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## Executive Summary

This summary report is required by California *Education Code* Section 53076.2, as written, and established by Assembly Bill 130 (Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021). Within this document is a quantitative overview of the progress made by local educational agencies receiving Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) funds towards the three listed objectives in the aforementioned statute: the expansion and support of high-quality, industry-valued career technical education and workforce development opportunities; improving coordination and alignment with postsecondary educational institutions and workforce agencies and programs; and mitigating equity gaps in program access and pathway completion.

The quantitative data from the 2023 data collection period affirms the efficacy of career technical education (CTE) courses and pathway completion in direct relation to positive academic outcomes. Special student populations traditionally marginalized within public education are thriving in the enhanced learning environments afforded to them by CTE programming, and the CTEIG serves as an exemplar vehicle of effective public policy implementation, regional workforce development, and educational interventionism.

This report further validates the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) informed and longstanding contention – CTE courses augment pupil engagement, and pathway completion proliferates formidably higher attendance and graduation rates, observed across all disaggregated racial, gender, and CTEIG region subgroups.

This report is available on the CDE CTEIG web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/ig/cteigexecsummary.asp>. If you would like to request a copy or have any questions regarding this report, please contact Colby Franklin, Education Administrator I, Career and College Transition Division, at cfranklin@cde.ca.gov.

## Introduction

In 2015, the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) program was created as a state education, economic, and workforce development initiative with a sustaining purpose to encourage, maintain, and strengthen the delivery and administration of high-quality career technical education (CTE) programs by kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) local educational agencies (LEAs) in California. Five years removed from the loss of categorial CTE funds, and two years after the implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula, Assembly Bill (AB) 104 (Chapter 13, Statutes of 2015) created the CTEIG program as a three-year infusion of grant funds solely dedicated to CTE programs in California.

The CTEIG funds were distributed sequentially by grant year (2015–16 through 2017–18); and in 2018–19, the California State Legislature established the CTEIG program as an annual appropriation in the K–12 education trailer bill, AB 1808 (Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018). In addition to revising the CTEIG statutes[[1]](#footnote-1), AB 1808 (Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018) required the California Department of Education (CDE) to submit a five-year evaluative report regarding the progress made by LEAs receiving CTEIG funds with respect to all the following[[2]](#footnote-2):

* Expanding the availability, and supporting the ongoing provision, of high-quality, industry-valued career technical education and workforce development opportunities.
* Improving coordination and alignment with postsecondary educational institutions and workforce agencies and programs.
* Closing equity gaps in program access and completion, to the extent possible.

The compulsory and inalterable changes to CTE programming brought by the Coronavirus disease of 2019 (COVID-19), combined with dubious data modeling during early CTEIG years, inhibited the efficacy of conducting a comprehensive five-year analysis of CTE completer data. To present a quantifiable five-year longitudinal analysis as actionable information and assign causality to the correlations between the aforementioned areas of interest listed in subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 53076.2 and the data presented would be premature and impractical. The analysis in this report was derived exclusively from CTE completer data submitted in spring 2023 for the academic year (AY) 2021–22, because it is the most current and comprehensive AY, post COVID-19, of CTE data collected and analyzed by the CDE. This report primarily juxtaposes cohort, CTEIG, and non CTEIG attendance and graduation rates for CTE participants and pathway completers disaggregated by race, gender, and CTEIG region.

## Background

This CTEIG Five-Year Progress report contains three primary areas of analysis and discernment: (1) expansion and support of high-quality CTE, (2) alignment with post-secondary and workforce development entities, and (3) mitigate equity gaps in program access and completion. As previously stated,the availability of quantitative CTE data has historically been limited; however, the collection and analysis of CTE data has improved due in large part to the CDE staff within the Accountability, Measurements, and Research Division (AMARD). The starting point of any consistent CTE data collection was the 2021 data collection period of the AY 2019–20, and the CDE’s continuous refinement of its collection and analytical methodology is reflected in the 2021–22 AY CTE data featured in this report.

Between 2015 and 2018, the collection of CTE data was in its infancy and structured utilizing data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) to obtain limited CTE participation and completer information. A survey is used to obtain postsecondary data for CTE completers. Up until the 2021 data collection period (2019–20 AY), CTE data was collected through multiple methods and sources. Through the collaborative work of staff from the AMARD and Career and College Transition Division (CCTD), the CDE has established a single point of data collection for CTE in CALPADS, which not only allows the CDE to flag and track CTE data, but it also allows for future trend analysis of CTE programs. Moreover, with a matured collection process firmly established, the CDE operationalized an annual CTE data collection, analysis, and reporting timeline for federal and state reporting purposes, including the reporting of CTE data for succeeding annual and Five-Year Progress Reports.

### CTEIG Data Metrics Collection Cycle (Two Parts)

The current annual CTE data collection process includes a two-part collection cycle of CTEIG metrics[[3]](#footnote-3) for each CTE data year reported. This collection includes (1) Metrics 1–4 which are collected during the regular End of Year Submission for LEAs, and (2) Metrics 4–6 which are collected in the following spring of each year. To diminish the administrative burden of annually collecting CTE Completer data for separate federal and state programs, the CDE created the CTE Completer Postsecondary Status Survey template, which includes Metrics 5–6. Once all student-level data has been compiled by the LEA, the data is uploaded into their Student Information System and then exported into the CALPADS through the Postsecondary Status (PSTS) file.[[4]](#footnote-4) It is worth noting, the data submitted through the PSTS file is solely reliant on former grade twelve students voluntarily responding to a survey six months after exiting secondary school.[[5]](#footnote-5)

### Logic for use of the Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

Beginning with the 2021 data collection period, staff of the CCTD, in consultation with AMARD staff, decided to use the Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) as the basis of measurement to maintain consistency within the CTE data that needs to be reported to the U.S. Department of Education and state entities including the State Board of Education, California Workforce Pathways Joint Advisory Committee (CWPJAC), the Legislature, the Governor’s Office, and the Department of Finance, as appropriate. The ACGR was used to determine the universe size for the analysis of CTEIG data metrics contained in this report.

The data currently collected and used to calculate the Four-Year ACGR 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. The one exception contained in this report – Appendix G: 2021–22 AY CTE Dual Enrollment Percentage Table – was derived from previous analysis conducted using the College and Career Indicator (CCI), per CTEIG statutes.[[6]](#footnote-6) The CCI is calculated using the ACGR, and then filtered using additional criteria to identify “Prepared” and “Approaching Prepared” students within the ACGR.

The decision to utilize the ACGR, along with the implementation of the annual two-part CTE data collection process allows the CDE to present a full set of data each reporting year to the CWPJAC[[7]](#footnote-7) in the fall of the spring data collection period. Moreover, these strategic decisions, in concert with the CDE’s perpetual commitment to continuous improvement, ensures the future normalization and consistency in CTE data collection, reporting, and analysis across all state and federal programs.[[8]](#footnote-8)

## CTEIG Progress Report

The data metrics[[9]](#footnote-9) collected for the CTEIG were most recently updated in Senate Bill 75 (Chapter 51, Statutes of 2019); and intended to provide discernable and quantifiable assessments regarding the engagement, achievement, and transition of CTE students in grades seven through twelve and beyond. The quantitative evidence contained herein is the natural byproduct of intentional policy alignment between the CTEIG data metrics and the requisite components of this Five–Year Progress report – High–Quality CTE and workforce development; post-secondary and workforce agency alignment; and mitigating equity gaps to program access and completion.

To satisfy the reporting requirements of this report, the AMARD and CCTD staff at the CDE conducted quantitative and qualitative data analysis and compiled this summary CTE report using 2021–22 AY data including – CTE cohort, participant,[[10]](#footnote-10) dabbler, [[11]](#footnote-11) and completer[[12]](#footnote-12) counts; worked-based learning (WBL) counts; dual enrollment percentages; attendance and graduation rates – disaggregated by Cohort, CTEIG, Non-CTEIG, race, gender, and region, as available and appropriate. Complimentary to the quantitative evidence within this report, the LEAs highlighted in each section are exemplars of High-Quality CTE, post-secondary and workforce development alignment, and mitigation of equity gaps to program access and completion.

A cursory review of the data yields encouraging results pertaining to graduation and attendance rates among all disaggregated subgroups. The cohort was comprised of 497,495 students; 70 percent (341,636) completed at least one CTE course, and of those students, over 90 percent (310,660) were CTEIG students. In the 2021–22 AY cohort 95 percent of pathway completers and CTE students obtaining industry-recognized certifications were CTEIG students.

Graduation and attendance rates observed across disaggregated racial subgroups coalesced around a single summary conclusion – CTE participants and pathway completers rates were markedly higher than rates for students who refrained from CTE entirely. This overall point was indicative of virtually all aggregated and disaggregated subgroups, including, all gender identification.[[13]](#footnote-13) Regional CTEIG[[14]](#footnote-14) trends were similarly identified for both attendance[[15]](#footnote-15) and graduation.[[16]](#footnote-16)

## High-Quality Career Technical Education and Workforce Development

Sustainable and effective High-Quality CTE and workforce development programs must be specific to regional workforce demands and informed by business and community partnerships closely aligned with the surrounding community to prepare students with relevant and marketable skills as they transition into the workforce. Inherently, relevant skill attainment and career development are indelibly linked to the financial benefit of individuals and the requisite economic permanence compulsory to a prosperous and progressive California. An integral component of High-Quality CTE, WBL empowers students to leverage relevant technical, academic, and employability skills obtained in the classroom – inclusive of race, gender, ability, socioeconomic status, and specialized educational needs – with opportunities to prepare for careers, along with college.

Graduating from high school has been linked to several measures of economic mobility and security. Compared with people who dropped out of high school, graduates have higher wages, better physical health outcomes, engage in healthier behaviors, and are less likely to be unemployed.[[17]](#footnote-17) To these ends, the CTEIG data offers promising results for CTE pathway completers and high school graduates. The 2021–22 AY graduation rate for all student within the cohort was 87 percent; but when they completed at least one CTE course during their secondary career the graduation rate increased by 7 percent; and when they complete the CTE pathway the graduation rate rises to an impressive 99 percent.

The data supports the same conclusion among all disaggregated racial, gender, and CTEIG region subgroups, graduation rates consistently increase when students obtain CTE pathway completion. There is a dramatic increase in graduation rates within Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) populations; particularly, CTEIG pathway completers. By way of example, in the 2021–22 AY the graduation rates for non-CTEIG, non-CTE students for the identified subgroups – Native American and Alaskan Native, Black, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and two or more races – were 54.6, 51.4, 56.4, 64.8, and 64.0 percent, respectively.[[18]](#footnote-18) When compared to the cohort graduation rate of these same disaggregated racial subgroups, which range between lows 70’s and 80’s,[[19]](#footnote-19) the data confirms the remarkable potential of developing CTE as an intervention within these subgroups. Data from CTEIG LEAs, shows CTE completer graduation rates for the exact same disaggregated subgroups, and the impact of CTE programming is undeniably evident; the lowest graduation rate of BIPOC subgroups, Native American and Alaskan Native, was 97.4 percent. The stark contrast between non-CTE student graduation rates across BIPOC subgroups and the graduation rates of their pathway-completing counterparts[[20]](#footnote-20) in CTEIG LEAs – Native American and Alaskan Native increased by 33.9 percent; Black increased by 33.7 percent; Pacific Islander increased by 25.4 percent; Hispanic increased by 26.1 percent; and two or more Races increased by 25.4 percent – are an unqualified, definitive endorsement of CTE pathway completion and the CTEIG program.

This aligns with what you will see in the attendance rates regarding a clear distinction between CTE completers, and the more involved a student becomes in CTE, both the attendance and graduation rates are higher. These data points quantify student engagement and CTE as a predecessor to economic stability and long-term upward mobility for students from socio-economically challenged backgrounds and underrepresented communities.

### Coachella Valley Unified School District

All Coachella Valley Unified School District (CVUSD) students, beginning in grade seven, register for a California College Guidance Initiative [[21]](#footnote-21) account and are guided through lessons on how to use the self-assessments and explore links to learn about industry sectors, careers, and colleges offering majors related to the career. By the end of grade eight students work with counselors to create their four-year high school to be updated annually, and eventually include postsecondary plans. The CVUSD has done an excellent job combining this comprehensive strategy to career-focused academic planning with unique WBL opportunities with regional employers committed to training and retraining the regional workforce. By way of example, CVUSD has been partnering with five resorts in the Coachella Valley to provide paid internships, job shadowing and training, college tuition assistance, and full-time employment after they graduate at a property in the Coachella Valley, or sister property owned by one of the five resorts.

### Tehachapi Unified School District

The Tehachapi Unified School District (TUSD) has developed WBL, pre-apprenticeship, and intern opportunities; and conducts monthly industry panels for students to learn about local industries and network with professionals throughout the region. During the 2023–24 AY, TUSD students will have access to a variety of industry-specific and large-scale events where they will have the opportunity to explore their interests, learn about different careers, and network with professionals located in their region, in industries related directly to their career interests. TUSD has launched new on-campus WBL themed events this year; such job shadowing, resume building, internships, and career fair for graduating students. TUSD’s commitment to High-Quality CTE programs and regional workforce development continues to produce tangible, WBL opportunities and expose students to expert practitioners in their respective industries. This past summer, three TUSD engineering students were accepted to a week-long summer program offered by the National Test Pilot School (NTPS) in Mojave, CA. The NTPS is an internationally recognized test pilot school for training military and civilian aviation personnel – Flight Test Engineers (pilots).[[22]](#footnote-22)

## Alignment with Postsecondary Institutions and Workforce Agencies

Improving coordination and alignment with postsecondary educational institutions and workforce agencies and programs exposes a greater number of high school students to rigorous core curriculum, instilling in them the essential knowledge and skill required for success in their careers and post-secondary pursuits. Despite administrative and legal constraints, community college districts throughout California have become increasingly responsive to regional industry sector labor markets demands for skill-specific training by shifting from a transfer-centric model and incorporated an equilibrium of classroom and WBL education.

Workforce development agencies work to provide essential postsecondary training opportunities intended to address significant gaps in earnings and reduced career mobility. Alignment with postsecondary educational institutions and work agencies provided enhanced learning exposure, increasing student engagement, while expanding dual enrollment and skill attainment opportunities. The data analysis of the 2021–22 AY cohort was promising regarding CTE alignment with post-secondary institutions and workforce agencies. Over 90 percent of the CTE pathway completers enrolled in a state apprenticeship or another form of job training programs were CTEIG students, and 95.6 percent of pathway completers (87,881) who enrolled in post-secondary education were CTEIG students. Overall, 15.8 percent of students completed college coursework during the four-year cohort, whereas CTEIG pathway completers outperformed their cohort counterparts by 10.9 percent.[[23]](#footnote-23)

WBL remains a pillar of High-Quality CTE pathways; expectedly, the rate of pathway completers who were CTEIG students and completed WBL experiences was 93.6 percent. Postsecondary WBL data offers great potential for future longitudinal analysis; however, similar to issues with post-secondary data, the CDE’s analytical capacity remains limited until the interested parties[[24]](#footnote-24) can agree on a unique identifier to be used across all state government entities and bring the highly anticipated “Cradle-to-Career” data system to fruition.

### Apple Valley Unified School District

All CTE pathways in Apple Valley Unified School District (AVUSD) have at least one articulated course with Victor Valley Community College (VVCC). Secondary and post-secondary curriculum are fully aligned and teachers from both institutions meet and collaborate on a regular basis. The number of articulated credits earned each year has increased for the last several years. AVUSD hosts annual advisory meetings by industry sectors to review curriculum and instruction across all levels, review alignment needs as industry standards evolve, and maintain connections with industry professionals and local business partners. Regional advisory meetings with all regional K–12 and post-secondary institutions in each pathway are conducted regularly, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with VVCC is updated every two years.

### Eureka City School

The Eureka City Schools (ECS) has established an MOU for dual enrollment for several of their CTE classes with College of the Redwoods (CR). CTE teachers with students attending dual enrollment classes through CR, meet regularly with CR professors for curriculum alignment and assist students with pathway transitions. The CR and Eureka High have created an exciting new dual enrollment opportunity for their welding pathway with the CR professor joining them in the ECS classroom to teach alongside the Eureka High teacher. ECS will begin plans to align CTE courses offered at Eureka High with Cal Poly Humboldt University.

## Equity Gaps to Program Access and Completion

Mitigating equity gaps in program access and completion across all programs remains an operational imperative at the CDE and informs every single administrative and policy decision impacting the CTEIG. BIPOC, English learners, foster care, special education (SPED), and socio-economically disadvantaged students are confronted with far more complex challenges than their peers. Programs with target support services provide equitable educational journeys for all students to achieve their academic and professional goals. While teacher effectiveness remains the strongest determinant of academic success,[[25]](#footnote-25) attendance has also consistently been a powerful indicator of positive educational outcomes. The inextricable association between CTE programming and positive educational outcomes for traditionally marginalized student populations is invariably the result of the same by-product – CTE pathway completion.

Equitable program access and pathway completion are essential to the CTEIG program and the growth of High-Quality CTE in California. Equity in education aims to create a level playing field for all children by supporting those who need it most. Again, as evidenced and supported by a thorough analysis of the 2021–22 AY data, CTE pathways provide the greatest opportunity for the subgroups in greatest need of opportunity, namely, BIPOC populations. The attendance rate across the cohort of CTE completers was well above 90 percent, and nominally higher for CTEIG completers; however, non-CTE participants attendance rates across all BIPOC populations was 15 to 20 percent lower.[[26]](#footnote-26) Non-CTE student attendance rates at non-CTEIG LEAs, for the identified subgroups – Native American and Alaskan Native, Black, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and two or more races – were 73.6, 68.3, 78.6, 73.4, and 75.6 percent, respectively.[[27]](#footnote-27) When analyzing the exact same disaggregated racial subgroups at CTEIG LEAs a familiar pattern emerges; as CTE engagement rises and pathway completion increases, there is a subsequent and substantial increase in attendance and graduation rates.[[28]](#footnote-28)

### John Muir Charter School

The John Muir Charter School (JMCS) has implemented targeted strategies and supports to promote recruitment, retention, and success of special population students and teachers. The most recent enhancement to their CTE instructional program is the addition of instructional support staff in each of our CTE pathway programs. Students with special needs are fully supported to succeed; particularly, in the laboratory setting with additional instructional support. Made possible by the CTEIG, JMCS has dedicated CTE Coordinators implementing recruitment strategies to attract students from special populations and employer retention efforts. The JMCS’s use of CTE programming emphasizes special population students through equitable access and support.

JMCS has a youth campus created for the purpose of serving students who have yet to thrive in a traditional academic setting and belong to special populations. Over 95 percent of pupils on JMCS’s youth campus are socioeconomically disadvantaged and struggle with socio-emotional issues. Students often enroll in the school because they have learning disabilities, requiring special accommodation and additional academic support. Each JMCS student receives a Chromebook and mobile hotspots to access the internet, receive free meals, and the opportunity for dual enrollment classes at the postsecondary level. Additionally, JMCS provides students with full access to social services through Harmony at Home and the Monterey County Behavioral Health; and conducts student workshops with student access to services such as prenatal health education, parenting classes, along with healthcare and childcare services to facilitate parent and family engagement in the success of each JMCS student.

### Wheatland Union High School District

Wheatland Union High School District’s (WUHSD) has made considerable efforts to develop their CTE program with an emphasis on special education students and WBL opportunities. Each student enrolled in CTE courses has their schedule integrated within WUHSD’s buddy system program called the “Inclusive Peer Mentoring” program. All WUHSD students enrolled in a CTE pathway meet with counselors 1:1 to develop a career plan; and the general population students serve as a buddy to SPED students within the CTE class and pathway. WUHSD has strengthened its relationship with California Department of Rehabilitation resulting in 100 percent of students with Individualized Education Plans and 504s who are over 16 years of age obtaining WBL opportunities, job placement upon graduation, and support services to assist in their transition to post-secondary education. WBL opportunities within WUHSD are structured to ensure the standards progress in intensity as students navigate their chosen CTE pathways. They participate in workplace tours, virtual and in-person job shadowing, mentor programs, internships, and apprenticeships. The CTE teachers work to align each student’s 10-year plan with an appropriate WBL experience and CTE pathways with an obdurate resolve towards equal access and pathway completion for all students.

## Conclusion

Automation, innovation, and globalization continue to progressively evolve; and by extension, the milieu of work and employers’ mounting insistence for a highly educated and skilled California workforce. To this end, LEAs should pair technical programs with rigorous academic coursework to further prepare BIPOC, English learners, foster care, socio-economically disadvantaged, and SPED students for the accelerated academic rigor of college coursework, putting them on a trajectory towards professions affording them self-worth, dignity, and sustainable, prosperous careers.

This will require increased enrollment of special population students in upper-level courses and ensuring accountability systems are in place to avoid tracking students into reduced academic course work and career preparation. Sustaining equitable CTE programs requires LEAs to provide students with the support services needed to be academically successful, while simultaneously addressing equity gaps in access and completion amongst special student populations. As an economic imperative, the encouragement, maintenance, and strengthening[[29]](#footnote-29) of High-Quality CTE programs requires patience and resolve; but it is morally incumbent upon California to remain at the forefront of social and educational progress.

Future programmatic and analytical considerations for the CTEIG and the next Five-Year Progress Report may potentially include: the development of Geographic Information System mapping of CTE pathways offered throughout the state to access viability related to Regional Labor Market Reports; growth in youth apprenticeship programs through Governor Newsom’s Master Plan on Career Education;[[30]](#footnote-30) the potential expansion of dual enrollment in CTE pathways by promoting new CCAP partnerships; and the comprehensive integration of core curriculum into CTE pathways utilizing the Golden State Pathways Program as the statewide implementation model for California.

This report summarizes and further validates CTE programming as a harbinger of pupil engagement; moreover, observed attendance and graduation rates – irrespective of the disaggregated subgroups – invariably rose when students enrolled, and eventually completed their respective CTE pathways. Attendance as a key indicator significantly correlated with secondary graduation rates[[31]](#footnote-31) and CTE pathway completion remains laudable and inform workforce development policy discussions. The conclusions in this report further affirm the efficacy of CTE programs as an intangible component to student engagement; and the CTEIG as an exemplar of state workforce development and grant administration to the direct benefit student target populations traditionally marginalized within California’s public education system.

## Appendix A: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Cohort Attendance Rates by Race2021–22 AY Cohort Attendance Rates (All 4 years of cohort)

| Ethnicity | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) ParticipantsCohort Count | CTE Participants SingleCohort Count | CTE Participants 2 or more Cohort Count | CTE Completers Cohort Count | Non CTE Participants Attendance Rate | CTE Participants Single Attendance | CTE Participants 2 or more Attendance Rate | CTE Completers Attendance Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 852 | 552 | 798 | 378 | 72.8% | 82.5% | 86.0% | 93.2% |
| Asian | 18,589 | 14,337 | 16,099 | 11,662 | 93.4% | 95.5% | 95.7% | 97.1% |
| Black | 9,817 | 6,129 | 7,427 | 3,450 | 74.1% | 84.7% | 88.5% | 93.3% |
| Hispanic | 86,690 | 58,751 | 80,095 | 48,438 | 82.3% | 87.8% | 90.7% | 94.8% |
| Pacific Islander | 786 | 581 | 655 | 369 | 79.4% | 87.5% | 89.1% | 93.5% |
| White | 32,602 | 24,752 | 33,174 | 20,538 | 85.2% | 90.0% | 91.2% | 94.8% |
| Two or More Races | 6,973 | 4,739 | 5,666 | 3,046 | 83.3% | 88.9% | 90.8% | 95.0% |

## Appendix B: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) Attendance Rates by Race2021–22 AY Attendance Rates among CTEIG Local Educational Agencies (All 4 years of cohort)

| **Ethnicity** | **Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Count** | **CTE Participants Single Cohort Count** | **CTE Participants 2 or more Cohort Count** | **CTE Completers Cohort Count** | **Non CTE Participants Attendance Rate** | **CTE Participants Single Attendance Rate** | **CTE Participants 2 or more Attendance Rate** | **CTE Completers Attendance Rate** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **American Indian/Alaska Native** | 583 | 412 | 642 | 342 | 72.4% | 84.4% | 87.0% | 93.6% |
| **Asian** | 16,289 | 13,513 | 15,322 | 11,308 | 94.2% | 95.8% | 95.9% | 97.2% |
| **Black** | 6,63 | 5,189 | 6,672 | 3,266 | 76.5% | 86.9% | 89.4% | 93.7% |
| **Hispanic** | 64,139 | 51,431 | 72,684 | 46,490 | 83.5% | 89.3% | 91.3% | 94.9% |
| **Pacific Islander** | 653 | 525 | 610 | 357 | 80.7% | 88.4% | 89.5% | 93.6% |
| **White** | 25,005 | 21,342 | 29,462 | 19,295 | 87.4% | 91.5% | 92.2% | 95.1% |
| **Two or More Races** | 4,964 | 3,981 | 4,954 | 2,863 | 86.4% | 91.1% | 92.0% | 95.4% |

## Appendix C: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Non-Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) Attendance Rates by Race2021–22 AY Attendance Rates among Non–CTEIG Local Educational Agencies (All 4 years of cohort)

| Ethnicity | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Single Cohort Counts | CTE Participants 2 or more Cohort Counts | CTE Completers Cohort Counts | Non CTE Participants Attendance Rate | CTE Participants Single Attendance Rate | CTE Participants 2 or more Attendance Rate | CTE Completers Attendance Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 269 | 140 | 156 | 36 | 73.6% | 76.8% | 81.9% | 90.3% |
| Asian | 2,300 | 824 | 777 | 354 | 88.0% | 90.6% | 91.8% | 95.9% |
| Black | 2,854 | 940 | 755 | 184 | 68.3% | 72.5% | 80.0% | 86.5% |
| Hispanic | 22,551 | 7,320 | 7,411 | 1,948 | 78.6% | 77.7% | 84.8% | 90.6% |
| Pacific Islander | 133 | 56 | 45 | 12 | 73.4% | 78.5% | 83.2% | 88.9% |
| White | 7,597 | 3,410 | 3,712 | 1,243 | 77.8% | 80.7% | 83.4% | 89.5% |
| Two or More Races | 2,009 | 758 | 712 | 183 | 75.6% | 77.7% | 82.7% | 89.8% |

## Appendix D: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Cohort Graduation Rates by Race2021–22 AY Cohort Graduation Rates (All 4 years of cohort)

| Ethnicity | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Single Cohort Counts | Non CTE ParticipantsCohort Counts | CTE Completers Cohort Counts | Non CTE Participants Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Single Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Dabblers Graduation Rate | CTE Completers Graduation Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Native American/Alaska Native | 852 | 552 | 798 | 378 | 60.68% | 79.35% | 88.97% | 97.09% |
| Asian | 18,589 | 14,337 | 16,099 | 11,662 | 90.22% | 95.80% | 97.54% | 99.43% |
| Black | 9,817 | 6,129 | 7,427 | 3,450 | 60.96% | 80.54% | 91.23% | 97.77% |
| Hispanic | 86,690 | 58,751 | 80,095 | 48,438 | 70.56% | 83.87% | 92.29% | 98.44% |
| Pacific Islander | 786 | 581 | 655 | 369 | 70.61% | 87.44% | 91.91% | 98.37% |
| White | 32,602 | 24,752 | 33,174 | 20,538 | 81.46% | 90.51% | 94.71% | 98.75% |
| Two or More Races | 6,973 | 4,739 | 5,666 | 3,046 | 75.69% | 87.95% | 93.03% | 98.65% |

## Appendix E: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) Graduation Rates by Race2021–22 AY Graduation Rates among CTEIG Local Educational Agencies (All 4 years of cohort)

| Ethnicity | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Single Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Dabblers Cohort Counts | CTE Completers Cohort Counts | Non CTE Participants Graduation Rate  | CTE Participants Single Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Dabblers Graduation Rates | CTE Completers Graduation Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Native American/Alaska Native | 583 | 412 | 642 | 342 | 63.5% | 82.3% | 91.1% | 97.4% |
| Asian | 16,289 | 13,513 | 15,322 | 11,308 | 90.9% | 96.0% | 97.7% | 99.4% |
| Black | 6,963 | 5,189 | 6,672 | 3,266 | 64.9% | 84.7% | 92.6% | 98.2% |
| Hispanic | 64,139 | 51,431 | 72,684 | 46,490 | 72.6% | 86.4% | 93.4% | 98.7% |
| Pacific Islander | 653 | 525 | 610 | 357 | 73.5% | 89.7% | 92.6% | 98.9% |
| White | 25,005 | 21,342 | 29,462 | 19,295 | 84.4% | 92.0% | 95.4% | 98.9% |
| Two or More Races | 4,964 | 3,981 | 4,954 | 2,863 | 73.5% | 90.2% | 94.1% | 98.9% |

## Appendix F: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Non–Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) Graduation Rates by Race2021–22 AY Graduation Rates among Non–CTEIG students (All 4 years of cohort)

| Ethnicity | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Single Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Dabblers Cohort Counts | CTE Completers Cohort Counts | Non CTE Participants Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Single Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Dabblers Graduation Rate | CTE Completers Graduation Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Native American/Alaska Native | 269 | 140 | 156 | 36 | 54.6% | 70.7% | 80.1% | 94.4% |
| Asian | 2,300 | 824 | 777 | 354 | 85.2% | 92.1% | 93.8% | 98.9% |
| Black | 2,854 | 940 | 755 | 184 | 51.4% | 57.6% | 78.9% | 89.7% |
| Hispanic | 22,551 | 7,320 | 7,411 | 1,948 | 64.8% | 66.0% | 81.8% | 93.3% |
| Pacific Islander | 133 | 56 | 45 | 12 | 56.4% | 66.1% | 82.2% | 83.3% |
| White | 7,597 | 3,410 | 3,712 | 1,243 | 71.8% | 81.1% | 89.6% | 96.6% |
| Two or More Races | 2,009 | 758 | 712 | 183 | 64.0% | 76.0% | 85.8% | 94.5% |

## Appendix G: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Cohort Graduation Rates by Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) Region 2021–22 AY Cohort Graduation Rates by CTEIG Region (All 4 years of cohort)

| Regions | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Single Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Dabblers Cohort Counts | CTE Completers Cohort Counts | Non CTE Participants Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Single Graduation Rate | CTE Participants Dabblers Graduation Rate | CTE Completers Graduation Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region 1 | 2,334 | 1,720 | 3,876 | 1,774 | 57.9% | 81.0% | 92.4% | 97.8% |
| Region 2 | 10,868 | 7,212 | 11,760 | 6,553 | 73.4% | 85.8% | 92.7% | 99.1% |
| Region 3 | 33,869 | 20,649 | 22,225 | 13,341 | 71.3% | 89.0% | 94.6% | 98.7% |
| Region 4 | 16,083 | 13,576 | 23,165 | 17,579 | 69.6% | 81.0% | 91.4% | 98.5% |
| Region 5 | 4,542 | 5,435 | 10,134 | 5,854 | 72.5% | 86.1% | 94.3% | 98.9% |
| Region 6 | 53,637 | 36,047 | 42,062 | 23,864 | 77.5% | 88.5% | 94.0% | 98.7% |
| Region 7 | 34,976 | 25,202 | 30,692 | 18,916 | 78.0% | 87.0% | 93.3% | 98.4% |

## Appendix H: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Cohort Attendance Rates by Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) Region2021–22 AY Cohort Attendance Rates by CTEIG Region (All 4 years of cohort)

| Regions | Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Single Cohort Counts | CTE Participants Dabblers Cohort Counts | CTE Completers Cohort Counts | Non CTE Participants Attendance Rate | CTE Participants Single Attendance Rate | CTE Participants Dabblers Attendance Rate | CTE Completers Attendance Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region 1 | 2,334 | 1,720 | 3,876 | 1,774 | 67.2% | 81.7% | 87.3% | 92.7% |
| Region 2 | 10,868 | 7,212 | 11,760 | 6,553 | 82.0% | 87.7% | 91.1% | 95.4% |
| Region 3 | 33,869 | 20,649 | 22,225 | 13,341 | 80.2% | 90.7% | 92.8% | 95.4% |
| Region 4 | 16,083 | 13,576 | 23,165 | 17,579 | 82.0% | 87.0% | 90.1% | 94.8% |
| Region 5 | 4,542 | 5,435 | 10,134 | 5,854 | 85.2% | 89.7% | 92.2% | 95.6% |
| Region 6 | 53,637 | 36,047 | 42,062 | 23,864 | 86.7% | 90.6% | 92.2% | 95.5% |
| Region 7 | 34,976 | 25,202 | 30,692 | 18,916 | 84.5% | 87.9% | 89.8% | 94.3% |

## Appendix I: Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Regions by County – Key

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Regions | Counties |
| Region 1 | Butte, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity |
| Region 2 | Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Tuolumne, Yolo, and Yuba |
| Region 3 | Alameda, Contra Costa, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma |
| Region 4 | Alpine, Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare |
| Region 5 | Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura |
| Region 6 | Los Angeles, Orange |
| Region 7 | Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego |

## Appendix J: 2021–22 Academic Year (AY) Cohort Statewide Rates by Gender2021–22 AY Cohort Graduation and Attendance Rates (All 4 years)

| Participation Status | Female Cohort Counts | Male Cohort Counts | Nonbinary Cohort Counts | Female Attendance Rate | Male Attendance Rate | Nonbinary Attendance Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Non-Career Technical Education (CTE) Participants** | 81,957 | 74,161 | 191 | 81.0% | 67.8% | 71.2% |
| **CTE Participants Single** | 54,674 | 55,032 | 135 | 90.2% | 83.6% | 78.5% |
| **CTE Participants Dabblers** | 62,034 | 81,742 | 138 | 94.7% | 92.4% | 87.7% |
| **CTE Completers** | 42,559 | 45,282 | 40 | 98.9% | 98.3% | 92.5% |

| Participation Status | Female Cohort Counts | Male Cohort Counts | Nonbinary Cohort Counts | Female Attendance Rate | Male Attendance Rate | Nonbinary Attendance Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Non CTE Participants | 81,957 | 74,161 | 191 | 85.5% | 81.6% | 73.9% |
| CTE Participants Single | 54,674 | 55,032 | 135 | 89.7% | 88.7% | 81.3% |
| CTE Participants Dabblers | 62,034 | 81,742 | 138 | 91.0% | 91.5% | 85.6% |
| CTE Completers | 42,559 | 45,282 | 40 | 94.8% | 95.2% | 88.3% |
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