

THE MINNESOTA P-16 PARTNERSHIP ROUNDTABLE

DECEMBER 19, 2007

MISSISSIPPI ROOM, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

1:00-3:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT: Beth Aune, Linda Baer, Mary Bents, Bill Blazar, Lois Bollman, Bob Bruininks, Cyndy Crist, Tom Dooher, Mary Lou Dresbach, John Ferlaak, Jim Field, Jennifer Godinez, Joellen Gonder Specek, Susan Heegaard, Christy Hovanetz-Lassila, Jeanne Herrmann, Sean Kershaw, Karen Klinzing, Joann Knuth, Charlie Kyte, David Laird, Carlos Mariana-Rosa, Paula Martin, Geoff Maruyama, Scott McMahan, Jim Meffert, Mike Newman, Kent Pikel, Gene Piccolo, Grace Schwab, Alice Seagren, Craig Swan, Julie Sweitzer, Cathy Wagner

1. Review and discussion of working group charges and starting questions

Discussion resulted in suggested changes for final drafts of each working group charge.

Several points that need to be included in the work of each working group:

- Each charge statement needs a crisp statement of purpose & expected benefits
- Be sure to think internationally as well as locally
- How we communicate the messages to the public is critical
- We need to ask for input from various stakeholders when necessary
- Working groups will produce periodic progress reports using a common template that will be disseminated electronically to the members of the P-16 Roundtable.
- Each group's work could result in changes/recommendations in both educational policy and practice.

Note: A revised draft of the working group charges that reflects the discussion at the December 19 meeting is attached to these minutes.

2. Additional working groups may convene as necessary in summer, 2008. Potential focus areas could include:

- Educator quality
- Early childhood

3. Chair announced co-chairs of working groups:

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Working Group Co-Chairs

- Laura Bloomberg, Associate Director, Center for School Change, University of Minnesota
- Cynthia Crist, System Director for P-16 Collaboration, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
- Karen Klinzing, Assistant Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Education

Postsecondary Science Readiness Working Group Co-Chairs

- Beth Aune, Director, Division of Academic Standards and High School Improvement, Minnesota Department of Education
- Janet Dubinsky, Professor of Neuroscience, University of Minnesota

K-12 Science Instruction Working Group Co-Chairs

- Liesl Chatman, Director of Professional Development, Science Museum of Minnesota
- Steve Kelley, Director and Senior Fellow, Center for Science, Technology and Public Policy, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota
- Judith Ramaley, President, Winona State University

Data Systems Working Group Co-Chairs

- Susan Heegaard, Director, Minnesota Office of Higher Education
- Christy Hovanetz-Lassila, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Accountability and Improvement, Minnesota Department of Education

4. Discussion of making 4 years of high school math an expectation for admission to the U of M and Minnesota state universities

U of M Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Craig Swan began the discussion with the following observations:

- Four years would be a recommendation, not a requirement (3 years doesn't mean a rejection but 4 years would make a stronger application). Two primary reasons:
 1. Researcher Cliff Adelman's work at the US Department of Education's underscores the benefit of math for college success
 2. U of M statistics show students who enter with more high school math are more likely to graduate.
 3. Stronger math serves students well whether they attend college or not.
- The recommendation would not mean that all high schools would be required to teach calculus but would be required to offer a fourth year of rigorous mathematics, which could also be met by a course with strong math content such as statistics.
- The requirement would be phased in.
- It will be critical to send the message to parents and educators about why this is important

Linda Baer, Senior Vice Chancellor, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, provided the following observations:

- Our state universities are also considering this but are earlier in the conversation.
- We need to look at both quality and quantity of math and the relationship to being "college ready."
- Parents need to be part of the conversation.
- She remembers that schools changed after the 3 year requirement was adopted in the early 90s
- We need a full blown discussion of the math continuum.

Charlie Kyte, Executive Director, Minnesota Association of School Administrators, offered the following observations:

- 100 superintendents responded to a survey regarding the proposed college math requirement. Overall they supported the requirement. Four themes emerged:
 1. Staffing issue—it would affect the supply and quality of teachers
 2. We need to be cautious about the implementation timeline and potential loss of some students
 3. Adding an additional year of math could reduce participation in elective courses
 4. Many schools will have significant budgetary concerns
- It doesn't mean requiring every student to do four years of math—it is meant for those going to college. We need to make the option available—it's not a requirement for all.
- We need to pay attention to parents understanding that math and science is important.
- This change would help us move toward the attitude that exists in some high-performing countries--you succeed on hard work not ability

- It will be critical to produce both more and better teachers if we do this
- The signal by the U of M and MnSCU would cause change to happen.

MASA recommendation:

Move forward with the 4 year math requirement as a 'standard' admission requirement, but also recognize the need to develop an alternative admission option when/if appropriate.

FEEDBACK from the P-16 Partnership Roundtable

- We need to think about the number of teachers needed and the retention of teachers
- We need to assist our teachers in teaching science and math
- It requires rigor and continuity
- Private colleges seem to agree on the 4 year math requirement.
- The longer we wait, the farther behind we'll be with our international competitiveness
- Is it possible our young people will be better in teaching math than we'll ever be?
- The Mentoring Partnership is working on technology to help adults learn how to help kids meet science and math standards
- Out of school time predicts student achievement and life outcomes. 91% of a student's time is out of school.
- We have to remember the reality of children and parents—it could very well be counterproductive to success. Many students who need math for their future goals are already in college preparation programs—PSEO, AP, etc.
- This change would only give students a slight edge—it won't necessarily keep a student out of college.
- There are different ways of learning math—accounting, computer programming, etc.
- Rural vs. metro is an issue to be aware of regarding availability of specialized teachers.
- We need to articulate the benefits of 4 years of math clearly and broadly.
- The business community wants more math as well, and it needs more variety such as statistics and accounting.
- Parents have a great deal of anxiety on this issue. We need to increase creative types of thinking that will lead to quantitative thinking and analysis. One concern about making this change is more math at the expense of...what?

- An important benefit of math is the training in the habits of mind
- If all students take Algebra II it no longer will be a marker of the students who have the academic potential to go on to college. .

5. Announcements and suggestions for future agenda topics

- Joanne Knuth suggested that members look at ASCD's new initiative called "The Whole Child."
- Susan Heegaard shared information on a Lumina Foundation grant opportunity called "Making Opportunities Accessible." She is submitting a letter of intent on behalf of the state. Susan also shared information about the college awareness school counseling grant process which will begin in January 2008.
- The P-16 Partnership web site www.MNP16.org is coming in January 2008. It will serve as a repository of P-16 agendas, minutes and other materials and will promote collaboration within and beyond the P-16 Partnership.
- Communication with legislators is important. The P-16 chair and vice chair will meet with committee chairs on January 30.
- Chair Bruininks asked if the group would be interested in co-sponsoring a conference as P-16 has done in the past. Perhaps it could bring an international context to our work—we could look at high performing systems and the 2007 report from McKenzie and company "How the World's Best-Performing School Systems Come Out on Top." The conference could involve other partners beyond P-16. The main thrust of the conference might be: What does it take to make reform stick? Kent Pekel agreed to do some thinking on this potential conference.

FUTURE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS

March 3, 2008 9-11:00 AM
Coffman Union, Mississippi Room
University of Minnesota

June 18, 2008 1-3:00 PM
Walter Library, Room 101
University of Minnesota