

STEM Action Center Board Meeting Minutes

April 8, 2015 • 3:00pm

Utah State Capitol: 350 North State Street, Salt Lake City

Members Present:	Reza Jalili, Jeffery Nelson, Gene Levinzon, Bert VanderHeiden, Rich Nelson, Stan Lockhart, Val Hale, Norm LeClair, Tami Pyfer
Members Absent:	Brad Smith, Blair Carruth, Robert Brems, Mark Huntsman
Staff:	Tami Goetz, Sue Redington, Gina Sanzenbacher, Sarah Young, Jenna Johnson, Kaitlin Felsted
Visitors:	Sarah Brasiel, Brent Peterson, Connie Ronburt, Allison Nicholson, Jared Haines

I. Welcome and Related Business

Jeff Nelson, STEM Action Center Board Chairman, called the meeting to order, introduced and welcomed the group and asked the Board to approve the minutes from the March Meeting.

APPROVE MINUTES

MOTION: VALE HALE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, SECONDED BY BERT VANDERHEIDEN. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

II. Board Discussion

Project Updates: Sue Redington, Program Manager, began the discussion by giving an overview of the Math Technology Grant and its current status. Board members asked questions about measuring success and the goal of the project. Discussion continued about the process of evaluation, and there was some confusion about what the process means and why it is important. Dr. Tami Goetz, Executive Director, made the comment that there is concern about waiting for the data to come out for public view, and that in the meantime there is not a way to show success or progress. Chairman Nelson stressed that the staff should be focused on showing that success on a daily basis, and Rich Nelson, Board Member, also stressed visible outcomes and the importance of communicating to the State Legislature on the progress of the STEM Action Center. Gina Sanzenbacher, Community Engagement Specialist, gave the next overview of the applied science and the professional development projects, and their current status. Gina summarized what she has been learning during her visits to the schools and her discussions with educators, mostly reporting good news and excitement, but also that utilization is not as high as it should be due to a late roll out of software. Gina stressed that it is important to work on raising utilization, but Chairman Nelson expressed a concern that the STEM Action Center might be “stuck” in the utilization period of the process for a long time. The Board and staff discussed why there are unexpected usage numbers, and what the significance was of a late roll out. Tami Pyfer explained that education agencies have a planning period where they are expected to make their curriculum and learning plan for the upcoming year, and that these education agencies make that plan, but often, they are criticized for altering their plan instead of following through. It was concluded that earlier awareness and roll out will help these

education agencies stick to their plan and show results. Sarah Young, STEM – USOE Liaison, gave a summary of the Elementary STEM Endorsement that is currently underway with the goal of training for educators in the subjects of science, technology, engineering and mathematics through State and local universities. Sarah spoke to her next project, the STEM Schools Designation, and the new research that has been published regarding STEM Schools. The research institution, Outlier within the University of Chicago, will be presenting at the next board meeting on their research and what a model looks like for Utah to implement in order to encourage designating STEM schools. Chairman Nelson asked about how to measure need or demand for STEM schools, and Sarah replied that it is difficult to establish that because of the limited capacity of one person overseeing the project. Chairmen Nelson acknowledged that and then asked about the partnerships with higher education institutions and how they view the STEM Action Center. Reza Jalili asked what the current criteria is for schools to become a STEM school, and Sarah answered that the STEM labels on schools currently are self-labelled, but when the Designation criteria is approved, there will be an official way to recognize these schools. Gene Levinzon asked who will have authority to approve these schools, and Sarah replied that the Board would be able to approve the portfolios submitted by the applying schools. Jenna Johnson then spoke about the Fairs, Camps and Competitions, gave current statistics on the number of students impacted and that currently, students are turning in receipts to receive reimbursement and completing surveys through the Active Learning Lab at USU. Chairman Nelson asked about the evaluation component and if, over time, the results of the data will help to lead to a more refined way to target students. Dr. Sarah Brasiel from the Active Learning Lab stated that students are asked subjective questions and are asked to provide their Student State Identifier Number to help track their progress academically, but because this is subjective, it might be hard to make decisions based on that information alone. Jenna suggested looking at the difference between students who are participating for their first time versus students who have participated in STEM activities in the past to see if there are larger gains with those students, which would help to refine the grant in the future. Kaitlin Felsted, Marketing and Communications Coordinator then gave an update on the STEM Festival and the 13,000+ attendees and the news coverage, along with 70 sponsors and exhibitors. Kaitlin then mentioned that surveys have been given to attendees, but have not been analyzed yet. The Board was pleased. Last, Dr. Tami Goetz gave the update on the High School STEM Certification Grant and that the first quarterly reports are due at the end of April 2015, so we should have numbers to report on soon.

Legislative Strategy: Rich Nelson, Board Member, was able to speak about the Utah Innovation Awards by UTC and how the STEM Action Center will be giving awards at the banquet in April. He also gave an update on the Legislative Session of 2015, and how the interest in the STEM Action Center has grown, but that there is also a need for deliverables and outcomes that has not been seen yet. Rich went on to say that there is a concern from the industry perspective with the lack of urgency, and that it is important to get the Legislature to understand that urgency. Rich expressed his opinion that there is a need to move the projects along and show the value of the STEM Action Center.

Higher Education Partnership: Dr. Tami Goetz opened up the discussion for a higher education partnership. The 2015 Legislative Session brought to light the need to work together and engaging the higher education partners and supporters. Dr. Goetz proposed two ideas of having Board Members host a legislative site visit in places that will tell the story of the STEM Action Center. This will be important as it gets Legislators and Board Members engaged with each

other, and with community and education partners. The other idea is to have Board Members engage in conversations with Legislators one on one. The Board was receptive to this idea, but had questions as far as preparing and having talking points. Stan Lockhart made the point that no one should be afraid to show less than positive outcomes, but that as a whole, the STEM Action Center as a whole is succeeding. Chairman Nelson spoke about the desire of certain higher education institutions wanting to seek independent funding under the banner of STEM, which could confuse or dilute what we are doing. Dr. Goetz and Blair Carruth, Board Member, are working on a plan to work together using collaboration with these institutions without the competition.

HJR 26, possible STEM Action Center Audit of third party contracts: Dr. Goetz spoke about the potential for an audit of the STEM Action Center third party vendor contracts. This would mean that the contracts will be looked at for accuracy and effectiveness, but this could be the first step to an audit of the entire Center. The Division of Purchasing recommended hiring an external auditor to prepare for this audit and make sure things are in place for the actual State audit of those contracts.

Sponsorship Approvals: Kaitlin Felsted presented on the current requests for sponsorship from the STEM Action Center, first from the Utah Technology Council for \$7500 for their Innovation Awards Ceremony, which would allow us to be a part of this ceremony and offer our own awards. The second request is to support a conference for middle to high school girls (minority) to talk about leadership in STEM.

APPROVE SPONSORSHIPS

MOTION: STAN LOCKHART MOVED TO APPROVE THE PRESENTED SPONSORSHIPS, SECONDED BY GENE LEVINZON. THE MOTION WAS UNANAMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Closed Session

MOTION: PURSUANT TO THE OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT, I HEREBY MOVE TO CLOSE THE MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF A STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY. AND PURSUANT TO THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT, I HEREBY MOVE TO CLOSE THE MEETING FOR THIS PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, LEASE OR SALE OF REAL PROPERTY AND I BELIEVE THE CLOSURE IS APPROPRIATE BECAUSE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF THE TRANSACTION WOULD PREVENT THE PUBLIC BODY FROM COMPLETING THE TRANSACTION ON THE BEST POSSIBLE TERMS. THIS VOTE REQUIRES 2/3 VOTE OF THE BOARD. THE CLOSED MEETING SHALL BE HELD IN THE CAPITOL BOARD ROOM OF THE UTAH STATE CAPITOL, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Name of Member of Public Body	VOTE TO CLOSE MEETING
Bert VanderHeiden	Yes
Reza Jalili	Yes
Tami Pyfer	Yes
Gene Levinzon	Yes
Jeffery Nelson	Yes
Stan Lockhart	Yes
Norm LeClair	Yes

Dr. Tami Goetz was asked to relay to the Board Members the need for independent space and the process to acquire it. She was also asked to provide the decision that had been made on which property to acquire. Tami began by stating the needs of the Center, and the amount of square footage required for the team (3000-4000 sq. ft.) reporting on the process of looking for property and the cost of the district the STEM Action Center is looking at, around \$20-22 per square foot. Dr. Goetz needed to work through the State Department of Facilities, Construction and Management. In conversations with commercial real estate agents, Dr. Goetz learned that there would need some type of retrofitting in order to accommodate the STEM Action Center. The World Trade Center Tower, where the Center is currently located with GOED, has space available at about \$28 per square foot and paying 100% of the tenant improvement costs, along with a 3% annual increase. Dr. Goetz relayed that the Center declined that offer, however, the building manager came back with another offer of \$25 per square foot and that the building would cover up to \$35 of tenant improvement costs (build out), with a 3% annual increase. Tami countered that offer with the same amount per square foot, but with the building covering 100% of the tenant improvement costs, but the building manager politely declined the counter offer. This would mean that the STEM Action Center would be responsible for about \$77,000 for tenant improvement costs, a one-time, lump sum. Per year, the ongoing cost for the Center would be just over \$96,000 for that space. Stan Lockhart asked about "plan B," which would be to spend more time looking for space that meets the requirements and allows for a workable space. Another question was asked about how long the STEM Action Center can remain with GOED, and Tami replied that while the GOED team is not pushing to have the Center leave, but that they want us in our own space. Another question asked was what a comparable price would be, for example, what GOED pays for a similar, but bigger space, which is \$24.22 per square foot. Dr. Goetz mentioned that she is perfectly willing to go out and walk through other spaces, but she wanted to find the bottom line for the World Trade Center Tower. Dr. Goetz was asked questions about GOED's lease, but did not have answers for the Board. Chairman Nelson also made the point that the STEM Action Center is not only housed within GOED, but that it also receives some oversight from the GOED team, along with the use of their finance team, HR team, marketing team, Desktop Support Services, and other administrative benefits. Stan Lockhart pointed out that there is nothing in the Center's legislation that requires them to be tied to GOED, however, GOED has some responsibility for the STEM Action Center. Chairman Nelson opened the subject up to the Board for comments and perspectives on whether the STEM Action Center should pursue the lease at the World Trade Center, or if the Center should continue looking. Norm LeClair commented that he felt there was not enough of an "audit trail" to prove Dr. Goetz correctly shopped for spaces, and that perhaps the Center is moving too fast. Stan Lockhart then commented that Dr. Goetz will want to look closer at GOED's lease, and that we should try to find a mirror image of what that lease entails. Dr. Goetz was asked about other costs such as wiring for phones, computers, etc. and other possible hidden costs, which the Board would like her to find out before they approve of the space. Stan also stressed that the Center is not bound to the current deal, and that it is still in the negotiation stage, and Gene Levinzon reiterated that it should be an extension of what GOED currently has. Chairman Nelson mentioned that it might not be comparable due to the timing and the current market price. Reza Jalili agreed that the ideal would be the extension of the GOED lease, but again, Chairman Nelson was unsure of this possibility. Bert VanderHeiden shared the insight that if the Center is a part of GOED, can GOED "kick the Center out," but Dr. Goetz stated that the real issue is that GOED does not have enough space. Dr. Goetz next steps are to continue looking for space comparable to the price of GOED, and to report back to the Board at the next board meeting in May.

CLOSE THE CLOSED SESSION

MOTION: CHAIRMAN JEFF NELSON MOVED TO CLOSE THE CLOSED MEETING. THE MOTION WAS UNANAMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Adjournment

MOTION: NORM LECLAIR MOTIONS TO CLOSE THE OPEN MEETING, SECONDED BY REZA JALILI. THIS MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.