

Annual Performance Report FY21

Form status

Consortium name: Lakes Country Consortium

FY21 Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V)

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.

The APR is a federal reporting requirement that will:

Why is the APR important to the state?

- 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.

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:

<https://public.education.mn.gov/MDEAnalytics/DataSecure.jsp>

• For postsecondary indicator definitions, go here:

https://minnstate.edu/system/cte/consortium_resources/documents/Perkins-V-Report-Structure-and-Definitions.pdf

• To access postsecondary data reports in Power BI, go here (requires postsecondary credentials to view PowerBI reports):

<https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/ac6f9c92-0a60-4e58-814e-b5b17f941353>

• For your consortium's state determined performance levels, please see the "Grant Years 2021-2024" document in the appropriate consortium folder here:

<https://minnstate.edu/system/cte/perkins-consortia.html>

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)

At the surface, and in aggregate, the performance of our secondary concentrators are strong across all indicators that we are able to ascertain data in relation to our state determined levels of performance.
At the surface, our concentrators graduate at 94.28%, almost 42% higher than the performance target. Our concentrators overperform target by 20% in on post-program placement, and overperform by over 30% in nontrad concentration.

1a. 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)

While none of our overarching indicators show significant cause for concern on the meta-level, the unknown of the consortia's concentrator's performance on 2S1 and 2S2 is always a concern. The other small concern is the WBL indicator - while we are overperforming and the consortium actively has strategies in place to create additional WBL opportunities for students in our programs, there are still significant opportunity gaps for students that are hidden because of infrastructure or geographical concerns more than curricular or other locally leverageable concerns.

2. What significant population performance gaps are revealed in the performance data and for which specific indicators?

2.1 (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)

Each of the performance indicators that the consortia has data for provides for opportunities for growth within specific subset populations. Ones of note that are very much worthy of further study & longitudinal analysis are:

- * Nontrad graduation rates
- * EL graduation rates
- * Special Education post-program placement & nontraditional enrollment
- * Enrollment trends in all subgroups with WBL programs

Certainly there are plenty of other areas that do raise concern, but with relatively low numbers of students in relation to the much larger numbers of students in the above categories. The next tier of indicators that should be watched for trend data, as indicated in this current disaggregated data include:

- * Hispanic & multi-race students in post-program placement
- * Native American/Indigenous & EL students in nontrad enrollment

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?

3.1 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.

Perhaps depending upon the 2021 data as it is released, if there becomes a persistent pattern amongst any of these performance gaps, further study is certainly warranted to determine some level of root cause analysis before a potential solution/strategy is applied. Without a root cause analysis, any solution or strategy would simply be searching for a problem, which will be ineffective.

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))

M State's 2020 Actual Performance Data shows that we are slightly ahead of the State Determined Consortium Levels of Performance with indicators 2P1 and 3P1 (Earned Recognized Postsecondary Credential 47.53% vs. 46.54% and Nontraditional Program Enrollment 12.15% vs. 11.76%).

4.1 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)

Based on the same comparison for 1P1 data (Postsecondary Retention and Placement) – M State's performance is slightly under the state level (89.02% vs. 90.15%). The indicator data in aggregate is not alarming or suggestive of struggle.

5. What significant population performance gaps are revealed in the performance data and for which specific indicators?

Further disaggregating the data revealed that there is a 23% disparity for our students with disabilities and their M State retention and placement compared to the state determined norm (67% vs. 90%, indicator 1P1).

5.1 (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)

M State female students are reportedly earning a recognized postsecondary credential at rates 13% behind their male counterparts (41% vs 54%, indicator 2P1). Additionally, 2P1 data suggests that our English Language Learners (ELL) students are earning a recognized postsecondary credential at alarming low rates (16.13% versus the 46.54% state determined norm).

Additionally, disaggregated 2P1 data revealed that M State students of color are earning a recognized postsecondary credential at 20% under their non-students of color counterparts (31% vs. 51%).

These data sets will require further inspection and analysis before any intervention or supports can be determined.

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?

6.1 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.

Perhaps depending upon the 2021 data as it is released, if there becomes a persistent pattern amongst any of these performance gaps, further study is certainly warranted to determine some level of root cause analysis before a potential solution/strategy is applied. Without a root cause analysis, any solution or strategy would simply be searching for a problem, which will be ineffective.

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).

Considering size, scope, and quality in relation to the entire consortium juxtaposed over how the consortium spent Perkins funds over the course of FY21, the programs and focus was explicitly on what was well within the confines of the definitions – and frankly, was not out of line of past practice from previous iterations of Perkins. Perkins dollars in our consortium, specifically at the secondary level, are spent on active programs that either fall under the federal definition of program of study or would be an eligible expense under reserve funds (and are identified in our local plan), so therefore have already been vetted through the lens of size, scope, and quality. In relation to high skill, high wage, & in demand occupation considerations - the consortium determined at the onset of the application cycle that Perkins funding would only be prioritized to programs that would meet the threshold of all three considerations of high skill, high wage and in demand in our consortium. While that was an operational switch for our consortium between Perkins IV and V, it has also helped better clarify and identify clearer purpose and distinction around true career and technical education programs and the purpose of Perkins funding in the ecosystem of CTE programming.

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).

During the transition year, the consortium's effort was focused on the comprehensive local needs assessment, which was began in August of 2019 and wrapped up in May of 2020. As a result of the CLNA and all the consultation and data analysis of available labor market information, the consortium landed on the following seven programs of study for the consortium:

1. Accounting
2. Construction
3. Teaching/Training
4. Web & Digital Communications
5. Transportation Operations
6. Power, Structural, & Technical Systems
7. Therapeutic Services

Once the programs of study were identified, consortium leadership completed a program/course inventory with all secondary approved programs aligned to the postsecondary programs and will use that inventory as the catalyst for conversation and further program development in FY21 and beyond.

9. What actions did the consortium take to advance teacher

It is well known that Lakes Country Service Cooperative was the first alternative teacher preparation provider approved in Minnesota in 2018 and subsequently have had programs approved in Construction, Manufacturing, Transportation (and corresponding CTE Core) and Work-Based Learning.

recruitment, retention, training, and education? What were your successes and challenges? (Relates to CLNA Element #4 and Application Narrative #8).

LCSC has been operating these programs since 2020 in all areas and now has recommended candidates for licensure in all of the program areas. To date, LCSC has recommended 14 candidates for licensure - three in construction, two in manufacturing, three in transportation, and seven in WBL. Currently LCSC has seven candidates enrolled in the construction program, two candidates enrolled in manufacturing, two in transportation, and 44 candidates currently enrolled in the WBL program. These candidates are from across the entire state, and not just part of the Lakes Country consortium. Consortium leadership consistently assists CTE teachers from across the state in advocating for them around licensure on a daily basis, providing them with guidance on pathways towards licensure. While all of this has proved to be successful in both temporary and permanent employment for CTE instructors (depending on individual circumstances), there is only so much capacity one person has. LCSC is working to increase capacity in the teacher preparation realm, but further work needs to be done to increase capacity across the state around policy and advocacy in understanding teacher licensure in general; particularly as it relates to the nuances of career and technical education. History also tells us that the field cannot rely on the licensing agency to provide this guidance, particularly in the current political climate as that same agency is actively attempting to dismantle some of the exact policies that allow successful entry into the profession for career and technical educators.

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?

When comparing all M State students to students in CTE programs there was no notable or obvious representation gap across the racial demographic. However, there was disparities noted in historical fall-to-fall success rates (e.g. persistence) and overall program completion rates within our special population students, specifically students of color (SOC).

Our ongoing work with the CLNA in FY20 led the college to take an acute look at the services and supports offered to career and technical students, and specifically those in the special populations demographic. These comprehensive efforts will continue to guide the evaluation of our services and aid in further discovery of areas that the college could bolster in order better support our SOC in academic persistence and completion.

• What resources supported awareness, recruitment and retention of all students, especially special populations?

During FY21, M State and LCSC (Lakes Country Consortium) subcontracted with Dr. Rose Chu to facilitate Perkins-supported ecosystem change/design, in part, as a result of the capacity grant result/report from Dr. Kandace Creel Falcón dated 1/15/2021. Our consortium views this as a vital component to institutional change and each invested \$3000 for contracted expenses. This work continues into FY22 having stalled briefly due to staffing resignations, new employee/leadership hires and pandemic-related barriers. Ultimately, this important work was and is still aligned to our Perkins plan: Narrative 5, CLNA Element 5. Following the work with Dr. Chu the intention is to have leadership within the consortium begin to build stronger, more robust and innovative student supports while simultaneously breaking down the barriers that have stood in place for decades.

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

The consortia continues to refine the decision making process each year. The primary action that the consortia took in FY21 included:

* Revised the postsecondary request for supplemental funding process, which required faculty to further flesh out program priorities and align to consortium needs as well as looped in secondary partners 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).

M State invested our FY21 postsecondary reserve funds into new and innovative equipment for two of our healthcare programs: Dental Hygiene/Assisting and Surgical Technology. These equipment purchases were bold investments into our student learning, ensuring that our students have access to the latest technologies - which align to industry standards and prepare our students for the competitive workforce.

Based on your reflections, what changes do you anticipate as you start your next CLNA?

As we embark on our next (2021-2022) CLNA journey - there is great anticipation to dive deeper into the data. There is also a desire to involve a more diverse representation of stakeholder groups.

We see this next round of the CLNA as a mechanism for building onto our original (CLNA) foundation. Round two hopes to produce even more meaningful data and analysis, which will guide increased strategic planning and more focused financial investments.

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 in your consortium plan 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?

The consortium's number one priority is to continue to focus every decision based on students first. While this seems to be a lofty and seemingly obvious priority for any grant administration, for far too long, particularly evidenced over the of the pandemic, the needs, wants, desires, and comforts of everyone but the students were prioritized over students. If the Lakes Country Consortia can commit across the board to centering every decision around students - and the needs of the students that need it the most, we will be incredibly successful in the implementation of our grant priorities. Every budget item listed in our application is ultimately focused on student success. If we as a consortium cannot answer the question, "who does this priority ultimately benefit?" and if that answer is not the student - then it does not belong as a priority.