

STEM Committee Meeting Minutes

Dayton Regional STEM School
1724 Woodman Dr.
Kettering, OH 45420
February 15th, 2019

A meeting of the STEM Designation Committee established in Ohio Revised Code 3326.02 was held on February 15th, 2019 at 2:30 p.m. at the Dayton Regional STEM School.

Committee members in attendance:

- Mr. Paolo DeMaria, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ohio Department of Education
- Dr. Tom Schwieterman, VP, Clinical Affairs and Chief Medical Office, Midmark Corporation, Appointed by the Ohio Senate
- Ms. Jessica Mercerhill, Senior Director of Educator Preparation, Ohio Department of Higher Education (designee for Randy Gardner)
- Ellen Marrison, Content Strategist, SSTI, Appointed by the Governor of Ohio

Not present:

- Mr. Matt Peters, Assistant Direction, Ohio Development Services Agency (designee for Lydia Mihalik)
- Mr. Stephen Lyons, EVP, The Columbus Partnerships, Appointed by the Ohio House of Representatives
- Mr. Stephen White, Esq, VP External Affairs, Strategic Initiatives, and Business Development, COSI, Appointed by the Governor of Ohio

Also present were:

- Charlotte McGuire, Ohio State Board Vice President, District Three Representative, Appointed by the Governor of Ohio
- Heather Sherman, Ohio STEM Learning Network
- Buddy Harris, Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning, Ohio Department of Education
- Kimberly Bell, STEM Education Program Specialist, Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning, Ohio Department of Education
- Brett Doudican, Greene County Career Center
- Ryan Rismiller, Graham High School

Dayton Regional STEM School Presentation

Sara Collins, Director of Development, Andrew Sears the Middle School Principal and Jessica Short the High School Principal presented about the last ten years of Dayton Regional STEM. The presentation highlighted the growth of Dayton Regional STEM School, student success, career exploration and the creation of additional career pathways.

I. Call to Order

Dr. Tom Schwieterman called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.
Minutes were recorded by Kimberly Bell

II. Approval of Agenda

Dr. Tom Schwieterman discussed the agenda with the committee and guest attendees present. Dr. Tom Schwieterman, STEM Committee Chair motioned to **Approve** the agenda. Motion was **approved unanimously** by the committee.

III. Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Tom Schwieterman started committee wide introductions with Ellen Marrison, one of the newest appointed members to the committee who gave a brief overview of her career and roles as related to STEM education.

Old Business:

IV. Discussion of Approval of Bio-Med Elementary Addition

Heather Sherman, OSLN, led the discussion of Bio-Med's addendum to their STEM designation proposal. The proposed addendum would create the addition of fourth and fifth grade with a proposed implementation for the 2019-2020 school year. This will lead to a shift of grade levels within current buildings to provide room for the fourth and fifth grade addition, but no new IRN will be needed. Dr. Tom Schwieterman moved to **Approve**, and the committee unanimously seconded the motion to **approve** the amendment to the original proposal, to extend the school's STEM designation down to fourth grade.

V. Discussion of I Promise School Visit

Heather Sherman, OSLN, led the discussion informing the committee about the I Promise School follow up visit with Kimberly Bell. I Promise School was granted a 2018-2019 STEM designation with conditions of opening for the 2018-2019 school year. The school currently only serves second and third grade, but as the years progress more grades will be enrolled. There are students tied to the I Promise School but do not attend the I Promise School. These students are enrolled at various Akron City Schools but are associated with I Promise School through The Lebron James Family Foundation. Heather discussed how the school is meeting the basic needs of the students and their families within the community. The school provides clothing, food and high school credit options to students and students' guardians. Kids are open and aware of the available resources. Students are becoming self-advocates for their needs and informing school personnel. Heather noted the school has a unique schedule meant to meet the needs of the families. Students attend school from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. with an afterschool enrichment hour from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. I Promise has very strong partnerships within the community to support the school. STEM education is happening during the school day and their afterschool program. Dr. Tom Schwieterman moved to **Approve** the removal of conditions from I Promise Schools designation, the committee unanimously seconded the motion to **approve**.

New Business:**VI. Discussion of Emerging Category additional to the STEM School Designation Process**

- Dr. Tom Schwieterman introduced the idea of incorporating an “emerging” (The term emerging has not been finalized) category to the STEM designation. There is a need for an emerging category due to the increase in applications and to foster a growth continuum with the STEM designation process. Heather Sherman emphasized the need for this process to be more about growth along a continuum rather than a one and done approach. The addition of an “emerging” category would help with this growth mindset, allow school districts to be encouraged to grow and reapply the following school year.
- Paolo DeMaria and Dr. Tom Schwieterman brought forward the question of how the “emerging” category would be shared. Committee discussed various options and agreed a slide with the categories and requirements of each category displayed provide a visual for schools to observe the growth continuum.
- Paolo DeMaria stated the need for the distinction between emerging and a designated STEM school or that the word emerging needs to change so schools cannot advertise that they are an emerging STEM school per the state.
- Heather Sherman brought up an idea previously discussed with Buddy Harris and Kimberly Bell about having two different STEM designation meetings. One with only the committee to determine who would receive STEM designations, “emerging” on their proposal and who was not receiving either a designation or emerging status and one another where schools who are receiving the designation would be invited to a meeting and to the following State Board meeting in May to celebrate their achievement. This would prevent the people who are not receiving a designation from taking time out of their day to come to a meeting and not be designated. This meeting would need a public meeting, so the attendees would be known beforehand. Paolo brought up that the steps leading up to this meeting will need to be clarified and determined beforehand. Heather Sherman agreed and stated that she would work with Buddy Harris and Kimberly Bell to determine what procedures would be necessary to implement the following state board meeting for acknowledgement of their accomplishment.
- Schools within the emerging category would be provided additional assistance from the time of designation meeting until the new proposals are due the following school year. The idea of having a STEM Emerging work group for schools, OSLN and ODE to collaborate and work towards a model STEM school with constructive, detailed feedback, one on one assistance and guidance through helping the schools with their growth areas was presented by

VII. Discussion of STEM schools maintaining application expectations post designation

- Dr. Tom Schwieterman initiated the discussion of how STEM schools should be held accountable to the proposals they submit for designation.
- A process is necessary to insure beyond assurances how designated STEM schools are continuing their STEM practices post designation. Dr. Tom Schwieterman inquired about how would this be impacted or impact the legislation tied to STEM schools? Buddy Harris brought up about how schools are required to completely assurances prior to each school year, the rubric could be incorporated in with the assurance process.
- Paolo DeMaria mentioned perhaps the creation of a walkthrough document for easy documentation and gathering of data on schools.
- Schools would not lose their designation but if they receive a certain number of deficiencies from the rubric, they may be asked to reapply and create a growth plan.

- The idea of a rubric for STEM schools was brought to the committee. Kimberly Bell discussed findings from researching states also doing STEM designation. These states included Tennessee, Indiana, Nevada, Arizona and North Carolina. Each state has a rubric for STEM schools who are seeking designation. Tennessee and Indiana also require for schools to reapply every three- five years. Kimberly continued to explain how she took the feedback form the Ohio STEM Learning Network provides the volunteers providing feedback and created a draft rubric with three categories: Initial, Emerging and Model. The rubric is still very much in the draft phase all terms are flexible and additional categories may be necessary.
- It was mentioned that schools needed some form of accountability with being a STEM school, but the rubric and school visits did not want to be viewed as a compliance between the agency and the school.
- Jessica Mercerhill asked that as the STEM designation has progressed through the years, has the application changed with it? Would the new rubric reflect the current application?

VIII. Closing Remarks

Committee briefly discussed how meeting and touring a STEM school was beneficial.

IX. Adjourn

Dr. Tom Schwieterman, Committee Chair, seconded by Jessica Mercerhill

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Next Meeting TBD April/May

