MINUTES

I. Call to Order/Roll Call (Information/Discussion)
Mark Newburn, Co-Chair
Kelly Barber, Co-Chair

Ms. Barber called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm and will chair this meeting.

Members Present: Mark Newburn, James Huckaby, Shelace Shoemaker, Marcus Mason, Gerd Poppinga, Richard Knoeppel, Kelly Barber, Dave Brancamp, Dr. Carl Reiber, Cory Hunt, Kristine Nelson

Excused Members: Dr. Anne Grisham, Adam Kramer, Judy Kraus, Mary Frey
Guests: Beth Wells, Susan Keema, Greg Dye

Staff Present: Brian Mitchell, Jodi Bass, Dale Ann Luzzi

A quorum was declared.

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 (Information/Discussion)
Kelly Barber, Co-Chair

Ms. Barber welcome the committee members and thanked everyone for attending.

IV. Approval of the Minutes from the January 25, 2016 meeting (For possible action)
Kelly Barber, Co-Chair

Dr. Reiber moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Huckaby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. STEM Advisory Council Subcommittee Reports and Updates (For possible action)

Recognition Subcommittee - Mr. Knoeppel reported for the recognition subcommittee. The subcommittee started by reviewing the previous work done. The biggest concern of the previous committee was the funding. Mr. Mitchell told the subcommittee that there was approximately $15,000 for events, awards and travel. The committee tabled the application process to the next meeting and went on to talk about how the applications would be evaluated. The biggest concern is getting enough people to do the evaluations. The subcommittee discussed recognition of five exploratory programs, five developing programs and five established programs. The preliminary timeline for the rolling out the process would be: August/September for the evaluation tool, the first week in December applications would be due, the review process would start at the end of January, by the end of February the finalist would be selected and they would film there video for recognition. The subcommittee also talked about the possibly of creating a Governor’s award. The details still need to be worked out.

Survey Subcommittee – Mr. Mitchell provided the updated for Dr. Grisham who is the chair of the survey subcommittee. The subcommittee reviewed the previous survey that was sent out in 2014. The feedback was that the survey was too long and the responses tailed off the further people got in completing the survey. The subcommittee discussed ways to shorten the
survey but still get valuable information. Elements of a revised survey would include basic information including the level of school, where the school is located and if they are a teacher or administrator, how and to what extent STEM is taught at the school, what barriers to teaching STEM exist, and finally, would the respondent like to provide contact information follow up questions. The questions would have various levels of responses. The hope is that a shorter survey will lead to a better response rate, essentially getting the same information as before.

Strategic Planning Subcommittee – Kris Nelson reported that the strategic planning subcommittee thinks that it is important to have benchmarks and metrics that are specific and obtainable, leading to the creation of best practices. Also, the strategic plan should specify what the pipeline for education and workforce will look like. The subcommittee also thinks it is important to include diversity as an objective. Ms. Nelson said they will use the NPWR data to extract and analysis the education workforce data for the plan. Mr. Mitchell said having the plan completed by November 1 would give the Council the ability to make presentations to the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents to enable any legislative initiative to be moved forward.

VI. Discussion on Computer Science Initiatives at the State and Federal Levels
(For possible action)
Mark Newburn, Co-Chair

Mr. Newburn provided the council with a briefing presentation (Attachment A) on computer science initiatives both state and federal. He informed the Council of the announcement from the President regarding a $4 billion “computer science for all initiative”. He noted that by 2020 half of the STEM jobs will be computer related and of those graduating only 2% of STEM degrees are in computer science. Using those numbers, there will be one million jobs that won’t be able to be filled. Diversity is a huge issue in computer science but by changing the structure of the courses it will start to attract more diverse students. In Nevada, a task force has been formed that will draft goals and recommendations for the State Board of Education and the Legislators. At the STEM summit in September there will be two breakout sessions in computer science lead by Mr. Newburn.

VII. Overview and Discussion Regarding a Marketing Campaign
(For possible action)
Brian Mitchell, Director, Office of Science, Innovation and Technology (OSIT)

Mr. Mitchell said during one of the subcommittee meetings the importance of marketing the STEM plan was discussed. He is in the process of drafting a plan for the Governor. The idea is to create an exciting and recognizable STEM brand that highlights the full spectrum of STEM opportunities,
painting Nevada as a leader in STEM education. Mr. Mitchell provided the Council with a list of potential people/partners who should be involved and asked if there were other who should be on this list. The Council members provided him some additional names to add to his list. He said there is a variety of strategies for outreach and he will be pitching the Governor on a yearlong STEM initiative. The working title is “Full Steam Ahead to the New Nevada”. The idea is to do a yearlong initiative that would began in August, lining up with the school year. The plan is for monthly themes throughout the year to keep STEM in people’s minds. Possibly having a logo contest and video produced my students to take on the road. A lot of coordination will need to be done to have a successful roll out in August. This initiative could culminate with the recognition events and be the finale of the yearlong events. This should be a data driven campaign that is backed up with a lot of good information. Ms. Nelson suggested providing fact sheets with a clear definition of STEM.

VIII. Discussion Regarding the Selection of a Non-Profit Corporation  
(For possible action)  
Brian Mitchell, Director, OSIT

Mr. Mitchell was asked to expound upon his explanation from the last Council meeting regarding the selection of a nonprofit corporation. He said one of the biggest difference with the current Council is that there is money for the recognition events and a staff to provide support. Mr. Mitchell said a lot of work had been done by the previous Council in vetting a nonprofit but no action was taken by the entire Council. What is needed now is a nonprofit to act as a fiscal agent and to manage any money the Council receives.

Mr. Mitchell spoke with Beth Wells from the STEM Coalition and they are not interested in being the fiscal agent for the Council. Mr. Mitchell will pursue an agency that specialize in being a fiscal agent. He said this Council will continue to collaborate with the STEM coalition and looks forward to using information gained at the STEM summit in drafting the strategic plan.

IX. Opportunities for STEM Advisory Council to Learn about STEM Activities in Nevada  
(Information/Discussion)  
Kelly Barber, Co-Chair

Mr. Newburn said March 5 is First Robotics Las Vegas Competition taking place at the Cashman Center.

Dr. Reiber asked for clarify on this agenda item. Was it just for STEM events or was it for opportunities to learn about STEM things or for the STEM Council to provide information and present to specific groups. Mr. Mitchell asked if he wanted to bring groups in to present to the Council or have the Council go to other groups to hear what information they want to provide
us. Dr. Reiber said the Council needs to understand what our business partners want, economic development sector wants, the system of K-12 wants, higher education wants. Mr. Mitchell suggested that this agenda item serve to suggest STEM activities in the State that should be publicized and opportunities for the Council to engage with the public on its work, such as presenting at other meetings or soliciting feedback from various stakeholder groups. Suggestions for future presentations to the Council should be made under the agenda item referencing future meeting topics. Dr. Reiber also suggested an open forum meeting on how people feel about STEM.

X. Consider Agenda Items for the Next Meeting *(For possible action)*

- Presentation from Bob Potts with GOED on workforce demand data
- The subcommittees will be standing agenda items
- Kim Vidoni with Nevada 21
- Presentation on NGSS
- Update on the marketing plan
- Inviting school districts in to tell us what they are doing and how we can help

XI. Next Meeting Date is March 21, 2016. The meeting will be video conferenced between Carson City (location TBD) and the Grant Sawyer Building in Las Vegas.

The correct meeting date is March 28, 2016.

XII. 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.

XIII. Adjournment

Ms. Barber adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.