

Enhancing resources in New Mexico to support secondary and postsecondary learners to access high-quality Career and Technical Education programs to prepare them for future jobs and technological advances.



New Mexico Perkins V State Plan 2024-2028

Career and Technical Education



Public Education Department
State of New Mexico
Michelle Lujan Grisham, Governor
Revised July 1, 2024

SUMMARY OF CHANGES, FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND RESPONSES

PROPOSED CHANGE #1: ADD STATE AND LOCAL PRIORITY CHOICES, IN ADDITION TO REGIONAL.

Current CTE State Plan	Proposed Revision
The NM Perkins V 2020-2024 CTE State Plan identified only regional priorities to be allowable for funding.	The revised 2024-2028 NM Perkins V CTE State Plan proposes to create a three-tiered system of state, regional, and local priorities.

Feedback Received	Response
Yes, I love the flexibility.	<p align="center"><i>No response needed. Thank you for your feedback!</i></p>
The three-tiered approach is best.	
I appreciate this approach because [our region] has been somewhat hamstrung in how we can spend these funds with only two regional priorities identified at the 2020 CLNA. Between very small districts challenged to offer multiple pathways (career cluster directions) to the limit of the two regional priorities, districts will be much better served just starting with the three state-wide priorities before we even address a CLNA now in 2024 to either confirm or update existing industry priorities. Thank you for your support.	
By expanding CTE opportunities, both students and the community benefit. In [our region], supporting employment in health care, education, agriculture, and art/engineering could benefit the community.	
Local seems best for spending grant monies on CTE = closest community members to students and industries.	
There are local CTE requests for programs which may differ from those of the State or Region.	
Each region has unique needs and varying industries that may differ from statewide priorities.	
STEAM education priority	
I think we need to intensify our programs on how to get/collaborate with industry partners.	<p align="center"><i>Your regional grant coach is available for Technical Assistance at any time. Reach out to any member of the College and Career Readiness Bureau staff: CCRB Staff – New Mexico Public Education Department (state.nm.us)</i></p>
Require assistance with [our LEA's] student data	

<p>Removing the number of priorities that each region can choose and placing state-mandated choices removes local power and prioritization.</p>	<p><i>Having state, regional and local priorities makes more choices available, but institutions are not obligated to fund every priority. LEAs and IHEs may select from any of the seven available priorities to fund programs that best meet their needs.</i></p>
<p>Depending on the local/regional priorities, programs may not be selected due to the imposition of the state funding priorities being required. Allowing each region to choose its priorities makes more sense in meeting the local economic needs of the region</p>	
<p>Community colleges cannot raise tuition costs easily, and cutting funding would greatly impact their ability to support technical training at an affordable cost. Career exploration at middle school level does not necessarily lead to decisiveness. Cutting funding would negatively affect CCs' ability to keep up with latest technologies in CTE and hinder their ability to produce skilled employees for local industries.</p>	<p><i>Funding allocations are addressed in PROPOSED CHANGE #4.</i></p>
<p>Increased funding for Colleges/Universities, will be required to address statewide needs if approved.</p>	

PROPOSED CHANGE #2: ALLOW FUNDED PROGRAMS OF STUDY TO MEET IN-DEMAND, HIGH-WAGE OR HIGH SKILL QUALITY INDICATOR (RATHER THAN REQUIRING ALL THREE).

Current CTE State Plan	Proposed Revision
The NM Perkins V 2020-2024 CTE State Plan required that a program of study meet in-demand, high-wage, and high-skill to be funded.	The revised 2024-2028 NM Perkins V CTE State Plan proposes revising the definition to in-demand, high-wage, or high-skill.

Feedback Received	Response
<p>Improve allocation of funds</p> <p>This allows more flexibility in supporting high skill or in demand careers that are locally in need, but may not be high-wage.</p> <p>In-demand local employment requests for isolated, rural communities are at least as important as high wage or skill, regional or state-wide positions that local graduates may not have access to.</p> <p>[Our] community is included with urban areas ... In-demand, high-wage and/or high skill may involve other career pathways in [Our community] vs urban areas in the region.</p> <p>In some parts of the state, all three parts of the definition may not be possible, so having the "or" instead of the "and" allows for more flexibility that can help students across the state.</p>	<p><i>No response needed. Thank you for your feedback!</i></p>
<p>To attain that goal, I think we need to provide our educators a rigid, hands-on, and relevant training so they can be effective in implementing the programs.</p> <p>Industry companies hiring and higher education should be the ones labeling these skills.</p> <p>I think looking at job projections along with skill requirement can help guide this, but I thank you for redefining the way it's written to be more inclusive.</p>	<p><i>The College and Career Readiness Bureau is developing a statewide CTE Advisory Board, including industry partners from all clusters, as well as all other required Perkins stakeholders. We intend that the Board should be able to help provide this guidance to LEAs and IHEs in the future as they select and implement programs.</i></p>
<p>These areas of support for in-demand, high-wage jobs are important however other areas that are not High-wage, but in-demand, need to be considered as well, ie., support for the growing service, tourist, and outdoor recreation industry in the state.</p>	<p><i>The proposed revision will allow your institution to select programs that align to such occupational outcomes if they fall under a state, regional or local priority.</i></p>

PROPOSED CHANGE #3: REVISE THE COMPREHENSIVE LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT (CLNA) PROCESS TO BETTER ALIGN TO PERKINS LAW.

Current CTE State Plan	Proposed Revision
The NM Perkins V 2020-2024 CTE State Plan identified the CLNA process as a consortia model focused on regional data analysis.	The revised 2024-2028 NM Perkins V CTE State Plan proposes revising the CLNA model as a multi-step process supported at individual LEA and CTE regions, meeting all requirements outlined in Perkins Sec 134(c) and (d).

Feedback Received	Response
Using labor market analysis allows LEAs to craft CTE programs of study that are specific to the available jobs in their area, and therefore a student can stay close to home if they choose to.	<i>No response needed. Thank you for your feedback!</i>
This consultation activity together with all the stakeholders can help make the CLNA model defined, strengthened, and culturally sensitive because everybody will be given a chance to share their valuable ideas.	
Require technical assistance	<i>The College and Career Readiness Bureau facilitated Steps 1, 2 and 3 and worked one-on-one with all participants for Steps 4 and 5.</i>
If the CLNA process is used to exclude districts who struggle to participate (small, rural districts especially), then I am not in favor of the change and suggest retaining a consortium approach for the sake of needs analysis. If this new process somehow gives the LEAs more control without asking more of them, then I am in support. I'd like to see perhaps a flexible option where multiple LEAs can join together for shared needs assessments, narrative reports, and applications where possible.	<i>The five (5) requirements of the CLNA process are in Perkins law, Section 134(c). The revised state plan seeks to bring our state and subgrantees into closer alignment with this law. Although the revision makes the CLNA itself somewhat longer, it shortens many sections of the Annual Performance Report (APR) and local application.</i>
Now this sounds like complicating the decision making process instead of simplifying it and helping it. I think I need more information.	
The CLNA model is great for larger school districts and larger entities; but was not thought about for rural America with micro districts.	

<p>It would seem unlikely that state or even regional workforce experts would be immediately aware of all small community labor needs.</p>	<p><i>We agree. Perkins law [134(d) and (e)(2)B and C requires that programs are informed by labor market information, in consultation with all of the following stakeholders:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>CTE educators at the secondary and postsecondary levels</i>• <i>State and local workforce boards and a range of industry professionals</i>• <i>Parents and students</i>• <i>Representatives of special populations, as defined by Perkins</i>• <i>Representatives of out-of-school, homeless and at-risk youth</i>• <i>Tribes</i> <p><i>All applicants identified relevant parties in Step 1, and were instructed to invite them into the process for Steps 2-5</i></p>
<p>The CLNA must include Tribal and community input to show what is needed.</p>	

PROPOSED CHANGE #4: REVISE THE SECONDARY/POST-SECONDARY FUNDING SPLIT

Current CTE State Plan	Proposed Revision
The NM Perkins V 2020-2024 CTE State Plan set the secondary/post-secondary Perkins funding split at 50%/50%.	The revised 2024-2028 NM Perkins V CTE State Plan proposes to revise the secondary/post-secondary split in a yearly step-down progression to distribute Perkins funds to secondary 65% and post-secondary 35% by 2026.

Feedback Received	Response
Additional funding across the board for all levels of education (K-12, post-secondary).	<p><i>No response needed. Thank you for your feedback!</i></p>
We need more funding as secondary schools begin to build CTE programs for students with little to no interest in post-secondary education.	
I am commenting as a post-secondary administrator, but I believe we have been lacking CTE emphasis at the middle and secondary levels and colleges trying to pick up the slack is a poor solution. More CTE funding at the secondary level gives more students access to those courses at a time when they need to be making major advances towards their careers so that college is not purely career exploration.	
For small, isolated communities with historically low post-secondary student enrollment, this is new model would be a clear choice.	
I support the move to consider the breakdown of 50/50 for K-12 public education and higher education to a 75/25 model with more funds going into K-12 public education to spark CTE growth in our states, particularly in rural areas that are of the highest need. Phase in should be faster so money gets to K-12 sooner Higher Education has more resources and capabilities to grow programs and where in the connectivity to offerings in K-12 public education	
Rural Small Schools or Rural Schools Access Grants where local schools can apply for funding to initiate programs in their school and plan for sustainability at the local level with funds. This can be \$100,000 one time funding or a three year cycle of \$300,000 in 3 installments of \$100,000 for good planning and implementation with the district responsible for sustainability after that.	
Increase student engagement for post outcomes.	

<p>This will allow for more money to go into K-12 program development and connecting to the higher education institutions and recreate a dual enrollment model that can service priority pathways for our state.</p>	
<p>Higher education would not have any students entering their skills programs if secondary 6-12 grades were informing their passions and career knowledge and exposures. Starts with middle & high school exposures to high paying skills.</p>	
<p>Automatic allotment of funding through Perkins V for micro districts or districts smaller than 400 students of \$50,000 with state matching funds to of no less than \$25,000 to advance CTE in rural NM. The most needy districts are being limited in implementing expensive programs because of distribution and redistribution of funding based on student enrollment or other factors. This will allow small districts to start programs that are high-quality, high-need in our state where students can start in good careers and jobs with training gained in high school</p>	<p><i>Beginning with FY25, the College and Career Readiness Bureau has proposed using Reserve funds [Sec 112(c) and 133(1)(B)] to ensure that all secondary and post-secondary LEAs receive the minimum allocation specified in Perkins. Although state CTE funds are not guaranteed from year to year, CCRB has allocated a minimum award of over \$77,000 in addition to formula funding for FY25.</i></p>
<p>The current funding allocation is acceptable, however I would recommend that the proposed allocation be flipped to increase the Post-Secondary Allocation funding where it is really needed and critical for supporting students in their more focused educational/career goals.</p>	<p><i>One of the main factors in the reallocation of funds is spenddown.</i></p>
<p>There is an assumption that the reduction of funding to post-secondary institutions can be mitigated through raised tuition costs. This is not feasible since community colleges are not able to raise tuition costs without going through an arduous process and getting regents to approve.</p>	<p><i>Post-Secondary reversion rates for Perkins funds remain consistently high post-pandemic. In FY23, the statewide reversion of funds was 27.10% with just three post-secondary participants spending more than 90%. FY22 reversion = 14.98% FY21 reversion = 16.52%</i></p>
<p>The majority of CTE programs that lead to employment happen at the CC level, and cutting funding would greatly impact their ability to support the equipment and staffing costs associated with offering technical training at a highly affordable cost to the community. We continue to see students who have not sufficiently researched and/or been exposed to the options of CTE, and they end up coming to CC after having traveled down numerous other educational pathways. Cutting funding to CCs would have a major negative impact on their ability to keep up with the latest technologies in CTE and hinder the</p>	<p><i>FY20 = 18.07%</i></p> <p><i>This suggests that more funds are allocated at the post-secondary level than are needed or able to be spent within the grant's constraints. Another consideration in the decision to reallocate is the need to offer more resources at the middle grades.</i></p>

<p>ability to provide sufficient up-to-date training for the majority of CTE certificates and degrees. This will, in turn, have a negative impact on the local industries that rely on the CCs to produce talented and skilled employees for the labor marketplace.</p>	
<p>Funding should be equally split evenly between the two.</p>	
<p>Post secondary programs are quite costly and are directly tied to producing a credentialed workforce. Funding should remain 50/50.</p>	
<p>The funding cut from Post Secondary may be too drastic. We leverage dual credit classes for completionary courses for career pathways and to bridge the gap between skills at the High School to students having the confidence that they can be successful at College and complete a certificate or degree that allows them to be more competitive in their careers. We currently have free Dual Credit courses for our students, but if Post-Secondary funding is cut I worry the College will not be able to do that and it would significantly impact our low-income students' participation in Dual Credit and impact their confidence in being able to attend college in general.</p>	<p><i>As detailed in the proposed State Plan revision, the College and Career Readiness Bureau will evaluate the impact of reduced statewide Post-Secondary Perkins allocation on CTE programming, including Dual Credit attainment.</i></p>
<p>This proposal would be catastrophic in the advancement of dual credit programming for CTE fields in high demand, high wage fields etc. Secondary institutions are not staffed and lack the essential facilities necessary to effectively offer high caliber CTE programming leading to successful employment. Removing the funding streams that support these efforts for both dual credit and traditional college students would be detrimental to the collective efforts. In doing so, there would be significant decrease in secondary and postsecondary partnerships and alignment.</p>	
<p>If post-secondary institutions are ultimately responsible for the end-outcomes of Perkins funding (degree completion, industry collaboration, and workforce entry), then cutting the funding for higher education institutions does not make sense and would severely impact our college's ability to achieve the mission of Perkins. Further, New Mexico colleges and universities are not adequately funded for Dual Credit given the state mandate to waive tuition. Even Early College High School students' tuition is waived.</p>	

Therefore, I strongly oppose cutting the Perkins funding for postsecondary institutions.

Post-Secondary institutions currently provide CTE courses and support for secondary institutions. Currently the post-Secondary institutions are not reimbursed for these dual credit students. Furthermore, when students articulate from their secondary programs, they will attend the post-secondary institutions. Costs for technical programs at the post-secondary level are more expensive to ensure that students are using technology that will be used in industry. While secondary provides career exploration 5th - 8th grade level, so do the post-secondary institutions. San Juan College hosts an 8th grade expo every year for the 8th graders in all of our "feeder districts". We use Perkins funding for this expo. Perkins V focuses on pathways for students that lead to High Wage h

Post secondary institutions in our region partner with K-12 school districts to ensure robust career exploration, institutional collaboration and support. Colleges bear many of the costs of this work plus providing dual credit for which the institution is not reimbursed. The first question above is a very slanted question. Of course, who does not support career exploration even for students in elementary schools? However, this should not happen at the expense of the colleges who will need those funds in order to actually train the emerging workers utilizing current technologies in the careers of their choice.

Additional Feedback Received:

Do you support an additional focus on career exploration for students in middle grades (5th-8th)?

- It is vital that we get middle school students exposed to and on starting pathways toward careers to keep them interested in staying in school
- Career exploration for students in middle grades is a good innovation or additional program to give middle schoolers the chance to reflect and see the real world of work as early as they age so they can better choose and prepare for their future careers.
- Students enrolled in CTE courses in the lower grades need to be funded.
- I am commenting as a post-secondary administrator, but I believe we have been lacking CTE emphasis at the middle and secondary levels and colleges trying to pick up the slack is a poor solution. More CTE funding at the secondary level gives more students access to those courses at a time when they need to be making major advances towards their careers so that college is not purely career exploration.
- The funding for career exploration in the middle schools can come from other sources, such as through the SEG distribution. There are also free career exploration platforms such as Tiggbee that can be used by middle schools (see the Association for Career Technical Education resources).
- While I believe that career exploration at the middle school level can be somewhat beneficial, no clear evidence supports starting early leads to decisiveness amongst students once they reach college.