



Data Session: Activity

Element 1: Postsecondary

Exercise 1: Core Indicator [2P1] Trend Report

This example has data similar to what is found on the Core Indicator 2P1 Trend Report in the Perkins V Power BI app, though the same exercise could be done with the 1P1 or 3P1 report. While this data is simulated, feel free to repeat this exercise with your consortium's actual data from the Power BI Report. Note that in this report, data is *incomplete* for years after 2025.

Questions:

1. In which way is the data trending from 2020-2025? Is it trending upwards, downwards, staying steady, or jumping up and down?
 - a. ☐ Trending upwards
 - b. ☐ Trending downwards
 - c. ☐ Staying steady
 - d. ☐ Increasing
2. Do you notice any cliffs (jumps up or down) in the trend data between 2020-2025?
 - a. ☐ Upward cliffs (jumps upward)
 - b. ☐ Downward cliffs (jumps downward)
 - c. ☐ Neither
3. If Concentrator counts are below, what is one reason that could explain your answer above?

2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
841	830	833	828	797	801

Bonus Question(s)

These will not be covered as part of the exercise but are worth considering:

1. In the Core Indicator 2P1 Trend Report in the Perkins V Power BI, do the trends in performance for the entire population match the trends in performance when drilled down by subpopulations (such as gender, race/ethnicity, etc)?
2. In the 2P1 Career Cluster Report (select a year such as 2024). Which clusters are above the total 2P1 rate? Which clusters are below the total 2P1 rate?

Exercise 2: SDPL Gap Report

This example has data similar to what is found on the SDPL Gap Report in the Perkins V Power BI app. While this data is simulated, feel free to repeat this exercise with your consortium's actual data from the Power BI Report.

Questions:

- Is the consortium meeting all three SDPLs? Which SDPL is not being met if not?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No, 1P1
 - ☐ No, 2P1
 - ☐ No, 3P1
- For the SDPL that isn't being met, determine how many additional students are needed in the numerator in order to meet the SDPL:
$$\frac{\text{SDPL}}{(\text{SDPL})} \times \frac{\text{denominator}}{(\text{denominator})} - \frac{\text{numerator}}{(\text{numerator})} = \frac{\text{students}}{(\text{students})}$$
- For the SDPL that isn't being met, determine the safety margin in students between the consortium's current numerator and the minimum numerator needed to stay at or above 90% of the SDPL in order to avoid an improvement plan:

$$\frac{\text{90\% of SDPL}}{(90\% \text{ of SDPL})} \times \frac{\text{denominator}}{(\text{denominator})} - \frac{\text{numerator}}{(\text{numerator})} = \frac{\text{students}}{(\text{students})}$$

Exercise 3: SDPL Gap Report

This example has data similar to what is found on the SDPL Gap Report in the Perkins V Power BI app. While this data is simulated, feel free to repeat this exercise with your consortium's actual data from the Power BI Report. Note, for this exercise it is recommended to ignore the students in the "Unknown" category.

Questions:

- Are all sub-populations meeting the 1P1 SDPL? If not, which sub-population is below the SDPL?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No, Students of Color
 - ☐ No, Non-Students of Color
- What is the difference in percentage between the highest performing sub-population and the lowest?

Highest Rate %	Lowest Rate %	Difference

- For the sub-population that is below the SDPL, determine how many additional students are needed in the numerator in order to meet the SDPL:
$$\frac{\text{SDPL}}{(\text{SDPL})} \times \frac{\text{denominator}}{(\text{denominator})} - \frac{\text{numerator}}{(\text{numerator})} = \frac{\text{students}}{(\text{students})}$$
- If the sub-population that is below the SDPL gained the number of students in the numerator to meet the SDPL (calculated above), what would the total SDPL be?
(Hint: Add the number above to the overall numerator and divide by the overall denominator)
- For the sub-population that is below the SDPL, determine the safety margin in students between the consortium's current numerator and the minimum numerator needed to stay at or above 90% of the SDPL:

$$\frac{\text{90\% of SDPL}}{(90\% \text{ of SDPL})} \times \frac{\text{denominator}}{(\text{denominator})} - \frac{\text{numerator}}{(\text{numerator})} = \frac{\text{students}}{(\text{students})}$$



Data Session: Activity

Element 5: Postsecondary

Exercise 1: Population Comparison Report – Gender

This example has data similar to what is found on the Population Comparison Report in the Perkins V Power BI app, with Gender selected as the comparison group. While this data is simulated, feel free to repeat this exercise with your consortium's actual data from the Power BI Report.

Questions:

1. Choose either gender:
 - a. ☐ Male
 - b. ☐ Female
2. Using the gender checked above, what are the differences in percentage you observe between the General Population, Participants, and Concentrators?

Comparison	Group 1 % (e.g. General Population)	Group 2 % (e.g. Participants)	Difference (Group 1 – Group 2)
General Population vs Participants			
General Population vs Concentrators			
Participants vs Concentrators			

3. Does representation for the gender you chose increase, decrease, or remain stable as students move from General Population → Participants → Concentrators?
 - a. ☐ Increasing
 - b. ☐ Decreasing
 - c. ☐ Stable
4. Is this gender overrepresented or underrepresented in CTE programs?
 - a. ☐ Overrepresented
 - b. ☐ Underrepresented
 - c. ☐ Matches the General Population

Bonus Question(s)

These will not be covered as part of the exercise but are worth considering:

1. Look up demographic data for the county your consortium is located in. How closely does the percentage of enrollment for gender you selected match the percentage of that gender in your county? Is there overrepresentation, underrepresentation, or are they aligned?
<https://data.census.gov/profile/>
2. In the 3P1 CIP Program Report found in the Perkins V Power BI app, which CIP Programs are nontraditional for the gender you selected?

Exercise 2: Population Comparison Report – Special Population: Economic Disadvantage

This example has data similar to what is found on the Population Comparison Report in the Perkins V Power BI app, with the Special Populations>Economic Disadvantage selected as the comparison group. While this data is simulated, feel free to repeat this exercise with your consortium's actual data from the Power BI Report.

Questions:

1. What are the differences in percentage of Individuals with Economically Disadvantaged Families you observe between the General Population, Participants, and Concentrators?

Comparison	Group 1 % (e.g. General Population)	Group 2 % (e.g. Participants)	Difference (Group 1 – Group 2)
General Population vs Participants			
General Population vs Concentrators			
Participants vs Concentrators			

2. Does representation for Individuals with Economically Disadvantaged Families increase, decrease, or remain stable as students move from General Population → Participants → Concentrators?
 - a. ☐ Increasing
 - b. ☐ Decreasing
 - c. ☐ Stable
3. Are Individuals with Economically Disadvantaged Families overrepresented or underrepresented in CTE programs?
 - a. ☐ Overrepresented
 - b. ☐ Underrepresented
 - c. ☐ Matches the General Population

Bonus Question(s)

These will not be covered as part of the exercise but are worth considering:

1. In the Participant Count Trend Report or the Concentrator Count Trend Report found in the Perkins V Power BI app (choose whichever is most different from the General Population), do you notice any trend in the Participants or Concentrators with an Economic Disadvantage? Has the trend increased, decreased, remained steady, or jumped up and down?
2. In the Performance Gap Report in the Perkins V Power BI app, how do 1P1 and 2P1 rates for Individuals with Economically Disadvantaged Families compare to your consortium's overall 1P1 and 2P1 rates? (Note, this question can also be applied to Element 1)