SC STEM Hub Advisory Board Minutes

March 24, 2015

SC STEM Hub Advisory Board Meeting

1. Members and others present: Singleton, Pattison, Corbin, Sieck, Wayne, Chai, Derry
2. Members absent: Wigeland, Madison, Gittinger, Derry, Henson, Harrington
3. March minutes approved.
4. Overview of Robert Half Technologies by Singleton
5. Cater to technology, finance and accounting, accounting operations
6. Seek Permanent and temporary employees throughout the state
7. Top 3 skills they seek: the technical skill they’re recruited for, solid work history and good communication skills
8. Scale-Up discussion
9. Applicant and budget overview
10. Almost 200 applicants in just SC region. If we were to fund every single we would need 1.2 million dollars. Way more requests than last year, due to the fact an administrator could apply for an entire district. The SC region was consistently #3—right in the middle.
11. This year, we have 477,000 to spend from the State plus 23,000 from Alliant Energy, which we can carry over in unrestricted dollars. The total to award $488,491.95
12. Options for decision making
13. Option 1 – Defined STEM Regional License. The pro is that it offers STEM to non-STEM areas and materials are downloadable; the con is that it is very difficult to evaluate because it doesn’t fit into our current measurement system very well. In the past it has had a low history of sustainability. Only 6% of year 1 applicants sustained Defined STEM on their own.
14. Option 2—This option ranks applicants in the following ways
15. Need through free and reduced lunch counts
16. All first new choices that the educator applied for
17. Groups that showed the highest need for the 2nd award got it. At least 3 new districts that are not on the heat map got their first choice. Multiple districts applied for Defined STEM, but it was ranked 5th. Impact 18,000 students.
18. Option 3—Looks at Define STEM by building, prioritize district implementation.
19. Awards all 1st choice for new programs
20. Second choice awards will be decided based on district implementation plans. Distribution would be more concentrated in districts like Waukee, WDM, Johnston, but those 3 districts are in the bottom half of need.
21. Some concerned about Defined STEM accountability; Sarah will be working to rewrite the Defined STEM contract.
22. Some say based on what we’ve talked about—option 3 is not viable; in reality, not sure that the possibility of impacting the most students—wants to make sure the numbers that are impacted are the right numbers. It’s a quality versus quantity issue; there’s little data for either when looking at Defined STEM
23. Some would like looking at total allocated amounts, the festival amount goes down in Option 3. Sarah notes she allocates $2000 per festival, but it’s rarely spent down
24. Some hope for more sustainability information on ST-Math. Sarah notes they have provided us with access to studies in other areas.

C. Options to a vote

1. A recommendation for Option 1; one for Option 2
2. Option 2 wins with a vote of 5 for and 1 against
3. Request for more information on Defined STEM
4. Will announce in April.
5. State STEM Summit
6. Breakout session—Sarah will start with intro; break into regional networking session using an activity called Speed Networking—Wagon Wheel
7. Over 500 people registered; break into round table discussions
8. STEM Kit Materials—Best Practices Information will be provided
9. Derry will email with the time and location of the next meeting
10. Adjournment