Name of Organization: STEM Advisory Council

Date and Time of Meeting: Thursday, August 30, 2018 @ 3:00 PM

Place of Meeting: Nevada State Library and Archives
Boardroom (First Floor)
100 North Stewart Street, Suite 220
Carson City, NV 89701

This Meeting will be Video-Conferenced to the following Location:

Grant Sawyer State Office Building
Governor’s Conference Room – Suite 5100
555 East Washington Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89101

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
Co-Chair Kelly Barber

The STEM Advisory Council was called to order by Co-Chair Kelly Barber at 3:10 P.M. on August 30, 2018, at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building Governor’s Conference Room – Suite 5100, 555 East Washington Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89101. She will be running the meeting today.

Members Present:
Brian Mitchell
Camille Stegman
Chris Sewell
Judy Kraus
Kelly Barber, Co-Chair
Kristen Averyt
Mark Newburn, Co-Chair
Mary Holsclaw
Richard Knoeppel

**Members Absent:**
Marcus Mason
Shelace Shoemaker

**Guests Present:**
Aaron Leifheit – ISLE Subcommittee
Brandolyn Thran – Community Partnerships Subcommittee
Marisa Cooper - STEAM Subcommittee

**Staff Present:**
Debra Petrelli
Tracey Gaffney

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 and Announcements** (For information only)
Co-Chair Kelly Barber

Co-Chair Barber welcomed everyone, she will be running the meeting today.

IV. **Approval of the Minutes from the January 30, 2018 and April 23, 2018 Meetings** (For possible action)
Co-Chair Kelly Barber

Co-Chair Barber asked if there were any corrections or additions to the January 30, 2018 or April 23, 2018 Minutes, as written. None were made. Co-chair Newburn made a motion to approve the Minutes of January 30, 2018 and April 23, 2018, as written. Ms. Holsclaw seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. **Subcommittee Updates** (For possible action)
- **Computer Science Subcommittee**, Mark Newburn

Co-chair Newburn reported on the Computer Science (CS) subcommittee. He said under SB 200 the CS subcommittee has the responsibility for making recommendations for K-12 computer science to school districts and the State Board of Education, as well as the legislature. He pointed out this is a new core academic subject being built, without already having any infrastructure. He reported the subcommittee had a statewide computer science summit in June 2018, which was funded by a $20,000 grant from the Expanding Computing Education Pathways (ECEP) Alliance that facilitated bringing teachers and administrators together from across the state. He said the summit included speakers, breakout sessions, a curriculum presentation by Code.org, a question and answer period for
administrators, and speaker Dr. Andreas Stefik, a national expert at UNLV in teaching kids with disabilities computer programming, who spoke on various strategies that can be used to teach computer science to students with disabilities. Mr. Mitchell added that each attending school district had team time during which time was given for strategic planning. He said a framework was provided to each district to submit review and feedback back to the CS subcommittee.

Co-chair Newburn said the subcommittee has currently been working on a set of frequently asked questions and assisting the Department of Education with guidance documents. He commented the subcommittee has recently made recommendations to the Department of Education for changes in teacher licensing for computer science, which have now gone through the Commission on Professional Standards (COPS) and have passed through the State Board of Education. He mentioned the subcommittee has developed new regulations for the ½ credit graduation requirement for computer science. He added the subcommittee had a workshop in Reno in August, wherein a guidance document was developed to help school districts and teachers better understand the content requirements for that class, as well as recommended professional development courses.

There was a discussion on how many school districts were in attendance at the computer science summit. Co-chair Newburn said that he would find out that information for the council. He added there were more than just traditional school, but also charter schools were also represented, as SB 200 also applies to charter schools. He said it was a good first step for the subcommittee.

Ms. Thran remarked she had received feedback from charter school teachers who highly praised the event and the opportunity to learn more about the computer science standards, and they look forward to similar summits in the future.

- **Community Partnerships Subcommittee – Discussion and possible vote to endorse Community Partnerships Manual, Brandolyn Thran**

Ms. Thran, Chair of the Community Partnership Subcommittee, gave a brief overview of the subcommittees’ process in completing the Community Partnerships Manual for endorsement by the STEM Advisory Council. She said this document is a first step in providing information to community members and industry members to assist in STEM education. She said it is a high-level document that was developed to serve business representatives in establishing, or improving, community partnerships with formal educators. She pointed out the importance of evaluation and how the document encourages that evaluations to be included in a community partnership program. She added that the document includes areas to consider when creating an evaluation tool and three templates form which to start, including a strategic evaluation, operational level evaluation and student input. She said after this document is approved by the STEM Advisory Council, the subcommittee’s next step will be to produce a one-page guide with excerpts from this manual with information that can be handed out to school districts and businesses to assist each of them in creating viable partnerships.

Co-chair Newburn asked for a scenario in which this manual would be used. Ms. Thran replied one example would be for the establishment of local STEM councils working
within their communities to reach into schools and establish relationships between those schools and local business to better serve their local community, and community-based events. She pointed out there are times when a formal agreement between industry and education is necessary, which this document would provide valuable input. Co-chair Newburn requested information on how the evaluation would be used. Mr. Mitchell said the purpose of the evaluation template is for a school to understand what they need to be looking at in order to evaluate whether or not students feel a business presentation was successful or not. He said if you have businesses coming in to a classroom, an evaluation helps to determine how to make sure they are helping to augment or support what students learn. Likewise for getting feedback from either students or teachers back to the organizer of incoming businesses/community partners, in order assist in making the experience better for students in the future.

Ms. Stegman asked whether any graphic changes or alterations would be addressed by either the Community Partnership subcommittee or the Governor’s Office of Science, Innovation and Technology (OSIT). She also suggested including the STEM Ambassador program under the ‘community partnerships’ list within the document. Mr. Mitchell responded that the STEM Ambassador program could be added and pointed out this is currently a draft document, and the council could work through the document’s content today, with future changes to the graphics once the content is approved. Ms. Stegman suggested that Box 1 on page 12 be attached to the paragraph it refers to for more continuity within the document. Ms. Thran and Mr. Mitchell both agreed.

Ms. Kraus made a motion to adopt the Community Partnerships Manual as a STEM Advisory Council approved resource with the necessary graphic or cosmetic changes mentioned. Ms. Stegman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- **STEAM Subcommittee.** Possible vote to endorse the STEAM subcommittee’s White Paper, Marissa Cooper

Ms. Cooper, Chair of the STEAM Subcommittee, gave an overview of the subcommittee’s white paper. She said after looking around the state the subcommittee concluded that with numerous variations of the definition of STEM and STEAM practices in the classroom throughout the state, there wasn’t a singular definition, with many variations, of what schools were calling STEAM. She said the subcommittee felt very strongly that a baseline definition needed to be developed for what STEAM education means. She said the subcommittee worked with other organizations across the state, as well as with organizations across the country who expressed interest in STEAM, in putting together this document and has been workshopped at the Nevada STEAM Conference this summer. There were 200 teachers in attendance at the conference working in teams along with a combined session at the close of the conference in which the subcommittee received valuable input for this document. She pointed out there may be a few superficial changes to the document, but the overall content is final.

Co-chair Newburn said he liked the idea of a shared definition. Ms. Cooper pointed out the subcommittee did a lot of groundwork to produce this document and used their collective belief in the power of arts integration to leverage STEM education, which will ultimately prepare students most effectively for the new economies of Nevada’s future. She said this
document will hopefully alleviate people practicing something that the subcommittee would not agree with, but rather something the group could put their stamp of approval on. Co-chair Newburn commented the arts tend to be project oriented in a creative nature and by adding arts to siloed subjects, they became STEM, making this a very powerful process and element. Mr. Mitchell suggested that Co-chair Newburn put together several lines of comment on that subject for Ms. Cooper to add to the paragraph on page 6 concerning project-based learning. Co-chair Newburn agreed.

Co-chair Newburn made a motion to adopt the STEAM subcommittee’s white paper as a STEM Advisory council approved resource with the addition of one or two sentences regarding project-based learning. Ms. Kraus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- Informal STEM Learning Environments Subcommittee (ISLE), Aaron Leifheit

Mr. Leifheit, Chair of the ISLE Subcommittee, updated the council on recent activities of the subcommittee. He commented that ISLE represents informal STEM learning providers in the State of Nevada, which mostly consists of parks and lands, museums, and non-profits. He said the subcommittee previously completed a white paper outlining their goals and what they can accomplish, which was presented to and approved by the STEM Advisory Council. He said, from that white paper, the subcommittee organized a logic model, which is similar to a strategic plan outlining goals for the subcommittee. He commented that in the first year and a half, the subcommittee defined who they are and what they need to do. He pointed out that currently the subcommittee is entering more of an action phase of goals. He said they are currently compiling a list of all informal STEM providers in the state, defining who is doing what. He said once that list is together the subcommittee anticipates producing a survey based on STEMworks recommended STEM providers, with the help of OSIT and the Survey subcommittee, to do an evaluation with all informal STEM providers in the state on how well they are matching the STEMworks standards. He pointed out this will give the subcommittee an idea of areas that need the most attention. He said the subcommittee would also like to conduct a survey that goes out to recipients of informal STEM providers. He said in general, the subcommittee is focused on the strengths and weaknesses of informal STEM education in Nevada. Once determined, those successes can be highlighted as well as areas requiring additional assistance.

Ms. Stegman asked how the subcommittee plans to develop that contact lists and how it will be inclusive of all programs. Mr. Leifheit replied they are currently collecting information from each member within the subcommittee, which includes leaders representing various aspects and regions in the state, as well as information from this advisory council and OSIT. Mr. Mitchell agreed the subcommittee has a very diverse membership and said once the subcommittee has compiled a complete set of STEM providers, they can reach out and ask those questions including strengths of programs, weaknesses of programs and how this subcommittee can develop resources that can help the various programs throughout the state to become better. He added the subcommittee’s goal is to build resources for these programs to become higher quality.
Ms. Stegman commented she appreciates the outcome of creating a statewide professional learning community for informal STEM learning representatives.

- **SB 241 STEM/STEAM Seal Subcommittee, Brian Mitchell**

Mr. Mitchell gave a brief recap of the STEM/STEAM Seal Subcommittee. He said it derived from a piece of legislation from last session creating a STEM/STEAM seal that can be affixed to a student’s high school diploma. It involving a set of requirements a student must meet in order to receive the seal, certifying they have the incentive required to become a STEM or STEAM student. He pointed out the overall goal of this program is to “signal” colleges and universities that a student has met the rigorous requirements in high school and are seeking further STEM programs at the postsecondary level. He said this is a way to both guide students along their path in high school in taking the right classes to prepare for STEM classes at the postsecondary level, but to also partner with institutions of higher education in Nevada, by identifying students who are on a STEM path in order to cultivate and mentor them.

Mr. Mitchell said the subcommittee is currently finalizing a one-page flyer to distribute to school counselors, teachers, parents and students outlining the requirements that need to be met in order for students to receive the seal, which includes a certain amount of math and science classes, either a Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway or computer science class, plus meet certain benchmarks and scores on either the ACT or SAT, as well as the National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC), a work ready assessment. He said another project this subcommittee is working on involves changes to the Infinite Campus system (Statewide student information internet access system) to make it easier for counselors and teachers to see where students are on the pathway to receiving either the STEM or STEAM seal. He said the subcommittee is also planning outreach to counselors at their annual meeting and outreach to teachers at their various annual meetings. He said the subcommittee additionally plans on contacting each of the family engagement offices at each school district to provide them with information that can be passed on to families.

Mr. Mitchell suggested that Ms. Averyt assist the STEM/STEAM Seal subcommittee in contacting college deans in helping to make them aware of this program and assist in developing plans to recruit these students who are on the seal pathway. There was further discussion on how school districts can provide information to universities without violating any privacy laws.

Mr. Knoppell commented on high school student’s perspective on the program and how rigorous the program will be. He discussed feedback from administration and the concerns of making the program easier for counselors to ensure they get information rapidly and the information is meaningful in the process of ensuring these students are meeting the rigorous criteria required. Mr. Mitchell said those are the two key points with this program; 1) can value be communicated; and 2) can it be made easier for counselors so they continue to encourage students to pursue the program. He added these will be the two challenges ahead for the subcommittee in making changes to Infinite Campus.
• **STEMworks Subcommittee, Brian Mitchell**

Mr. Mitchell reported on the STEMworks Subcommittee. He gave the council a quick update that STEMworks is a rubric to evaluate the level of quality of a STEM program or curriculum. He said the subcommittee partnered with WEST Ed for the second year and sent out a Request for Applications (RFA) for STEM programs to apply, to be added to the STEM Advisory Council’s list of recommended programs. He added there is not necessarily funding, but rather sharing this vetted list of high-quality STEM programs with the Department of Education and school districts for programs to choose from. He said the next RFA is ready to go live on September 1, 2018, through September 30, 2018. He said a team of reviewers, trained by West Ed, will then evaluate the applications received. He commented that for both national and local programs that did not make the list in the last round, the subcommittee wants to build capacity for local programs and use this as a way to give direction and lead them on a pathway to becoming a higher quality STEM provider, by encouraging them to reapply. He added the list should be complete by late November 2018, in time for schools to start making their funding decisions.

• **Recognition Subcommittee, Brian Mitchell**

Mr. Mitchell reported on the Recognition Subcommittee. He said this subcommittee has only met once, which was just prior to last year’s recognition events. The group is preparing to get started again for this year. He reminded the council that two student recognition events are required by statute, one in Northern Nevada and one in Southern Nevada. He said upon the subcommittee meeting again, there will be discussion of what worked well last year and what improvements or changes need to be made. He commented he will be reaching out to those members very soon.

Ms. Kraus commented that moving the location from an institution of higher education to a business site for the events might be a positive change. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that the statute was written very specifically as to the location of these events, which requires the location must be at an institution of higher education. He commented he has pitched the idea of removing this requirement to the Governor’s office for a change in the legislation.

There was further discussion on the proposed dates of the events and how to increase attendance.

• **Survey Subcommittee, Brian Mitchell**

Mr. Mitchell reported on the Survey Subcommittee. He said two years ago a statewide survey went out to teachers in all school districts, which included; how often teachers teach STEM, what their resources are within their school, and what the barriers are in teaching STEM. He added that good information was received which helped build the Nevada Strategic Plan. He commented that the subcommittee plans to do a very similar survey in order to see what changes have occurred and whether teaching STEM is growing, and whether barriers have changed. That follow up survey will go out in approximately two months. Once that survey information is received back by the subcommittee, it will determine the next steps. He added the group had also discussed several smaller surveys that could be conducted. He pointed out the Survey subcommittee is currently working
with other subcommittees of the STEM Advisory Council, including the STEAM and ISLE subcommittees in monitoring and ensuring that surveys do not overlap, as well as reducing the number of surveys going to teachers so as to not put an extra burden on the same group of teachers.

Ms. Stegman, as a member of the Survey subcommittee, commented that from the first survey conducted by the subcommittee, they are now doing an evaluation to examine the questions asked, looking for ability and reliability, which if found will determine this process of receiving data is valuable.

VI. Introduction of New OSIT STEM Program Manager and Update on New OSIT Initiatives (For information only)
Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell introduced the newest member of the STEM Advisory Council, Kristen Averyt, President of Desert Research Institute (DRI), who was nominated by Dr. Thom Reilly, Chancellor of Nevada System of Higher Education, who said, “Ms. Averyt is an accomplished environmental scientist who has been recognized for her contribution to the scientific community.” Ms. Averyt is replacing Carl Reiber who has left the state. Mr. Mitchell thanked Dr. Reiber for all his years of hard work.

Mr. Mitchell introduced the new STEM Program Manager for OSIT, Tracey Gaffney, a former STEM coach at Washoe County School District. Ms. Gaffney discussed two new programs being launched by OSIT within the next two weeks.

Ms. Gaffney said the first is the Engineering Fellows Program, in which OSIT is partnering with UNR, UNLV and RPDP to create workshops to help build capacity around constructive engineering lessons for two groups of 5th grade teachers (a total of 24 teachers). She said the program will offer collaboration with professional engineers and university engineering students, it will align instruction with NGSS standards and local industry needs to strengthen workforce pathways, is will increase students and teachers confidence and awareness of engineering, it is designed for the teacher to keep a kit to accompany lesson they create, the teacher will receive a bank of vetted engineering lessons designed by Fellows and accompanying kits valued at $1,000, and give teachers an opportunity to earn 1 in-service credit toward license renewal.

Ms. Gaffney said the second program OSIT is starting is the STEM Leaders Academy, which was created to increase the quality of STEM education throughout the State by providing consultation and professional development to leaders from aspiring STEM schools. She said applicants from schools across the state were invited to attend five-day workshops that take place throughout the school year. Schools will be guided through a process to create a strategic plan and school-specific roadmap for improving STEM education and receiving the Governor’s STEM School Designation. Participating school teams will receive STEM professional development, develop a strategic plan, and have the opportunity to submit a grant application to OSIT for up to $20,000 to implement their strategic plan. Participating schools are invited to apply for the Governor’s STEM School Designation in the spring and participate in an end-of-year student showcase.
Mr. Mitchell reported on other OSIT initiatives to include the STEM Workforce Challenge Grant opportunity, which is a grant for institutions of higher education to develop STEM programs and build new programs at the postsecondary level, giving students industry recognized credentials. He said OSIT has also recently launched a new STEM Workforce Pathways grant. He said this grant program aligns with previous OSIT STEM Workforce Challenge Grants at the postsecondary level and builds a partnership with career and technical education at the Nevada Department of Education and in high schools in order to build pathways to rewarding STEM careers. He added the first of the pathways grant has been awarded to two schools in the Washoe County School District, who will be starting cybersecurity programs, to which equipment was funded in order to start these programs as well as professional development. He said another program he is working on is with the College of Southern Nevada (CSN), which is a four-year project to increase recruitment, retention and completion rates of underrepresented students in STEM to include females, students of color, and/or students of poverty. He added that OSIT will be providing funding for innovative STEM projects over the next four years, followed by an evaluation of those projects to increase underrepresented students’ completion of college degrees in STEM.

VII. Overview of Regional STEM Hubs or Networks in Other States and Discussion Regarding the Possible Creation of Regional STEM Hubs or Regional STEM Networks in Nevada (For possible action)
Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell said after looking at different STEM policies in other states, he came across the idea of regional STEM hubs. He gave a presentation and went on to explain that a regional STEM hub has important roles to include the following: 1) Identify on-the-ground programmatic gaps or implementation challenges in need of a state-level solutions; 2) Grow interest and awareness of STEM in the region; 3) Carry out on-the-ground implementation of state-level programs and goals by identifying and building local programs worthy of scaling statewide; 4) Facilitate connections and sharing of resources among K-12, higher education, and business/industry. He explained there are twelve STEM hubs in other states. In Iowa each region has a regional “Manager” housed at a local institution of higher education and each region has an advisory board to “identify, grow, and create STEM Programs that strengthen the region.” He said in Massachusetts each network is managed by an executive director and housed in either an institution of higher education or a regional employment board, and they work to cultivate interest in STEM in the region and implement priorities of the STEM Council. He pointed out in Ohio, Hubs share resources and facilitate partnerships between K-12, higher education and business/industry. He explained that in Tennessee they created cost-effective education programs and leverage statewide impact by sharing projects, with promising results. He said in Washington their STEM hubs lead locally, share ideas and foster innovation.

Mr. Mitchell discussed Nevada Regional STEM Hubs and why the state should consider being a part by pointing out it will increase equity in STEM, increase interest and awareness, with a local flavor, act as the arms and legs of the STEM Advisory Council especially with the STEM recognition events, and act as the eyes and ears of the STEM Advisory Council by following up different concerns or needs to the state level, and finally by building partnerships between businesses and schools.
Mr. Mitchell discussed his vision would be to fund a part-time position, possibly in partnership with an institution of higher education, or a STEM focused non-profit, and share the costs for a Director’s position who would be the individual to carry out these duties and organize a local board to pursue these goals. He said he could possibly get funding from the legislature, which could be used for the directors’ salaries and also fund each one of the regions allowing them to give out local grants to schools for STEM activities. He suggested creating three different regional STEM hubs, Northwestern Nevada, Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada. He added this would be a way to fund STEM activities at the local level to increase interest and awareness.

There was discussion that communication would be most important and some of the problems that would arise from Clark County School District, mainly due to its size and infrastructure. Mr. Mitchell pointed out by having a local director, more could be done. Co-chair Newburn asked what the critical element would be that delineates that Nevada is ready for STEM hubs versus being centralized. Mr. Mitchell pointed out the added values these STEM hubs could provide would include assistance in building more capacity at the local level and including others that are advocates of STEM. He explained his current plan is pending feedback from a body of stakeholders and pending whether OSIT gets funding from the legislature. He said RFP’s could be issued to the three regions, to include institutes of higher education, and STEM focused non-profits with a strong track record. He said perhaps a portion of the funding for the director’s position could come from one of these institutions. The responses from those RFP’s would determine whether there would be a partner in this project.

Ms. Stegman suggested being cautious with roles and responsibilities by articulating what the difference is between this program and what is currently being done. Mr. Mitchell said he would circulate to the council, an informational page on this program along with information on the Regional Director’s position duties. He pointed out it would be ideal to present this program as an enhancement to the OSIT budget in the upcoming legislature session convening in January 2019.

VIII. Discussion Regarding the Possible Creation and Designation of an Annual Statewide Nevada STEM Week (For possible action)
Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell discussed the possibility of either the Governor or another high-ranking official designating a STEM week and a set of activities that go around that week. He said several other states are currently doing this and asked whether the council felt Nevada should pursue an annual statewide STEM week. He pointed out that media material could be put together to include activities at home or even after school activities. Ms. Stegman commented that a steering committee was formed to have a Northern Nevada science and technology festival that will mirror Las Vegas’s annual Science and Technology Festival. She said this year it will be in May, and if successful, she believes a Nevada STEM week could very possibly bring those two events together. She added the creation and designation of an Annual Statewide Nevada STEM Week could be exactly what is needed. Co-chair Newburn asked whether this would actually be a formal recognition of the week chosen. Mr. Mitchell said he would not expect that schools already participating in STEM activities would change, but rather this could help raise awareness to those schools not currently participating in STEM activities, which is the target audience.
There was discussion on the timing of selecting a particular timeframe and the need to be cautious that it does not conflict with other events and school activities. Co-chair Newburn suggested getting a handle on statewide STEM events that are currently set to better help coincide with each other. Mr. Mitchell said he would do more research on this item and continue the conversation at the next STEM Advisory Council’s meeting.

IX. **Discussion Regarding the Appointment of New Members to the STEM Advisory Council**  
(For possible action)  
Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell pointed out there are currently several vacancies on the council, which are legislatively appointed positions, and it has been a challenge to fill them. He said he has had discussions with Co-chairs Mark Newburn and Kelly Barber regarding the creation of a list of possible individuals to fill these vacancies, and perhaps some of those individuals could be representatives of underrepresented communities within the state. He asked all members of the council to consider qualified individuals they feel could strengthen the membership of the council, especially in the area of underrepresented communities. Co-chair Newburn suggested one source of these individuals would be members from the current subcommittees under the council. He added how much he would appreciate broadening the diversity of the council. Mr. Mitchell said he will send out a reminder email to members of the council next week for suggestions for the appointment of new members to the council.

X. **Consider Agenda Items for the Next Meeting**  
(For possible action)  
Co-Chair Kelly Barber

Co-Chair Barber asked for items for consideration on the next meeting agenda, along with whether the discussion of a STEM license plate was still up for consideration by the council. Mr. Mitchell replied he had pitched the idea of a STEM license plate bill to the Governor. He added the STEM license plate is now in the process of whether or not the Governor choses to make it a Bill Draft Request (BDR). He said if it becomes a BDR and passes through the legislature becoming a bill, this council can then determine where and how proceeds collected would be distributed, i.e. scholarships, school funding, STEM activities, etc.

Mr. Mitchell commented that ideas and suggestions for the next council meeting could be emailed to him for inclusion on the next agenda.

XI. **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.)

Co-chair Newburn made a comment, as public. He corrected that 11 of the 17 counties had been present at the Computer Science Summit in Las Vegas on June 18, 2018. Storey, Pershing, Lyon, Lander, Eureka and Esmerelda Counties did not attend.

XII. **Adjournment**  
Co-Chair Kelly Barber

Co-Chair Barber adjourned the meeting at 5:02 PM.