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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

| PI       | Academic Attainment | Reading/Language Arts | Math | Science | Social Studies | Writing | Grad Rate |</table>

| 470504 Automotive Mechanics Technician | 69 | 35 | 55.56% | 58.00% | -2.44% | 52.54% | 100.00% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| 460201 Building/Construction Trades | 9 | 2 | 22.22% | 58.00% | -35.78% | 22.22% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| 120500 Cooking and Related Culinary Arts, General | 23 | 18 | 78.26% | 58.00% | 20.26% | 55.56% | 92.86% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | 100.00% | 77.27% | 68.67% | 83.33% | 92.86% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| 120401 Cosmetology | 69 | 35 | 50.72% | 58.00% | -7.28% | No Enr | 50.72% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | 33.33% | 57.50% | 57.63% | 100.00% | 17.65% | 42.86% | 16.67% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| 132110 Early Childhood Education and Teaching | 23 | 18 | 78.26% | 58.00% | 20.26% | No Enr | 78.26% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | 100.00% | 76.19% | 50.00% | 77.78% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| 240101 Engineering, General | 21 | 16 | 76.19% | 58.00% | 18.12% | 76.19% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | 33.33% | 57.63% | 100.00% | 80.00% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| 460559 Plumbing and Water Supply Services, Other | 13 | 8 | 61.54% | 58.00% | 3.54% | 61.54% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |
| **Local Totals:** | 223 | 132 | 59.73% | 58.00% | 1.73% | 55.56% | 63.64% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | 33.33% | 25.00% | 50.00% | 61.19% | 100.00% | 22.22% | 51.56% | 41.67% | 98.44% | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr | No Enr |

**Font Key:**
- Bold - Above goal
- Italic - Below goal
- Underline - Improvement needed

**Legend:**
- Red Bars - The red bar indicates that the goal is substantially below 90% of the goal.
- Green Bars - The green bar indicates that the goal is substantially above 90% of the goal.

**Notes:**
- If an eligible recipient fails to meet at least 90% of an indicator, the local education agency is required to develop and implement an improvement plan. (Perkins Act of 2006, Section 113(b)(4))

---

Based on these results, does my center need to submit a targeted improvement plan for this indicator? **NO, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS NOT Required**
Unpacking the Report (continued)

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

**School Year**: 2013-2014

**Center-Level Perkins Performance Indicators**

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

**PI Code**: 151

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

**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**

- **Denominator**: 221
- **Numerator**: 132
- **Local Totals**: 59.73% 58.00% 1.73%

**Local Performance Goal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Title</th>
<th>Total Assessed</th>
<th>Total Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Local Goal</th>
<th>+/- Local Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Mechanics Technician</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Construction Trades</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking/General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education and Teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>10.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, General</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>10.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
### 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>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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%

**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**

---

- Students per program who satisfy the DENOMINATOR definition
- Students per program who satisfy the NUMERATOR definition
- Percent of students per program who satisfy the PI definition ($\frac{\text{Numerator}}{\text{Denominator}}$)
## Unpacking the Report

### The Colorful Text

<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>151 Automotive Mechanics Technician</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>-2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460204</td>
<td>460204 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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120401</td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>221</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59.73%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.” ¹

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?

**Local Totals:**

- **90% of Local Goal**:
  - **Actual performance is EXCEEDS the local goal (performance is in black font)**
  - **90% of Local Goal**
  - **(+/- 90% of Goal)**
  - **59.73%**
  - **58.00%**
  - **1.73%**
  - **NO, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS NOT Required**

- **Actual performance is WITHIN 90% of local goal (performance is in purple font)**
  - **54.62%**
  - **55.00%**
  - **-0.38%**
  - **NO, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS NOT Required**

- **Actual performance is BELOW 90% of local goal (performance is in red font)**
  - **28.51%**
  - **32.00%**
  - **-3.49%**
  - **YES, a Targeted Improvement Plan IS Required**

Based on these results, does my center need to submit a targeted improvement plan for this indicator?
Unpacking the Report

The Special Populations Section

- 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

0 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.

0 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.

0 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

Percent of Special Population Students Proficient in Mathematics

"No En" = No students in the associated special population were enrolled in the program.

|----------------|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----|----------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| 27.12% of male students in this program who satisfied the PI definition were proficient in Math.
| 50.00% 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.
| 0.00% of black or Hispanic students were proficient in Math.
| 15.79% of students with IEPs were proficient in Math.
| 50.00% of Limited English Proficiency students were proficient in Math.
| Nontraditional student proficiency should match the proficiency of the program's nontraditional gender. In this case, females.
### 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 En&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 En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
<td>No En</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No En  | 18.64% | No En  | No En  | No En | 0.00% | 12.50%| 21.05%| 0.00%       | 5.83%    | 14.29%        | 0.00%| No En    | No En      | No En         | No En   |
| No En  | 21.74% | No En  | No En  | No En | No En | No En | 23.81%| No En       | 0.00%    | 11.11%        | No En| No En    | No En      | No En         | No En   |

| 66.67% | No En  | No En  | No En  | 66.67%| No En | No En | 66.67%| No En       | 80.00%   | 100.00%       | 80.00%| No En    | No En      | No En         | No En   |
| 15.38% | No En  | No En  | No En  | No En | 15.38%| No En | 0.00% | No En       | 25.57%   | 44.44%        | No En| No En    | No En      | No En         | No En   |

| 33.33% | No En  | No En  | No En  | 66.67%| 0.00% | 8.33% | 29.83%| 0.00%       | 15.67%   | 21.88%        | 33.33%| No En    | No En      | No En         | No En   |

- 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.
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

- The term “Enrollment Reports” is misleading.

- These reports are about STUDENT totals as well as ENROLLMENT totals.

- For ENROLLMENT totals, students are counted in every program in which they participate. Some students may only enroll in one program, while others may enroll in two or more.
  - This is done to provide information about how many students take part in each program, which can help identify programs in need of student outreach, or programs that excel in attracting student participation.

- For STUDENT totals, students are counted only once per center, in their Primary Program.
  - This is done to provide unduplicated student counts, to indicate how many individual people make use of the center’s programs (a student enrolled in more than one program is still only ONE person).
  - 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

**28000 Awesome Career Technical Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th>Gender Totals</th>
<th>Number of Primary Program Students in Special Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>470604 Automotive Mechanics Technician</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Male 88 1</td>
<td>Native Amer. 1 0 0 1 8 79 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450201 Building/Construction Trades</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female 2 0 0 0 1 15 0</td>
<td>Pac. Island 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120500 Cooking and Related Culinary Arts, General</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39 1</td>
<td>Asian 0 0 1 0 1 45 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130401 Cosmetology</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Female 4 19</td>
<td>Black 0 0 0 3 19 73 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131210 Early Childhood Education and Teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female 0 19</td>
<td>Hispanic 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140101 Engineering, General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Female 30 5</td>
<td>White 0 0 0 1 32 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400599 Plumbing and Water Supply Services, Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female 39 1</td>
<td>Male 0 0 0 1 36 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary Program Enrollments</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>209 137</td>
<td>Migrant 3 0 1 5 34 361 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not NJ indicates that the program is not considered nontraditional for either gender.

- 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.
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 COMPLETE Enrollments

All concentrators and completers are also participants.
All completers are also concentrators.
You should expect to see more students in the Overall Enrollment report than the Concentrator report, and potentially more in the Concentrator report than the 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

  0 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)
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
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