Annual Performance Report FY21

Form status

Consortium name:	Great River 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.
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.

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)

Based on the performance indicators that we have access to in the secure database, we feel the indicator that is strong is in the area of non-traditional participants, especially for females in CTE courses.

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)

levels of performance)
Performance indicators for non-traditional participants for males regarding graduation rate is below expectations.

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)

Students who are categorized as non-English speaking have poor graduation rates.

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.

We will investigate success rates of non-English speaking students in regards to their access to CTE courses. We are trying to determine the answers to student access to CTE courses through a survey in partnership with our CLNA.

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

Our consortium's strongest performance indicator was 1P1 at almost 96%, compared to 54% for 2P1 and just over 11% for 3P1. Most of the categories in gender, race/ethnicity and students of color ranged between 95% and 100% with the lowest being unknown race or ethnicity, which population size was well below 10. The single

your upcoming grant-year-1 local level of performance (target))	parent special population was the only one that was under 90% but even that was at 87%.
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)	Our consortium's weakest performance indicator was 3P1 at just over 11%. Females enrolled in nontraditional programs, while not great at 23%, it is quite a bit better compared to males at not quite 5%.

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

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)	1P1: The biggest performance gap is in the Special Populations segment with Single parents falling at 87% while all the other special populations were 90% or higher. That is not a huge disparity. 2P1: Upon first glance it appears English Learners and Youth in Foster Care would have the biggest performance gap, however, upon further exploration those population sizes are not comparable to the size of the other special populations. All of the other special populations are within a few percentage points from the one above or below it. Single parents have the least post secondary credentials at almost 45% with Out of Workforce having the highest at 54%. Overall the 2P1 is not overly high in percentages and as a whole has quite a bit of room for improvement across all special populations. 3P1: Within the special populations none of them are overly impressive in the nontraditional program enrollment. The Individuals with Disabilities is the highest at 25% with the lowest Individuals with Economically Disadvantaged Families at 12%. Males are at 4% and almost 20% less than females, who are at 23%. Within the career clusters it was not surprising to see the four lowest nontraditional enrollment was in Health Sciences, Agriculture & Construction, Information Technology and Education & Training.

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.	The performance data confirmed what we had already known and were working towards before COVID shook things up. We were focusing on Black of African American students, which has only a 28.57% earned post secondary credential by hosting various events aimed at that demographic, for example Somali Information Sessions, but these events had to be paused due to COVID. We will pick that work back up and explore additional ways to reach out to these students. We are in discussions with the secondary partners about a co-operative health sciences concurrent enrollment offering, which will be a strong focus now that most are in-person again.

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).	As seen in the table below from our CLNA we gathered extensive data on scope, size and sequence of our programs of study. The table below represents both opportunities and gaps in our programs of study. This table combines information about not only the size ,scope and sequence of our programs of study but also how that compares to labor market data and how it relates to high skill, high wage and in demand occupations.. We have used this information to guide us in our grant application and funding decisions. While we use this data for funding decisions, we also take into

account size, scope and quality of local programs and local initiatives. We also take into consideration those programs that are listed as "GROW" in the table. An example would be our work on the Health Sciences pathway which we have referenced in both this document and our application for 21-22.

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).

We have partnered with College-High School Partnership articulations so that our consortium schools have access to a wider variety of college credit opportunities. This was an initiative specifically aimed to fulfill the desire for college partnerships in the career field of Agriculture.
As part of our CLNA process and student interest surveys the consortium board started discussions on developing health science related concurrent enrollment offerings via a co-operative partnership with various schools districts and SCTCC.
SCTCC continued to offer concurrent enrollment offerings with various member school districts, however, some disciplines were not able to be offered due to COVID and uncertainty surrounding in-person learning in the high schools. SCTCC submitted their NACEP Accreditation Application in FY21, will learn the outcome in FY22.

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).

Teacher recruitment is very challenging and compounded due to COVID. The economy is proving that individuals can get jobs outside of schools and get paid at a higher rate than teaching. However, we have targeted workers who are closer to retirement and looking for a change of pace.
Additionally, we have multiple tracks of teacher mentorship dependent upon the PELSB tier. This allows for our CTE teachers to receive training that is pertinent to them and at their level considering they have not received traditional teacher prep in the areas of classroom management, assessment, etc.
SCTCC had challenges in offering professional development for our faculty due to COVID and the related restrictions.

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?

Originally SCTCC was planning on using a large amount of their reserve funds towards CTE Faculty Professional Development but due to COVID we were unable to do so. Instead we redirected those funds towards updating welding equipment, however, due to knowing how important professional development is it was included in the FY22 plan.

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

Due to COVID restrictions SCTCC was unable to host the annual Diversity Fair and the workshop for secondary counselors.
One of the successes in the uncertain year of COVID restrictions was offering virtual sessions for students. SCTCC's Center for Academic Success successfully serving students through the addition of virtual tutoring sessions. The Academic Advising offices pivoted to successfully offer virtual advising appointments. The success of these offerings prompted both departments to continue offering virtual appointments as an option once we were back in-person.
At the secondary level, of course, difficulties existed in order to implement originally planned opportunities. However, we continued to move forward with consortium high schools with conversations surrounding the cooperative expansion of health sciences course offerings. We have done this in partnership with SCTCC and employer/industry advisory groups. This effort is due to the findings of our CLNA, identifying health sciences as an area of need.
Additionally, we were successful in adding partnerships with post-secondaries outside the consortium for the sake of articulation offerings. This will assist our many high schools in continuing students on the Ag pathway as we have a lot of Ag programming occurring with fewer opportunities for pathways to continue into post secondary education.

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 GRPC Governing Board started developing a policies and procedure manual. Needs and concerns from each of the member schools is brought to the GRPC Governing Board through communication with superintendents, principals and stakeholders. GRPC has 5 coordinators that work with various schools.

Program and funding priorities are based off information collected in the CLNA and input requests from member school districts and stakeholders. Each coordinator works with their schools to create a spending plan or budget.

The governing board reviews requests and funds those requests that align with the results of our CLNA labor market data as well as priorities of local school districts.

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).

Originally SCTCC was planning on using a large amount of their reserve funds towards CTE Faculty Professional Development but due to COVID we were unable to do so. The college made the decision to use this opportunity to update some very old and out of date Welding equipment. Bringing our students' experiences to the same level as current industry levels. Manufacturing was one of the areas identified in the GRPC CLNA as an high demand high wage high skill career field, thus supporting the welding students aligned nicely. CTE Faculty Professional Development is still an important need and is an initiative we keep top of mind.

The majority of the secondary reserve funds were used to fund mini-grants within our member schools. Due to COVID anticipated spending plans had to be altered to fit the ever changing landscape of education during the pandemic. We encourage our local schools to submit mini-grant requests to update equipment within their programs to industry standards.

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

Also used a portion of the reserve funds to fund an Ag teacher at Wright Tech Center in an effort to reestablish that program at WTC.

The mini-grant process has been successful and in the future we look to continue that process as an avenue to allow member schools to request funds to improve programs of study and accomplish grant priorities and initiatives. We feel this is an excellent way to get stakeholder input from individual schools, teachers and programs. This also allows individual teachers to be innovative and BOLD which aligns with our grant priorities.

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?

Our first consortium priority is to grow the health sciences career field for the sake of student accessibility (especially at the secondary level).
Another high priority is to expand opportunities for articulated college credit, especially in the field of agriculture.
Continue discussion around the health science related concurrent enrollment offerings via a co-operative partnership with various schools districts and SCTCC.
We budgeted funds to join the College High School Partnership (CHSP). This partnership expands our articulated college credit opportunities in the area of agriculture as well as our other programs of study.
We anticipated spending money in FY21 for the CHSP, however, due to COVID and the cancellation of CHSP meetings we moved that expenditure to FY22.
Health Care concurrent enrollment programs were able to check out purchased equipment. The discussions in FY21 were the leg work to impact future students.
We are now a member of CHSP for FY22 allowing our students the opportunities to take articulated college credit courses within the agriculture career field, as well as, our other programs of study. This greatly expands articulated college credit opportunities for students of our member schools.

• What were your results as they impacted students?

Cancel