



Steve Sisolak
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF SCIENCE, INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY

100 North Stewart Street, Suite 220
Carson City, Nevada 89701
775-687-0987 Fax: 775-687-0990



Brian L. Mitchell
Director

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Name of Organization: Community Partnerships Subcommittee
Date and Time of Meeting: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 at 2:00 PM
Place of Meeting: Nevada State Library and Archives
Governor's Office of Science Innovation and Technology
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 #

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Brandolyn Thran

The Community Partnerships Subcommittee was called to order by Chair Brandolyn Thran at 2:00 P.M. on December 17, 2019, on the tele-conference remote site, listed above.

Members Present

Audra Bauer
Brandolyn Thran
Brian Mitchell
Cheryl Wagner
Pom Jintasawang
Richard Knoepfel
Sue DiBella

Members Absent

Leah Ochs

Staff Present

Debra Petrelli

2. **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.)
Chair Brandolyn Thran

There was no public comment.

3. **Welcoming Remarks and Announcements**

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Chair Thran welcomed everyone for joining the meeting today. There were no announcements

4. **Approval of the Minutes from the November 14, 2019 Meeting** (For possible action)

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Chair Thran asked if there are any corrections to the November 14, 2019 Minutes as written. Ms. DiBella requested a correction on page 4, second paragraph, 5th line, which should read "...had to hire the *UNLV Cannon Survey Center* to conduct...". There were no other corrections. Chair Thran made a motion to approve the Minutes of November 14, 2019 with the correction above mentioned. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Discussion on Edits to the "At-A-Glance" One-pager Documents and Finalize** (For possible action)

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Chair Thran suggested that Ms. Bauer, author of the draft "At-A-Glance" documents take some additional notes on comments from members of the group and after the meeting she will strategize with Ms. Bauer on the next steps. She referred to a group email sent earlier in the month with comments:

General Comment #1: Both documents look very similar --- is there a simple way to quickly distinguish them from each other?

Ms. Bauer remarked the easiest way to distinguish each document is by their coloring, as well as with different layout designs. She said she could make a couple of different examples to display that content and distinguish them from each other. Mr. Mitchell suggested changing their titles at the top of the pages, possibly with a subtitle underneath. Ms. Bauer agreed and said that is a minor layout change and she can provide some different styles.

General Comment #2: With regard to "Next Steps" Boxes, is there a way to get all the steps on the first page? Or, be sure to direct reader to flip over for continuation?

Ms. Bauer agreed with this question and said when creating these documents, she felt there were a lot of words on the page and suggested using an arrow to turn the page or possibly do a shorter summary of the program in order to make the document one-sided. Mr. Mitchell said the purpose of these two documents is to create short, easy to read, "How To" guides,

and pointed out that the “Next Step” boxes do just that. He pointed out the boxes are located on the side-bar. He said the bulk of the main information is more about what the standards are and why establish community partners. He said he feels that most people who would read this guide are most likely to be familiar with the standards and already want to establish community partnerships. He suggested flipping or exchanging the information in the side-bars with the body of the documents, by making the main content more of “How to Establish” a partnership. He added the side-bar could contain a shorter version of the definition of STEM and why community partnerships are valuable. Ms. Bauer said, in looking at the “Education to Business” document, that non-technology businesses do not necessarily have the knowledge of what a community partnership is, whereas a technology company has a better idea. She added the value proposition of a community partnership is that a business would want to know what is in it for them and suggested she create something to address value, and not only doing education a favor but there is a value for businesses. She asked whether the document specifically targeted at education should be addressed by grade level, due to the different value properties for businesses. Ms. Wagner replied that a general document is better than addressing each grade level and feels these documents should both remain as one-page general information guides. Ms. Bauer asked whether the programs should be differentiated based on younger students and older students and pointed out the “Career Awareness Partnership” is actually very different for an elementary school child versus a high school student or college student. She asked whether they should go into more detail depending on the businesses they want to approach and said she could make what they have into one page with a focus on “next steps.” Mr. Mitchell pointed out the “educator” guide’s audience who are generally familiar with what state standards are might be more interested in how to set up a community partnership and suggested the guide directed at the business audience start off with the value proposition. Mr. Knoepfel commented that in the high-school setting it is more about career awareness by exposing students at an early age of what it takes to move into a career. He added that with most businesses coming into the school they seem aware of this and do not necessarily need it spelled out to them depending on how the program is structured. Ms. Wagner said she believes the simpler the better and agrees that not one size fits all, but these guides should contain general informational and if someone wants to learn more about specifics of community partnerships, they contact the subcommittee. Mr. Knoepfel agreed and said the most positive thing about this is to simply outline community partnerships and they will grow as the program grows without necessarily defining what the school will get out of it or what that particular business partner will get out of it. Mr. Mitchell requested Ms. Jintasawang, a current business partner with schools, to look at the documents from a business perspective as to what information she would want to know in order to take that next step to find out more on the subject. Ms. Bauer said she would make some changes in preparation for the next meeting.

General Comment #3: Is the audience for these electronic or paper? We may need two versions, one with hyperlinks (electronic) and one without (printed) so it looks best for the intended format. Same with contact info at the bottom, on the printed version we should have contact info listed.

There was a brief discussion on making the paper format and electronic format identical with the hyperlink typed out in the printed version. Mr. Knoepfel suggested putting a QR code on the printed document as well.

General Comment #4: In Next Step boxes, final step on both documents should be evaluation. Maybe have "Review the Community Partnership Manual" as first step of both?

There was a brief discussion on the pros and cons of listing the Community Partnership Manual be read and/or reviewed as a first step, or to simply offer it as additional information.

Page 1 on BOTH:

Comment #1: Under "The NVACSS allows for", consider changing "encourages" to "Encouragement of" the application...

Comment #2: For the "Why establish a community partnership with the State of Nevada?" question: It's not with the State of Nevada, it would be a partnership with a variety of potential entities, so that should maybe just read generically, "Why establish a community partnership?"

Comment #3: (spelling) Paragraph beginning "Given the challenges..." - 3rd line, change "allows" to "allow" (remove s).

Comment #4: Likewise, further down, just above the bullets, remove "State of Nevada".

Page 2 on BOTH:

Comment #5: Under Operational Community Partnership Types, Mentor Partnership please add "Teleconferencing is a viable option for some mentoring partnerships."

Comment #6: (punctuation) Under "Internship Partnership" capitalize the 'E' in Educators.

Next Steps on Education to Business:

Comment #7: With regard to the next steps box, is #2 and #4 redundant? Both are about deciding partnership types?

Comment #8: For step #4: insert 'is' between 'partnership' and 'best' so it reads, "...what type of partnership is best..."

Comment #9: For Step #4: Ask about STEM Ambassador Program. Do we want to call out a specific program like that? If so, do we want to put contact for larger districts community offices?

There were brief discussions on the above comments. Chair Thran commented on the importance of identifying specifics versus anything generic and concept information so that things do not get out of date. Mr. Mitchell suggested that rather than calling out any specific program on the guide, to list suggested resources, or list websites, or even a link to the STEMhub website which also lists resources as opposed to listing resources that may or may not stay current.

6. Discussion Regarding Interview Questions to be Sent to Schools with Accomplished Community Partnerships in Order to Create School Spotlights. (For possible action)

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Chair Thran commented that at the last meeting, potential options for interview questions being sent to schools with accomplished community partnerships already in place were discussed and ultimately it was decided that case studies or accomplished community partnerships may be the most powerful way to help others enter into a community partnership relationship versus collecting data and conducting a survey. She said after consideration it was decided that data collecting and conducting a survey would be too labor intensive for the group and not the direction this subcommittee should go. She added that Mr. Mitchell had written up some conversation questions to assist in creating "School Spotlights" for the purpose of highlighting schools already involved in successful community partnerships with questions and answers to share with those schools. Mr. Mitchell commented that perhaps after a school reviews the Community Partnership one-page guide and decides they want to create a partnership, as a supplement, these questions could be a blog post or interview. He said if these interviews were added as a supplement to the one-page guide it would provide individual context on how to set up a community partnership. Ms. Wagner suggested adding the question, "What type of partnership do they have?"

Ms. DiBella asked whether a school that sets up a community partnership is required to have a formal agreement with the school district and/or business partner. Mr. Mitchell said he does not believe so. Ms. Wagner agreed they do not require a formal agreement. Ms. DiBella asked how a business is acknowledged for the work they are doing as a community partner and suggested adding a question as to how the students benefit. She said the most compelling stories about partnerships include a vignette about how it benefits with a quote or exchange with a student about what good they received from the experience. Impact is the goal. Mr. Mitchell agreed that is a great idea for an addition to use a side-box on the guide with a school provided picture of the partnership in action along with a quote from a student. Ms. DiBella commented that is an excellent idea and said if this is used as any type of publicity or promotion, that would be sought after by the media. She added that any type of public relations would benefit from that type of material. Mr. Mitchell suggested that information may be beneficial to the "Business to Education" one-pager how-to guide. He pointed out they could add information on whether formal agreements are necessary with the explanation that in most cases they are not, but to check with their school district.

There was further discussion on the elements of a partnership and individual recognition within some schools. There was discussion on whether a question outlining a specific amount of volunteer-time is required or minimum donation amount required in order to be recognized by a school or school district as an accomplished business partner, as well as whether individual events such as judging a science fair can be considered as a successful accomplishment. It was also discussed whether a visitor or presenter is required to get vaccinated before visiting a school or working with students could also be addressed on the guide. Ms. Bauer commented there is no standardization across the state, because every school district in every county is different and pointed out they need common guidelines of what is recognized as a partner. The group discussed whether a partnership can grow from a single volunteer event and become successful and recognized for improving and impacting children's lives by repeating that event. Mr. Mitchell suggested the group stay away from formal criteria that requires specific elements in order to be a partnership. He added, someone who only comes one time to a school or event can be considered a partner. He said

the question for schools would be how they turn that onetime visit into a second or third visit and then into something where the partner wants to come on a regular basis.

There was a brief discussion whether this subcommittee could do more of an outreach to all volunteers coming into the school district and have that information collected into a common database in which the subcommittee to help with that retention element. It was discussed that a partnership needs to be developed. Mr. Mitchell said he sees the role of the subcommittee as providing resources, guides and best practices that an individual could use in enhancing a community partnership program. Chair Thran suggested that everyone forward additional questions or comments to Mr. Mitchell before the end of the week and asked whether he could put that together for the next meeting. Mr. Mitchell agreed.

7. Decision on which Schools to Send Interview Questions. (For possible action)

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Mr. Mitchell asked for additional suggestions of schools that could be considered as “spotlight” schools for the interview questions. It was discussed that several schools would be considered but will be contacted first to see if they are interested. Ms. Jintasawang said she knows of several middle schools that would be interested in Clark County and asked whether charter and private schools could be included. Mr. Mitchell responded that any school in Nevada could be interviewed. He requested all members to submit potential “Spotlight” school names to the OSIT office.

8. Consider Future Agenda Items for the Next Meeting (For possible action)

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Chair Thran said the next meeting will include review and further discussion of the “At-A-Glance” one-page documents; a conversation of the interview questions for schools selected at “Spotlight” schools; and a conversation on the selected “Spotlight” schools. Ms. Bauer asked whether she should create a template for a case study. Chair Thran responded that would be helpful and that can be added as a forth item on the agenda.

Chair Thran suggested the next meeting date as Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. The subcommittee agreed.

9. 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.)

Chair Brandolyn Thran

There was no public comment.

10. Adjournment

Chair Brandolyn Thran

Chair Thran adjourned the meeting at 2:57 p.m