboard.

The first immediate question to be resolved is whether we should only include the number of pupils meeting a score of Level 2 “Standards Nearly Met,” or if we should include Level 1 “Standards Not Met,” Level 3 “Standards Met,” and Level 4 “Standards Exceeded” when analyzing Indicators 3A and 3B. Secondly, Indicators 3C and 3D can be provided with the caveat that the CCI number of CTE Completer totals will not align with the same 4 Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) cohort as the other CTEIG and K–12 SWP metrics. The decisions made in relation to the outstanding indicators (1C, 1D, 2C, and 2D), along with the entirety of Metric 3, must be made prior to finalizing the 2018–19 AY data, and will inform how these metrics are interpreted and analyzed for reporting of CTE data in future years, beginning with the 2019–20 CTE data collection to be reported in Summer 2022.

### Logic for use of the 4 Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

The Career and College Transition Division (CCTD), in consultation with the Analysis, Measurement, and Accountability Reporting Division (AMARD), have decided to use the 4 Year ACGR as the basis of measurement to keep consistency within the CTE data that needs to be reported to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) and state entities including the CWPJAC, the Legislature, and the Department of Finance. The data currently collected and used to calculate the Four-Year Adjusted cohort is based on the number of students who enter grade nine for the first time, adjusted by adding into the cohort any student who transfers in later during grade nine, or during the next three years, and subtracting any student from the cohort who transfers out, emigrates to another country, transfers to a prison or juvenile facility, or dies during that same period. In other words, the CTE participant and CTE completer is a student completing one or more courses flagged with either a CTE pathway or industry sector, within the four-year cohort period. The 2018–19 cohort includes AYs 2015–16, 2016–17, 2017–18 and 2018–19. The use of the ACGR will not yield an exact comparison to the College/Career Indicator (CCI) because the methodology used to calculate the CCI begins with the ACGR and then filters out student level data and is modified to produce the CCI metrics, so it is not a purely ACGR calculation. The primary reason for using the Four-Year ACGR as the basis of measurement is to ensure consistency across all CTE data analysis for meeting federal and state reporting requirements. CTE participants in grades seven through eight (7–8) are currently excluded from using the Four-Year ACGR, as students in grades 7–8 may participate in both the CTEIG and K–12 SWP.

Staff from the CDE’s AMARD and the Educational Data Management Division (EDMD) will participate in the presentation for this item. Included within that discussion will be information about the progress CCTD is having with the AMARD and EDMD regarding the systematic collection of CTE data. Also, it’s important to consider how the CTE data collection effort links up to the broader CDE present and future data collection and analysis, particularly as it relates to the CCI and how that differs from the Four-Year ACGR approach used with the rest of the CTEIG and K–12 program data analysis.

### CTE Data Analysis of the 2019–20 Academic Year (Spring 2021 Data Collection)

Up until the 2021 data collection period of the 2019–20 AY, the CDE collected CTE data through multiple methods and sources. Through the collaborative work of the AMARD and CCTD, the CDE now has established a single point of data collection for CTE in CALPADS, which will not only allow CDE to flag and track the CTE data, but it will also allow for future trend analysis of CTE. As such, the CDE will work with an annual CTE data collection and reporting timeline for federal and state reporting purposes, including the reporting of CTE data for the CTEIG and the K–12 SWP.

This annual CTE data collection process includes a two-part collection cycle for each CTE data year reported. This collection includes (1) CTEIG and K–12 SWP Metrics 1–4 which will be collected during the regular End of Year Submission for LEAs (beginning in late August 2021), and (2) CTEIG and K–12 SWP Metrics 5–6 which will be collected the following Spring (beginning in March 2022) of each year. The table below provides an approximate updated schedule of when the two components are reported and how the timing of their reporting informs the anticipated reporting date to the CWPJAC:

### Table 3: Data Timeline

| **CTE Data Reporting by Academic Year** | **CTEIG and K–12 SWP Metrics 1–4 Collected** | **CTEIG and K–12 SWP Metrics 5–6 Collected** | **Anticipated Reporting Date to the CWPJAC** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2018–2019 | August 2019 | March 2020 | Fall 2021 |
| 2019–2020 | August 2020 | March 2021 | Summer 2022 |
| 2020–2021 | August 2021 | March 2022 | Summer 2023 |
| 2021–2022 | August 2022 | March 2023 | Summer 2024 |

The annual data collection process allows the CDE to present a full set of data for each reporting year to the CWPJAC in the Fall following the Spring data collection period, rather than providing various pieces of CTE data throughout the year. This will ensure the normalization and consistency in reporting across all state and federal programs, while allowing for an annual review and analysis of the compound metrics and indicators reported to the CDE. The data reported is always one AY in arrears, and it takes another full year to compile and analyze the data for presentation to the CWPJAC in order to provide a full account of all data metrics together.

Using the current analysis of the 2018–19 AY CTE data collection and related discussions of the metrics and indicators as a starting point, the CDE has begun to refine the data analysis and reporting calendar for the presentation of these metrics for 2019–20 and for future years. As these metrics and indicators become more clearly defined, the CDE will provide an updated timetable for delivery of the data analysis to the CWPJAC. Therefore, as discussions remain ongoing, once the indicators for each metric have been solidified, the CDE program, data, and accountability offices will begin to organize and analyze the data metrics of the 2019–20 CTE AY for presentation to the CWPJAC in Summer 2022.

## Summary of Previous CWPJAC Discussion(s) and Action(s)

**January 29, 2021:** The CDE presented a plan of action for collecting, reporting, and analyzing CTE data programs. Additionally, data was presented on CTE participants and CTE completers across different state and federal-funded CTE programs.

**November 20, 2020:** The CDE presented updates on the FY 2020–21 CTEIG funding allocations, the FY 2020–21 K–12 SWP application process, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) data sharing agreement between the CDE and CCCCO. Staff recommended that there be no change to the data metrics for both the CTEIG and K–12 SWP, and that a phased approach be used to operationalize the data metrics.

**September 25, 2020:** The CDE presented an update to the CTEIG application, and the CCCCO provided an update on the status of the K–12 SWP application process. Staff presented summary data reports, a status report of the CTEIG and the K–12 SWP Data MOU, and recommended revisions to the CTEIG and the K–12 SWP Matrix of Metrics.

**January 31, 2020:** The CWPJAC reviewed an updated Matrix of Metrics, an overview of both the CTEIG and K–12 SWP FY 2019–20 grant processes, and the 2018–19 CTE Postsecondary Status of CTE Completers Survey Template.

**November 7, 2019:** The CWPJAC approved the Matrix of Metrics revisions which incorporated the requirements of Perkins V language.

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

Funding available to eligible recipients under the CTEIG is $150 million for the program year (PY) 2020–21, and funding available under the K–12 SWP is $150 million for PY 2020–21 for eligible recipients. In addition, $13.5 million is provided to support eight K–14 Technical Assistance Providers and 72 workforce pathway coordinators to support for both CTEIG and K–12 SWP initiatives.

In 2018–19 the Perkins IV allocation was $120,196,084; for 2019–20 the Perkins V allocation was $127,058,834; and for 2020–21 the Perkins V allocation is $128,798,161.

## Attachment(s)

# Attachment 1: Career Technical Education Incentive Grant and Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve Strong Workforce Program Data Metrics as Presented During the January California Workforce Pathways Joint Advisory Committee Meeting (3 pages)

# Attachment 2: Four-Year Cohort Statewide Career Technical Education Summary for 2018–19 (1 page)

1. A secondary student that enrolls and completes at least one CTE course. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A CTE student who completes at least 300 hours of course sequence in an industry pathway, and the sequence includes the capstone course; and the CTE student receives a grade of C- or better in the capstone course. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)