

BRIAN SANDOVAL
GOVERNOR



BRIAN L. MITCHELL
DIRECTOR

STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF SCIENCE, INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY
100 North Stewart Street, Suite 220
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(775) 687-0987 * Fax: (775) 687-0990

MINUTES

Name of Organization: STEMworks Subcommittee of the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Advisory Council

Date and Time of Meeting: February 3, 2017 at 1:00 PM

Place of Meeting: Governor's Office of Science Innovation and Technology (OSIT)
100 North Stewart Street, Suite 220
Carson City, NV 89701

Please use the following numbers to join the conference call:

North: 775-687-0999 or
South: 702-486-5260

Access Code: 70987 push #

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call.
Brian Mitchell- Director, OSIT

Members Present: Dave Brancamp, Mary Pike, Kris Carrol, Kelly Barber

Members Excused: Connie Thompson, Kendra Fox, Mike Pacheco

Guest Present: Claus Von Zastrow

Staff Present: Brian Mitchell, Debra Petrelli

- II. **Public Comment** (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.)

There was no public comment.

- III. **Welcoming Remarks.**
Brian Mitchell- Director, OSIT

Mr. Mitchell welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the STEMworks Subcommittee and introduced Claus Von Zastrow, CFO and Director of Research for Change the Equation. Mr. Zastrow directs a leading national database of STEM education programs that meet rigorous standards for effectiveness.

- IV. **Determine Nevada-specific questions to add to the STEMworks rubric.** (For possible action)
Brian Mitchell- Director, OSIT

Mr. Mitchell asked for Nevada specific questions regarding the STEMworks rubric. He pointed out that Mr. Zastrow provided some examples from other states for reference. He referred the Subcommittee to information from Idaho and Iowa and what they have done and asked for specific ideas that we may want to add to the general STEMworks rubric. It was asked whether the descriptors could be modified. Mr. Zastrow responded we can change or add whatever we want. Questions can be changed entirely or you can choose to have no questions at all. He added the only thing Change the Equation focuses on are the core STEMworks rubric questions to avoid inconsistent standards across states. Mr. Mitchell said this would be a good way to recommend or certify certain programs, whether using state money or to provide help to school districts to assist in the process of choosing different programs to put into the classroom. It would be a good idea for us to think about some different goals; maybe Career Technical Education (CTE), professional development or specific things that are “must haves” for a program.

The Subcommittee discussed Idaho’s questions and Interdisciplinary Aspects, and because of the diversity of our school districts, how programs could be scaled and replicated regardless of size or location. Mr. Zastrow suggested polling different groups specifically for feedback for possible programs. The Subcommittee further discussed teacher professional development and how creating a partnership would be beneficial and what good professional development looks like, as well as ways to develop a framework. It was discussed as a goal to tie in the opportunity for professional development or apprenticeship-type programs be used as partnerships. Mr. Mitchell suggested the Subcommittee review the STEMworks website for more information.

The Subcommittee discussed the larger school districts differing from the rural school districts and some of their concerns. We will need to provide some type of guidance to avoid potential limitations. Mr. Zastrow agreed and said with the combination of a huge urban school district along with many rural school districts, it will be necessary to provide information for programs that will meet each of their needs and requirements. Mr. Mitchell suggested when we ask questions of the applicants, we can also ask them to include a 75-word brief overview of their curriculum which could be posted on the STEMworks website. Additionally to the programs merits, the reviewers could request information on the limitations or particular focus of the program, to include areas of strength. The Subcommittee discussed different approaches to what each reviewer might submit on the programs they are assigned to as well as the purpose of different programs and how to delineate each of them to help direct school districts and schools in the direction of each of their particular needs other than just addressing State Standards.

Mr. Carroll suggested a “prep-sheet” for reviewers going through programs of pre-established categories, capturing information while the reviewers are making notes of these programs. Mr. Mitchell said with the strong consensus here today we add to the rubric, and rather than hash it out now, he will further review the Idaho and Iowa rubrics and create a document of what they have done. This will be sent to members of this Subcommittee. It was discussed to use Google Docs for the circulation of this document for any changes and or additions. Mr. Carrol suggested a piece on cultural identity and student interest. Another piece he believes is extremely valuable to include is something in their criteria about how they connect with Nevada Partners. Lastly, whether the program is a phenomena-based design.

- V. Determine the timeline for the initial review process and whether to have an ongoing review process or set times(s) throughout the year for providers to submit their programs for review. (For possible action)
Brian Mitchell- Director, OSIT

Mr. Mitchell discussed “open enrollment” as an option for applications either once a year or possibly twice a year. The Subcommittee discussed they will need to be aware of funding and budget cycles for the different schools and school districts as this timing will play a big role in programming decisions. The Subcommittee discussed dates. A suggested time for the new list to come out had a September timeline for review, giving October a time for going over the reviews and publishing by early November. Ms. Pike suggested a deadline of the middle or end of December for the list to be fully ready and final. Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Brancamp whether this timeline aligns with the College and Career Readiness Grant, Great Teaching and Leading Fund and other state pods funding cycles as well as federal cycles with Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Mr. Brancamp responded those deadlines should work. It was decided to put out a call for applications and have review in early fall (September) with a list to come out either mid or late-October, no

later than November 1st. Everyone agreed. Mr. Carrol suggested giving the applicants at least six (6) weeks to apply. Mr. Mitchell said this give us plenty of time to identify reviewers and get them trained, as well. Mr. Zastrow agreed.

- VI. Discuss the recruitment of reviewers. (For information only)
Brian Mitchell- Director, OSIT

Mr. Mitchell said he had spoken to several individuals at Desert Research Institute (DRI) that are very interested in becoming reviewers for this program. He added Mr. Zastrow has suggested we get at least ten (10) reviewers, because each applicant requires two (2) reviewers. He asked whether any members of the Subcommittee were interested in becoming reviewers. Ms. Pike said she may have an interest. Mr. Carroll also said he would be interested. Mr. Zastrow added these reviews typically last between two and three hours. Ms. Pike asked what type of people typically become reviewers in other states. Mr. Zastrow responded reviewers include people who know about education and quality to include building administrators, school district curriculum specialists, education consultants and program developers. He added we have to be cautious of conflicts of interest. They do need to have some experience in the area of education. Based on that, Mr. Carrol asked whether we need to have quality control in place and suggested it would be wise to have a large pool of potential reviewers. Mr. Mitchell responded all reviewers will be trained through several training sessions allowing everyone to be on the same page. He suggested the Subcommittee submit to him through Google Docs the names of ten to twelve possible reviewers to whom we can reach out to that would make good reviewers. Mr. Zastrow said he has a form the Subcommittee can use outlining the obligations of a reviewer. He stressed the importance that the reviewers take detailed notes in order to distinguish different programs from others.

- VII. Public Comment. (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.)

There was no public comment.

- VIII. Adjournment.

Mr. Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 1:58 pm.