

STRENGTHENING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

MINNESOTA PERKINS CONSORTIUM ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (SFY22)

Version 8/29/2022

FY22 APR Questions:

1. For the programs of study funded by Perkins in your approved local application, address the following for the reporting year (July 2021-June 2022):
 - Were projects implemented as planned or did they need to be revised? If Perkins funding was not used as planned in the consortium's local application, explain what changes were made. What drove the change?

The consortium's plan around programs of study in FY22 was substantially accomplished. FY22 dollars aligned to this narrative was spent on equipment purchases at both the secondary and postsecondary level. At the secondary the focus was primarily on manufacturing and power, structural, technical systems. The consortium was able to provide funding for significant upgrades to sever district's programs. The funding purchased a plasma cutting system, a hydraulic plate roller, a lathe & vertical mill. At the postsecondary level, projects were implemented as planned. M State made several investments in innovative technology, advancing CTE programs of study and their delivery. The funding purchased an electric car to be used for instruction in a new program offering training and certification in automotive technology. Also, purchased with Perkins funding were solar energy equipment (installed by students) and a virtual reality platform for nursing that creates a number of workplace scenarios that can't always be created in a tangible lab setting.

Utilizing funding for professional development opportunities for M State CTE faculty did fall short. This can be attributed to numerous personnel challenges in CTE and Perkins leadership. Greater effort will be made in FY23 on the part of the CTE Deans and the Perkins LCC leadership to promote these funds for the purpose of professional development to CTE faculty, as well as supporting staff from career services, academic advising, and counseling that impact the student experience in CTE programs.

- What accomplishments/outcomes resulted from this spending? What evidence do you have to support this? Include any relevant accomplishments on the following topics:
 - Collaboration with stakeholders
 - Integrating academic and technical skills into CTE courses and programs
 - Providing greater access to CTE programs for special populations students
 - Expanding access to postsecondary credit for secondary students
 - Advances in recruitment, retention, and training of teachers and other education professionals
 - Changes to your consortium structure or processes

On the secondary side, consortium teachers had the opportunity to better connect and align with both their postsecondary partners as well as business/industry advisory members through the process of selecting and ultimately requesting the funding for equipment. In years past, funding was requested based on the wishes of solely the instructor, but the consortium has now required significant consultation through the program advisories to determine program equipment needs. This has helped align perceived wants & desire of teachers to actual labormarket / industry expectations. The consortium is also continuing to work on the integration of academic & technical skills within programs in a more formal way. In FY22 a continued partnership between the northwest Minnesota Perkins consortium has now resulted in a series of professional development that intentionally intersects academic, technical skills through the process of understanding SCRUM project management techniques. This pd is set to pilot in FY23. While there is no hard data to support this assertion (correlation is not causation), there seems to be a continued trend that districts/teachers that have actively engaged in the consortium's professional development, requested equipment upgrades, and worked with consortium staff have shown a higher level of retention than those who have chosen not to engage as frequently. While quantitative metrics would be difficult to track regarding this, the consortium is working on attempting to track some of this to watch trends.

2. For Reserve funding, what projects were completed or accomplishments achieved during the reporting year? If Reserve funding was not used as planned in the application, explain what changes were made. What drove the change?

Similar to programs of study, the secondary side of the consortium spent reserve dollars on supporting new and innovating programs in the consortium, most specifically through equipment purchases. The consortium has realized a need to expand and grow plant science programs in the consortium to better align with industry expectations. This was particularly true on the southern side of the consortium. As a result, the consortium supported with Perkins dollars equipment upgrades to two secondary programs that included purchases of a germination chamber and enhanced greenhouse tables. In addition, Moorhead began an aviation program in FY22 as a direct result of a partnership with the Fargo Jet Center and Hector International Airport in Fargo. The consortium supported equipment purchases of upgraded flight simulators to that Moorhead program. At the postsecondary level, M State spent reserve dollars towards innovative equipment transformative to CTE programs of study and for new program design. Funds were used to purchase innovative technology such as a soft-tissue laser for Dental Hygiene and Assisting programs. This will allow the student to receive hands-on practice and the skills for reduction of inflammation, pocket therapy, perio-debridement, and herpetic lesions. It is the kind of technology that makes M State students stand out from a competitive labor market. Additionally, funds were used towards the purchase of an electric car for a new program in automotive technology that will provide certification and training in the repair and maintenance of electric cars - a prevalent and growing industry across the U.S.

3. Work-based learning: What activities did the consortium complete during the reporting year to expand access to work experiences in excess of 40 hours to secondary students? What were the results?

Lakes Country is in a unique position to support and expand WBL opportunities not only in our consortium, but statewide through LCSC's alternative teacher preparation program to obtain the WBL endorsement. Since it's inception through FY22, 59 teachers statewide have enrolled in our program, of which 30 have already obtained the endorsement. In the Lakes Country Consortium alone, there have been 22 candidates enroll thus far in our WBL licensure program. While the immediate impact has yet to be realized in increased programs (there has been a small increase in programs in the LC consortium), the full realization will start to be evident in the next year or two as these newly endorsed teachers are starting to get their feet under them and start to request program approval, and ultimately connect students to formal WBL experiences.

4. What initiatives or projects are you especially proud of within the reporting year? What do you consider most successful? Why?

While only minimally funded with Lakes Country Perkins grant dollars, the teacher licensure work statewide has been a significant source of pride for our consortium. Through FY22, LCSC's programs have worked with 179 candidates to obtain the appropriate license eligible for CTE program approval – of which 99 have been awarded those licenses. That does not account for the more than 30 teachers that were assisted by LCSC to obtain licenses in areas that LCSC does not have approved programs nor the hundreds of tier 1 and tier 2 teachers that LCSC supports to get on a pathway to a permanent tier 3 license.

5. What challenges did you encounter when implementing your local plan during the reporting year? How did you respond to them?

The proverbial elephant in the room within all facets of the schooling ecosystem continues to be COVID fatigue and the lingering impacts of the pandemic. While this phenomenon is not unique to career and technical education, it disproportionately impacts cte teachers and faculty simply because there is more required of them than traditional "academic" teachers as well as they are oftentimes more strongly connected to students and the world beyond the classroom. The role that the consortium has increasingly had to fill is in the spaces of fundamental teacher support and essentially being a cheerleader for cte staff across the consortium. Consortium leadership has had to do everything in their power to shield teachers from even more "extra" work or bureaucracy that is oftentimes unnecessary.

6. How can State staff (Minnesota State, MDE) best help you meet the goals of your plan?

Two very blunt and honest answers:

1. Avoid creating universal procedures to target individual problems. If there is a compliance issue within a consortium, directly address the compliance issue in that consortium and do not create additional burden on all other consortium simply because of one bad apple. This is not only poor practice, but also disincentives the actual bold work many of us are trying to do.
2. Define your role to consortia. Is state staff purely compliance? Is state staff focused on continuous improvement? Both can be true, however using the compliance hammer to motivate continuous improvement is not effective – it creates significant redundancies that ultimately motivates consortia to find loopholes. Stick to the law, implement the law with fidelity (don't make it up or incorrectly reference the law), and get out of our way.

7. If your consortium completed monitoring by State staff during the past year, please include information requested in the monitoring report with this APR.

Not applicable – Lakes Country was not monitored.

8. If you were required to submit an improvement plan for any performance indicator in your FY23-24 application for funding that you submitted May 1, 2022, please provide a description of the progress you have made in implementing your action plan for that indicator.

Not applicable – Lakes Country was not required to submit an improvement plan.

9. (Optional) As part of the APR submission, you may request changes to your consortium performance levels for one or more of the performance indicators (1S1, 2S1, 2S2, 3S1, 4S1, 5S3, 1P1, 2P1, 3P1). However, if the consortium is on an improvement plan for an indicator, you cannot request a change for that indicator. If requesting a change, a consortium must provide sufficient rationale/justification for the proposed change.

Lakes Country is not requesting an adjustment to the annual performance levels.