


Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

Report to the Legislature



2015

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

2015 Report to the Legislature

As required by Minnesota Statutes, section 127A.70

Submitted January 2015, amended February 2015

Submitted by:

Dr. Brenda Cassellius

Minnesota Department of Education

Chair, Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

Cost of Report Preparation

The total cost for the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to prepare this report was approximately \$800. Most of these costs involved staff time compiling survey responses and preparing the written report. Incidental costs include paper, copying, and other office supplies.

Estimated costs are provided in accordance with Minnesota Statutes 2011, section 3.197, which requires that at the beginning of a report to the Legislature, the cost of preparing the report must be provided.

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

2015 Report to the Legislature

Purpose

In 2009, legislation was enacted to formally codify the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership (formerly called the Minnesota P-16 Education Partnership). The purpose of the partnership is to “create a seamless system of education that maximizes achievements of all students, from early childhood through elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, while promoting the efficient use of financial and human resources” (Minn. Stat. § 127A.70). The P-20 partnership is jointly led by the commissioner of education, the chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, and the president of the University of Minnesota. The chair of the partnership rotates every two years between the commissioner and the higher education leaders. Commissioner Brenda Cassellius serves as the current chair of the P-20 partnership through Fiscal Year 2015.

The partnership is required to submit an annual report to the governor and legislative leaders that summarizes the partnership’s progress in meeting its goals and that identifies the need for any draft legislation that might be needed to further its goals. Legislation passed in 2014 directed the partnership to provide recommendations to the governor and the legislature in several areas related to career pathways and technical education (*Appendix A*). The focus of this year’s report is to communicate the recommendations that were developed in response to the 2014 legislation.

Areas of recommendations

At the request of Chair Brenda Cassellius, staff of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) identified five key areas in the 2014 legislation and developed a process for working with partnership members to identify recommendations for each area. Five work groups (one for each area in the legislation) were established as follows:

Work Group 1: Chaired by President Eric Kaler through his designee Dr. Geoff Maruyama. Legislative charge: Realign the governance and administrative structures of early education, kindergarten through grade 12, and postsecondary systems in Minnesota. (P-20 Amendments, Page 1, Minn. Stat. § 127A.70, Subd.2)

Work Group 2: Chaired by Commissioner Larry Pogemiller. Legislative charge: Identify changes to revise a P-20 education system premised on students’ individual career and college readiness plans and goals. (P-20 Amendments, Pages 2-3, Minn. Stat. § 127A.70, Subd.2a (1), (2), and (3))

Work Group 3: Chaired by Chancellor Steven Rosenstone. Legislative charge: Organize and implement a framework of foundational skills and career pathways. (P-20 Amendments, Page 3, Minn. Stat. § 127A.70 (b))

Work Group 4: Chaired by Commissioner Brenda Cassellius

Legislative charge: Examine possibilities for redesigning teacher and school administrator licensure requirements, and make recommendations to the Board of Teaching and the Board of School Administrators, respectively, to create specialized licenses, credentials and other endorsement forms to increase students' participation in language immersion programs, world language instruction, career development opportunities, work-based learning, early college courses and careers, career and technical education programs, Montessori schools, and project and place-based learning, among other career and college-ready opportunities. Consistent with the possibilities for redesigning educators' licenses, the stakeholders also must examine how to restructure staff development and training opportunities under sections 120B.125 and 122A.60 to realize the goals of this subdivision. (P-20 Amendments, Page 1, Minn. Stat. § 127A.70, Subd.2a, (c))

Work Group 5: Chaired by Commissioner Katie Sieben through her designee Jeremy Willis
Legislative charge: Recommend to the Department of Education, the Department of Employment and Economic Development, and postsecondary institutions and systems how best to create a mobile, Web-based hub for students and their families that centralizes existing resources on careers and employment trends and the educational pathways required to attain such careers and employment. (P-20 Amendments, Page 1, Minn. Stat. § 127A.70, Subd.2a (d))

Partnership and Stakeholder Involvement

Members of the partnership were asked to select from and be part of the discussions of one of the work groups listed above. Each member was asked to identify up to three areas of interest and was assigned one of those areas. Members who did not respond were assigned to a work group so that each group had an approximately equal number of partnership members.

In order to gain broader input and involvement, other stakeholder groups interested in education issues were invited to be part of the work groups. Many of these groups accepted the invitation and their members participated. A complete list of the members of each work group is attached to this report (*Appendix B*).

Development of Work Group Recommendations

Work groups were put in place in July of 2014 and were asked to meet once prior to the regular August 27, 2014 partnership meeting. MDE staff members were assigned to each group to support the members in completing their tasks. Each group was asked to design a work plan to be presented to the full partnership. The work groups briefly presented their plans at the August 27 meeting and were provided feedback to help them move forward in developing their recommendations.

The work groups held several meetings during September, October and November. They gathered information, reviewed documents, heard presentations and invited testimony as needed to complete their work. Each group then developed and refined its recommendations.

The work groups presented their recommendations to the full partnership at its December 9, 2014 meeting (*Appendix C*). Following discussion of the recommendations, it was decided that partnership members be granted time to consider the recommendations and visit with their organizations prior to taking a position on them. In lieu of an additional meeting, members requested that they be allowed to indicate their support for each recommendation (“yes” or “no”)

including any comments that they wished to express, via e-mail. A survey was sent to them for this purpose with a request to return it no later than December 23, 2014.

Response of Partnership Members to Work Group Recommendations

Fifteen (15) of the 28 members of the partnership returned completed surveys. The low survey response rate may be indicative of reluctance on the part of members to take a position on recommendations that have not been thoroughly vetted by their respective organizations, or those which may be in conflict with their organization's legislative agenda. These concerns were communicated by several members at the December 9, 2014 partnership meeting. For this reason, it was decided that *all* of the recommendations of the work groups would be included in this report.

Given that approximately half of the members responded to the survey, it is difficult to evaluate the overall degree to which members of the partnership support the recommendations. Those who responded indicated support for most, if not all, of the recommendations. Several responders provided comments that qualified their support.

A summary of responses including the tally of "yes" and "no" votes and comments submitted by members is attached (*Appendix D*).

Appendices

Appendix A: Legislation

Appendix B: Work Group Membership

Appendix C: Work Group Recommendations

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Work Group Recommendations

Appendix E: Partnership Members

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

Legislation

Laws of 2014, Chapter 272, Article 3, Sections 49 and 50

Minnesota Statutes 2012, section 127A.70, as amended:

Subdivision 1. Establishment; membership. (a) A P-20 education partnership is established to create a seamless system of education that maximizes achievements of all students, from early childhood through elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, while promoting the efficient use of financial and human resources. The partnership shall consist of major statewide educational groups or constituencies or noneducational statewide organizations with a stated interest in P-20 education. The initial membership of the partnership includes the members serving on the Minnesota P-16 Education Partnership and four legislators appointed as follows:

(1) one senator from the majority party and one senator from the minority party, appointed by the Subcommittee on Committees of the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

(2) one member of the house of representatives appointed by the speaker of the house and one member appointed by the minority leader of the house of representatives.

(b) The chair of the P-16 education partnership must convene the first meeting of the P-20 partnership. Prospective members may be nominated by any partnership member and new members will be added with the approval of a two-thirds majority of the partnership. The partnership will also seek input from nonmember organizations whose expertise can help inform the partnership's work.

(c) Partnership members shall be represented by the chief executives, presidents, or other formally designated leaders of their respective organizations, or their designees. The partnership shall meet at least three times during each calendar year.

(d) The P-20 education partnership shall be the state council for the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children under section 127A.85 with the chair serving as the compact commissioner responsible for the administration and management of the state's participation in the compact. When conducting business required under section 127A.85, the P-20 partnership shall include a representative from a military installation appointed by the adjutant general of the Minnesota National Guard.

Subd. 2. Powers and duties; report. (a) The partnership shall develop recommendations to the governor and the legislature designed to maximize the achievement of all P-20 students while promoting the efficient use of state resources, thereby helping the state realize the maximum value for its investment. These recommendations may include, but are not limited to, strategies, policies, or other actions focused on:

(1) improving the quality of and access to education at all points from preschool through graduate education;

(2) improving preparation for, and transitions to, postsecondary education and work; ~~and~~

Appendix A

(3) ensuring educator quality by creating rigorous standards for teacher recruitment, teacher preparation, induction and mentoring of beginning teachers, and continuous professional development for career teachers; and

(4) realigning the governance and administrative structures of early education, kindergarten through grade 12, and postsecondary systems in Minnesota.

(b) Under the direction of the P-20 Education Partnership Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System Governance Committee, the Office of Higher Education and the Departments of Education and Employment and Economic Development shall improve and expand the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System (SLEDS) to provide policymakers, education and workforce leaders, researchers, and members of the public with data, research, and reports to:

(1) expand reporting on students' educational outcomes for diverse student populations including at-risk students, children with disabilities, English learners, and gifted students, among others, and include formative and summative evaluations based on multiple measures of student progress toward career and college readiness;

(2) evaluate the effectiveness of educational and workforce programs; and

(3) evaluate the relationship between education and workforce outcomes consistent with section 124D.49.

To the extent possible under federal and state law, research and reports should be accessible to the public on the Internet, and disaggregated by demographic characteristics, organization or organization characteristics, and geography.

It is the intent of the legislature that the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System inform public policy and decision-making. The SLEDS governance committee, with assistance from staff of the Office of Higher Education, the Department of Education, and the Department of Employment and Economic Development, shall respond to legislative committee and agency requests on topics utilizing data made available through the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System as resources permit. Any analysis of or report on the data must contain only summary data.

(c) By January 15 of each year, the partnership shall submit a report to the governor and to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees and divisions with jurisdiction over P-20 education policy and finance that summarizes the partnership's progress in meeting its goals and identifies the need for any draft legislation when necessary to further the goals of the partnership to maximize student achievement while promoting efficient use of resources.

Subd. 2a. Career pathways and technical education; key elements; stakeholder collaboration.

(a) The partnership must work with representatives of the Department of Education, the Department of Employment and Economic Development, the Department of Labor, the Board of Teaching, the Board of School Administrators, trade associations, local and regional employers, local school boards, adult basic education program providers, postsecondary institutions, parents, other interested and affected education stakeholders, and other major statewide educational groups and constituencies to recommend to the legislature ways to identify specific policy, administrative, and statutory changes needed under sections 120B.11, 120B.125, 122A.09,

Appendix A

122A.14, 122A.18, and 122A.60, among other statutory provisions, to effect and, if appropriate, revise a comprehensive, effective, and publicly accountable P-20 education system premised on developing, implementing, and realizing students' individual career and college readiness plans and goals. In developing its recommendations, the partnership must consider how best to:

(1) provide students regular and frequent access to multiple qualified individuals within the school and local and regional community who have access to reliable and accurate information, resources, and technology the students need to successfully pursue career and technical education, other postsecondary education, or work-based training options;

(2) regularly engage students in planning and continually reviewing their own career and college readiness plans and goals and in pursuing academic and applied and experiential learning that helps them realize their goals; and

(3) identify and apply valid and reliable measures of student progress and program efficacy that, among other requirements, can accommodate students' prior education-related experiences and applied and experiential learning that students acquire via contextualized projects and other recognized learning opportunities.

(b) The partnership must recommend to the commissioner of education and representatives of secondary and postsecondary institutions and programs how to organize and implement a framework of the foundational knowledge and skills and career fields, clusters, and pathways for students enrolled in a secondary school, postsecondary institution, or work-based program. The key elements of these programs of study for students pursuing postsecondary workforce training or other education must include:

(1) competency-based curricula aligned with industry expectations and skill standards;

(2) sequential course offerings that gradually build students' skills, enabling students to graduate from high school and complete postsecondary programs;

(3) flexible and segmented course and program formats to accommodate students' interests and needs;

(4) course portability to allow students to seamlessly progress in the students' education and career; and

(5) effective and sufficiently strong P-20 connections to facilitate students' uninterrupted skill building, provide students with career opportunities, and align academic credentials with opportunities for advancement in high-skill, high-wage, and high-demand occupations.

(c) Stakeholders under this paragraph must examine possibilities for redesigning teacher and school administrator licensure requirements, and make recommendations to the Board of Teaching and the Board of School Administrators, respectively, to create specialized licenses, credentials, and other endorsement forms to increase students' participation in language immersion programs, world language instruction, career development opportunities, work-based learning, early college courses and careers, career and technical education programs, Montessori schools, and project and place-based learning, among other career and college-ready opportunities. Consistent with the possibilities for redesigning educators' licenses, the stakeholders also must examine how to restructure staff development and training opportunities under sections 120B.125 and 122A.60 to realize the goals of this subdivision.

Appendix A

(d) The partnership must recommend to the Department of Education, the Department of Employment and Economic Development, and postsecondary institutions and systems how best to create a mobile, Web-based hub for students and their families that centralizes existing resources on careers and employment trends and the educational pathways required to attain such careers and employment.

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

Work Group Membership

Work group 1: Realign the governance and administrative structures of early education, kindergarten through grade 12, and postsecondary systems in Minnesota.
(P-20 Amendments, Page 1, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, Subd.2, (4).)

Lead: Eric Kaler, President University of Minnesota

Designee: Geoff Maruyama, Chair, Educational Psychology Dept., University of Minnesota

Members:

Bill Blazar	Minnesota Chamber of Commerce
Sara Ford	Education Minnesota
Jane Gilles	Education Minnesota
Pahoua Hoffman	Minnesota Citizens
Janet Mohr	Board of School Administrators (BOSA)
Fred Nolan	Minnesota Rural Education Association (MREA)
R.T. Rybak	Generation Next
Kirk Schneidawind	Minnesota School Boards Association (MSBA)
Chuck Wiger	Legislator

MDE Staff:

Steve Dibb, Executive Team
Daron Korte, Lead Staff
Bobbie Burnham

Support

Clair Gades

Appendix B

Work group 2: Identify changes to revise a P-20 education system premised on students' individual career and college readiness plans and goals.
(P-20 Amendments, Pages 2-3, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, Subd.2a.(1), (2), and (3).)

Lead: Larry Pogemiller, Commissioner, Office of Higher Education

Members:

David Adney	Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)
Mary Cecconi	Parents United
Paul Cerkvenik	Minnesota Private College Council (MPCC)
Scott Croonquist	Association of Metropolitan School Districts (AMSD)
Mary Gottsch	Bridges Workplace Connection
David Isham	Tribal Nations Education Committee
John Klaber	Minnesota Administrators for Special Education
Geraldine Kozlowski	Minnesota Tribal Nations Education Committee
Jennifer Landy	Education Minnesota
Carlos Mariani	Minnesota Minority Education Partnership, Inc. (MMEP)
Mary McKehey	Parents United
Jodi Olson	Education Minnesota
Mike Ptacek	Schools for Equity in Education (SEE)
Student 1	
Student 2	

Ex-Officio

Kathy Brynaert

MDE Staff:

Rose Hermodson, Executive Team
Angie Johnson, Lead Staff
John Gimpl

Support

Anne Danielson

Appendix B

Work group 3: Organize and implement a framework of foundational skills and career pathways. (P-20 Amendments, Page 3, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, (b).)

Lead: Steven Rosenstone, Chancellor MnSCU

Members:

Gary Amoroso	Minnesota Association of School Administrators (MASA)
Jim Bartholomew	Minnesota Business Partnerships (MBP)
David Bly	Legislator
Kathy Brynaert	Legislator
James B. Field	Minnesota Independent School Forum (MISF)
Jon Millerhagen	Minnesota Elementary School Principal's Association (MESPA)
Katie Misukanis	Minnesota Career College Association (MCCA)
Michael Newman	Minnesota Council on Foundations
Katy Perry	Education Minnesota
Rob Simonich	Education Minnesota
Julie Sweitzer	University of Minnesota
Pakou Yang	Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU)

MDE Staff:

Rose Hermodson, Executive Team
Beth Aune, Lead Staff
John Olson
Michelle Kamenov
Brad Hasskamp

Support

Terry Alvarado

Appendix B

Work group 4: Redesign teacher licensure and restructure staff development and training.
(P-20 Amendments, Page 3, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, (c).)

Lead: Brenda Cassellius, Commissioner MDE

Members:

Tracy Dewberry	Minnesota Parent Teacher Student Association (MNPTA)
Deborah Dillon	University of Minnesota
Kitty Foord	Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)
Garnet Franklin	Education Minnesota
Kathryn Gardner	Education Minnesota
Grace Keliher	Minnesota School Boards Association (MSBA)
Deb Kiel	Legislator
Anne Krafthefer	Minnesota Board of Teaching (BOT)
Kathleen O'Donnell	Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
Richard Rosivach	Irondale Teacher: Chair of Career Pathways Task Force
Daniel Sellars	MinnCAN
Barb Yarusso	Legislator

MDE Staff:

Kevin McHenry, Executive Team
Richard Wassen, Lead Staff
Tyler Livingston

Support

Clair Gades

Appendix B

Work group 5: Create a Web-based hub with career, employment trends and needed educational pathways for students and families.

(P-20 Amendments, Page 3, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, (d).)

Lead: Jeremy Hanson Willis, Deputy Commissioner of Workforce Development (DEED)

Members:

Jodee Buhr	Education Minnesota
Julia Espe	Princeton Schools
Joellen Gonder-Spacek	Mentoring Partnership of Minnesota (MPM)
Bill Leland	Schools for Equity in Education (SEE)
Mary Mackbee	Board of School Administrators
Michael Mullins	Education Minnesota
Branden Petersen	Legislator
Eugene Piccolo	Minnesota Association of Charter Schools (MACS)
Andrea Roethke	MinnCAN
Amy Walstien	Minnesota Chamber of Commerce
Gregg Wright	Education Minnesota

MDE Staff:

Jessie Montano or Kevin McHenry, Executive Team
Paula Palmer, Lead Staff
Matthew Porett, (MNIT)
Deb Proctor
Dorothy Wolf
Kara Arzamendia

Support

Anne Danielson

**Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership
2014 Work Group Recommendations**

Work Group #1 Recommendations

Work group 1 Charge: Realign the governance and administrative structures of early education, kindergarten through grade 12, and postsecondary systems in Minnesota.

An Enhanced SLEDS

- Increase resources to conduct research and improve the SLEDS system, from data input to research outcomes.
- Explore universal, unique identifier that works across agencies and systems (other than a social security number).
- Enhance data security and portability.

Kindergarten Readiness

- Increase access to high quality prekindergarten programs for low income students
- Adopt a menu of kindergarten readiness assessments that are reliable, valid and aligned to early childhood indicators of progress and academic standards that all districts can choose from.
- Affirm importance of linking early childhood data with SLEDS data to measure program quality through outcomes.
- Study ways to effectively coordinate and align early childhood education services from birth-age eight.

Career and College Transitions

- Study methods to ensure consistent quality of PSEO providers and increase access to PSEO, concurrent enrollment, and other dual credit programs.
- Enhance career and college counseling to implement postsecondary transition plan statutes and World's Best Workforce legislation.

Work Group #2 Recommendations

Work group 2 task: Identify changes to revise a P-20 education system premised on students' individual career and college readiness plans and goals.

(P-20 Amendments, Pages 2-3, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, Subd.2a.(1), (2), and (3).)

The P-20 Partnership Work group #2 met monthly from August to November 2014. The work group gathered information about the current implementation of Statute 120B.125, Planning for Successful Transition to Postsecondary Education and Employment, Personal Learning Plans (PLPs) and related initiatives. The work group heard from a variety of Minnesota schools recommended to the committee for their exemplary work, representatives from electronic portfolio systems currently in use in Minnesota, and other states that mandate PLP's.

Context

Minn. Statute 120B.125 directs districts to help all students explore their educational, college and career interests, aptitudes and aspirations. By no later than grade nine, each student must develop a plan for a smooth and successful transition to postsecondary education or employment. Under the statute, each year each student, with the active participation of the student's parent or guardian and the school or district, must review and revise the student's PLP to ensure the student's course-taking schedule allows the student to make sufficient and timely progress to meet state and local academic standards and high school graduation requirements and have a reasonable chance to succeed in employment or postsecondary education without need for remediation.

What the Work group Heard

PLPs can help ensure Minnesota students stay on a path toward postsecondary training and education or sustainable, living-wage careers. However, if implemented without adequate support, PLPs can become simply a series of checkboxes and hoops for students to jump through. Adult support for PLPs is essential for making PLPs engaging and meaningful in students' development and planning. Not all districts have sufficient resources to provide electronic platforms for PLPs, or trained personnel to make PLPs meaningful. In most schools, student performance information and postsecondary planning activities are not currently linked, which limits the relevance and utility of PLPs. PLPs have greater impact when parents or guardians are able to fully engage with students in developing and implementing these plans.

Based on our assessment of the current barriers to effective implementation of PLP's, the following actions are recommended:

Recommendation 1. Minimum Requirements

All districts must use a platform that:

- includes developing and documenting students' academic, personal, social, and financial literacy skills as they pertain to career and college exploration;
- creates PLPs that are portable across schools and districts;
- ensures planning activities and personal learning plan documents are accessible on mobile devices;
- populates students' career and college planning activities with their current, relevant enrollment and academic performance data to ensure that students' high school course taking aligns with their individual career and college goals;
- connects with electronic transcript services to facilitate student requests to transmit transcripts and make PLPs part of a student's portfolio; and,
- provides parents/guardians a meaningful way to engage with their student and school staff in developing the PLP.

This recommendation allows districts to select a software system appropriate to their students' needs while ensuring basic functionalities are met. Additionally, secure, appropriate and ethical use of data is critical to the effective, meaningful use of data—and Minnesota's policies, practices and communications must reflect the moral and legal responsibility to protect data. In doing so, Minnesota will ensure the privacy and confidentiality of students' personally identifiable information, mitigate risks related to the intentional and unintentional misuse of data, and ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities around data use. To this end, all third party providers should be explicitly restricted from the use, sale and/or marketing of student data.

Action: Implement Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)

There are significant barriers that currently restrict the meaningful implementation of PLP plans in Minnesota. School districts in Minnesota use a variety of Student Information Systems and are required to report a myriad of data to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). Traditionally, the standalone applications used by public school districts have the limitation of data isolation; that is, it is difficult to access and share their data. This often results in redundant data entry, data integrity problems, and inefficient or incomplete reporting. In such cases, a student's information can appear in multiple places but may not be identical, for example, or decision makers may be working with incomplete or inaccurate information.

Many district and site technology coordinators also experience an increase in technical support problems from maintaining numerous proprietary systems. SIF was created to solve these issues.

Rather than have each application vendor try to set up a separate connection to every other application, SIF has defined the set of rules and definitions to share data within the "SIF Zone"—a logical grouping of applications in which software application agents communicate with each other through a central communication point. The SIF specification defines such events and the "choreography" that allows data to move back and forth between the applications.

Appendix C

Implementation of SIF allows for real-time data exchange between software applications, which would result in multiple benefits including:

- Increasing the relevance of PLPs by allowing current student enrollment and performance information to populate students' plans;
- Real portability of PLP's between K-12 and postsecondary institutions;
- Instant transfer of student records from district to district, eliminating the lag time in transferring paper records that too often results in students being placed in the wrong classrooms and/or receiving the wrong services for a period of time;
- The ability to detect patterns in transient populations which, along with the instant transfer of student records, will assist in identifying and addressing achievement gaps; and,

Reduction in reporting requirements.

It is estimated that the cost to achieve SIF capabilities in Minnesota would be approximately \$10,000 per LEA, with additional investments at the state level. Assuming that there are 538 LEAs in the state, the local portion of this cost would be \$5,380,000. Building out the SIF infrastructure at MDE in a meaningful way is estimated to cost approximately \$500,000. This would not cover retrofitting all reporting systems to accept SIF structured data, but would position MDE to accomplish this task with the proper infrastructure in place. We recommend state funding to support both local and state implementation of SIF with an estimated total cost of \$5,880,000.

Recommendation 2. Parent/Guardian Outreach & Engagement

The governing statute requires parent/guardian involvement, which is essential to supporting and realizing students' career and college goals. Best practices to make use of PLPs successful and meet the requirement for annual parent/guardian involvement include:

- intentional communication, outreach and engagement of families in developing PLPs during students' enrollment process;
- prioritizing the students' PLP as a foundation of discussion that is appropriate for students' development level at all school/family meetings;
- electronic access for parents/guardians to their students' ongoing PLP development;
- digital and printed parent/guardian guides to accompany PLP activities including resources from MDE that districts can adapt to their student and family needs;
- family events focused on connecting parents/guardians to developing students' PLPs and career and college readiness; and,
- engaging students and their parents/guardians in developmentally appropriate financial planning for students' career and postsecondary education, that includes relevant state and federal grant and scholarship programs.

Students and their families need varying levels of professional guidance. The fastest growing demographic groups in Minnesota are those with the least experience preparing for and making the transition to careers and higher education.ⁱ Institutional structures and support are needed to target low-income families, families with first-generation college-bound students, families of color, immigrant families, English learning familiesⁱⁱ, and families of youth with disabilities to ensure that all parents/guardians can access resources and participate in students' career and college planning activities. Additionally, districts should utilize district and community resources connected to targeted populations to further engage students and families in developing career and college goals and PLPs.

Action: Allocate \$170,000 in startup funds for MDE to undertake a robust state-wide outreach and engagement campaign to students, families, and community stakeholders, including developing and disseminating materials that districts may then customize, to improve the impact of PLPs and allow Minnesota to leverage PLPs to smooth the transitions between K-12, postsecondary training and education, and the workforce. This allocation would include one full time equivalent at \$120,000 to oversee and implement the campaign and a supply and printing budget of \$50,000.

ⁱ McMurry, M. (2006). *Minnesota Education Trends, 2000 to 2005*. Minnesota State Demographic Center. OSD-06-122.

Brower, S. (2014, July 24). *Presentation to MPR employees*. Minnesota State Demographic Center.

ⁱⁱ In alignment with the 2014 Learning for English Academic Proficiency and Success Act (LEAPS) Act, we recognize the importance of improving the circumstances of non-native English speaking students for the state's economic and civic future.

Recommendation 3. Professional Support

All students should receive effective, professional guidance toward sustainable careers and postsecondary education that aligns their educational pathway with their aspirations and goals and maximizes students' choices and opportunities. The current case load of guidance counselors or other college and career planning professionals in most Minnesota schools does not allow this to occur.ⁱ The statute requires districts to provide students regular and frequent access to multiple qualified individuals within the school and local and regional community who have reliable, accurate information, resources, and technology that students need to successfully pursue career and technical education, other postsecondary education, or work-based training options.

To support meaningful development and use of PLPs by all Minnesota students, adequate and ongoing appropriations are needed to fund sufficient numbers of trained professional staff. These professionals, including school counselors and deans, need reliable and accurate information and resources to help students and their families make important decisions about postsecondary education and employment options.

Action: Allocate resources for hiring additional licensed school counselors for career and college support. An additional \$30 million/year would allow districts to hire 700 more licensed school counselors on a 50 percent local/50 percent state (dollar-for-dollar state-local) match. Funding would be used to hire new counselors, not supplant existing counselor positions or salaries.

Action: Create a fund to support districts and community partners in developing and implementing alternative models of professional support for PLPs. Districts could apply for state grants to support their transition to a model that decreases counselor case loads and increases the one-on-one contact students receive from counseling staff or other adult mentors. Other models of system-wide staff development to support PLPs could also be considered. In addition to the total amount of grant funds available for districts, the allocation would need to include a half- to full-time equivalent for MDE to implement the grant (\$60,000-120,000).

While many Minnesota students successfully navigate their high school to career/college transition, many other Minnesota students need targeted support. The improved technology for implementing PLPs recommended in this report will benefit all Minnesota students, and the final recommendation provides professional resources to those students who need additional support to navigate the transition. Some number of these recommendations must move forward in a timely manner if personal learning plans required under MS section 120B.125 are to be effective. If no or too few resources are allocated to support these recommendations, districts will not be able to implement the statute in a meaningful way.

ⁱ In the 2010-11 academic year, the student to counselor ratio in Minnesota was 782:1 while the American School Counselor Association's suggested ratio is 250:1. American School Counselor Association. Student-to-School-Counselor Ratio 2010-2011. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/ratios10-11.pdf>.

Work Group #3 Recommendations

Introduction

The Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership charged Work group #3 with developing recommendations for organizing and implementing *a framework of foundational knowledge and skills and career fields, clusters, and pathways* for students enrolled in a secondary school, postsecondary institution, or work-based program. The key elements of these programs of study for students pursuing postsecondary workforce training or other education must include:

1. Competency-based curricula aligned with industry expectations and skill standards;
2. Sequential course offerings that gradually build students' skills, enabling students to graduate from high school and complete postsecondary programs;
3. Flexible and segmented course and program formats to accommodate students' interests and needs;
4. Course portability to allow students to seamlessly progress in the students' education and career; and
5. Effective and sufficiently strong P-20 connections to facilitate students' uninterrupted skill building, provide students with career opportunities, and align academic credentials with opportunities for advancement in high-skill, high-wage, and high-demand occupations.⁴

The "framework" that the work group referenced in its work is the *Minnesota Career Fields, Clusters & Pathways* document, commonly known as the "wheel chart."⁵ This framework was published by the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) and the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) in 2007.

The work group reviewed dozens of programs and initiatives that are successfully implementing one or more of the above five key elements. The work group also surveyed secondary and postsecondary educators, and MDE and MnSCU staff who work in career and technical education (CTE) to gauge obstacles that significantly hinder the implementation of the key elements. The information obtained through these activities led the work group to focus its recommendations on the following goals: a) System-wide responsibility for student career pathways and readiness and alignment with future workforce needs (Recommendations 1-4), and b) A competency-based education system (Recommendation 5). The group's final recommendation (Recommendation 6) is focused on issues related to teacher preparation, licensure, credentialing, and program accreditation and was forwarded to Work group 4 for its consideration as well as included in this report.

⁴ P-20 amendments, Page 3, Minn. Stat. § 127A.70 (b).

⁵ *Minnesota Career Fields, Clusters & Pathways*; Minnesota State Colleges and Universities and Minnesota Department of Education, October 2007.

System-wide responsibility for student career pathways and readiness and alignment with future workforce needs

The work group's first set of recommendations (Recommendations 1- 4) for "organizing and implementing a framework of foundational knowledge and skills and career fields, clusters, and pathways" are based on this premise: Responsibility for implementation needs to be shared by educators and stakeholders throughout the system rather than shouldered by a few individuals; and program implementation needs to be aligned with the needs of Minnesota's future workforce.

Recommendation 1: *The Minnesota Career Fields, Clusters & Pathways document should be adopted across the P-20 education system as the guiding career pathway framework for how secondary and postsecondary offer their academic programs and instruction and provide information about career pathways and readiness.*

Adoption of the career pathway framework will fundamentally change the culture of "career pathways," recognizing that all education at the secondary and postsecondary levels includes foundational knowledge and skills and discipline/career knowledge and skills towards a career pathway. All educators, not just CTE instructors, should have responsibility for integrating the framework into their programs, courses, and daily instruction.

The framework should be used within an information-rich environment that informs the usage of planning tools, allowing students the opportunities to explore multiple career pathways and create personal career and college plans. This information-rich environment should provide information of future career demand and wages; knowledge, skills, and competencies needed for careers; and multiple tools to help students create individualized pathways.

Recommendation 2: *Determine ways to increase the availability of high school career counseling.*

The capacity of high schools to implement the framework is severely hampered by an inadequate supply of high school career and academic counselors. Minnesota currently has one of the highest student-to-counselor ratios in the country. Information and advice about careers can and should come from multiple individuals within the school and community, with reliable and accurate information about what students need to be successful. For example, students need to understand how to achieve their career goals once they are identified. This requires an understanding of the role of postsecondary education in preparing students for their adult lives, the different types of colleges and how they relate to different jobs and career fields, the entrance requirements for colleges that can prepare students for their careers of interest, ways to cover the costs of postsecondary education, and the social/emotional skills needed for success in postsecondary and in the workplace. A coordinated approach is needed to assure all students can process the information and practice necessary skills in a developmentally appropriate way.

Recommendation 3: *Encourage the use of integrated instructional approaches and the development of interdisciplinary courses by providing funding and other kinds of support.*

Integrated instruction provides students opportunities to learn concepts and skills in the standards by connecting multiple subject areas to a unifying theme or issue. Through interdisciplinary courses, students get opportunities to connect concepts and skills across disciplines. Both approaches typically offer options for students to apply their learning in authentic "real-world" contexts that make their learning more relevant and meaningful.

These approaches can be implemented along a continuum of collaboration that ranges from an individual teacher using real-world contexts to teach content in one subject area to full-scale implementation in

Appendix C

which interdisciplinary courses are co-taught by teachers from multiple subject areas throughout the school system.

In order for integrated instruction and interdisciplinary courses to be implemented system-wide, educators need time and resources to learn new skills and collaborate with colleagues in their own and other content areas, and across the secondary and postsecondary systems. The provision of additional resources to develop co-taught, co-listed courses or other career and college readiness programming would open more students to fields of study and careers than the currently fragmented array of courses that are largely dependent on the efforts of a single teacher or small group of teachers. Resources also could be directed toward professional development that helps teachers understand how their course or program fits into a career pathway and how the framework can be integrated into their classrooms.

Recommendation 4: *Require system-wide recognition of articulated high school to college credits.*

Through Minnesota CTE consortia, students have the opportunity to earn postsecondary credits along with their high school credits. The consortia agreements for articulated high school to college credits are made between local high schools or school districts and an individual postsecondary institution. These local agreements provide dual credit opportunities but the local agreement limits the portability of the credits.

As K-12 and postsecondary institutions create more routes for students in career fields, clusters, and pathways, the ability of students to earn dual credits that are portable to other postsecondary institutions is increasingly important. Postsecondary institutions need to move away from individual agreements towards a system-wide model (i.e., concurrent enrollment model) where course completion of dual credit courses are transcribed and are made more portable for students. A consistent model needs to be established that ensures the quality of the course offerings with standards in place for how courses are delivered and who delivers the courses.

A competency-based education system

The work group's next recommendation (Recommendation 5) for "organizing and implementing a framework of foundational knowledge and skills and career fields, clusters, and pathways" is based on the establishment of a competency-based education system.

Recommendation 5: *Encourage the expansion of competency-based education.*

Competency-based education, also known as proficiency-based education, refers to academic instruction and assessment that is reported by the students' demonstrated mastery of the knowledge and skills that they are expected to learn before they progress. Currently, all CTE Programs of Study in Minnesota have core competencies and state approved technical skills assessments for local district and college usage. Some Minnesota high schools have implemented a competency-based approach through various curricula such as *Project Lead the Way*, but overall, competency-based education has not been implemented as a school- or system-wide approach. Minnesota colleges and universities approach credit for prior learning on an individual basis and many allow students opportunities to demonstrate college and university level learning gained in non-credit or experiential settings through credit for prior learning, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, College-Level Examination Program, and other national examination program credits. With limited statewide or regional coordination, there is wide variation across the colleges and universities in course equivalencies for national exams and for the transferability of credit for prior learning.

Appendix C

“Competency-based curricula” is identified as an element of Programs of Study, yet it is an element that if fully implemented, would have the power to impact all the other elements. Several strategies should be considered for encouraging the expansion of competency-based education in Minnesota including the following:

1. Encourage schools to require that the Foundational Knowledge and Skills (i.e., the center of the “wheel” graphic⁶) be a central component of P-20 education, or at least, their local P-12 education system. Schools should be expected to support the acquisition of, and all students should be expected to demonstrate proficiency in, the core skills at the center of the “wheel” (e.g., problem solving, critical thinking, and employability) and the academic areas of communications, mathematics, science, social studies and English. School boards should develop an understanding of, and establish policy for, the adoption and implementation of the Foundational Knowledge and Skills. Districts should establish implementation practices through a district or school-wide proficiency-based committee charged with aligning components of the competency-based system with instruction and assessment. Finally, districts should establish a clear communication plan that engages students, parents, and the public about the school’s competency-based education system.
2. Identify school districts that are implementing competency-based education and describe their policies and practices.
3. Study successful policies, programs and practices at the postsecondary level and the K-12 level in other states for how these could inform a Minnesota K-12 approach to competency-based education.
4. Examine Minnesota’s Adult Basic Education (ABE) diploma program for competency-based elements that could be applied to K-12.
5. Identify school districts with standards-based grading policies and disseminate information about their grading, promotion, and reporting practices to other schools.
6. Suggest ways to ensure consistency in standards-based grading and reporting practices among teachers.
7. Explore methods for providing credit for prior learning.
8. Make the case for the value of competency-based education including how education costs overall can be decreased and the speed by which students achieve their education (e.g., stackable credentials) can be increased.

Teacher preparation, licensure, credentialing and program accreditation

As a final recommendation, the work group suggests that Work group # 4 (Redesign teacher licensure and restructure staff development and training) should address issues related to teacher preparation, licensure, credentialing, and program accreditation. Problems related to these areas are interdependent with the implementation of programming, curriculum, and instruction recommendations in other areas.

Recommendation 6: Request P-20 Work group #4 to address issues related to teacher preparation, licensure, credentialing and program accreditation.

There currently exists a critical shortage of CTE teachers and CTE preparation programs and the trend appears to be worsening. With the state's focus on career development, meeting Minnesota's business

⁶ Ibid.

Appendix C

and industry workforce needs, and preparing our students with the competencies to become the world's best workforce, the lack of and diminishing of CTE programs is counterproductive. CTE programs are frequently either dropped or not expanded due to the districts' inability to hire adequately licensed teachers. CTE teacher candidates need to complete an entire set of courses in teacher education in order to get licensed. In the case where a teacher is teaching a course without a CTE license, the district does not qualify for CTE revenue and Perkins grant funding. This creates a disincentive for districts to maintain or increase CTE offerings for students.

There also exists a lack of licensed chemistry, physics, and earth science teachers in the state. One way to leverage existing resources and expertise is to develop pathways for core content area teachers to obtain CTE licensure or endorsement. Strategies should be considered for amending the required 24 months of industry experience as well as options for adding CTE career field endorsement to existing licenses.

Agencies that accredit teacher preparation programs place limits on the extent to which institutions can provide pathways for licensure or endorsement. Strategies should be considered for collaborating with accreditation agencies on this issue so that institutions will be encouraged to develop innovative pathways without threats to their accreditation status.

To build upon a framework that addresses foundational knowledge and career fields, clusters, and pathways, students need to have opportunities to explore career fields while in high school. The shortages of CTE and science teachers limit the opportunities to offer courses and curriculum that provides an assortment of career exploration. Minnesota needs to offer an array of teacher preparation programs in CTE, revisit CTE licensure, and revise CTE credentialing.

Work Group #4 Recommendations

Work group 4 Charge: Stakeholders under this paragraph must examine possibilities for redesigning teacher and school administrator licensure requirements, and make recommendations to the Board of Teaching and the Board of School Administrators, respectively, to create specialized licenses, credentials, and other endorsement forms to increase students' participation in language immersion programs, world language instruction, career development opportunities, work-based learning, early college courses and careers, career and technical education programs, Montessori schools, and project and place-based learning, among other career and college-ready opportunities. Consistent with the possibilities for redesigning educators' licenses, the stakeholders also must examine how to restructure staff development and training opportunities under sections 120B.125 and 122A.60 to realize the goals of this subdivision. (P-20 Amendments, Page 1, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, Subd.2a, (c).)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The Board of Teaching should be directed and charged with developing a process to approve a Certificate of Advanced Professional Study (CAPS). CAPS are 'stackable' credentials which provide additional permissions for teachers to teach in a variety of subjects and are recognized by the state. The Board of Teaching should develop ways to address this charge to create more innovative or optional credentials to manage the quality of the certification. In addition the process will need to allow for flexibility in order to have the ability to create new credentials as the need arises. In order to successfully implement the CAPS program the Board of Teaching needs to be appropriately funded and staffed.
- In areas identified by data where there are shortages of teachers, the Board of Teaching should create an expedited licensure/CAPS process, or pilot. Priorities should include Career and Technical Education, Agricultural Education, Montessori Education and Immersion Education. The Teacher Supply and Demand Report is a data point that could be an option for identifying teacher shortages. The Board of Teaching should be appropriately funded and staffed to implement the expedited process and/or pilots.
- In order to attract and retain talented professionals in the teaching profession there should be financial incentives for candidates that align with areas of need in the teaching profession. Incentives should address the current landscape, as well as help to address the future pipeline of teachers. Options should include college loan forgiveness for candidates teaching in hard to staff or shortage areas. Incentives should be provided to current teachers or paraprofessionals who agree to teach in hard to staff or shortage areas. In all cases, eligibility requirements should be established to guarantee high quality.

Work Group #5 Recommendations

Charge for P-20 Work group 5

Recommend to the Department of Education, the Department of Employment and Economic Development, and postsecondary institutions and systems how best to create a mobile, Web-based hub for students and their families that centralizes existing resources on careers and employment trends and the educational pathways required to attain such careers and employment. (P-20 Amendments, Page 1, Stat. § Minn., 127A.70, Subd.2a, (d).)

Planning Principles

A 'first-stop shop' for all students and job-seeking adults

Accessible: free to users and accessible to ESL learners

Nimble, adaptable

Examine and learn from past practices and existing tools

Coordinate multiple data systems and connect to support services

Technology cannot be applied in a vacuum without people support and guidance

Supported with adequate resources to sustain and maintain system to keep relevant

Implementing the tool – not the tool itself – will support the success of postsecondary planning and career development

“Career planning is a journey, not an event.”

Recommendation

- Apply, improve and expand existing tools to reach more people: MCIS
- Begin with existing tool, but explore opportunities for improvement
 - More upfront guidance for users
 - Add translation software, translators for ESL users. Spanish version toggle exists, but could be better integrated and expanded.
 - Improve user mobility in future phases. MCIS is in development to design a mobile app and create a portfolio dashboard.
- Tool needs adequate training for guidance staff in all locations service customers
 - Staff who are trained to assist parents, students, and adult users such as counselors, workforce center navigators, ABE centers, advisors, etc.
- Recommend \$1.2M in annual state funding to incentivize expansion statewide
 - Cost for all middle and high schools, private schools, libraries, workforce centers, MnSCU and U of Minnesota campuses, ABE Learning Consortia, ABE sites, charter middle and high schools, area learning centers
 - Funding amount based on estimated annual license fees costs

Appendix C

Organization Type	Number in State	Most Likely Product	Annual License Fee Cost Estimate	Estimated Gross Potential for Annual License Fees
Area Learning Centers	271	MCIS - small site	\$655	\$177,505
Alternative Learning Programs	52	MCIS small site	\$655	\$34,060
K-12 Schools	14	MCIS small site	\$655	\$9,170
Middle Schools (Grades 5-8)	210	MCIS JR	\$350	\$73,500
Junior Highs (7-9)	32	MCIS JR	\$350	\$11,200
Senior Highs (9-12 or 10-12)	219	MCIS (Avg. fee)	\$768	\$168,192
Combined (7-12)	217	MCIS (Avg. fee)	\$768	\$166,656
Library Systems	25	MCIS 3-VS; 6-S; 10-M; 6-L	\$360-\$1,110	\$21,120
MN Branch Libraries*	173	MCIS very small	\$360	\$62,280
MN Central Libraries*	110	MCIS 45-VS; 22-S; 23-M; 20-L	\$360 to \$1110	\$74,745
MN Work Force Centers *	48	MCIS Adult large site	\$1,110	\$53,280
Charter High Schools (Assume small school)	58	MCIS (Avg-small & very small)	\$500	\$29,000
Charter middle schools	48	MCIS Jr.	\$350	\$16,800
ABE sites (fiscal agents)	112	MCIS (28- large, 28-med, 28-small, 28-very small)	\$360-\$1,110	\$95,960
Vocational Rehabilitation Offices	6	MCIS Adult large site	\$1,110	\$6,660
MNSCU Schools*	54	MCIS Adult- large site	\$1,110	\$59,940
University of MN	7	MCIS Adult- large site	\$1,110	\$7,770
Private high Schools	107	MCIS (Avg. fee)	\$768	\$82,176
Private middle schools	170	MCIS JR	\$350	\$59,500
Total Estimate				\$1,209,514

* Group Orders are possible

MCIS Very Small Site Annual License fee	\$360
MCIS Small Site Annual License Fee	\$655
MCIS Medium Site Annual License fee	\$945
MCIS Large Site Annual License fee	\$1,110
MCIS JR Annual Site License Fee	\$350

Note: Estimates are based on an average of very small to large site Annual License Fees. This cost does not include optional components.

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

Summary of Responses to Work Group Recommendations

(Comments are verbatim)

Work Group 1

Recommendation #1: Enhanced SLEDS **14 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

Per recommendation #1: MPCC is supportive of enhanced data security. MPCC has reservations about the expansion of SLEDS until we see what uses are made of its existing tools and what level quality of research results from the existing tools. (Minnesota Private College Council)

Our caution with the SLED following a student into the workforce is the need to protect data on teachers, especially assessment data from teacher preparation and teacher evaluation data from districts/schools. The other concern is the potential cost to districts if/when their data providers can't or won't offer SIF compatibility. (Education Minnesota)

We think the SLEDs data is a very useful tool. Enhancement of this would be a great idea. (Minnesota School Boards Association)

Recommendation # 2: Kindergarten Readiness **14 Yes** **0 No**

Comments:

Kindergarten readiness access is essential and developmentally appropriate assessment tools are crucial. Placing undue emphasis on lengthy and harmful assessment of pre-K and K is however not appropriate. Let's make that clear in our recommendations so we aren't testing pre-K and K inappropriately. (Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education)

My support is contingent upon my recommendation to change "prekindergarten" to "early childhood" in Kindergarten Readiness bullet #1 and to add to bullet #4 "services" (i.e., "... early childhood education services and systems"). (Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children/Minnesota School-Age Care Alliance)

Of these, K Readiness is the most important with additional funding per child and focused on school site-based programs for children that may be caught in the achievement gap and/or in need of EL services. (Minnesota Elementary School Principal's Association)

As written ("increase access for low income students") we can support this, though it depends on the total price tag; universal pre-K funding would likely carry too high a price tag and require significant implementation time for school districts and local providers. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Relating to access to high quality pre-K programs that such an allocation, if requested, be sought in addition to meeting K-12 needs. (Minnesota School Boards Association)

Recommendation # 3 Career and College Transitions **12 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

The first bullet is clear and reasonable, but I'm not sure what the 2nd bullet means as an actionable recommendation so I can't approve as is. (Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education)

In recent years many higher ed institutions have been laying off counselors and moving to a model in which colleges only have academic advisors. There are precious few actual counselors left. (Education Minnesota)

Consistent quality of PSEO providers is important – we could support studying methods to ensure consistent quality. On counseling however, the state should figure out the role and expectations for career and college counselors before significantly increasing funding. What are the expectations for this role – how will we

Appendix D

measure success? We could instead give schools and students more flexibility to pursue internships, work shadowing, or other experiential learning. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

As it pertains to Recommendation #3, Citizens League encourages additional and more culturally-appropriate communication targeted to parents and students of color and those in low income communities to increase access to PSEO. (Citizens League)

Absolutely support improved methods to enhance PSEO, concurrent enrollment and other dual credit options. Career and college readiness is important. We would not support an unfunded mandate that would require SDs to meet this recommendation. (Minnesota School Boards Association)

Other comments related to Work Group 1 Recommendations:

MCCA supports all three recommendations presented by Work Group #1 but would like to see that all of higher-ed is included in PSEO programs. Many of our schools offer programs that are at no cost to the students nor can we accept state dollars. We would like to be included in the program but not take the dollars and allow the school districts to still keep the dollars but keep the no-cost option available for students. (Minnesota Career College Association)

The total cost of proposals has a significant impact on the strength and likelihood of our support for them. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Work Group 2

Recommendation #1: Minimum Requirements

15 Yes

0 No

Comments:

Most school districts would be challenged by this recommendation if proper resources are not allocated. Any decrease in the funding would set up further inequity in districts. (Education Minnesota)

Recommendation #1: We support the platform but it seems to be exclusive of out-of-school-time programs. We hope there is a way to fold in this critical piece into the requirements. In addition, we encourage including youth in the development and piloting of this platform to ensure we're meeting their needs and getting their buy-in. (Citizens League)

Recommendation # 2: Parent/Guardian Outreach & Engagement

14 Yes

1 No

Comments:

We have deep concerns with this recommendation if the resources were depleted in any way. Training families for success in this program will take significant staff time to make it meaningful and successful. (Education Minnesota)

Outreach and engagement may be more effectively achieved at the school or district level, perhaps with resources prepared by MDE, and should be managed within existing department and school budgets. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Parent outreach requires planning and staff to coordinate events. Would districts have this capacity? Would additional staff be needed to coordinate and implement the outreach and engagement? Ongoing, local impact costs need to be considered as it relates to parent outreach and training. (Minnesota School Boards Association)

Recommendation # 3 Professional Support

12 Yes

2 No

Comments:

The experience and training of licensed school counselors and their critical role for students in both action steps is of utmost importance. (Education Minnesota)

As stated above: the state should figure out the role and expectations for career and college counselors before significantly increasing funding. What are the expectations for this role – how will we measure success? (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Appendix D

Other comments related to Work Group 2 Recommendations:

Minnesota Career College Association believes that these suggestions are good, however we are concerned with the funding and mandates. (Minnesota Career College Association)

The funding requests for these recommendations are quite high, especially for Recommendation #3. (Minnesota Elementary School Principal's Association)

Again, support depends on total cost of proposals. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

We are concerned about the actual dollar amounts attached to the recommendations – since the process for estimating costs are not explicit. We are not sure that we are in the best position to estimate costs for these recommendations. Another concern has to do with P-20 directly making recommendations that come with a funding request, since many of the P-20 organizations (certainly MNSCU and U of M – among other), also receive state funds. (University of Minnesota)

The recommendations are good. We are not sure of the cost for local SDs as it relates to each of these recommendations. Do all SDs have the capacity and platform to implement the SIF? Do all SDs have the capacity to implement a PLP model for all K-12 students? How would rec #1 impact current contractual arrangements with existing service providers for SDs? Are the PLP's required for students in grades 9-12 or all students? We would also maintain that SDs maintain the discretion in the hiring of personnel. Even at a 50/50 local/state match or grant program there are ongoing costs and other legal requirements that will exist for SDs. The quality and skill set of counselors is also an important consideration. Most districts would want additional money on the formula to manage their districts rather than targeted toward a specific personnel grouping. (Minnesota School Boards Association)

Work Group 3

Recommendation #1: Career Fields, Clusters & Pathways framework **13 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

While we support the broad goal of workforce awareness and readiness for students in the K-12 system, Rec #1 sounds highly prescriptive. A better, more affordable way to go might be to expand career exposure opportunities for students. Information should certainly be available, but a highly prescriptive framework is less appealing. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 2: Increasing High School/ Career Counseling **11 Yes** **3 No**

Comments:

Simply increasing counseling numbers will not be helpful and will create internal disruption. Counselor delivery systems must be updated before a new hiring strategy is implemented. A "split cost" strategy may make sense in high need areas. (Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals)

We enthusiastically endorse increasing the number of high school counselors. We have concerns that this may be interpreted as another task for classroom teachers to perform, in homeroom formats, for example. (Education Minnesota)

Rec #2 is "Determine ways to increase the availability of high school career counseling", not "increasing HS/career counseling". We agree some study may be necessary to determine the goals to which counselors would be held accountable. We do not support a large funding increase for counselors at this time. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 3 Encourage Use of Integrated Instructional Approaches and Development of Interdisciplinary Courses **13 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

Recommendations 2 and 3 will require considerable additional financial support from the legislature and this should be included in the recommendations lest they enact and expect unfunded mandates to be implemented

Appendix D

with existing revenues that are already stretched too thin. The professional development and additional work involved to increase and develop interdisciplinary, integrated courses and instruction will require additional professional development funds, perhaps earmarked to this purpose. (Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education)

Support for #3 assumes this is a recommendation for K-12 only. (Minnesota Private College Council)

Resources for teacher professional development that encourage career exposure and “real-world” context are good, but “interdisciplinary” by itself sounds exceptionally broad. Much can be done through cooperation with the private sector. Not sure additional funding is really needed to accomplish this. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 4: System-wide Recognition of Articulated High School to College Credits **13 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

We oppose recommendations #4 and #5 to the extent that they are mandates imposed on the higher system. (Minnesota Private College Council)

The right of individual colleges to determine when to grant credits should not in any way be infringed upon by these recommendations. This is fundamental to preserving high quality and high standards in higher education as well as the independence of nonpublic institutions of higher education. (Minnesota Private College Council)

We note that recommendation #4 uses the word says “require system-wide recognition.” –We recommend that at a minimum it be changed to “encourage system-wide recognition” consistent with the wording in #3 and #5. (Minnesota Private College Council)

We need to ensure that everyone is at the table as the system-wide model is developed to ensure continuity and flexibility. (Education Minnesota)

Private sector institutions should not be included in this recommendation; within the MnSCU system however, we support it. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 5 Encourage expansion of Competency-based Education **10 Yes** **4 No**

Comments:

Minnesota schools and colleges are strongly aligned to standards-based curriculum and assessments. A shift to thinking about competency-based alignment and assessments is not a productive direction for three reasons: 1) it creates duplicate terminology which can be misinterpreted as being identical when it is not, 2) the competencies in the center of the wheel broad topics, not competencies and are already a small part of a broad set of more inclusive, well-defined standards used in all schools and professional/technical degrees, 3) movement toward standards based assessment and grading recommended in another recommendation will produce the alignment and documentation sought. (Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education)

We oppose this to the extent that it is a mandate on higher education. The right of individual post-secondary institutions to make determinations about competency-based education should not be infringed upon by this recommendation. (Minnesota Private College Council)

Competency based education is a promising direction, and we should strive to give credit for prior learning; however, this proposal is highly top-down and prescriptive. We do support the proposals to collect and disseminate best practices and learn from the ABE program. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 6 Teacher Preparation, Licensure and Credentialing and Program Accreditation (Referred to Work Group #4) **13 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

Recommendation 6 is not needed because it was addressed by Work Group 4. (Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education)

Appendix D

Other comments related to Work Group 3 Recommendations:

We support all of these initiatives as we worked on this work group. We stand committed to accreditation as a standard. (Minnesota Career College Association)

This is a problem, and does need to be examined for solutions that increase the supply of CTE teachers without unduly watering down experience or licensure requirements. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

As discussed in the P-20 meeting, we are concerned about asking the legislature to pursue specific instructional/pedagogical approaches above others. This is a local control issue and one that is better made locally, understanding the unique learning needs of students and families locally. (University of Minnesota)

There is significant difference between “encouraging” and “requiring” in relation to rec #3 and #5. In relation to rec #3, would such an approach be scalable for our smallest school districts? How does rec #3 and #5 blend with current state standards? If left as “encourage”, we could support. If mandated this would be a very heavy lift for each SD. Research-based Instructional techniques and methods are generally left to the discretion of the SD and teacher. (Minnesota School Board Association)

Work Group 4

Recommendation #1: Board of Teaching (BOT) to Develop a Certificate of Advanced Professional Study (CAPS)	15 Yes	0 No
--	---------------	-------------

Comments:

Our level of support would depend on the estimated amount of funding required to carry out this recommendation. We would hope this could be designed and implemented efficiently. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 2: BOT Create Expedited Process in Shortage Areas	15 Yes	0 No
---	---------------	-------------

Comments:

Again, support would depend on total funding required. Hopefully this could be implemented in a quick, efficient manner. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

While we see the value in creating a CAPS process/pilot to address shortages of teachers and support the intent, we would only support it if an expedited process did not jeopardize or raise concerns with the quality of teachers. (Citizens League)

Recommendation #3: Incentives to Attract and Retain Teachers	13 Yes	1 No
---	---------------	-------------

Comments:

None submitted.

Other comments related to Work Group 4 Recommendations:

In addition to the recommendations above, the state ought to make it easier for out-of-state teachers to use their licenses or gain MN teacher licenses. (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

We like all of these recommendations. A streamlined process for out-of-state teachers should also be developed and promoted to enhance the pool of applicants for SDs. When we have our smallest, out-state districts and our large urban districts concerned about teacher availability it is time to review the current licensure practices to meet their needs. Of all the recommendations, this area should receive top priority. (Minnesota School Board Association)

Appendix D

Work Group 5

Recommendation # 1: Apply, Improve, Expand Existing Tools--MCIS **14 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

We would need more information on this before we could support it. Is an expanded tool truly needed? Is MCIS the best option among existing and possible tools? How can we know it is needed, if goals and outcomes measurements are not yet attached to it - how will we know that funding this has led to any positive outcomes? Are there other tools that should be phased out, and the funds repurposed? If there were a choice between more people (counselors, mentors, concerned adults) and a web-based hub, which would be the priority? (Minnesota Chamber of Commerce)

Recommendation # 2: Explore Ways to Improve Existing Tools **14 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

None submitted.

Recommendation # 3: Adequate Training for Users **12 Yes** **2 No**

Comments:

None submitted.

Recommendation # 4: Incentivize Expansion Statewide—State Funding **12 Yes** **1 No**

Comments:

Please also add to the training list career counselors and faculty on college and university campuses. Although state funds may only be spent on state schools, what measures might be in place for private schools and colleges to access this resource at a fee? We don't want to create a system that denies access to segments of our population who may need the information, if we can assess a fee. (Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education)

Other comments related to Work Group 5 Recommendations:

We support these but would request that all private higher-ed institutions, including our sector be included in the tools usage. (Minnesota Career College Association)

Private nonprofit colleges should be included alongside MnSCU and the University of Minnesota in the allocation of funds to incentivize the expansion of this tool statewide. (Minnesota Private College Council)

My support includes the following recommendations:

#1 bullet #2 should add an additional sub-bullet stating "work closely with users to design improvements, in particular youth"; #1 bullet #3 include an explicit additional listing of "and others who work with youth in school and community settings" (rather than "etc."); #1 Bullet #4 should include "MN Private Colleges" along with MnSCU and U of MN. (Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children/Minnesota School-Age Care Alliance)

Yes to these recommendations, yet the funding sources and amounts seem to be vague and uncertain. It bears the question, "At what cost?" (Minnesota Elementary School Principal's Association)

This is a laudable goal that looks to the future of career planning. What is MCIS? How does one make this relevant for students and districts each year? Markets change, employers needs change, etc. A good idea, but would the investment and product be relevant and usable for SDs? Some type of marketing would also be needed. Would there be additional time and costs for SD's and other local governments. Additional staff is recommended for SDs in addition to the training that would be required which is a recognized cost for SDs. We support training as long as it is recognized that time and cost is considered. Adequate funding needs to be included in the recommendation #3 since it appears that it will be the SDs responsibility to train everyone. What is available in this area for districts today? Of the recommendations, we know less about this topic than others. This recommendation would be a low priority. (Minnesota School Boards Association)

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership 2014 Members

Organization	Name
Education Minnesota	Denise Specht
Mentoring Partnership of MN (MPM)	Joellen Gonder-Spacek
MN Association for the Education of Young Children/ MN School-Age Care Alliance (MnAEYC-MnSACA)	Kathleen O'Donnell
MN Association of Charter Schools (MACS)	Eugene Piccolo
MN Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	Kathleen Foord
MN Association of School Administrators (MASA)	Gary Amoroso
MN Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	David Adney
MN Business Partnership (MBP)	Charlie Weaver
MN Career College Association (MCCA)	Katie Misukanis
MN Chamber of Commerce	Bill Blazer
MN Citizens League	Pahoua Hoffman
MN Council on Foundations	Michael Newman
MN Department of Education (MDE)	Brenda Cassellius
MN Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED)	Katie Clark Sieben
MN Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)	Jon Millerhagen
MN Independent School Forum (MISF)	James B. Field
MN Legislature	David Bly
MN Legislature	Deb Kiel
MN Legislature	Branden Petersen
MN Legislature	Chuck Wiger
MN Minority Education Partnership, Inc. (MMEP)	Carlos Mariani-Rosa
MN Office of Higher Education (OHE)	Larry Pogemiller
MN Parent Teacher Student Association (MNPTA)	Tracy Dewberry
MN Private College Council (MPCC)	Paul Cerkvenik
MN School Boards Association (MSBA)	Kirk Schneidawind
MN State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU)	Steven Rosenstone
MN Tribal Nations Education Committee	Geraldine Kozlowski
University of Minnesota	Eric Kaler

