Minnesota Annual Performance Report (APR) Questions (FY21)

In this APR, you will be asked to report on the Perkins V plan year FY21 (July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2021) corresponding to your Perkins local application, *FY21 Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V*) in Amplifund.

Why is the APR important to your consortium?

- This serves as your consortium's report on the priorities identified in your Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) that translated into commitments to action items in your local FY21 consortium plan.
- It allows you to reflect on consortium priorities, changes made, action steps taken on identified needs, and implications for future consortium plans aimed at continuous improvement.

Why is the APR important to the state?

The APR is a federal reporting requirement that will:

- Identify opportunities for professional development, technical assistance, or direct support to consortia
- Examine accountability of results and shifts in consortium plans
- Provide context which informs Minnesota's Consolidated Annual Report (CAR) submitted annually to the Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education (OCTAE)

You will find the following questions when you log in to AmpliFund. The APR is divided into two interrelated parts: Performance Indicators and Narrative responses. You may use this document as a worksheet and record your responses here; then, copy and paste them into Amplifund. Please keep your font sizes consistent before you copy and paste to avoid formatting issues.

Amplifund login: www.gotomygrants.com

PART I: Performance Indicators

Relates to CLNA Element #1 and Various Application Elements:

Purpose: local funding decisions must be based on the comprehensive local needs assessment (Perkins V, Section 135). The following questions are aimed at aligning needs as identified in the data, strategies being implemented, and resources being allocated toward those efforts.

Directions: After reviewing your consortium's performance data for all secondary and postsecondary indicators, please respond to the questions below. Since 2021/grant year #1 data is not fully available for secondary and postsecondary at this time, please review consortium data for reporting year 2020.

- To locate **secondary** indicators and definitions, go here.
- For **postsecondary** indicator definitions, go here.
- To access postsecondary data reports in Power BI, go here (requires postsecondary credentials to view PowerBI reports).

- For your consortium's state determined performance levels, please see the "Grant Years 2021-2024" document in the appropriate consortium folder [here](#).

Secondary Performance Indicators (1s1, 2s1,2s2, 3s1, 4s1, 5s3):

As you review your secondary core indicator performance data from 2020, please respond to the following questions:

1. **On which indicator(s) do you consider your consortium's performance strong? (i.e., your performance level is in reach of your upcoming grant-year-1 local level of performance (target)) On which indicator(s) is your consortium struggling? (i.e., your performance level is lagging behind your upcoming grant-year-1 local levels of performance)**

   <mark>Sample Response:</mark> #1a. Our highest and best student outcomes for FY20 are the 1S1: 4-year graduation rate. Even with the updated CTE Concentrator definition we are at an impressive 92.21% with all student groups graduating within 4years at a rate of 80% or higher. While there are still performance gaps present across some student groups, we are very proud of the progress we have made and continue to do good work in this area.

   <mark>Sample Response:</mark> #1b. Our weakest student outcomes are in academic achievement, both reading and math. Although no data were reported for these indicators for FY20, we know that improving students' academic ability and reducing/eliminating gaps in student outcomes will be our primary focus this year.

2. **What significant population performance gaps are revealed in the performance data and for which specific indicators? (review the performance rates of each gender, racial/ethnic group, special population, and career cluster, looking for sizable differences between those populations and the overall performance rate of your whole population on an indicator)**

   <mark>Sample Response:</mark>

GAPS (Ss group-GTtl)	4yr Grad Rate	Reading	Math	Post-Program Placement	nonTrad	Work-based Learning	Total Across=
Male				-4.45	-4.68		2
Female						-0.06	1
Am Ind	-10.28	Am Ind	Am Ind	**-24.19**	-1.48		**5**
Asian					-0.46	-2.74	2
Black	-6.50	Black	Black				3

White					-0.31	-0.26	2
H/PI	-12.21	H/PI	H/PI	-10.14	-25.20	-13.01	6
Hispanic	-5.46	Hisp	Hisp	-11.70		-1.47	5
Multi	-5.53	Multi	Multi	-8.21			4
EconDis	-6.16	EconDis	EconDis	-12.80			4
SpecEd	-15.39	SpedEd	SpecEd	-27.56	-9.34		5
EL	-9.50	EL	EL	-1.81	-3.34		5
Total Down=	**8**	**8**	**8**	**8**	**7**	**5**	

In summing up the number of student groups that have gaps in performance outcomes, the 4 performance indicators that emerge as having the highest number of gaps appear to be: 4yr Grad Rate, Reading, Math, and Post-Program-Placement. While there are performance gaps in the 4-yr graduation rate those gaps are not as wide as the performance gaps in reading and math are known to be. It makes sense that students who are not confident in their academic ability would then not enroll in postsecondary or seek employment. Therefore, our top three priorities for addressing gaps in student outcomes are: reading, math, and post-program-placement.

In summing up the total number of times each student group has a performance gap, the priority student groups are: American Indian, H/PI, Hispanic, SpecEd, and EL students. Even though they appear to have larger gaps, H/PI student counts are so small in our consortium the percentages can be misleading. Therefore, our top four priorities for addressing populations of students will be American Indian, Hispanic and EL students, as well as Special Education students. These four student groups appear to consistently have lower academic and postsecondary enrollment/employment outcomes.

3. Consider your data review, identified performance gaps (both overall and in specific population groups) and allocation decisions made in planning for 2021. What future actions will you consider based on your review of these components? **These could include gathering different information in your CLNA process or setting your local application/funding priorities, specifically as it relates to focusing programming and resources.**

Sample Response: The data reviewed in the previous table represent consortium level data. The next step was to review individual district level data to determine the districts in which these students are enrolled. Next, we looked at the state-approved programs being offered within those districts to see where our greatest opportunity to reach these students exists. Now that we know which teachers we need to engage, we will be reaching out to both those teachers and their building administrators to gather additional information regarding building priorities, resources, and needs as well as existing initiatives. Once we have inventoried this information, we will begin co-creating strategies with our CTE teachers and implementing our plans.

We anticipate allocating 15% of our budget toward these goals with 10% going to support academic achievement and 5% going toward post-program-placement efforts. The strategies we implement for academic achievement may look quite different and involve a distinct set of people than the work we will be implementing around post-program-placement which will involve creating coherent secondary to postsecondary career pathways, create articulation opportunities, and producing family engagement materials.

Postsecondary Performance Indicators (1p1, 2p1, 3p1):

4. **On which indicator(s) do you consider your consortium's performance strong? (i.e., your performance level is in reach of your upcoming grant-year-1 local level of performance (target). On which indicator(s) is your consortium struggling? (i.e., your performance level is lagging behind your upcoming grant-year-1 local levels of performance)**

   Sample Response: The strongest performance indicator was 1P1 which showed an overall level of performance at 89%. What contributes to the strength of this indicator is that as we drilled down into performance based on gender, ethnicity or special populations status there were no glaring disparities. The only notable disparity was a low % of English learners. However, for this group the population size was well under 10.

   The weakest performance indicator was 2P1 which had an overall performance level of 62%. While overall this is not a bad percentage, when broken down into categories this indicator had the most discrepancies.

5. **What significant population performance gaps are revealed in the performance data and for which specific indicators (review the performance rates of each gender, racial/ethnic group, special population, and career cluster, looking for sizable differences between those populations and the overall performance rate of your whole population on an indicator)**

   Sample Response: 1P1: Again, as we drill down, the only other discernable difference is in clusters that are not part of our S-R POS. Also, these two clusters have less than 10 students.

   2P1: No discernable gaps in relation to gender
   Here the most startling gap is in relation to ethnicity where the Black or African American % at 11% which is 51% below the average indicator level of 62%. Hispanic levels were at 54% which is 8% below the average.

When looking at special population status we find that Economically Disadvantaged, Single Parents, English Learners and Youth in Foster Care are experiencing large gaps. It should be noted that that in the case of English Learners, and Youth in Foster Care the number of students is quite low.

In reference to career clusters the only S-R POS cluster that has a large gap is in the Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics area with a 14% performance level which is 52% below indicator average.

3P1: For gender enrollments, we find a gap for male students which is at 4%, fully 10% below the average performance indicator of 14%.

In relation to ethnicity, again we find that Black or African American and Hispanic students are below the average. The percentages respectively are 0% and 10%.

The special population status our data displays has the same result that we had in 2P1.

When we look at career clusters the only cluster that represents our State-recognized POS is Human Services where the level is 0%.

6. **Consider your data review, identified performance gaps (both overall and in specific population groups) and allocation decisions made in planning for 2021.** What future actions will you consider based on your review of these components? **These could include gathering different information in your CLNA process or setting your local application/funding priorities, specifically as it relates to focusing programming and resources.**

Sample Response: An initial action will be to focus on the populations that have the largest gaps in performance and also have a significant number of students. A second action will be to drill down into the clusters and see the actual impact by S-R POS. For instance, when we look at the S-R POS in Therapeutic Services, we note that in Phlebotomy there are only white females in this area. We also note that in the LPN program there are 26 females and only 2 males. We also note that there are 21 White students, 2 Black or African American students and 1 Hispanic student. As we do this for all our S-R POS, we will find areas that need in-depth attention in terms of resource allocation. We will utilize the training that we have previously had in root cause analysis and discuss the next steps with our governance board and stakeholders.

PART II: Narrative Responses

7. **Explain how size, scope, and quality informed your data-determined decisions concerning programs of study and local uses of funds. Include high-skill, high-wage and in-demand occupation considerations as well (Relates to CLNA Element #2 and Application Narrative 1 & 2).**

data from the needs assessments were the blueprint for initiatives and strategies in implementing Perkins V, size, scope, and quality considerations were a challenge for us. We have always tried to support all our CTE programs and educators. However, with limited funds, we recognize the need to prioritize our investments including time and money. Last year the consortium moved our Transition Committee into our Perkins V implementation committee. We used that group to help us prioritize our work and our investments, which helped us focus our spending on priority programs of study. Another priority for this team is to work closely with school district and college administrators to clarify CTE funding support that could come from Perkins funds and those needs which need to come from district/college budgets or other sources.

Challenges, though, include serving our small rural districts where small class size might also represent the only CTE experience for the students versus always putting resources into the larger classes or fully subscribed programs at the college.

Another challenge is having a unique college program in the consortium that the CLNA did not categorize as high-skill, high-wage or in-demand in our geographic area. However, it is the only program in the state of Minnesota. The classes run at full capacity and every student who wants to work after program completion can get a job. Again, we are trying to balance size, scope, and quality with the unique offerings of the consortium. We try to balance equity of access with the cost of programming and staffing.

Our CLNA data related to our Hospitality and Tourism POS shows a high need for careers in hospitality management pathways, but most of our program focus currently is in the area of culinary. We will make intentional efforts to incentivize secondary business management teachers, postsecondary instructors, and hospitality industry professionals to work together to increase the development and delivery of courses in this needed POS area.

We do recognize that size is a relative variable based on student, industry, and consortium need at the local level. Scope is the alignment of secondary course work with postsecondary course work and industry credentials. We are making sure that this is the case with all our programs of study. We also have dual enrollment options of one form or another for all S-R POS. Quality includes vetted current curriculum, WBL opportunities, connection with CTSO's and evaluation processes. We need to improve our WBL opportunities for 3 of our 7 S-R POS and need to seek connection with CTSO in four.

We will continue to ask critical questions at the local level, with the support of our Perkins V implementation committee, to grapple with the critical balance of equity of access and size, scope, and quality.

8. **Describe the consortium's efforts to collaborate on (secondary/postsecondary), designing, implementing, and/or improving programs of study during the Perkins V transition year (Relates to CLNA Element #3 and Application Narrative #2).**

   Sample response: During the leadership review of the high-level labor market information and capacity of our institutions, it became apparent that not all our identified POS are well-aligned with our regional needs and did not always have solid connections secondary to postsecondary programming. The two State-recognized POS that fit in this category were Consumer Services and Natural Resource Systems. Our approach was twofold. One approach was to provide professional development to our instructors at both the secondary and postsecondary level to continue to become knowledgeable in the content of the other partner and promote alignment. The second strategy was to look outside of our consortium for a brokered connection. Regional staff professional development events featured peer-to-peer sharing and relevant and timely agenda topics specific to the instructors' disciple. One example of the efforts to collaborate is in the career field of AFNR, identified in our CLNA as a regional need. We worked to provide financial resources to support movement towards a full POS. Specifically, we supported curricular development between districts and the post-secondary Sustainable Food and Farming program, provided support to build the FFA CTSO. These opportunities gave instructors and students an opportunity to stay up to date in current and future innovations within AFNR. Also, it provided the venue for conversation between our secondary and postsecondary educators. The State-recognized POS rubric was the backbone of the collaborative work.

   In summary, using the CLNA information the consortium prioritized AFNR as a career field that needed support for growth to meet regional demands. We used Perkins funding to incent the dialogue between secondary and postsecondary partners. The POS rubric gave us our direction.

9. **What actions did the consortium take to advance teacher recruitment, retention, training, and education? What were your successes and challenges? (Relates to CLNA Element #4 and Application Narrative #8).**

   Sample response: The lack of qualified teachers continues to be a challenge. However, the consortium employed several strategies to support recruitment and retaining teachers including:
   - Targeted professional development for teachers and faculty including support for new teachers in CTE career fields
   - Increased engagement of industry professionals on Advisory committees specifically to encourage potential teachers
   - Exploring joint appointment positions with local partners. Working with our business and industry partners to explore shared personnel appointments. Teachers

for the nursing assistance course are an example of a potential shared position between the district and the long-term care facility.

- Support for teachers seeking licensure through portfolio.
- Partnering with Centers of Excellence to offer teacher training and industry certification to have secondary and postsecondary program partners meet, keep the knowledge and skills of our educations current, and support teacher retention.

We were successful in supporting one of our teachers through the portfolio process. We were not successful in getting joint appointments with business and industry. The professional development evaluations were positive and an activity we will continue in our next Perkins year.

10. **Describe successes and challenges in your efforts to improve service to special populations during the past year (Relates to CLNA Element #5 and Application Narratives #5 & 9).**
      - **Based on the data, what student group(s) did you identify as needing specific attention?**
      - **What resources supported awareness, recruitment and retention of all students, especially special populations?**

<mark>Sample Response:</mark> As identified in questions # 4-6. We are focusing on our male students in Therapeutic Services. We are focusing on our Black or African American students in all our 7 State-recognized POS. We are also focusing on our special population students who are economically disadvantaged and/or single parents. We are in the process of exploring root cause analysis and verifying and discussing this with our governance group. The considerable success is that we were able to identify those individuals and those S-R POS that need further attention due to large gaps. The challenge is to complete the root cause analysis and then narrow our focus to assisting a specific group. We do not want to be paralyzed by trying to do too many things at once. We have already identified scheduling of CTE courses at times that are less accessible for these students as a significant barrier. Part of our plan will be to convene work sessions with administrators responsible for course scheduling to review options for making CTE courses more accessible to more students. We also hypothesized that our marketing materials were not reflective of the groups we were trying to recruit. In subsequent discussions with our highlighted populations, they agreed that it would be helpful to have a more diverse representation portrayed on our marketing materials. We are in the process of updating both our printed and web-based literature.

11. **Describe the actions you took over the past year to improve your decision-making process, specifically to prioritize programing and funding (Relates to Narrative #10). Governance aspects should include:**

- **how needs and concerns of learners, teachers and administrators are brought before consortia leadership**
- **how program and funding priorities are determined**
- **how status of consortium activities is communicated to teachers and administrators**

<mark>Sample Response:</mark> Our most significant gains this year were made through improved communications between governance team members and with member school district administrators. More clarification and dialogue took place over opportunities in CTE, the role of Perkins V funding, and how CTE and Perkins have evolved in recent years. These discussions helped these administrators understand the nature of program innovation sought in Perkins fund expenditures, and the need to align development and support activities to the CLNA findings. We anticipate greater involvement in the upcoming CLNA process because of these informative and reflective conversations. In fact, the CLNA itself was the start of a more strategic and evidenced based decision-making process. We have also created decision trees or process flow charts to help us codify how we approach our funding. Communication between partners continues to grow and assist in strengthening CTE programs of study as the team has been able to utilize consistent messaging and objectives in decision making.

12. **Considering your reserve allocation amount ($xx,xxx), describe actions taken and major accomplishments from the use of reserve funds to make progress toward BOLD innovations in CTE program design and delivery (Relates to Narrative #11). Based on your reflections, what changes do you anticipate as you start your next CLNA?**

<mark>Sample Response:</mark> In the past two years we have spent much of our reserve dollars on updating equipment for POS in our small rural districts. This was not necessarily a bold innovation, however the need to stay current on industry grade equipment is necessary. In the future we may look to other sources for funding, such as general funds, advisory committee connections/donations, or partnering with post-secondary on equipment usage. As we look to make BOLD changes in the next CLNA, our consortium plans to narrow our focus on one priority POS. Our CLNA and workforce data showed a high need for health care workers in our region, now and into the future. Our consortium plans to spend most of the reserve funds on the creation of new health science programming at the secondary level. Our post-secondary partner has seven programs (radiologic technology, surgical technician, nursing assistant, paramedic fire science, dental assistant, nursing, and dietetic technology) however at the secondary level only three of our twenty-four districts have an approved Health Science program. The consortium goal is to support the creation of at least five additional secondary Health Science programs by 2024.

13. **Choose one of your consortium's priorities. Walk through how the consortium identified the priority from the CLNA data and carried it through actions and results.**

- **Clearly state the priority.**
- **What actions did you identify <u>in your consortium plan</u> to address this priority?**
- **What expenditures were made in FY21 to address and support the implementation of this priority?**
- **What were your results as they impacted students?**

<mark>Sample Response:</mark> Our **C**LNA pointed to a need for diesel mechanics in our region. It was one of the highest needs expressed by our employers.   The consortium's program data revealed very low enrollment and completion rates in that college program and no clear pathway from secondary offerings for diesel mechanics. A survey to help identify root causes of this problem revealed that few people, students, parents, community members or even teachers and faculty were aware of this career opportunity.   We used reserve funds to build marketing materials communicating the high-skill, high-wage and in-demand components of this career to career advisors, parents, potential students, current students and the community. We saw no changes in enrollment numbers this year but future results should include an increase in enrollment numbers.