

**STEM Action Center
Board Meeting Minutes
April 10, 2024, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm
STEM Action Center Conference Room**

Members Present: Jen Jackson, Ed Atienza, Steven Christiansen, Wendi Secrist, Dee Mooney, Jad Mahnken, Jake Reynold

Staff Present: Matthew Reiber, Stephanie Lee, Sarah Howard, Morgan Howard, Meliah Anchustegui, Katie Bosch-Wilson, Nate Dean

Call to Order

Jennifer Jackson called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm.

Approval of the minutes

Changes to the October 31 Board meeting minutes were requested. The second page, indented bullet, Jennifer corrected that Idaho is not the first state to have a STEM Action Center, but “one of the first states” or “modeled after successful models.” Wendi Secrist moved to approve the minutes with changes, Dee Mooney seconded, motion passed unanimously.

Wendi Secrist moved to approve the November meeting minutes, Dee Mooney seconded, motion pass unanimously.

Changes to the February 7 board meeting minutes were requested. The second page, change wording from “legislative intent has changed” to “STEM Action Center’s response has changed.” Wendi Secrist moved to approve the minutes with changes, Dee Mooney seconded, motion passed unanimously.

STEM Workforce Report

STEM Workforce report, Ed Atienza. Ed shared a presentation on “GREAT” Days at Schweizer Engineering Laboratory, reaching over 150 8th grade students with 80 volunteers from SEL. He shared the activities that students completed and shared details about the SEL headquarters in Pullman, WA. SEL sells electronic products worldwide and has experienced sustained growth since its inception in the 1980s. The manufacturing plant in Lewiston, ID employs over 800 people, and a new printed circuit board factory opened in Moscow, Idaho. Over 1000 of SEL’s 6000 employees are based in Idaho. He shared the main hiring needs of SEL in 4 categories: Electrical Engineering, Computer Science, Technicians, and Assemblers. He shared that SEL is projected to continue growing and their need for skilled employees will grow even more quickly. Ed then detailed the outreach efforts in the K12 and postsecondary education spaces. He highlighted “Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day,” which recognizes women in engineering and encourages participation from 5th grade girls. Ed also detailed classroom visits, field trips, and site visits. In the 2023-2024 academic year, SEL has engaged with over 3300 students and had participation from over 150 SEL volunteers. Year over year, SEL is seeing 30% increase in engagement. Dee asked what the education requirements for assemblers are. Ed responded that a high school diploma is sufficient, and that the hiring pool ranges from recent high school grads to veterans to former educators. Dee then asked how that differed from technician and

engineering positions. Ed responded that these positions generally require a 2- or 4-year degree, and that SEL has to look to hire from outside Idaho to reach sufficient numbers of electrical engineers. Jennifer thanked Ed for his efforts and for sharing.

Agency Updates

Matthew Reiber shared staffing updates. He introduced himself, sharing his position as the K12 policy advisor for the governor and the interim director for the STEM Action Center. He introduced Morgan Howard, the new communications manager and Meliah Anchustegui, the new financial technician. Matthew turned the time over to Katie Bosch-Wilson.

Programmatic Updates

Katie shared programmatic updates for STEM AC programs. The Externship program received 123 applications, and was on track to exceed the goal of 90 placements. Istem received over 400 participant applications and will be able to serve all of them. IDSEF will be taken on by EcosySTEM, with STEM AC continuing to handle the International affiliation. Nate Dean chimed in that ASRT applications had closed, but that there were still open slots and he would be happy to help support application for any interested teachers. The STEM School Designation Leadership PLC has met and Nate is creating a new process to align with newly adopted standards. STEM AC is working with multiple school districts in alignment with the CSforAll NSF Grant, and providing grants for teacher certification in computer science. Additionally, STEM AC is working with AVID (statewide & regional partner) to support code.org trainings over the summer. Jen Jackson asked how many new hosts and new externs were involved vs. repeat participants. Nate responded that there were several repeat Externs and that there have been several new host sites participating, and that Nate and Halle have attempted to prioritize new participants. Jen then asked if teachers have to go through ASRT training to participate in IDSEF. Nate responded that it wasn't required, but was offered as many teachers expressed the need for additional training, and clarified that club leaders or local volunteers were also welcome to participate in order to better support IDSEF in the future. Jen asked that there be more training opportunities for IDSEF participants in the future. Jen then shared that INL has been hiring high school interns, and that mentors are asking for computer science learning for their interns. She shared that interns were well served by having computer science literacy, and that public schools are not meeting that need. She shared that the best intern applicants had found other resources to learn computer science and coding, but that nearly all out-of-state applicants had proficiency in at least one, if not several coding languages. Katie asked if those students were coming from states with computer science graduation requirements. She emphasized the need for students to have a background in computer science. Dee asked how many high schools around the state offer computer science. Katie responded that 38% offer computer science in-person courses, while IDLA offers computer science across the state. She added that there were only 43 computer science-certified teachers in the state, and that not all of those teachers were in the classroom. Jen suggested that Idaho pursue computer science requirements for graduation. Katie shared that she is sitting on a board looking into preparing Idaho, Oregon, and Washington for computer science graduation requirements. Katie shared high-level updates on the EcosySTEM, including the FY25 agreement that had settled on \$983,000. She highlighted that the EcosySTEM is clarified

for regional support and that STEM AC has pulled back on providing statewide sponsorship. She also detailed language changes in the STEM Ambassador and ISEF/IDSEF sections of the agreement. Katie then highlighted the funds that EcosySTEM regions had awarded, including statewide competition travel funds. Dee asked for clarification on the \$983,000 agreement. Katie reiterated that the \$983,000 comes from STEM AC to IBE to run EcosySTEM. Jenn asked for the amount that was changed, and Katie responded that EcosySTEM would receive roughly \$100,000 less, with a large part of that being the statewide sponsorships that EcosySTEM would no longer be awarding.

Foundation Updates

Sarah Howard, STEM Action Center Foundation Manager shared highlights and achievements of her 5-month tenure with the STEM Action Center Foundation. She has built relationships across the state and pursued giving campaigns. She also highlighted strategy changes that the foundation has pursued. She highlighted the upcoming Idaho Gives campaign. Sarah also directed attention to the draft Sponsorship Menu that would help guide giving from industry donors and the fundraising roadmap she has been developing. Sarah shared that the annual foundation Board meeting would be occurring at CWI during iSTEM and invited the Advisory Board to attend if they were interested. She shared that the foundation was on track to raise over \$300,000 for FY24. Dee commented that, at future meetings, she would be interested to see how EcosySTEM and STEM AC collaborated on grant applications. Sarah shared that the NASA Idaho Space Grant Consortium was a joint effort between EcosySTEM and STEM AC. Katie gave further context for how EcosySTEM and STEM AC will pursue funds jointly in the future.

Executive Director Updates

Matthew shared that the Board would receive polls to schedule Board meetings for FY25. He shared that STEM AC FY25 budget had been approved and that the budget request for FY26 would be due on September 1. He encouraged the Board and staff to consider what priorities they would like to pursue for the FY26 budget. He shared that he, the Governor, and the Governor's Chief of Staff would be discussing the next Executive Director, and that it is a top priority to find a suitable Executive Director. He shared that staff will be pursuing a strategic plan at the staff retreat next week, and that he would be following up with Board members to hear their priorities and recapped the 2024 legislative session. He shared that there was very little legislation directed toward STEM AC, except for \$40,000 shifting from STEM AC to the Library Commission. He shared that the legislative session was largely contentious, but had achieved a nearly \$1.5 billion investment over the next decade to address school facilities, and that LAUNCH was fully funded. He added that LAUNCH had received 13,500 applications out of 22,000 high school seniors. He highlighted the efforts of multiple agencies toward the success of the LAUNCH program and added that the Opportunity Scholarship had received record numbers of applicants. LAUNCH awards will be awarded this summer with funds going out in the fall. Wendi added that WDC had just started on updating the playbook relating to go-on opportunities, and that they would like to engage STEM AC in that effort. Matthew thanked WDC for their efforts getting LAUNCH passed.

Ed thanked STEM AC for their support of the First Robotics program.

Adjournment

Dee Mooney moved to adjourn, Ed seconded. Meeting adjourned at 2:34 pm.

**STEM Action Center
Board Meeting Minutes
July 10, 2024 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm
STEM Action Center Conference Room**

Members Present: Ed Atienza, Allison Duman, Wendi Secrist, Jennifer Jackson, Dee Mooney, Steve Christiansen, Jake Reynolds

Staff Present: Katie Bösch-Wilson, Sarah Howard, Morgan Howard, Francine McGrew, Matthew Reiber, Nate Dean, Halle Holdaway

Call to order

Jennifer Jackson called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm. Tabled approval of April meeting minutes till next meeting.

Review of Board appointments and positions

Wendi nominated Jenn to continue as chair. Jenn accepted. Ed seconded the nomination. Nomination passed unanimously.

Dee nominated Ed to continue as vice chair, Ed seconded, Steve seconded the nomination. Nomination passed unanimously.

Jenn remarked on the importance of the advisory board of the STEM Action Center.

Board Updates

Matthew gave an update that Dave Hill had resigned from the Board of Education, and advised that the governor's office would be working to nominate another Board member. Jad's position would be refilled, and Dee's would be renewed.

Jenn shared with Matthew that Board members would be happy to be assigned to working groups as needed.

Workforce Development Council Presentation

Wendi gave a presentation titled "Idaho's Talent Pipeline Management Initiative." The initiative originated with US Chamber of Commerce, viewing workforce from the supply chain perspective. The initiative views the supply chain by groups of related industries, reviews occupation demand projections, and identifies competencies required for in-demand jobs. TPM started in Idaho in 2020 with a partnership Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry to train 30 TPM facilitators throughout Idaho. Due to COVID, this training had to be moved online and faced several roadblocks. In 2022, WDC funded 5 regional host organizations and 2 statewide host organizations to expand TPM training across the state. Today, 5 of the 7 hosts have fully bought into TPM and are continuing to receive partial funding from WDC. The remainder of the funding is provided by the hosts themselves.

Jenn praised WDC's work on TPM and highlighted the value of the program. Steve asked if WDC has had trouble with engagement from employers. Wendi confirmed that there are always

employers that struggle to find the bandwidth to engage in collaborative efforts, but that the workforce shortage was not projected to end anytime soon. Dee and Jenn each commented that the number of initiatives could contribute to lower employer buy-in. Dee also added that TPM seems to have had greater buy-in than other initiatives, which may encourage greater participation moving forward. Allison offered Idaho Department of Education's engagement on TPM as well. Jenn commented that trades didn't seem to be specifically called out by the TPM. Wendi agreed and said that since the TPM is employer-driven, it focuses on what the local employers need.

Agency Updates

Matthew shared that the new director should be shared within the next week or two. He asked that the next Board meeting take place Tuesday, September 10th and committed to gather feedback on that date in his follow-up email.

STEM School Designation Process

Nate shared the draft materials for the updated STEM School Designation Process and requested feedback, as well as feedback on the level of detail that should be brought forward to the State Board of Education. Jenn encouraged Nate to move forward with high-level information only and allow granularity to be addressed on the individual level. Nate outlined the proposed process and shared that all schools that have expressed interest in STEM designation have been brought into the loop about the expected process moving forward. Jenn praised the inclusion of stakeholders and encouraged that approach to continue. Ed asked if interested schools were required to undergo Educurious training to submit their intent notification. Nate assured him that Educurious project-based learning training would not be a requirement. Jenn asked if any schools had reached the point of renewing their STEM Designation. Nate shared that one had started the process of redesignation, and another had chosen not to redesignate. Jenn asked if there was a way to gather data from STEM designated schools to show how STEM designation affected student outcomes. Katie shared that STEMAC hasn't been able to safely hold that sort of data in the past, but that we should be able to do so moving forward. Nate outlined the remaining components of the proposed process. Jenn asked that the Board review the rubric and scoring structure independently and return feedback to Nate. Dee and Jenn asked for further details on the inclusion of an industry professional in the review process.

Adjournment

Jenn and Dee suggested an additional meeting in August. Katie summarized the updates from Sarah. Jenn opened the floor for public comment; none came forward. Jenn adjourned the meeting at 3:18 pm



Governor Brad Little

State Capitol :: Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 334-2100 :: gov.idaho.gov

August 5, 2024

Wendi Secrist, Executive Director
Idaho Workforce Development Council
514 W Jefferson St.
Suite 131
Boise, ID 83702

Dear Director Secrist,

I am writing to inform you that the Idaho STEM Action Center, organized underneath my office, will begin reporting to the Workforce Development Council starting August 5, 2024. This move will bring the STEM Action Center underneath the Workforce Development Council and put you in charge of all duties, tasks, and employees of the agency. The agency shall work to conduct its budget, strategic planning, and all other functions through its determined administrator and the Workforce Development Council upon the enactment date of this letter.

Thank you for your continued service to the State of Idaho and ability to ensure our state government is as efficient and effective as possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Brad Little', is written over a blue horizontal line.

Brad Little
Governor of Idaho



Idaho STEM School Designation Application Requirements

This document outlines the high-level application requirements for an eligible public school or public school program (STEM program) seeking to be awarded an Idaho STEM School Designation by the Idaho State Board of Education pursuant to Section 33-4701, Idaho Code. In compliance with this framework, Idaho STEM Action Center will develop internal policies, procedures, and processes for reviewing such applications and recommending STEM programs annually to the Idaho State Board of Education for formal designation.

I. Annual Application Cycle

1. INTENT NOTIFICATION

Deadline: On or Before May 31st of School Year PRIOR to the Review School Year

- STEM programs hoping to become designated or renew their designation will notify Idaho STEM Action Center by May 31 of the school/fiscal year prior to the year they hope to be reviewed/approved in (their review school year).

2. PORTFOLIO BUILDING & STEM PROGRAM SELF-ASSESSMENT

Targeted Timeframe: Summer/Fall of Review School Year

- Idaho STEM Action Center will provide the STEM program seeking designation access to an online platform to upload their application materials (as outlined in Section III of this document).
- These application materials will constitute a “review portfolio” by which Idaho STEM Action Center will assess the STEM program’s success in implementing the State Board-approved Idaho Standards for STEM School Designation.
- As the STEM Program builds its review portfolio, it will perform a self-assessment of the portfolio utilizing the review criteria developed and published by the Idaho STEM Action Center. This self-assessment will be submitted to the Idaho STEM Action Center as part of the application process.

3. PORTFOLIO READINESS CHECK

Targeted Timeframe: End of Fall/Early Winter of Review School Year

- Idaho STEM Action Center will do perform a high-level check of the STEM program’s review portfolio and self-assessment to ensure it is complete and appears sufficiently developed to warrant formal review.
- If ready, a review team will be assembled (as outlined in Section II of this document) and an on-site visit will be scheduled with the STEM Program.
- If the portfolio is deemed incomplete or obviously not-ready, formative feedback will be issued by the Idaho STEM Action Center. The STEM program will need to delay review until feedback can be implemented and/or necessary adjustments can be made.

4. **DESK REVIEW & ON-SITE VISIT**

Targeted Timeframe: Late Winter/Early Spring of Review School Year

- The review team will perform a desk review of the review portfolio to identify areas of interest, gaps in evidence, or questions that may still need clarified during the on-site visit.
- Basic feedback from the desk review will be given to the STEM program to provide a preparation focus for the review team's on-site visit.
- The on-site visit will occur, and the review team will determine an overall recommendation for/against designation in accordance with the State Board-approved Idaho Standards of STEM School Designation and the related review criteria developed and published by the Idaho STEM Action Center.

5. **IDAHO STEM ACTION CENTER RECOMMENDATION**

Targeted Timeframe: Mid-to-Late March of Review School Year

- Idaho STEM Action Center will prepare a final report summarizing the review team's findings and official recommendation regarding the STEM program's application.

6. **IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DESIGNATION**

Deadline: April of Review School Year, Regular Meeting of Idaho State Board of Education

- Idaho STEM Action Center will bring the approved recommendations to the Idaho State Board of Education for official designation.
- Awarded designations will be good for 5 full school years (pursuant Idaho Code § 33-4701), beginning when school starts in the coming Fall. However, a STEM program may publicly announce themselves as having achieved Idaho STEM Designation as soon as the Idaho State Board of Education votes to officially approve their designation.

7. **IDAHO STEM ACTION CENTER AGREEMENT & AWARD EXECUTION**

Deadline: By May 31 of Review School Year

- Idaho STEM Action Center will work with the STEM program's administrative/financial team to execute an agreement for the following school year, which will be renewable for up to the 5 years of designation.
- The agreement will entitle the STEM program to ongoing public recognition, financial support, and professional development resources from Idaho STEM Action Center (as allowed by available and appropriated funds).
- Under the agreement, the STEM program will be required to execute their submitted *Plan for STEM implementation* to the best of their ability and provide the Idaho STEM Action Center with any reasonable and appropriate data related to the implementation of Idaho Code § 33-4701, the State Board-approved Idaho Standards for STEM School Designation, or Idaho STEM Action Center fiscal reporting requirements.
- Failure to comply with the above requirements may, at the discretion of the Idaho STEM Action Center, result in a revocation of the benefits associated Idaho STEM Designation.

II. Required Review Team Composition

The review team will be composed of 5 individuals as described below:

- **1 staff representative from the Idaho STEM Action Center** (who shall be familiar with the STEM Designation process and capable of leading and training the review team)
- **1 staff representative from the Idaho State Department of Education** (who shall have relevant expertise in STEM-related K-12 instruction, assessment, and/or educational program evaluation)
- **1 staff representative from the Idaho Division of Career Technical Education** (who shall have relevant expertise in STEM-related K-12 CTE instruction, college & career readiness education, and/or educational program evaluation)
 - For reviews of STEM programs that exclusively serve elementary students, the applying STEM program may request that an alternative representative take this slot in place of a representative from the Idaho Division of Career Technical Education. In such cases, the Idaho STEM Action Center will fill this slot with an appropriate individual from one of the other groups identified in this section.
- **1 certified staff member representing the leadership team of a current STEM-designated program or school** (strong preference given to individuals who hold a current Teacher Leader and/or Administrator endorsements).
- **1 representative from a STEM-related industry, professional community, or higher-education partner** (who shall have relevant background, training, and/or substantial experience engaging with youth STEM programs and/or K-12 education) will also serve.
 - If an appropriate industry, professional community, or higher-education partner is not reasonably available to participate on the review team, the 5th member may be an additional individual from any of the groups listed above.

Exceptional Circumstances: Should exceptional circumstances necessitate it, a STEM Designation review may be conducted with fewer than 5 individuals serving on the review team, or without membership from one of the required groups listed above.

However, this exception must be approved by both the Executive Director of the Idaho STEM Action Center and the leadership team of the program being evaluated prior to the start of the desk review.

- The reason for the exception must be explicitly documented in the review team's final report and cited in the recommendations provided by the Idaho STEM Action Center to the Idaho State Board of Education.

Conflicts of Interest: All members of the review team must be free of any interests, commitments, or personal relationships that could reasonably affect their ability to evaluate the STEM program and its provided portfolio in an impartial and objective manner.

III. Required Review Submissions

As part of their application, all STEM programs will be required to submit a review portfolio that includes the items described in this section. The review team will assess the review portfolio utilizing the criteria and processes established and published by the Idaho STEM Action Center in alignment with the State Board-adopted Idaho Standards for STEM School Designation. Definitions and descriptions for each required item in the portfolio submission are also provided below.

Review Submission Definitions

Artifact: A document, file, record, picture, video, or other piece of media (or a related and intentionally curated collection of such) submitted as a single, cohesive unit to serve as evidence of meeting some aspect of a standard.

- If multiple files or documents are meant to work together in support of a single claim or to demonstrate the same aspect of a given standard, they should be submitted together as a collection, serving as a single artifact.

Narrative: A persuasively written statement intended to make a compelling case for how a program is meeting a given standard and to provide specific context for how each submitted artifact supports that case.

- An effective narrative will intentionally address each submitted artifact. It will also draw specific connections between the artifacts and the related standard's rubric descriptors.
- The goal of the narrative is to make it indisputably clear to the review team that the standard is being met and that sufficient evidence has been provided to support that claim. It is recommended to be extremely explicit and leave as little up to interpretation by the review team as possible. In the absence of solid evidence for an aspect of a standard (either from artifacts or the on-site review), the review team will be forced to assume that there is no supporting evidence that aspect and score accordingly.

Portfolio: The organized collection of narratives, artifacts, and additional information assembled by a program to demonstrate that they are meeting the requirements laid out in Idaho Code § 33-4701 and each of the nine (9) State Board-approved Idaho Standards for STEM School Designation. This portfolio will be collected via an online, digital portal and assessed by the review team as part of an official STEM Designation Review led by the Idaho STEM Action Center.

- Contributions to the portfolio can (and, ideally, should) come from all staff within a program, but it is the responsibility of the program's STEM leadership team to assemble the portfolio.
- The portfolio will be considered by the review team, alongside evidence gathered during the on-site visit, to determine the final recommendation regarding STEM Designation.

Review Portfolio Submission Requirements

Plan for STEM Implementation / Program Strategic Plan – Pursuant Idaho Code § 33-4701(3)(c), all programs applying for Idaho STEM Designation must “adopt a plan of STEM implementation that includes, but is not limited to, how the school and district integrate proven best practices into non-

STEM courses and practices and how lessons learned are shared with other schools within the district and throughout the state.”

- The exact structure and length of this document is left to the discretion of program leadership. However, it should at a minimum include:
 1. A statement of the program’s mission and values/philosophy
 2. Specific goals for the next 5 years, related to the implementation of STEM program-wide and the integration of STEM best practices into traditionally non-STEM areas.
 3. A plan of action articulating how the program will work towards accomplishing those goals and share their successes/lessons learned with other programs over the next 5 years.
 4. Information on how and when this plan was formally adopted by program, school, and/or district leadership.
- So long as the above items are fully addressed, this requirement may be met through the submission of an existing school or district planning document. There is no expectation that a unique document be created specifically for achieving STEM designation if all the information already exists within another official document prepared by/for the program.

In addition, for each of the nine Idaho Standards for STEM School Designation, a program must submit the following to the Idaho STEM Action Center for formal consideration by the review team:

One (1) Narrative – 100 words minimum, 500 words maximum

- The narrative should address any aspect of the standard not explicitly demonstrated by the submitted artifacts for that standard and articulate how relevant evidence may be gathered during the on-site visit.

Three (3) to Six (6) Artifacts – The total collection of artifacts for a given standard should ideally attempt to address all aspects of that standard.

- At least one (1) artifact must come from the review school year, with the intention of demonstrating current performance.
- At least one (1) artifact must come from the two (2) years preceding the review school year, with the intention of demonstrating consistency and/or growth over time.
- Although it is a separate submission requirement (detailed above), the program’s *Plan for STEM Implementation*—or a subsection of said plan—may serve as an artifact for any/all of the standards (if noted appropriately in the STEM program’s review portfolio).