

### STEM Action Center Board Meeting Minutes

November 29, 2017 • 2:00pm

STEM Action Center: 60 East South Temple, Suite 850, Salt Lake City

<b>Members Present:</b>	Vance Checketts, Tami Goetz, Blair Carruth, Scott Nowlin, Jon Pierpont, Tami Pyfer, Dave Woolstenhulme, Joseph Fournier, Mikal Ann Byrd
<b>Members Absent:</b>	Val Hale, John Knotwell, Marc Sunday, Kathleen Riebe, Sydnee Dickson
<b>Staff:</b>	Tami Goetz, Sue Redington, Kaitlin Felsted, Kellie Yates, Lynn Purdin, Clarence Ames, Erin Paulsen, Lolly Bowler, Chuck Keeler, Brad Hunsaker, Colleen Fisher, George Pechmann
<b>Visitors:</b>	Brent Petersen, Alison Sturgeon, Andrea Rorrer, Stacy Eddings, Emily Swan, Vessela Ilieva, Parker Fawson

#### I. Welcome and Related Business

Vance Checketts, STEM Action Center Board Chairman, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. The first order of business was to welcome the newest STEM Action Center board member, Joseph Fournier of Intermountain Healthcare. Joseph was officially sworn in. The newest members of the STEM Action Center team were welcomed and introduced by Tami Goetz. George Pechmann and Colleen Fisher are the new Utah STEM Bus team members.

#### APPROVE AUGUST MINUTES

**MOTION: DAVE WOOLSTENHULME MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, SECONDED BY TAMI PYFER. THE MOTION WAS UNANAMOUSLY APPROVED.**

#### II. Board Discussion

The evaluation team from UVU and the U of U were then invited to present. During their presentation, they shared the data that has been collected thus far through surveys taken by students, teachers and administrators. The first section of the presentation focused on the feedback regarding the use of math digital learning software in the classroom. The majority of survey takers had positive feedback about the software. Based on the results, the considerations for improvement include: 1) increase use of the software, 2) increase training for effective use of the software, and 3) resolve access issues. There was a pause in the presentation at this point for questions from the board. Vance Checketts thanked the presenters for the partnership with the STEM Action Center and mentioned how helpful these evaluations are. He asked how the math product providers are chosen. Clarence Ames explained the vendor selection process. Vance asked if a school comes to the Action Center with a vendor that is not on the approved list, they can't be funded? Clarence confirmed that funding can only be provided for licenses from vendors that are on the approved list. Tami Goetz chimed in to bring up the fact that there will be a new pilot program this next school year to get ideas from the educational community about which software programs are the most effective or desired. Clarence added that through this pilot program, companies will be able to donate their software to schools to pilot them, so that we can conduct a one year evaluation to determine how effective they are and if they should be added to the approved vendor list. There was further discussion about the math digital learning program, specifically about whether unused licenses are being paid for (they aren't), if there are fidelity reports included in the data being shared, how each vendor defines and measures fidelity, etc.

The presentation continued on to the Elementary STEM Endorsement evaluation. Again, based on the data collected through surveys, the feedback for this program was incredibly positive. The considerations for improvement include: 1) increasing the impact of the endorsement and 2) increasing the number of teachers working toward endorsement. Vance Checketts asked what the constraints are that are keeping us from rolling this out more and reaching more teachers. Discussion followed, in which Tami Goetz and Kellie Yates spoke to the fact that the program is restricted because of the limit of the number of teachers that the higher education partners can fit into a cohort. They only have so much physical space and so many professors that are available to facilitate the endorsement program. There is also limited funding that prevents further expansion at this time. It was discussed that many rural districts would love to have their teachers in this program and that utilizing online options could be a solution. Vance brought up the question of how industry can get involved and posed the idea of having industry members take part in the instruction to provide more facilitators. It was decided that there is a high demand for the endorsement and that the STEM AC team will continue exploring other ways that we can get this program out to more teachers.

The presentation then shifted to the STEM Professional Learning program evaluation. While a lot of the feedback about this program is positive, it is definitely not as positive as the feedback received about the Elementary Endorsement. The only data that has been collected so far is based off of the usage of the program Edivate, which was formerly required for each LEA to use in their professional learning plans. Based on the evaluation outcomes, the considerations for improvement are: 1) improvements to training and 2) improvements to the platforms (Edivate and others). Tami Goetz and Kellie Yates went over the fact that each of the participants in the grant have other activities outside of Edivate that have been very effective. The data presented doesn't include the other methods that districts and schools are using for their professional learning programs. Kellie Yates mentioned that the grant has been amended so that Edivate is no longer the required platform, but that we currently can't fund other platforms. She explained that she had just met with State Purchasing to talk about setting up an approved vendor list, similar to the one used in the Math Personalized Learning program that would allow LEA's to select a different platform for professional learning. The funding for the Professional Learning program was also discussed. The contract for it was reduced this past year, due to the decrease in Edivate use, and the leftover funds were put into the Elementary Endorsement program. It was suggested that the Elementary Endorsement program fits under the category of professional learning, so perhaps we should evaluate those funds and work on transferring more over to the endorsement program due to its high demand.

Sue Redington, STEM Action Center Program Director, then presented on the Fiscal Year 2017-2018 budget. She showed slides that broke down the funds received, funds spent and leftover funds that will transfer over into the next year. Included in the breakdown were non-lapsing funds. Vance Checketts asked if there are any lapsing funds, and Sue replied that there are not, they are all non-lapsing. Vance requested a more specific, itemized breakdown of the office expenses category, since it was such a large amount. Sue passed around a sheet that listed all of the costs that are included in the office expenses category. The next part of the presentation showed a comparison between the FY 2016 and FY 2017. The amount of non-lapsing funds has gone down each year, Vance Checketts asked if that amount will continue to go down. It was explained that now that we have the STEM Foundation, those donations will affect that amount of non-lapsing funds, but that it will continue to decrease. Dave Woolstenhulme expressed some concern over the fact that legislators might see leftover funds and be less likely to distribute more funds to the STEM Action Center. He stressed the importance of being prepared to explain what those funds will go towards and that they will be utilized. Tami Goetz explained what the current plan is for the extra funds from the FY 2017 budget, including using some of the funds to revamp the STEM website and hire someone to create a searchable database of resources.

Vance expressed that he normally doesn't love the idea of having too many websites; too many places to go to find information, but he does think that the STEM website could be a very valuable resource. He suggested that \$100,000 be allocated to the website, an increase to the \$75,000 that was suggested. He also suggested that some of the extra funds be put towards the STEM Mentor Exchange App. Brent Peterson spoke to the fact that the app has 500 followers, but still needs additional web development to be successful. Funds from the STEM Action Center would be helpful in getting it off the ground. Tami Goetz mentioned that in order to put the STEM AC state funds towards the STEM MX app, it would need to be confirmed that it will never become a for-profit organization. There was further discussion as to how the funding could be shared; what the contracting process would look like, etc.

Vance Checketts asked for a vote on using \$100,000 for the website update, and the remaining leftover funds to support the STEM Mentor Exchange app web development.

Tami Pyfer made the motion, Dave Woolstenhulme seconded; it was unanimously approved.

### **III. Adjournment**