



3101 Technology Boulevard, Suite G  
Lansing, MI 48910  
(517) 336-7733

### Minutes of Board meeting 04/23/15

Meeting Convened at 12:03 p.m.

**Attendees:** Paul Agosta, Heather Gallegos, Gary Gilger, Greg Marks, Gary Farina, Ali Elyaderani

**On the phone:** Patty Cantu, Christy Cloud-Webb, Patty Farell-Cole, Lisa Gordon, Jodie Ledford, Brandon Lucas, Victor Naidu, Andrew Smart, Michael Tanoff, Monique Q. Wells, Tom Wessels, Nikki Rogers

**Apologies:** Greg Johnson, Jenny Schanker, Benjamin Gibert, **Linda Daichendt**

**Unexcused:**

**Guest Attendees:** Darcy McMahan,

**Public Comments:** There were no public comments.

1. **Call to Order** ED
  
2. **Welcome Members and Guests** ED
  
3. **Consent Agenda** ED  
Previous minutes: ED took a motion to approve the [minute of March](#). The motion to approve was passed. (Greg/Heather)
  
4. **Executive Director's Report** ED  
Regarding the [Executive Director's report](#), ED explained that during the last month the focus was on the grant process as there were issues that resulted in extending the submission deadline for a second time. Regarding the 501C3 application, ED reported, that except for the financial section, the form has been completed. Work continues on the multiple attachments that are required. Once the form and attachments are developed the draft will be sent to Yeo and Yeo financial consultant for review. The form is expected to be submitted to Yeo & Yeo by the end of May and ready for filing in June.  
Regarding the Hubs, the ED highlighted the section in the report that outline the need to instill a common understanding of the structure, alignment, communication process, and authority of the Partnership. There are different perceptions and understandings amongst individuals at the Hub level regarding where the primary alignment should exist, as some individuals/Hub operate with a stronger connection to the Math & Science Centers. Each hub is at a different stage of development which is impacted by the sector representation and geographic issues of the region. Future cooperative planning efforts with Hub leadership will be initiated to establish the common understandings necessary for effective operation and evolution of the Partnership throughout the Hubs and State Board.

In terms of legislation, Adam Zemke communicated at in the last MISTEM Committee meeting that he expects to see updated languages for the STEM certification endorsement bill. New language will hopefully provide additional options for

awarding endorsements rather than just completing of traditional math and science classes/credits. Heather asked if we have any movement to have Adam Zemke’s representatives join our board meetings. Paul commented that the MISTEM Committee includes representatives from TED and members the Partnership Board. Based on the relationship we are establishing with TED we are trying to engage a representative for the Partnership Board.

Paul added that Adam Zemke and legislators are interested in alignment with prosperity regions which means we need to determine ways to actively engage with the prosperity regions so we are aware and aligned with the resources and funding that they provide. The ED added that it is difficult for the volunteer Hub leadership to find the time to actively attend/engage in Prosperity Region meetings. The Partnership needs to continue solicitation efforts for funds that would enable a compensated position in each Hub. This would provide a conduit and make an active connection between the Hubs, prosperity regions, and the other entities.

Paul added that governor message is for organizations to provide collaborative efforts in serving the needs of individuals. This requires changes in the relationships between education, workforce development, and economic development. Greg asked Patty Cantu if she has any perspective or observations about prosperity regions and work force development. Patty added that all organizations/agencies making efforts to work together. In education, we don’t generally work with prosperity regions but we are looking the ways to communicate and coordinate better on regional bases.

In regard to the legislative section in the ED Report, Paul commented that there are continued efforts to get the state to adopt the NGSS/MSS. This would provide the catalyst for systematic changes in instructional delivery of math and science throughout education.

## 5. Committee Reports

### Executive Committee

Paul Agosta

- a. **Financial issues** - Paul reported that we are working with our fiscal agent, Wayne RESA, and getting feedback from MDE (through Steven Best) to clarify exactly what we can do with our funds. Paul added, based on the fact that some part of our money comes from general funds and according to the section 99.7 of funding, there are still many decisions that we cannot make without MDE permission. He added that we are expecting to hear from Steven shortly. Paul added that Wayne RESA is currently operating as if the Partnership is underneath the hub and Steve is communicating to resolve this issue. Additionally, efforts are being made with legislators to move the Partnership funding out of MDE thus allowing greater flexibility in how funds are utilized.

Paul reported that there is still no progress in getting the contracts processed for the ED and Development Specialist (Christy) or receiving complete financial information. Wayne RESA has taken the position that they will not move on anything until they get direction/clarification from MDE. A meeting was held with MDE (Stephen Best) resulting in the expectation that actions will be taken to resolve the situation soon.

- b. **STEM Data and Prosperity Region Alignment** - Paul referred to the [Boundary map](#) (The document has been uploaded on our Google shared drive for your review) which includes the prosperity regions, Partnership Hubs, Math and Science Centers, and ISDs. This map demonstrates that there are a number of areas of the state with multiple overlaps within the Hubs. This makes it difficult in those areas for Hub representative to actively engage with other entities due to time constraints and geographical issues. Mike Tanoff raised the question, should the number of hubs change so they that all hubs and prosperity regions are aligned together?
- c. **HUBs – Development Needs and Action Plan for Development** - Paul reminded that there are some systemic issues that have risen as the nature of our relationship with Hubs and Network. Heather added that we need to have a strong relationship and alignment between the Partnership and the Networks. Today only one hub has a dedicated person

(Bay hub - Darcy) and the other Hubs are led by persons from the Network. This means we are inter-dependent upon one another. Darcy added that it is vital and critical that Partnership and Network have a strong working relationship. She added that the Partnership is really helping to build a bridge between education and other STEM minded entities and without that bridge it is hard to get people and talk in the same language. Action steps have been outlined to identify the structure and essential roles necessary in leading and operating the Hubs and establishing a strong collaborative relationship between the Partnership and Network in this effort.

#### **Finance Committee**

**Gary Gilger**

##### **a. Financial Information/Reports**

Gary Gilger reviewed budget worksheet for MI STEM Partnership for 2015 fiscal year (You may get access to the document on MI STEM Partnership Google Drive [budget worksheet](#)).

Gary Gilger explained that the total expenditure to date is \$56,204.75 and the balance for the end of March is \$447,304. With the current estimate for salary expenditure we project a deficit of \$3580.93 in the salary line item but there is a project surplus in the expenditure line item that will more than cover this. He added that this estimate may differ with Wayne RESA's records as we are waiting for more detailed records to gain an exact picture. Additionally, the Partnership needs the detailed record to complete our application and become a 501C3 corporation.

ED mentioned that he is working with Wayne RESA to get more details about our financial statement.

Gary Gilger added that we need to establish our own financial records so we have the most updated detailed information. ED added that as a registered corporation with the State of Michigan, we should be able to plan and recommend budgets and should approve distribution of funds within grant guidelines. This issue has been discussed with Steven Best at MDE and is part of the response we expect back shortly.

##### **b. Christy's Position**

Greg marks asked about the state of the money we spent last year. ED referred to [budget worksheet](#) and reported that recent information from Wayne RESA shows that over \$28,000 was carried over from last year. Gary Gilger added that we have the money in our account to fund Christy's position. ED added that because contracts through Wayne RESA are processed through their Board of Education the contract request must be initiated in early May to ensure it gets on the agenda for the next Wayne RESA board meeting. Gary Gilger mentioned that Christy position was already factored into that estimation with deficit of \$3600 and by adding Christy position it does not change the projection. Regarding carry over funding, Tom Wessels mentioned that the board discussed last month that the funds are available for Christy position but the budget worksheet shows that \$17,500 has already been funded for ED position line. So it looks like that we are projecting \$6600 deficit at the end of the year. He asked for clarification. ED clarified that \$50,321.10 in estimated cost column (on the budget worksheet) includes the cost of fulltime director and part time development specialist position from May through September.

#### **Strategic Direction Committee**

**Brandon Lucas/Monique Wells**

Monique referred to document [4.7 \(Action Items MSP\)](#). The first draft of this document contains current action items related to the different board committees. The ED asked that board members to review the document and let him know if there are any tasks that should be clarified or belong to different areas.

Monique discussed about the possibility of the Partnership hosting or partnering in a statewide STEM conference/summit. She also added that she is going to refine documents for the MISTEM Committee and will present it to strategic committee in the coming weeks.

Monique reviewed the discussion and issue for the second deadline extension for the STEM grants.

(The first draft of the committee Action Items document has been created and uploaded on MI STEM Partnership Google drive for your review).

**Governance Committee**

**Greg Marks**

- a. **Board Member Attendance** - Paul reminded the board that he has issued an email to all board members regarding board meeting attendance expectations. He mentioned that board need to take action regarding board members with significant unexcused absences (to determine continuation as a board member). Paul asked if there is any discussion regarding the email he has sent out.

Heather mentioned that board had passed a motion before. She asked Paul if board has passed second motion regarding this issue. Paul said that the only motion we have passed requires us to put attendance on our meeting minutes. It also requires us to clarify if absence is excused or not. Paul added that we had no board action towards those who don't attend the board meetings.

Heather mentioned that the board had passed a motion that board members need to participate at least the 80% of board meetings. She added that, later the board determined that participating for 80% of the board meeting is a high expectation and made another motion to remove that 80%. If we are going to expect a new requirement then everyone should be aware of any consequence. We cannot take an action if we are not agreed as a board.

Regarding the Board membership process, Greg Marks explained different reasons board seats turnover. This includes: a member not meeting the official requirements for attendance/participation (involuntary removal), a person voluntarily removing themselves, and the normal cycle of the board term and renewal.

Attendance at Board meetings will now include recording unexcused absences. Follow-up will be done with Board members that have reoccurring and sequential absences from Board meetings.

There are currently 3 open Board seats and the upcoming normal term openings (approximately eight). Actions will be initiated to promote and recruit for the board open/opening board seats. Representation needs discussed include post-secondary, Talent and Economic Development, Career Technical Education

- b. **Process for approving a MSP partner:**

The question has been raised regarding the process required to approve a partnering organization for the Michigan STEM Partnership as there have been recent requests. Greg Marks asked what should be constituted to be a partner of Michigan STEM Partnership. The ED pointed out the partner' page of our website identifies the recognized partners for the Partnership. Currently the partnership has a rubric to evaluate the requesting organization's qualification. To-date there is no established procedure for review that information and approving (or rejecting) the request to be a partner.

Gary Gilger asked what benefits partners receive form MSP; can we charge new partners for a membership fee, or receive other resources. ED mentioned that larger corporate partners could be a good source for donations in the future. Brandon recommended that it is very important to categorize the level of partnership.

Gary Gilger mentioned that we can categorize partners into groups such as founding partners, general partners, and providing/collaborating partners (organizations with efforts that overlap the work of the Partnership).

The ED will develop a draft document outlining categories of partners and a procedure for approval for review by the Executive Committee.

**Break at 1:21 to 1:31**

**Communication Committee**

**Heather Gallegos**

Heather reported that the Communication Committee will start working on communication plans and will update the board at the next meeting.

**Board Task Force Committee**

**Brandon Lucas/Andrew Smart**

- a. **Grant Proposal Applications:** Brandon reported that the grant application process for this year is complete and the next step is to get the review team together. Reviewers are needed at the Hub level to read and score local grants. Review of the larger/state grants needs to be done by the Task Force Committee.
- b. **Waiver of liability, Use of logo, Promotional requirements:** ED added that we need to make some few additions in the requirements for grant awards that include a waiver liability and directions on the use of the partnership logos in/on media that promote MSP as the funding source. He added that he already discussed these topics with executive committee.
- c. **Needs for Grant Awardees:** Paul asked about the process for application reviewers. He asked if task force is going to put these together. Christy explained that they have sent out the request for reviewers to each hubs and board. She mentioned that we currently have 83 total grant requests and depending to the number of reviewers in each group, we estimates that we need 20-30 readers/reviewers.

**6. Items for discussion**

**I. 2015 STEM Grant Applications**

**Christy Cloud-Webb**

Christy reported that we have the total of 83 applications for the total funding request of \$872,480. The number of applications by Hub is as follows:

Hub	Number Proposals Received
Bay Hub	17 requests
Lake Michigan Hub	16
Saint Clair Hub	25
Straits Hub	14
Superior Hub	11
Total Proposals	83

ED added that Friday April 24 is the deadline and we expect several more applications. Brandon asked if we could use this opportunity to solicit for additional funding. Paul mentioned that Christy had a previous conversation with Derhun regarding the idea of identifying any program/application that may fit the funding criteria for TARDAC. This would provide additional funding for the grant process. It was mentioned that only programs that directly serve students may be funded. Concerns were mentioned that there may not be time at this point to process this. The ED suggested that we could go through the process documenting information on grants that are funded proposal that we have not. We can use that information to solicit from organizations that have a history/purpose for giving money to STEM initiatives. Paul added that we need someone to work on that right now and see if there are any additional resources to grant proposals.

**II. Summary report for 2014 grants cycle:**

Regarding the last year STEM grant summary report ([2014 STEM Grant Summary](#)), ED reported that the document has been shared with executive committee. He added that we need to collect additional information through the final grant reports on items such as adult engagement; number of students served, and grade levels. The Summary Report for the

2014 STEM Grants is detailed by Hub, the organizations that received the grants, a brief descriptor of the grant, the number of students who engaged in the activity and the amount of grants. It is very gratifying that the Partnership grant program served 12,907 students in 2014-2015 for a total cost of \$361,533.00. Andrew Smart asked about the grant deadline and if ED could circulate the list of grants applications reviewers. ED mentioned that the deadline is tomorrow and as soon as the process finish we will provide summary information.

### **III. STEM Endorsement on the High School Diploma:**

At the recent MISTEM Committee meeting Representative Zemke reported that he expects language changes to the legislation for STEM endorsement. The change would provide broader options of consideration then just the current math and science course/credit completion. Paul commented that STEM is the integration and application of all of the elements of STEM and systematic change is necessary in how instruction is provided to students. He added that next generation of science standards need STEM requirements and would elevate the delivery in science and better provide for STEM certification.

Mike Tanoff mentioned that MSP does not have a working definition of what STEM means. He specified that it is premature to say "STEM is the integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math". He added that we need to have a well-researched on STEM definition.

Paul added that people have different definitions for STEM.

Brandon added that we should have a discussion in a group to determine a definition for STEM and STEM education. Heather recommended that the Task Force Committee develop a proposed definition both STEM and STEM education. ED added that even the federal government does not clearly define the STEM and STEM education.

ED also added that the Next Generation of Science Standards (NGSS) provides curriculum standards and a structural methodology to allow for project and inquiry based learning activities.

Lisa Gordon recommended that MI STEM Partnership make a connection with STEM.org as they have done research and publication on this topic. Regarding STEM certification, Mike asked if STEMx has adopted a definition for STEM and STEM education. Heather added that we have joined STEMx and we can take a look at their definition.

ED mentioned that we can do some research on this topic and bring it to the next executive committee meeting for review and then bring it to the next board meeting for discussion.

Regarding the STEM certification, Mike Tanoff mentioned we need to know what legislators expect from this certification and what they really want to accomplish through this certification. There needs to be clarity of the required qualifications and what the certification means.

**7. Next Meeting Date – May 28, 2015** **ED**

**8. Adjourn** **ED**  
The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.