Understanding Your Performance Indicator Reports

Bureau of Career Development
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What are Performance Indicators?

- Eight (8) of these indicators are at the secondary level.
- PIs were established “to assess the effectiveness of the state in achieving statewide progress in (career) and technical education, and to optimize the return of investment of Federal funds in (career) and technical education activities...”
- States negotiate annual performance goals with the Office of Career Technical and Adult Education (OCTAE)
- Local recipients negotiate annual performance goals with the state.
The Elite Eight
Secondary Performance Indicators

- 1S1: Academic Attainment in Reading/Language Arts
- 1S2: Academic Attainment in Mathematics
- 2S1: Technical Skill Attainment
- 3S1: School Completion
- 4S1: Graduation Rate
- 5S1: Placement
- 6S1: Nontraditional Participation
- 6S2: Nontraditional Program Completion
Definitions and Populations

- Performance is expressed through the outcomes of a specific population as defined by a numerator and denominator.
- Most (but not all) of NH’s PIs are focused on 12th grade CTE students who are concentrators in their primary program and who left secondary education at the end of the reporting year.
- PIs 1S1, 1S2, 3S1, and 4S1 focus on this population.
- 5S1 focuses on program completers, not just concentrators.
- 2S1, 6S1 and 6S2 do not take grade level into account, and 6S1 does not require concentrator status.
Unpacking the Report
(Or, “How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Charts”)

“Here are your data. Have fun!”

2013-2014 Center-Level Perkins Performance Indicators

28000 Awesome Career Technical Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI 151</th>
<th>Academic Attainment - Reading/Language Arts</th>
<th>Local Goal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Local Goal</th>
<th>Local Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>470604 Automotive Mechanics Technician</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-1.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460201 Building/Construction Trades</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-35.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120500 Cooking and Related Culinary Arts, General</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120401 Cosmetology</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.72%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-7.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121110 Early Childhood Education and Teaching</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240101 Engineering, General</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.19%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>13.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460599 Plumbing and Water Supply Services, Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Totals: 221 133 59.72% 58.00% 1.72%

Based on these results, does my center need to submit a targeted improvement plan for this indicator? **90% of Local Goal**

**NO, a Targeted improvement Plan IS NOT Required**
Unpacking the Report
(continued)

₀ The universal reaction:
Unpacking the Report
(continued)

0 Take a deep breath. Relax. Things aren’t as scary as they seem.
### Unpacking the Report

#### The Basics

**Report Title:** Center-Level Perkins Performance Indicators

**School Year:** 2013-2014

**CTE Center Name:** 28000 Awesome Career Technical Center

**CTE Center School ID:** 28000

**PI Code:** 151

**PI Name:** Academic Attainment - Reading/Language Arts

**Numerator:**
- Automotive Mechanics Technician: 6/3, 55.56% proficient
- Building/Construction Trades: 3, 22.22% proficient
- General (not specified): 35, 50.72% proficient
- Early Childhood Education and Teaching: 21, 78.19% proficient
- Engineering, General: 13, 61.54% proficient

**Denominator:**
- Total Assessed: 221
- Total Proficient: 132
- Percent Proficient: 59.73%
- Local Goal: 58.00%
- +/- Local Goal: 1.73%

**Approved Program Titles:**
- Cosmetology
- Early Childhood Education and Teaching
- Engineering, General
- Plumbing and Water Supply Services, Other

**Approved Program CIP Codes:**
- 470604 Automotive Mechanics Technician
- 460201 Building/Construction Trades
- 120500 Cooking, General
- 120401 Cosmetology
- 131210 Early Childhood Education and Teaching
- 140101 Engineering, General
- 460599 Plumbing and Water Supply Services, Other

**Local Performance Goal:**
- 58.00%
- -35.78%
- -7.28%
- 20.26%
Unpacking the Report
The Numbers

2013-2014 Center-Level Perkins Performance Indicators

28000 Awesome Career Technical Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Academic Attainment - Reading/Language Arts</th>
<th>Total Assess'd</th>
<th>Total Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Local Goal</th>
<th>+/- Local Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-35.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Totals: 221 132 59.73% 58.00% 1.73%

By what percentage the PROGRAM met, exceeded, or failed to meet the local performance goal

By what percentage the CENTER met, exceeded, or failed to meet the local performance goal
Unpacking the Report

The Colorful Text

Font Key:
- **Bold Purple** - Actual outcome falls below goal, but is within 90% of the goal.
- **Bold Red** - Actual outcome is below goal and falls outside the 90% threshold.
- **Purple Italics** - The % below goal if the outcome is still within 90% of the goal.
- **Red Italics** - The % below goal if the outcome falls outside 90% of the goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Academic Attainment - Reading/Language Arts</th>
<th>Total Assess'd</th>
<th>Total Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Local Goal</th>
<th>+/- Local Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Automotive Mechanics Technician</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460204</td>
<td>Building/Construction Trades</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-35.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120500</td>
<td>Cooking and Related Culinary Arts, General</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120401</td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50.72%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131210</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education and Teaching</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140101</td>
<td>Engineering, General</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>18.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460599</td>
<td>Plumbing and Water Supply Services, Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Totals:**
- Total Assess'd: 221
- Total Proficient: 132
- Percent Proficient: 59.73%
- Local Goal: 58.00%
- +/- Local Goal: 1.73%
Unpacking the Report

Targeted Improvement: Yes or No?

“If an eligible recipient fails to meet at least 90% of an agreed upon local adjusted level of performance for any of the core indicators of performance, the eligible recipient shall develop and implement a program improvement plan.”

The need for an improvement plan is based on **OVERALL** center performance on an indicator, not on a program by program basis.

However, centers may use their **program** level performance to inform which programs require improvement.

---

1 Perkins Act of 2006, Section 113(b)(4)
Unpacking the Report

**Targeted Improvement: Yes or No?**

- **Actual performance is BELOW 90% of local goal (performance is in red font)**
  - Local Totals: 221 63
  - 90% of Local Goal: 28.80%
  - +/- 90% of Goal = -0.29%
  - YES, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS Required

- **Actual performance is WITHIN 90% of local goal (performance is in purple font)**
  - Local Totals: 119 65
  - 90% of Local Goal: 49.50%
  - +/- 90% of Goal = 5.12%
  - NO, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS NOT Required

- **Actual performance EXCEEDS the local goal (performance is in black font)**
  - Local Totals: 221 132
  - 90% of Local Goal: 52.20%
  - +/- 90% of Goal = 7.53%
  - NO, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS NOT Required
Unpacking the Report

Targeted Improvement: What About Pink?

- Only applies to 2S1 (“Technical Skill Attainment”)
  - “One or more of your center's programs with concentrators had an approved Precision Exams assessment available, but no students were assessed. These programs are highlighted in bold blue font in the program list ... If a Precision Exams assessment is available, and no other approved assessment is used, the center must use the identified Precision Exams assessment OR identify a more fitting Precision Exams assessment. Please provide a TIP discussing how your center will ensure data are collected for these programs beginning in the current school year.”

- Doesn’t require a full targeted improvement plan
The Special Populations portion of the report generates by far the most questions.

“How can I have 100% black students AND 100% white students AND 100% Hispanic students in this program? That’s 300%, not counting the 50% Asian students! Is my program full of clones?”

Short answer: No (unless you’ve got a really advanced Biotechnology program...)
Unpacking the Report

The Special Populations Section

- For student privacy, the special populations section of each report doesn’t indicate the percent of students in a program who are members of a particular special population.

- Rather, the special populations numbers indicate the percent of students in a specific population who met the PI definition and are included in the numerator.

- In other words, “100% black students, 100% white students, 100% Hispanic students, and 50% Asian students” means that all black, white and Hispanic students (however many there are) enrolled in that program who satisfied the PI definition were in the numerator, while of the Asian students, only 50% (of whatever number there are) satisfied the PI definition and were included in the numerator.
### Unpacking the Report

The Special Populations Section: Program Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Special Population Students Proficient in Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No Enr&quot; = No students in the associated special population were enrolled in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 27.12% of male students in this program who satisfied the PI definition were proficient in Math.
- 50% of female students were proficient in Math.
- No Native American, Pacific Islander, or Asian students were enrolled in this program.
- 29.51% of white students were proficient in Math.
- 20% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient in Math.
- 50% of nontraditional students were proficient in Math.
- 0.00% of black or Hispanic students were proficient in Math.
- 15.79% of students with IEPs were proficient in Math.
- 0.00% of Limited English Proficiency students were proficient in Math.
Unpacking the Report

The Special Populations Section: Center Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Special Population Students Proficient in Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No Enr&quot; = No students in the associated special population were enrolled in the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.12%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
<td>No Enr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 33.33% of the center’s male students who met the PI definition were proficient in Math.

66.67% of Asian students were proficient in Math.

29.85% of white students were proficient in Math.

21.88% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient in Math.

44.44% of nontraditional students were proficient in Math.

23.64% of female students were proficient in Math.

0.0% of black students were proficient in Math.

16.67% of students with IEPs were proficient in Math.

33.33% of Limited English Proficiency students were proficient in Math.

8.33% of Hispanic students were proficient in Math.
Unpacking the Report

The Special Populations Section: For Example

"My Automotive Maintenance program’s Special Populations section on the Academic Attainment in Reading report (1S1) says there are 50% Males, 66.67% Females, 43% white students, 50% black students, and 16.2% students with IEPs."

This means:

- 50% of the males in Automotive Maintenance who met the PI definition were proficient in Reading.
- 66.67% of the females in Auto Maintenance who met the PI definition were proficient in Reading.
- 43% of white students and 50% of black students in Auto Maintenance who met the PI definition were proficient in Reading.
- 16.2% of IEP students in Auto Maintenance who met the PI definition were proficient in Reading.
Unpacking the Report

The Special Populations Section: For Example

- **This is where it’s important to know and understand the demographic makeup of your programs.**
- **50% of males were proficient in Reading.** How many males do you typically have in your Auto Mechanics program? Forty? Or four? That 50% could represent two students out of four, in which case it’s not very useful. But if it represents twenty out of forty, you know it’s an issue.
- **66.67% of females were proficient in Reading.** Again, how many females do you typically have in your Auto Mechanics program? Thirty or three? That 66.67% could represent two students out of three, or could represent twenty out of thirty. The former would change wildly based on a single student’s performance and thus isn’t very informative, but the latter would indicate that a solid 2/3 of your female students have a proficient grasp of Language Arts.
Unpacking the Report

Enrollment Reports

- There are two types of Enrollment reports: *Primary Program Enrollments*, and *Total Enrollments*.
  - “Total Enrollments” are a newer series of reports available as of 2014-2015.
- The *Primary Program* enrollment reports count STUDENTS.
  - Each student is counted only ONCE per category (Participant, Concentrator, Completer), in his/her primary program.
- The *Total Enrollment* reports count ENROLLMENTS.
  - Each student may be counted multiple times per category, once for each program in which the student was a Participant, Concentrator, or Completer.
- The *Primary Program* reports provide UNDUPLICATED student counts. The *Total Enrollment* reports provide DUPLICATED student counts.
- A student’s *primary program* is loosely defined as that program which the student is most likely to complete.
- Each center has its own method for determining the primary program of a student enrolled in more than one program.
  - EXAMPLE: Student survey; Program application; etc.
Unpacking the Report

How Enrollment Reports differ from PI Reports

- Enrollment reports are comprised of whole numbers, not percentages.
- Special populations, too, are expressed in whole numbers.
- Students are counted regardless of grade level.
- There are no goals and no targeted improvement plan requirements.
Unpacking the Report

Participants, Concentrators, Completers

- There are six Enrollment reports:
  - Participants by Primary Program
  - Concentrators by Primary Program
  - Program Completers by Primary Program
  - Total Participant Enrollments
  - Total Concentrator Enrollments
  - Total Program Completer Enrollments

- A student enrolled in a CTE program is a participant.
- All concentrators and completers are also participants.
- All completers are also concentrators.
- You should expect to see more students in the Participant reports than the associated Concentrator report, and potentially more in the Concentrator report than the associated Completer report.
Common Questions
3S1 vs. 4S1: What’s the Difference?

“What is the difference between 3S1 (School Completion) and 4S1 (Graduation Rate)?”

3S1 is a relatively basic calculation that looks at the number of senior CTE concentrators who received a diploma, a GED, or another credential in lieu of a diploma (such as a certificate of completion awarded to students aging out of special education).

4S1 is formula driven and is derived from the state’s overall computation of graduation rate “as described in Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.”

Graduation Rate is calculated using cohorts. School Completion is not.
Common Questions
School Completer vs. School Leaver: What’s the difference?

0 A secondary **school completer** is a student who received a diploma or some other accepted credential (such as a certificate of completion or GED).

  0 Diploma recipients are the most common school completer type. “They can be thought of as students who meet or exceed the coursework and performance standards for high school completion established by the state or other relevant authorities.”

  1 Students who receive some other credential in lieu of a diploma generally satisfy requirements that differ from those needed for a diploma but are sufficient to complete secondary education.

0 A secondary **school leaver** may be a school completer, but may also be a student who did not graduate, did not receive a GED, and did not receive another eligible credential.

  0 In addition to school completers, a school leaver may be a dropout, a student who moved out of state, a student who transferred to a private school, a foreign exchange student who returned to his or her home country, etc.

1 [https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/dropout00-01/#5](https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/dropout00-01/#5)
Common Questions
Special Populations vs. Special Education: What’s the difference?

- Special education students are only one of the special populations identified by Perkins IV.
- Perkins IV defines **six** specific special populations:
  - Economically Disadvantaged students, including foster children
  - Limited English Proficiency
  - Students with disabilities
  - Single Parents, including single pregnant teens
  - Displaced Homemakers
    - *At the secondary level, displaced homemakers are extremely rare.*
  - Nontraditional students
- Data driven activities and initiatives designed to improve access or outcomes for special populations should be considered for each of these groups.
Conclusion

Melissa Gilman
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