OREGON COAST REGIONAL STEM HUB
Steering Committee Quarterly Meeting
September 22, 2015, 11am – 3pm with lunch
OCCC North County Center, 2788 SE High School Dr, Lincoln City, OR

AGENDA

1. **Welcome & Introductions**

2. **Approval of the Recorded Notes: 6/16/2015**

Committee moved to approve the notes

3. **Committee Reports**

Tracy Crews presented on student learning experiences which has changed names to STEM experiences. Provided a handout of experiences.

Rachael Bashor shared successful and upcoming professional development experiences.

Cait Goodwin shared an update on communication strategies. Provided a handout.

4. **Vision and Mission**

Birgitte Ryslinge provided some background including:
- *Need to firm up statements for new grant cycle*
- *For recruitment of full-time Executive Director*
- *Steering Committee tasked Executive Committee to develop drafts of vision, mission and Executive Director position description to be reviewed for adoption/revision*
    - *Clarification of Executive Committee composition was made that it currently included: Janice, Dawn, Kerry Carlin-Morgan, Birgitte, Craig and Bruce*
    - *These documents were developed by the Executive Committee with some input from Backbone staff*
- *Impetus for any changes include need to reflect on:*
    - *Whether the statement developed by a smaller group of individuals accurately represents the collective impact partners*
    - *New/revised state vision for STEM*

Much discussion around composition of Executive Committee and how it was formed; clarifying point included
- *Executive Committee members volunteered*

Much discussion regarding role of guests in meeting and does a voting member represent an individual or an organization
- *Decided that if only a tie occurred during committee voting could a representative of an organization vote (i.e. Pete Tuana as a representative of Oregon Coast Aquarium*

in Kerry Carlin Morgan's absence could only vote if a tie occurs because he is not a committee member)

- *Identified that this issue should be discussed at greater length in another meeting.*

VISION
a. Discussion

New draft vision statements were shared and then discussed. Topics of debate included:

- *The past-tense nature of the statements, prefer active state.*
- *The inclusion/exclusion of 'students' or 'children'*
  - *Arguments that removal of 'students' seemed to veer the STEM Hub away from serving the primary audience currently established of K-12 students and audiences. Created a greater emphasis on employment and workforce and loses some things.*
  - *Arguments that removal of 'students' made the Hub more inclusive of community partner involvement which has been a harder place of engagement and is the end beneficiary of STEM Hub success.*
- *The statement lacked the excitement and passion behind STEM*
- *In an effort to create a more concise statement, some elements the Hub values may have been lost including 'creativity', 'passion', 'connecting',*
- *The Hub is more a tool than a thing.*

b. Action

Shamus Gamache made a motion to vote on the preferred statements.

After an initial vote, statements were narrowed down to statement 3 and 4.

Kyle Cole made a motion to adopt statement #4.

> *In favor: Dawn, Julie, Kyle Cole, Bruce Rhodes, Shamus Gamache, Birgitte Ryslinge*
> *and Janice Eisele*
>
> *Opposed: Kama Almasi*
>
> *Abstained: Kris*
>
> *Vision statement #4 was adopted.*

MISSION

a. Discussion

b. Action

Kyle Cole makes a motion to adopt mission #2. Dawn seconds.

Discussion ensues with all in attendance participating.

Kyle amends his motion to the following statement:

'The Oregon Coast STEM Hub engages learners with STEM by leveraging local and regional resources and collaborating with diverse partners.'

> *In favor: Unanimous*

> *The mission was been accepted.*

5. **Executive Director Position Description**

   Birgitte Ryslinge provided some background including:
   - *The committee identified they wanted a full time Executive Director*
     - *Considered critical in creating sustainability to STEM Hub model*
   - *Position description was developed using FSG Executive Director position description*
   - *Current document was developed as a draft for steering committee approval*
   - *Position description is not a requirement of the grant but is to be used in the hiring and to have documented purpose of position*

   a. **Discussion**
   Clarifications were sought and discussed:
   - *Does the grant require an executive director?*
   - *Executive Committee sought acknowledgment that they had completed the task set to them from the Steering Committee.*

   b. **Action**

   No action was taken.

6. **State Impacts**
   a. **New RFA / RFP**
      i. **Backbone Continuation**
      ii. **Programming**
   b. **Strategic Direction**
   c. **New Hub Applicants and Impacts on Oregon Coast STEM Hub**

Mark Lewis from the State shared insights including:

- o *Trying to establish a supportive environment for innovation and transformation to occur.*
- o *Need to try to promote student and educator engagement by creating diverse systems and structures to allow the diversity of resources flourish.*
- o *Educators are feeling embattles and not empowered to do things. STEM education is meant to bring different people together because diversity drives innovation. The transition and creative tension can be challenging.*
- o *The regional hubs are meant to be a way to learn by sharing brilliant successes and failures so that we may modify and adapt.*
- o *The Oregon Coast has a rich history of partnerships and accomplishments which is why the state does not want to be prescriptive.*
- o *Things that were learned through the 2014-2015 grant cycle include:*
  - ▪ *The collective impact model and grant application model were not necessarily compatible. It created a greater emphasis on programming than leadership. Due to this, programming and infrastructure will be funded separately in the next grant cycle.*
    - • *Encourage a move away from the "What's in it for me?" mentality*
    - • *Will try to strategically instill leadership in Hubs that will be able to sustain through challenging times*
  - ▪ *New hubs will have to demonstrate leadership before receiving funding. The state is treating these Hubs as start-up investments evaluating their capacity and leadership for success to determine funding.*
- o *Questions that were taken:*
  - ▪ *Who's applying for the programmatic funds?*
    - • *Answer. The Hubs will be applying directly for programmatic dollars. Hubs will need to identify programmatic priorities- addressing graduation rates should be a priority. Hubs should identify their regions needs and assets and identify priorities.*
  - ▪ *How may the NWESD STEM Hub impact our application for backbone and programmatic funding?*
    - • *Answer. The state will not define the geographic region a Hub should serve. Regions should be defined by common economic and regional needs and shared commitment to those efforts. If the North Coast feels they have a stronger sense of identity, that is their prerogative however they may face challenges as they cannot apply for programmatic funds immediately.*
  - ▪ *Can community partners be a part of multiple STEM Hub applications?*
    - • *Answer. Mark is comfortable with ambiguity. The application should be written with how partnerships are envisioned right now with the opportunity that more conversations may occur and relationships may shift.*
  - ▪ *Why can't organizations belong to multiple Hubs?*
    - • *Answer. An organization should reflect on what they are committing to the relationship and if they are willing to commit the time and energy to both Hubs. The Oregon Coast STEM Hub's partnership have largely been developed and been strong because*

of shared programming. He encouraged the Hub to stay action and goals oriented but understand what your strengths are that have given you this identity.

7. Continuing Partners for Oregon Coast STEM Hub

Steve Boynton sought confirmation that the LCSD would serve as the fiscal agent in the next application of funding. There were no objections but any other interested parties were encouraged to submit interest to Birgitte and Tracy.

A number of current partners have submitted continuing commitment documents:

- *There is the possibility of losing some folks to the North but are gaining some commitments on the South coast.*
- *Steve Boynton encouraged a direct dialogue with North Coast and other district administrators because the meeting notes may not necessarily sound inclusive of K12.*
- *The state will be conducting interviews with existing partners to evaluate where we've been and give suggestions on where to go next*
    - *This list will be created collaboratively by Tracy and Birgitte and will be communicated to the rest of the Steering Committee*
    - *These interviews will be the evaluation of our 14-15 grant cycle*
    - *All that will be submitted in the next grant application is the backbone budget and budget justification*

Discussion of concerns and motivations for being a partner

- *Concerns that STEM funds being more inclusive of additional audiences may be a dilution of our Hub objectives and may be re-focusing us away from k12 or k14. This may make some administrators, including current district partners, to move away from participating in the Hub.*
    - *Counterpoint was that a broader audience for the Hub may provide more opportunity for funds and resources to come in outside of state funds, specifically referencing more business inclusion*
- *Areas that require reflection for partners may include:*
    - *Would I be a part of the Hub if there were no monies?*
    - *What are our outcomes? How can we be a leader in the state and nation for STEM?*
    - *What partners are seeking to invest resources and not take resources to the Hub?*

Tillamook School District will be moving out of the current Oregon Coast STEM Hub to join the NWESD proposed Hub

- *There is new leadership in the region and as conversations have occurred, the leadership has decided they needed to invest in their existing local network*
- *Would like to propose that they still contribute as much as they can, host and participate in activities as they are available*
- *Felt they needed to make their decision and let people know as soon as possible.*
- *Should that Hub get funded, there may be value in two great neighboring Hubs working together*

8. **Steering Committee Leadership**

There can be situations that the person who signed a letter of commitment are not the person assigned to the meetings, we may want to alter the structure to insure that representation and engagement is kept equal.

9. **Our Collective Impact (CI) Organization and Development**
   a. **STRIVE Model**
   b. **State perspectives**
   c. **EC and Backbone recommendations**

10. **Potential Evolved CI Models**
    a. **Steering Committee / Operations Team**
    b. **Executive Committee**
    c. **Community Leadership Council**

11. **Transition Plans that may be needed**
    a. **Hub Members (Geography and Collective Impact Partners)**
    b. **Organizational Model**
    c. **Backbone staff** **(over)**

12. **Strategic Initiatives for 2015-17 Programming Grant**

Networking and Communication- creating strategies for communication

Best practices for STEM professional development

- *How to take kids outside*
- *STEM and literacy*
- *Engineering design challenges*

STEM Experiences

- *Reaching underrepresented audiences*
- *Engineering design challenges*
- *Career day opportunities*

Looking forward

- *Still struggling to have underrepresented audiences involved in all levels (leadership, programming, etc.)*
- *Discussion:*
  - *Outreach and getting family and parents involved- they are stakeholders even if not partners*
  - *There are some students and teachers that participate in all activities but we are beginning to reach new audiences*
  - *Math Counts does not have as much regional participation locally; occurs in Newport in February*
  - *Incorporating the M in STEM working with the RAC's*
  - *Working towards creating a shared expense for busing to events*
  - *More activities related to the worksforce- mapping the STEM related jobs in the regions we serve*
  - *Increased access and participation in research opportunities for undergraduates*

13. Set next Steering Committee meeting
- *October 2nd and September 29th were both proposed*
- *8:30 for September 29th as a webinar*

Good of the Order

Discussion:
- *Some people expressed an interest in the backbone staff's input*
- *Debate on input of backbone staff on budget- various models in different settings*
- *Request for steering committee's leadership to assist in the development of the budget to avoid conflict of backbone staff making recommendations for budget for positions*
- *Many echoed they would like it to be a steering committee decision on the budget itself*
- *Suggestions for structure of meeting- begin meeting with input from backbone staff and then a departure for steering committee to discuss and make decisions*