

Improvement Plan Process

PRESENTERS:

Carrie Schneider, *Minnesota State*

Kari-Ann Ediger, *Minnesota Department of Education*

Sue Selland-Miller, *Minnesota State*

Robb Lowe, *Minnesota State*

Stacy Karl, *Minnesota State*

Yingfah Thao, *Minnesota State*

February 10, 2021



MINNESOTA STATE
Career and Technical Education

m **DEPARTMENT**
OF EDUCATION

Welcome!

- You may want to have a copy of the Improvement Planning guide open and follow along with us as we walk through the elements.
 - Yingfah will guide us to where to find that information in just a moment.
- Thank you for remaining on mute during the presentation of the webinar content.
- Thank you for typing your questions into the chat during the presentation!
 - We will answer all questions listed in the chat following the presentation of webinar content.
 - Feel free to unmute and ask questions following the presentation of the webinar content. This is the Q&A time.

Download the Improvement Plan Guide and Template



Coordinators' Portal

Welcome to the Coordinators' Portal, a one-stop resource for Perkins Consortium leaders and their consortium partners.

- > February 18, 2021 Perkins Leadership Day Virtual Meeting
- > 2020 Perkins Leaders Annual Meeting
- Reporting Timeline
- Consortium Membership & Role and Responsibilities
- Consortium Monitoring Schedule and Resources
- ▼ Improvement Plan Guide and Template

Minnesota State and the Minnesota Department of Education are responsible to annually review each consortium Perkins program based on its performance on federally determined accountability indicators. Minnesota will monitor compliance with this requirement by collecting Improvement Reports or Improvement Plans.

When does my consortium prepare an Improvement Report vs. a full Improvement Plan?

If the consortium scored **between 90 and 99%** of their negotiated target for any indicator, they will be required to write an improvement report describing how or what they will do to increase their scores and must be completed for each indicator where a performance gap existed.

If the consortium scored **below the 90%** level of their negotiated target for any indicator, a written improvement plan will need to be submitted for each indicator where a performance gap lower than 90% occurred. The full Improvement Plan asks for more detailed information that will allow the State Perkins staff to assist your consortium to identify resources and interventions appropriate to address your situation.

- Improvement Plan [Guide](#) (.doc)
- Improvement Plan [Template](#) (.doc)

Career and Technical Education
Strengthening CTE (Perkins V)
Online Learning Resource Center
Perkins Consortia
Coordinators' Portal
Consortium Resources
Programs of Study
Professional Development
Perkins Local Application
Events
About Us
Staff Directory



Improvement Plan Process

Meeting Agenda

Introduction

Agenda

- Introduction: Rationale for process
- Requested revisions to SDPLs: update on status of requests & memo's

- Review annual Performance Reports and where to find them
- Improvement Planning Guide & elements
 - Data Review
 - Secondary reports & recommendations
 - Postsecondary reports & recommendations
 - Disparities Analysis
 - Secondary reports & recommendations
 - Postsecondary reports & recommendations
 - Collaboration
- Improvement Planning Template
 - Secondary example
 - Postsecondary example
- Timeline and Submission Process
- Questions & (hopefully) Answers

Introduction

- Annual review required by Perkins V
 - Consortium's performance outcomes on federally determined accountability indicators
 - Improvement plans submitted for any performance indicator(s) failing to meet at least 90% of the local State Determined Performance Level (SDPL)

Update: SDPL's & Memo's

- Update on State-Determined-Performance-Level requests for revision and postsecondary review process
- Update on Memo

SDPL Revision Requests

- **Local SDPL Revision Requests**
 - The State is reviewing and analyzing the requests and supporting documentation for revisions to local state determined performance levels (SDPLs) submitted by consortium leaders in November/December 2021 for ***Grant Years 2 through 4***
 - The State will determine whether adjustments will be made to local SDPLs
- **Postsecondary Review Process**
 - Postsecondary is conducting an analysis and broader review of all postsecondary SDPLs (state and local), with intent to revise due to impact of the pandemic/unanticipated circumstances
- **Limitation to Adjusting SDPLs**
 - The state cannot adjust a state or consortium SDPL for ***Grant Years 2 through 4*** on an accountability indicator where the state or consortium has not met at least 90% of the existing (i.e., ***Grant Year 1***) SDPL

Update on Memo/status of request for revisions

- **Secondary:** 4 revisions were requested.
- **Postsecondary:** 9 consortia requested revisions to 1+ indicators.
- Official memo with secondary and postsecondary responses will be sent within the next two weeks. (Postsecondary intends to share proposed broader revisions by end of February).
- Revisions requested this past November/December were not intended to impact the 2021/Grant Year 1 SDPLs (as that year was complete by that point in time). If your consortium is on IP status for an indicator for 2021, then the state is unable to revise any of the consortium's future SDPLs for that indicator at this time.
- Consortia leaders can determine if they are on an IP status for 2021/Grant Year 1 two ways:
 - 1) You should have received official notification from the Perkins State director, and
 - 2) Improvement Plan status is listed on the Performance Reports on the Minnesota State CTE website for your consortium.

Perkins V: Performance Reports

Determining Improvement Plan (IP) Status

Perkins V Performance Reports

- **Consortium** Performance Reports are posted to consortium folders here:
<https://minnstate.edu/system/cte/perkins-consortia.html>
- **State** Performance Report is posted here:
<https://minnstate.edu/system/cte/Strengthening-CTE/index.html> (scroll to **Perkins V: State Performance Report**)
- 2020 was a **baseline** year with no reporting requirements
- 2021 is first performance year we're being held to SDPLs
- Provides 'official' accountability indicator performance and performance status if an Improvement Plan is required (i.e., below 90% of SDPL for an indicator)

Perkins V Performance Reports

Page 1

Perkins V State Performance Report Minnesota January 18, 2022

The following report displays Minnesota's:

- current established performance levels (i.e., targets) for the four Perkins V grant years (Table 1, column **SDPL**),
- actual performance on the six secondary core indicators and three postsecondary core indicators (Table 1, column **Actual Perf %**),
- indication that an improvement plan is required based upon performance (Table 1, column **IP Req?**), and
- total number of secondary and postsecondary participants and concentrators (Table 2).

Table 1 provides a summary of Minnesota's established goals for future performance on the Perkins V secondary and postsecondary performance indicators, as well as the state's actual performance on those indicators each grant year, including the baseline year.

This report provides an indication of whether Minnesota is required to complete an Improvement Plan (IP) for any of the core indicators. The state and individual consortia are required to submit an improvement plan for any core indicator where actual performance is less than 90% of the established performance level for that indicator.

Updates to this document will be made annually, as actual performance data are finalized. Updates will also be made if/when there are adjustments to state determined performance levels.

If you have any questions about these reports, please feel free to contact Karl Ohm karl.ohm@minnstate.edu or Michelle Kamenov Michelle.Kamenov@state.mn.us. If you have questions about your data, please contact Kari-Ann Ediger (secondary data) Kari-Ann.Ediger@state.mn.us, or Carrie Schneider (postsecondary data) Carrie.Schneider@minnstate.edu.



Page 2: Shows if Improvement Plan is Required

Perkins V State Performance Report January 18, 2022

The table below displays established State Determined Performance Level (column **SDPL**), actual performance percentage (**Actual Perf %**), and whether an Improvement Plan (IP) is required (**IP Req?**) for each accountability indicator and each grant year. The year shown following the Grant Year label indicates the reporting year of the data reported on the federal CAR (Consolidated Annual Report) that corresponds with that grant year. For secondary indicators, reporting years align with school years (e.g. 2021 reflects school year 2020-21), with the exception of 1S1 and 3S1 which both lag by one year (e.g. students who graduated, enrolled in postsecondary and/or joined the workforce in school year 2019-20 are displayed in 2021 data). For postsecondary indicators 2P1 and 3P1, reporting years reflect the last year of the three-year cohort reported (e.g. reporting year 2021 reports on cohort 2019-2021). For postsecondary indicator 1P1, the cohort reporting lags by one year (e.g. reporting year 2021 reflects data from cohort 2018-2020).

Table 1. State Determined Levels of Performance, Actual Performance Rate, and IP Status by Grant Reporting Year

Indicator Name	Baseline (2020)	Grant Year 1 (2021)			Grant Year 2 (2022)			Grant Year 3 (2023)			Grant Year 4 (2024)		
		SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?	SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?	SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?	SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?
1S1: Graduation Rate (4-year)	92.21%	54.95%	92.66%		54.99%			55.08%			55.26%		
2S1: Academic Proficiency: Reading/Language Arts	N/A*	11.27%	57.48%		11.33%			11.45%			11.68%		
2S2: Academic Proficiency: Mathematics	N/A*	9.08%	39.73%		9.11%			9.17%			9.29%		
3S1: Post-Program Placement	65.70%	48.43%	61.93%		48.49%			48.61%			48.84%		
4S1: Nontraditional Program Concentration	36.31%	9.44%	31.56%		9.49%			9.59%			9.79%		
5S3: Program Quality: Work-Based Learning	13.08%	4.33%	9.98%		4.34%			4.37%			4.41%		
1P1: Postsecondary Retention and Placement	90.77%	91.12%	90.24%		91.37%			91.89%			92.92%		
2P1: Earned Recognized Postsecondary Credential	50.68%	50.60%	52.48%		50.96%			51.68%			53.12%		
3P1: Nontraditional Program Enrollment	13.98%	14.00%	14.68%		14.10%			14.31%			14.73%		

If actual performance rate on an indicator falls below 90% of the established performance level for the indicator/grant reporting year, an improvement plan (IP) is required.
*NOTE: MCA (Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment) testing was canceled due to the Cov-19 peacetime emergency. Therefore, no academic achievement data (Reading and Mathematics) are available to report for the 2019-20 school year.

Page 3

Table 2. Participant and Concentrator Enrollment by Grant Reporting Year

Enrollment	Baseline (2020)	Grant Year 1 (2021)	Grant Year 2 (2022)	Grant Year 3 (2023)	Grant Year 4 (2024)
Secondary Participants	121,141	121,915			
Secondary Concentrators	73,575	72,981			
Postsecondary Participants	45,541	44,400			
Postsecondary Concentrators	20,612	20,287			

Additional information:

[Perkins V Accountability](#) (Scroll to "Accountability Resources" bar/section)

[Secondary Perkins Definitions](#) and [Postsecondary Perkins Definitions](#)

[Secondary Data Site](#) (requires system login/account to use)

[Postsecondary Data Site](#) (Power BI reports require system login/account to use)

Performance Report Example

Showing Status
(note – grant year data are not real; for demonstration purposes only!!)

Table 1. State Determined Levels of Performance, Actual Performance Rate, and IP Status by Grant Reporting Year

Indicator Name	Baseline (2020)	Grant Year 1 (2021)			Grant Year 2 (2022)			Grant Year 3 (2023)			Grant Year 4 (2024)		
		SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?	SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?	SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?	SDPL	Actual Perf %	IP Req?
1S1: Graduation Rate (4-year)	92.21%	91.80%	92.25%		92.11%	92.30%		92.71%			93.93%		
2S1: Academic Proficiency: Reading/Language Arts	N/A*	56.35%	56.00%		56.65%	55.45%		57.23%			58.41%		
2S2: Academic Proficiency: Mathematics	N/A*	45.40%	44.10%		45.55%	44.50%		45.84%			46.44%		
3S1: Post-Program Placement	65.70%	48.43%	66.10%		48.49%	66.15%		48.61%			48.84%		
4S1: Nontraditional Program Concentration	36.31%	37.77%	32.13%	Yes	37.96%	33.57%	Yes	38.35%			39.14%		
5S3: Program Quality: Work-Based Learning	13.08%	17.31%	15.67%		17.36%	15.73%		17.46%			17.65%		
1P1: Postsecondary Retention and Placement	90.77%	91.12%	90.88%		91.37%	90.75%		91.89%			92.92%		
2P1: Earned Recognized Postsecondary Credential	50.68%	50.60%	49.50%		50.96%	49.55%		51.68%			53.12%		
3P1: Nontraditional Program Enrollment	13.98%	14.00%	14.68%	Yes	14.10%	12.45%	Yes	14.31%			14.73%		

If actual performance rate on an indicator falls below 90% of the established performance level for the indicator/grant reporting year, an **improvement plan (IP)** is required.
 *NOTE: MCA (Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment) testing was canceled due to the Cov-19 peacetime emergency. Therefore, no academic achievement data (Reading and Mathematics) are available to report for the 2019-20 school year.

Improvement Plan Guide

Data Review

Disparities Analysis

Improvement Plan Guide Elements:

Data Review

- Data Review –purpose is to gain an understanding of the current factors impacting the performance indicator, including but not limited to:
 - Trends
 - Districts/colleges involved
 - Range of outcomes within those districts/colleges
 - Student groups most impacted or exhibiting low performance

Improvement Plan Guide Elements:

Data Review (Secondary)

- How do I identify the key factors that contributed to missing the 90% of the SDLP?
 - Trends
 - Since we only have 2 years of data thus far –how do the outcomes from last year compare with the outcomes from this year for the performance indicator on IP status?
 - Review the **Accountability: Performance Indicator** reports for FY20 & FY21
 - IF (for example) 5S3: WBL is on IP status, notice also whether there was an increase/decrease in percentage of CTE Concentrators participating in WBL-Diversified, ACTE-SPED, or program area
 - NOTE: There weren't any changes in the **Course Report**, so, be sure to check this report for historical enrollment trends
 - Districts involved
 - Review the **Program Approval database** to document which districts hold a state-approved program and what type of program (e.g. WBL) <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/cte/progApp/>
 - Districts with capacity/need for a WBL program, **Enrollment: Participants & Concentrators** report
 - Range of outcomes within those districts/colleges
 - Review the **Waterline** report, notice which districts are "above the waterline" and which are below
 - Are there any districts consistently following below the Waterline during FY20 & FY21
 - Student groups most impacted or exhibiting low performance
 - Review the **Accountability: Performance Indicator** report for disaggregated data
 - Review the **Pipeline: Pathway** report to determine whether any over/under student group representations exist at a more detailed level for the disaggregated student group

Improvement Plan Guide Elements:

Data Review (Postsecondary)

- **How do I identify the key factors that contributed to missing the 90% of the SDLP for an indicator?**
 - Locate the Perkins V Reporting app in Power BI
 - For a refresher on Power BI: Go to the CTE Professional Development Monthly Webinars webpage, find **Postsecondary Data Reports & Accountability** Webinar from September 23, 2021
 - Identify Trends
 - Core Indicator Trend Reports
 - Identify Institutions/Programs Involved and their range of outcomes
 - Career Cluster report
 - CIP Program Report
 - Identify Student Groups most impacted or exhibiting low performance
 - Core Indicators Report
 - Performance Gap Report
- **How do I determine what growth and high need opportunities will be the focus of my improvement plan?**
 - Consultation with other individuals at your institution
 - Alignment with existing system and college plans/initiatives (Academic Program Improvement Plans, Annual Plans, Strategic Plans, Academic Master Plans, Strategic Enrollment Management Plans, Equity and Inclusion Plans, etc.)

Improvement Plan Guide:

Disparities Analysis

- Disparities Analysis –purpose is to identify:
 - Student groups with a meaningful group size, exhibiting performance gaps in comparison to the consortium’s SDPL
 - CTE programs and pathways with the highest enrollment of target group to maximize the impact
 - Existing district and/or college-level initiative opportunities

Improvement Plan Guide:

Disparities Analysis (Secondary)

- **How do I identify student groups and/or programs needing focused attention?**
 - Data Review results:
 - Student groups most impacted or exhibiting low performance
 - Review the **Accountability: Performance Indicator** report for disaggregated data.
 - Review the **Pipeline: Pathway** report to determine whether any over/under student group representations exist at a more detailed level for the disaggregated student group.
- Disparities Analysis –Going deeper:
 - Meaningful group size
 - Review the **Accountability: Performance Indicator** report for disaggregated data.
 - Programs & Pathways with high enrollment for the student group you have identified
 - Review the **Enrollment: Participants & Concentrators** report for disaggregated student information, by district and by career field.
 - Review the **Pipeline: Pathway & Pipeline: Career Field** reports to identify high impact programs/pathways and the grade level in which students typically take courses.
 - Existing districts and initiatives
 - Review labor market data from the CLNA to determine where the education pipeline (**Pipeline: Pathway & Career Field** reports) needs to grow, then, compare the growth needs to the existing career pipeline and WBL participation. Labor market needs and educational program participation, including postsecondary pathways need to be in alignment.
 - Talk with district ESSA and WBWF teams, connect with local workforce centers, WBL coordinators, and (definitely) Business & Industry partners.

Improvement Plan Guide:

Disparities Analysis (Postsecondary)

- **How do I identify student groups and/or programs needing focused attention?**
 - Data Review results
 - Additional Power BI Reports to identify meaningful gaps:
 - Performance Gap Report
 - Performance by Subgroup Report
- **How do I identify which of these student groups and/or programs to prioritize to serve and explain why?**
 - Consultation with other individuals at your institution
 - Alignment with existing college plans/initiatives
(Academic Program Improvement Plans, Annual Plans, Strategic Plans, Academic Master Plans, Strategic Enrollment Management Plans, Equity and Inclusion Plans, etc.)

Improvement Plan Guide:

Identifying gaps

- **Identifying where gaps exist & what constitutes a meaningful gap(s):**
 - Have these student groups and/or programs always been struggling?
 - What is the scope of the impact, is it 5 or 500 people?
 - Does the data provide insight into success or challenges for a specific population and/or program?
- **Determining why the gap(s) exists:**
 - Can other data help you understand why the gap(s) exists?
 - If not, what other types of data could you collect for more in-depth information? (interviews, focus groups, data from existing student surveys, etc.)
 - What conversations are needed for more information?
 - Who is missing from those conversations?
 - Are there consortia that do not have a gap and could share their practices and/or best practices for improving performance?
 - Are there existing district/institution initiatives with whom Perkins could partner?

Improvement Plan Guide

Consultation & Collaboration

Improvement Plan Guide:

Consultation & Collaboration

- Under Perkins V, the improvement planning process for the data review and the disparities analysis involves consulting & collaborating with stakeholder groups to:
 - Identify root cause(s),
 - Determine the best partnership opportunities,
 - Develop strategies to improve student outcomes and overall performance.

Improvement Plan Guide:

Consultation & Collaboration

- See Perkins V, Section 134(d)(1-7).
- Representatives of career and technical education programs in a local educational agency or education service agency, including teachers, career guidance and academic counselors, principals and other school leaders, administrators, and specialized instructional support personnel and paraprofessionals;
- Representatives of career and technical education programs at postsecondary educational institutions, including faculty and administrators;
- Representatives of the State board or local workforce development boards and a range of local or regional businesses or industries;
- Parents and students;
- Representatives of special populations;
- Representatives of regional or local agencies serving out-of-school youth, homeless children and youth, and at-risk youth (as defined in section 1432 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965);
- Representatives of Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations in the state, where applicable; and,
- Any other stakeholder that the eligible agency may require the eligible recipient to consult.
- Not listed in legislation but also very important are your business and industry partners.

Improvement Plan Guide

Legislative Consequences

Tie in with Application

Improvement Plan Guide:

Legislative Consequences

- The subsequent action for failure to meet at least 90% of an SDPL as outlined in legislation stipulates:
 - “the state may, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, withhold from the consortium all, or a portion, of the local consortium’s administrative or leadership funds” (Section 123 (a)(3)(A)(ii))
 - Process starts with the school year 2021-2022



Tie in with CLNA & Application

CLNA: Five Key Elements

Element 1: Student Performance on federal accountability indicators

Element 2: Program size, scope, quality, and alignment to labor markets

Element 3: Progress toward implementing POS

Element 4: Recruitment, retention, training

Element 5: Equity within CTE programs

Local Plan: 11 Narrative questions

- 1) CLNA
- 2) POS
- 3) WIOA
- 4) Integrated academic & Technical Skills
- 5) Special Populations
- 6) WBL
- 7) Early College
- 8) Support to Professionals
- 9) Performance Gaps
- 10) Consortium Governance
- 11) Reserve Funds

Tie in with CLNA & Application

- Depending on the Performance Indicator, there may be several 'touch points' --here are a few to consider:
 - CLNA, Element #3
 - Narrative #2 Programs of Study
 - CLNA, Element #5
 - Narrative #5 Special Populations
 - CLNA, Element #1
 - Narrative #9 Performance Gaps

Improvement Plan

Secondary Example –Kari-Ann

Postsecondary Example --Robb

Postsecondary Example



Examples: Secondary Postsecondary

- Improvement Plan Elements
 - ✓ Data Review
 - ✓ Disparities Analysis
 - ✓ Collaboration/Engaging Stakeholders
- Documenting the process and the plan

Improvement Plan

Timeline

Due Date

Submission Process

Timeline, Submission Process



- Start Improvement Plan now
- Submit with Application due May 2, 2022
 - Upload to Amplifund as separate document
- Report IP progress in the APR, October 1, 2022

Contact Us

Kari-Ann Ediger

Secondary Data
Minnesota Department of Education
Kari-Ann.Ediger@state.mn.us
(651) 582-8269

Carrie Schneider

Postsecondary Data
Minnesota State
Stacy.Karl@minnstate.edu
(651) 201-1825

Stacy Karl

Postsecondary Data
Minnesota State
Stacy.Karl@minnstate.edu
(651) 201-1825

Sue Selland-Miller

Postsecondary
Minnesota State
Sue.Selland-Miller@minnstate.edu

Robb Lowe

Postsecondary
Minnesota State
Rob.Lowe@minnstate.edu

Yingfah Thao

Postsecondary
Minnesota State
Yingfah.Thao@minnstate.edu

These professional development events are made possible through the *Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act*. Minnesota State is the sole state agency responsible for the administration of the grant.

www.minnstate.edu/system/cte



MINNESOTA STATE
Career and Technical Education



Minnesota State and Minnesota Department of Education are affirmative action, equal opportunity employers and educators.

Discussion:

National Career Clusters Framework Stakeholder Update and Revision

- Thoughts about the content in Wednesday's webinar
- Potential impact(s) to MN CTE programs and employment outcomes
- Action steps & strategies?