

3101 Technology Boulevard, Suite G

Lansing, MI 48910

(517) 336-7733

**Minutes of Board meeting 06/25/15**

Meeting Convened at 12:05 p.m.

**Attendees:** Paul Agosta, Greg Marks, Monique Q. Wells, Gary Farina, Ali Elyaderani

**On the phone:** Patty Cantu, Christy Cloud-Webb, Linda Daichendt, Lisa Gordon, Jodie Ledford, Andrew Smart, Vass Theodoracatos,

**Apologies**: Heather Gallegos, Greg Johnson, Jenny Schanker, Tom Wessels

**Guest Attendees:** Chris Standerford, Nikki Roggers

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

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Welcome Members and Guests**
3. **Consent Agenda**

Previous minutes:ED took a motion to approve the [minute of May](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVcXBzUmZTaU1hQUE). The motion to approve was passed. (Greg/Paul)

1. **Board Action(s)**

Board actions took place as part of the committee reports and are noted in the appropriate sections below

1. **Hubs Updates**

**Superior Hub**, Christy reported that the Soo Locks (the shipping industry) is sponsoring an engineering day and expects to have around 3000 guest. This event will happen tomorrow, May 26th.

Christy also reported that, due to the large geographic region, the Superior Hub is piloting a regional approach to its operations. Four smaller regions within the Hub will plan regional based programs and develop partners and representatives from within that area to assist with planning and programming. The leaders of each of the regions will meet regularly to discuss and determine development and resource needs, cooperative programming and share results with each other.

**Straits Hub –** no report

**Lake Hub -** no report

**Bay Hub –** no report

**St. Clair Hub ­** no report

1. **Executive Director’s Report**

Regarding Executive Director’s report, ED reported that during the past month his activities were focused on the areas ([ED’s Report](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVQTNRZlZnR181T2M)) as follows:

The first item was STEM penetration data collection ([STEM Penetration](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVTEJuNGxYRWVXVjQ)). ED added that reports have been prepared in two different documents for different needs. An Executive Summary report was developed. This report is one page in length and has very general information and broad recommendations. A general Summary Report was also developed. This report is just 5 pages in length, as more specific data indicators and more specific recommendations.

The ED also addressed the competitive grant process. Documents provided to the board list the grant proposals recommended for funding. This includes grants of both over and under $10,000 ([All STEM Grants](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVcFBBVER0RE1iS1U)). Additionally, the score sheet form used by the grant reviewers was shared with the board.

The ED provided an update on the 501C3 application for tax exempt status. The application form and all attachments have been provided to Yeo & Yeo for review. The review showed that there are some edits to both the form and several of the attachments needed. Those updates will be made and the materials will once again be reviewed by Yeo & Yeo prior to filing with the Internal Revenue Service. Additionally, a power of attorney will be signed with Yeo & Yeo which authorizes them to act on our behalf and let them to track the progress of the application and act on behalf of the Partnership. ED added that the filing fee was raised in April by the IRS from $450 to $850.

ED mentioned that he was trying to setup a meeting with hub leaderships to follow prior to an upcoming meeting with the Michigan Department of Education and Michigan Math and Science Center Directors. The intent of this meeting is to begin to begin relationship building and to solicit input on the operational transition of the Hubs as the partnership becomes a 501C3 organization and fiscals its own funds, and funds used by the Hubs. To-date no meeting has been scheduled.

Regarding the Partnerships sponsorship for the Women in Mobile/Wireless Technology event, the ED mentioned that, besides being a recognized sponsor of the event, we had two representatives in attendance. The ED asked Linda to explain more about this event.

Linda reported that the event helped to increase the understanding that mobile and wireless technology is very much STEM based and mobile/wireless technology skills need to be incorporated into education and training programs. Linda added that discussions concluded that there are not enough women in technology due to the difficulties they encounter in getting into preparation programs. A better job needs to be done to educate girls/women and help them to understand the potential career opportunities and the path to get there.

ED reported that he had a meeting with Ford Next Generation Learning (NGL). Ford Motor Company is sponsoring seven STEM Based Career Academy Model in four states and is looking to expand. Currently, one is located in the Utica School District operating as a math, science and career academy. A new academy is being developed in Detroit.

The model is a community engagement model. Ford Motor Company, in collaboration with the UAW and many of their large suppliers collaborate to provide technical professionals in the classroom and real world experiences in industry outside classrooms. The ED added that these academies are expected to serve about 7000 students this year. Andrew Smart asked about the Ford NGL activity and the potential values that the conversation can bring into the partnership. ED replied that engagement with this development will provide insight into the elements and benefits of the model and may help guide the funding of future grant initiatives and guidelines of the Partnership. It may also help us to gain connection to the resource network and funding provider (The Ford Fund).

Regarding the Partnership’s social media, ED acknowledged that Linda is actively posting on our Twitter account and our LinkedIn Group has a steady stream of discussion topics and promotions. He also mentioned our Facebook account has been created and is running.

Regarding the STEM support letter, ED mentioned that the item would be covered under Executive Committee reports.

**Committee Reports**

* 1. **Executive Committee**

[**STEM Support Letter**](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVY2E5dnd0RDg2NVE)

Paul mentioned that regarding the NGSS support letter, he had received an email from James Emerling (St. Clair Hub) asking the Partnership to write to a letter of support for the state adoption of the MSS/NGSS. He added that we need to re-position ourselves to support NGSS as workforce development. He also added that we have written a [STEM support letter](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVY2E5dnd0RDg2NVE) that supports the adoption of the Michigan Science Standards and views this as a critical step in providing K-12 education (The letter is available for your review on our Google drive). He mentioned that we are supporting MSS/NGSS because there is direct alignment between NGSS and Michigan STEM Partnership initiatives.

**Transition Plan**

Paul reported on the meeting that was held with Steven Best (from MDE) and MMSC Directors on Wednesday June 24th. Discussions were centered on how the Partnership will transition and align the hubs as a part of partnership. He clarified that goal is to support the Partnership and without this transition the Partnership’s growth is limited.

**Funding**

Related to funding, Paul reported that the Partnership is funded for fiscal year 2015-2016 at the same level as the past year. He added that under section 99.7, some part of our decisions on our funds have been limited. For this year, Executive Directors’ budget has been placed under general funds for the amount of $100,000. Paul also added that we don’t currently have fully control on our grant money and they are held by an education agency.

**MISTEM**

Paul mentioned was reported in our last meeting with Adam Zemke that there is $50,000 budgeted for staffing a Director for the Michigan STEM Advisory Counsel. Paul asked Monique to talk more about Adam’s vision regarding interaction between counsel and Michigan STEM Partnership.

Regarding Adam Zemke’s vision, Monique explained that Advisory Council will be decision makers who have eleven votes and are responsible for raising fuds and approving the Menu of fundable STEM programs. Greg Marks added that the goal of advisory council is to have business representation involve in the fundraising/collection process.

Paul mentioned that during the last year we really engaged in the everything STEM conversation. He referred to his follow up meeting on Wednesday, June 24th with TED (Talent and Economic Development). He mentioned that we hope to have a TED representation on our board and better engage in the future with the Prosperity Regions.

Paul also reported that the committee spent much of the time trying to identify the elements and organizations that need to be included in the process. This task was very difficult and the results of the effort were limited. Paul clarified that in order to make systematic changes we need to make connections and makes sure someone oversees those changes. ED mentioned that an option may be to contact Larry Smith (he had described facilitating a similar process for the American Society for Quality) to see if he could provide a service and methodology in order to help us to identify our full systems, scopes and necessary communication. ED added that this support will help us to better prepare for the committee work with Adam Zemke and an organization as a whole.

Vass mentioned that this is a great opportunity for us to be at table with Adam Zemke and pull everybody together for STEM programs in Michigan. Vass added that we need to have some direct feedbacks from Adam Zemke.

Linda commented that MI STEM Partnership also should have a seat on Advisory Council.

Greg Marks added that we need to recognize the CEOs and corporations who are interested to make investment in STEM education. Andrew Smart mentioned that there are groups who are interested in STEM initiatives which we can prioritize them and bring their knowledge to table. Andrew suggested that we need to have a deeper conversation and schedule a specific meeting regarding this topic.

Paul also reported that discussion at the last executive meeting highlighted the importance of our updating our website. The ED stated that he hopes to make that a priority for work in July.

[**All STEM Grants**](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVcFBBVER0RE1iS1U)

ED mentioned that we now have quorum and we can move to the action items.

ED stated that board need to take a vote on approval of the grants for both under $10,000 and over $10,000

A document that includes the total grant for each hub had been uploaded on our shared Google drive for your review.

ED mentioned that the grant details in the document are arranged by the name of the grant, location of the project, total of the grant, total for each hub and the overall grant total. ED clarified that total grants under 10,000 came up to $199,357.32.

ED asked Christy to review the process of scoring and reading of the grant process.

Christy explained that for the grants under $10,000 we had twenty two volunteer readers and they used a [rubric](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVbndhZkZNOGJibGs) to score the grants (rubric document has been uploaded on our shared Google drive). For grants over $10,000 grants, they were first reviewed by grant committee prior to being read and scored through the same rubric.

Christy mentioned that the electronic versions of the documents are available upon board request. Greg Marks asked Christy about the nature of the grant proposal documents and whether this could be a public document (or not), and who can get access to it. ED suggested that we need to have a historical record for grants with managed access.

Christy mentioned that she will send a copy of the grants list to ED.

**Grants approval motion:**

* ED took a motion to approve the under $10,000 grants listed. The motion was made and second to approve. The motion was passed. (Paul, Greg Marks)
* ED took a motion to approve grants over $10,000.

The motion was made and second to approve. The motion passed (Greg, Paul)

**Break at 1:31 to 1:41**

* 1. **Finance Committee**

Regarding the Finance Committee, Gary Gilger was not attending the meeting and ED updated the board members. He mentioned that there is a finance meeting on Monday, June 29th to review the plan to fund the cost of the 501C3 filling. Paul clarified that as the next step, we need to file this document (501C3), and get away from our current fiscal agent and manage our own funds. Paul also asked ED if we have a plan to solicit for funds. ED replied that the Finance Committee will develop and send out an email to solicit funds. Additionally, MVU will match funds raised up to $2500.

Paul stated that finding required funding to cover our costs is imperative to filing the 501C3 application. ED mentioned that due to having almost three years of philanthropic history, Yeo & Yeo has advised us that we can begin operating as a tax exempt organization as soon as we file.

* 1. **Strategic Directions Committee**

Monique reported that they have a meeting to discuss the feasibility of hosting a conference/summit or attaching on to an existing conference and providing a strand of STEM breakout sessions.

* 1. **Governance Committee**

Greg Marks mentioned that he has sent out emails regarding new board members candidate selection process. He asked members to respond back by emails and suggest candidate for open board seats. Greg added that we currently have six open board seats. ED asked Greg what information he needs from members about candidate when responding by email. Greg mentioned that he only need their name and contact numbers.

* 1. **Communication Committee**

Heather was not attending this meeting. ED explained that there is a significant need to update the content on our website. ED also added that currently we have three open positions at communication committee.

* 1. **Board Task Force**

ED mentioned that the grants were discussed and approved. There were no more updates for this item.

1. [**STEM Penetration Report**](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByM3JU_cr0TVTEJuNGxYRWVXVjQ)  **ED**

ED mentioned that this item originated through a contact by Senator Schmidt’s office with Christy. The Partnership was asked to provide information in regards to the extent of the penetration of STEM activities in education. We do not have the resources to do a full survey of all schools districts in Michigan. The approach was taken to identify indicators of STEM activities by reaching out to STEM providers. In order to do so, we made contacts with STEM providers, STEM academies, and STEM schools. We were able to categorize the type of STEM information into three categories:

* 1. Extra-curricular: summer camps, after school activities,
	2. Curricular: activities directly implemented into the classroom
	3. Development programs

Paul asked about the application of this information. ED replied that we will share this information with Adam Zemke, Senator Schmidt and others. The reports do provide indications of STEM activity but a much larger survey is needed. It would be best if that is done prior to the adoption of the Michigan Science Standards so growth from that point can be documented.

1. **July Board Meeting ED**

Due to the amount of the work which is required for all of the committees, the Executive Committee decided to cancel the July board meeting and dedicate that time to committee meeting in order to address action items.

ED also reminded board members that there is an action plan on our Google drive identifies the action items for each committee.

1. **Additional Items/Updates ED/Board**

ED mentioned that all of the following items have been already addressed.

* 1. **MTAM Community Sponsorship -**
	2. **Twitter Account**
	3. **Letter of Support – MSS/NGSS**
	4. **Hub Development Meeting(s)**
	5. **Other**

There were no more comments about these items.

1. **Next Meeting Date – August 27, 2015 ED**
2. **Adjourn ED**

The meeting has been adjourned at 2:01 P.M.