

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

January 12, 2010 (2:00 – 4:00 p.m.)
Conference Center A, Room 14
Minnesota Department of Education

Meeting Notes

Members Present: Linda Baer (MNSCU), Joann Knuth (MASSP), Mari Pokornowski (MN PTA), Kent Pekel (U of M), James Field (MISF), Geoff Mauryama (U of M), Brian Siverson-Hall (MAEYC), Jim Meffert-Nelson (MN PTA), Grace Schwab (MSBA), Cecilia Retelle (MN Chamber of Commerce), Bill Blazar (MN Chamber of Commerce), Bruce Munson (MACTE), Maureen Prenn (MACTE), Paul Cerkvenik (MN Private College Council), Mary Lou Dresbach (OHE), Jennifer Godinez (MMEP), Charlie Kyte (MASA), Dave Metzen (OHE) Jeanne Herrmann (MCCA), John Slama (MCCA), Senator Chuck Wiger, Representative Keith Downey, and Senator Gen Olsen.

Others Present: William DeJohn (U of M), Billi Wahlstrom (U of M), Gary Langer (MNSCU), Garnet Franklin (Education Minnesota), Barb Schlaefer (OHE), Jim Bartholomew (MBP), Dirk Mattson (MDE), Cathy Wagner (MDE), Amy Walstien (MDE) and Cyndy Crist (MNSCU).

Chair: Alice Seagren, Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Education

1. Welcome and introductions

Commissioner Seagren welcomed the newly appointed Partnership representatives from the PTA and Minnesota Chamber of Commerce.

The commissioner requested that members review the Partnership's list of voting members and designees and make sure that the information is correct. *Please see the attached list.* It will be an appendix to the bylaws and needs to be accurate.

2. Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Update

(see information under item #4 below)

3. Approval of minutes from the September 21, 2009 Partnership meeting

John Slama moved approval of minutes; James Field seconded. Minutes approved.

4. New Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership Bylaws

See attached bylaws. Historically, the Partnership has operated without formally established bylaws. Karen Klinzing asked if anyone had not received the proposed bylaws in the e-mail message sent prior to the meeting. No members expressed that they had failed to receive the bylaws.

Motion made and seconded to adopt the bylaws.

Discussion:

How long are the terms of service for the chair and co-chair?

Commissioner: The bylaws state that there will be two-year terms. A proposal for three-year terms originally came from the U of M with the intention of having staggered terms. However, this is a big commitment from the heads of MNSCU, MDE and the U of M, so I think that two years is sufficient.

Amendment regarding terms of service:

Motion to amend Sections 4.1 and 4.2 to reflect two-year terms. Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

Motion to adopt the new P-20 bylaws, as amended. Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

Proposed resolution for amendment to bylaws regarding establishment of LDS governance board:

(Note: A copy of the Minnesota Education P-20 Longitudinal Data System Charter is attached to these minutes. See the "Longitudinal Data Governance Structure Relationships" graphic on p. 11.) Motion to amend the bylaws to establish the Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Governance Committee.

Discussion:

How will the LDS research agenda be set?

Commissioner: It could come from within or outside of the P-20. If it comes from outside, then it is forwarded to the P-20 for consideration.

Motion to amend the resolution to include OHE in paragraph about the research subcommittee.

Moved by Mary Lou Dresbach; seconded by Bill Blazer. Motion approved unanimously.

Bill Blazar: Will the Governing Body make all of the decisions about which data is allowed out? Answer: Yes, for some of the data requests; no, for others.

Bill Blazar: The research committee that is recommended is closed and narrowed to the data collectors. Outside entities (e.g., business) are not represented on the research committee and advisory committee.

Is the proposed vetting process going to slow the process down too much?

Will these committees have access to private data?

Answer: MDE can do an anonymized file at the state level. We have an initial set of data elements and the purpose of this group is to focus on the ease of making the data available.

Bill Blazar, what is the role of the different LDS groups? Please send out the unabridged version of the longitudinal data structure. *(Note: A copy of the Minnesota Education P-20 Longitudinal Data System Charter is attached to these minutes.)*

Commissioner: The purpose of the LDS Governance Committee is to discuss the issues that come up with respect to the research agenda.

Jennifer: Should we clarify that the research agenda considerations include the demographics?

Jim Field: This data and governance structure does not include 100% of our students.

Jim Bartholomew: How do we make the data available?

Linda Baer: When setting up the LDS early on, weren't there some reporting expectations? Cathy Wagner: Yes, there are federal requirements and recommendations.

What is the roll that this P-20 group has in setting the research agenda? Recommend that the P-20 LDS Governing Body report to the P-20 Partnership.

Motion to change the resolution so that it is clear that the MN P-20 Education Partnership LDS Governing Body will meet twice a year to propose the research agenda and establish a work plan. The P-20 Education Partnership will set the strategic direction for the LDS Governing Committee and must, therefore, review and approve the research agenda and annual work plan of the Committee.

Question from the Citizens' League: The plan needs to specify to whom concerns about the LDS will be directed.

Motion to change the "Longitudinal Data System Governing Body P-20 Council/Board" to the "Minnesota P-20 LDS Governance Committee." Motion approved.

Discussion (continued):

MN Chamber of Commerce: It is good that the committee reports to the Board but the committee is too narrow. Committees should be half of the work plan implementers and half made up of the "customers," taxpayers, other non-K-20 insiders. Recommends restructuring the Governing Committee to follow this "half implementers/half customers" approach which would allow for business, parents, etc.

MN Office of Higher Education: This is the people's data – anyone can have access. P-20 may have an agenda but that is not the purpose of this LDS governance structure. The goal of the P-20 LDS is to get the data out there, not to keep it in.

MN Chamber of Commerce recommends redrafting the current resolution of the P-20 Partnership's LDS governance board to reflect Barb Schlaefer's comments and to vote on the newly drafted language at the next Partnership meeting.

How the MCA's are laid out is not well interpreted by parents. The "Joe General Public" perspective needs to be represented at the table.

Minnesota Association of School Administrators: The scopes of the duties are fair. Is there mission creep of the LDS Governance Structure – only meant to facilitate access to the data for all?

MN Chamber of Commerce: This group is not a gatekeeper; not evaluating topics. Redraft the motion; distribute electronically and get a vote on it.

MN Business Partnership: Delete on page two the first duty of the committees.

Page one: Add a number "5" that "Ensures information and access to collected data is provided."

Change membership of the Governing Body to expand the number of principals from two to four.

Motion by MNSCU to table the resolution until the next meeting of the Partnership.
Motion approved.

Motion to amend the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership bylaws to include a LDS Governance Committee. Moved by Jeanne Herrmann; seconded by Linda Baer. Motion approved unanimously.

It was requested that Linda Baer present information about the Minnesota Learning Commons to the P-20 Partnership as the first agenda item at the next meeting.

Next meeting

The next meeting of the Partnership is scheduled for **April 14, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Conference Center A, Room 14** at the Minnesota Department of Education, Roseville.

Attachments

- A. MN P-20 Education Partnership voting members and designees
- B. MN P-20 Education Partnership Bylaws
- C. Minnesota Education P-20 Longitudinal Data System Charter (*The "Longitudinal Data Governance Structure Relationships" graphic is on p. 11.*)