

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

October 17, 2011

(1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m.)

Conference Center A, Room 14

Minnesota Department of Education

1500 Highway 36 West, Roseville, MN 55113

MEETING NOTES

Members/Designees Present:

Steven Rosenstone Chair, Brenda Cassellius, Eric Kaler, Karl Aaro, Sharon Bergen, James Field, Jennifer Godinez, Joellen Gonder-Spacek, Jeanne Herrmann, Grace Keliher, Representative Deb Kiel, Larry Litecky, Representative Carlos Mariani-Rosa, Diane O'Connor, Jo Olsen, Senator Gen Olson, Eugene Piccolo, Representative Jeanne Poppe, Sara Radosevich, Susan Von Mosch, Senator Chuck Wiger

Others Present:

William DeJohn, Jane Gilles, Angie Johnson, Geoffery Maruyama, Leslie Mercer, Kent Pekel, Nancy Walton, Cliff Wittstruck II, Bob DeBour, Mary Lou Dresbach, Emily Laurence, Katie Misukanis

1. Introductions and approval of minutes (August 25, 2011)

Steven Rosenstone opened the meeting with introductions throughout the room. The minutes from August 25, 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Brief overview of P-20 member survey

Leslie Mercer provided summary/presentation of the survey. The two most frequently cited accomplishments of the Partnership were the development of the longitudinal data system and value in the gathering of so many people from different sectors of P-20 resulting in a system of trust. She noted that people are eager to build on this sound foundation and take it to the next lead. Members want to do something that would add value from the partnership beyond what each can do independently. The transition points between the various sectors are places we can make a difference. Suggestions for topics included readiness, teacher education, continuing the work of the SLEDs group and PSEO. There is a consensus that meeting four times a year is appropriate.

Group Discussion

It was noted that the September 2011 survey had remarkable parallels to the assessment conducted four years earlier. Members agreed that we need to focus and move ahead; we don't want to be in this same place four years from now. There was a consensus that we should pick one or two things and do them really well. When workgroups report back, let's act on the information.

3. Discussion: Next Steps for the Partnership

Focus on Policy :

Comments included:

- Is national level work re: P-20 similar to Minnesota?
- Policy needs deeper thought.
- Is this a policy entity or do we want to focus on process improvement?
- Effective P-20 groups in other states make policy recommendations.
- Do we want to strengthen policies that are made elsewhere?
Hard to make policy when you don't have consensus.
- What are our barriers? We're not using enough of our resources.
- We're all busy. Use the time we have to make maximum impact.
- State doesn't have vision for overall education codified in one document that we can come back to year after year that would direct what our policies are.
- It would be good to have a document that everyone agrees to, that doesn't sit on shelf.

Interface between K-12 and higher education

Specific comments included

- Don't just answer the questions – we should also be generating the questions.
- We need a sharper focus on the audience to which our message is directed.
- Who are the champions at the table? We all have jobs that touch on this subject, but who are the real champions? Who owns it? Who's moving it ahead? These questions need to be addressed.
- What red flags do we have in the system?
- If we ignore issues of the achievement gap – we won't reach our goal – we'll get no results.
- We have never created a measure to show that we are making progress towards this seamless system.
- Do we have equity in the state re: college in high school, PSEO, and other similar programs?
- Even kids that are not of minority status need to do better overall.
- Put out a big goal, instead of being in the bottom 10 of states regarding the Achievement Gap, let's be in top 10. We are in top 10 overall. We can no longer leave so many behind.
- Math is critical regarding equity and excellence. Gap is global when it comes to Minnesota.
- A focus on one topic like the Senate did with literacy will make a difference.

Steven Rosenstone noted that questions two and three from the survey seem to be where the biggest frustrations reside.

Question 2: How do we know the partnership's work has made a difference?

Question 3: If applicable, where has the partnership fallen short of its ambitions?

Lack of focus and follow through. He noted that two big areas of concern have been identified: transition and readiness.

After more discussion, the members narrowed the focus to two options: Should we address the performance gap in overall achievement? Or, should we focus on the achievement gap between white students and students of color? After more discussion the consensus that emerged was to focus on one topic: reducing or eliminating the achievement gap.

The Chair indicated that he will consult informally and bring a concrete proposal to the next meeting in December.