**Meeting minutes**

**Wyoming School-University Partnership**

**Governing Board Meeting**

**Thursday, April 5, 2012**

**In attendance**

Dave Barker, Debbie Bovee, Bob Bryant, Kathy Hitt, Paige Fenton Hughes, Joe McCann (by conference call), Kevin Mitchell, Kay Persichitte (by conference call), Ray Schulte, Audrey Shalinsky, Allen Trent, Michelle Hoffman.

Partnership Staff: John Anderson, Audrey Kleinsasser, Beth Wiley

Guests by conference call: Ann Foster and Greg Bernhardt, NNER

Chair Paige Fenton Hughes called the meeting to order at 10:00am. She welcomed everyone and stated that we would have several guests by conference call today, including Ann Foster and Greg Bernhardt. Then she asked all participants to introduce themselves by sharing a powerful professional development experience that helped each person to grow. Several participants mentioned NNER experiences in Seattle, and several participants mentioned an experience that allowed them a hands-on growth experience. There were also mentions of leadership opportunities, experiences that taught participants how to take care of themselves as educators, and lots of other interesting professional development activities that impacted participants. These observations related to the professional development report from the College of Education presented later in the meeting.

Ann Foster and Greg Bernhardt then joined by conference call. Paige explained that Greg is taking over Ann’s position as interim executive director for NNER. Ann and Greg were joining the conversation to talk to the Partnership governing board about this transition period. Paige then asked Audrey Shalinsky to facilitate the conversation. Audrey S. invited Ann or Greg to explain what has been done so far for the transition. Greg greeted everyone and explained that his goal is to have a good understanding of what Ann has been doing to try to create a seamless transition. In particular, he is focused on all current NNER projects, grants, the NNER journal, the upcoming conference, budget concerns, and new member recruitment. Ann emphasized that Greg will be an asset to the NNER for this transition period. He has served on both the NNER governing council and executive board as president. The goal is for Greg to fully take over as interim director after the July summer symposium in Seattle.

Audrey S. then explained that the transition committee (of which she is a member) is just beginning the process of looking into what this transition will mean. The committee is looking at several issues, one of which is deciding whether to move the NNER headquarters. Ann added that when the NNER started in Seattle, it was housed within Institute for Educational Inquiry. However, the NNER is now an independent non-profit organization. Audrey S. clarified that the transition team will be looking into where and how to house the NNER, collecting examples of possible models.

Next, Greg updated us on the future of the NNER. The mission of the NNER will remain unchanged and viable even if the location changes. Financially, the organization is sound and in a good place to relocate. At its February board meeting in Chicago, the NNER governing council approved individual NNER memberships for $100 per person per year. Kay Persichitte asked if the NNER is thinking about ways to contribute to the national conversation about education, trying to shift the focus from school accountability to school renewal. Ann answered that the NNER tries not to be a political voice, but encourages and supports members to be involved locally. They are looking into setting up more supports, such as a Facebook page to facilitate those conversations. Greg added that the NNER has plans to begin work on a data base that would help educators see what others are already doing to make a positive impact in education. The NNER wants to encourage educators and members to collaborate. Ann added that the data base will include information about student learning effectiveness and ways to attract and retain effective teachers.

Audrey S. asked for any final questions about the NNER transition. Paige commented that she would like to see the NNER bring experiences like the summer symposium in Seattle to the NNER member sites, instead of always having members travel. Audrey K also asked that, as soon as the transition committee has an idea of what it would take to apply to be the new NNER host site, they make the application information available.

Audrey S. thanked Ann and Greg for joining us to provide this information, and Greg reminded everyone that if they had any thoughts or suggestions to contact him or Ann.

Paige asked Audrey K. to present the meeting agenda and supporting materials which include the financial reports, January 19 meeting minutes, and the director’s report. Allen Trent commented that the Partnership and NNER should be commended for accomplishing so much on small budgets. Allen also suggested that perhaps we should be looking to find more grant money to help expand Partnership offerings. Dave Barker moved approval of the agenda and related consent agenda items. Bob Bryant seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Paige asked Audrey K. to present the proposed 2012-2013 budget. Audrey K. explained that the biggest change is finding a new source of funding to continue the community engagement initiative with John Anderson. Kevin Mitchell suggested looking at a State Farm grant for student led work. In the future, there might need to be conversations about increasing school district dues, individual memberships, or charging fees for the Lost in Transition colloquia. Audrey K. reminded everyone that there will be $20,000 in scholarships available for Partnership members to present at the upcoming NNER conference, October 18-20, 2012, in Denver, Colorado. That is a major commitment spanning two budget years (2011-2012 and 2012-2013). As there was no further discussion, Michelle Hoffman moved to approve the 2012-2013 proposed budget. Kevin Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Paige asked Allen Trent and Kay Persichitte to explain the professional development report from the UW College of Education. Allen explained that this was an action item for the university’s five year plan from Provost Myron Allen. A task force was convened, with Audrey K. serving as chair. The committee received and compiled information from 715 surveys received from educators throughout the state. The report contains not only what the university offers for professional development, but also a master chart that explains information such as the target audience, what kind of credit can be earned, and how often the professional development is offered. The main recommendations of the task force to the College of Education are promoting programs, sharing information, ensuring opportunities are accessible, and seeking feedback

Kay added that the College of Education wants to do a better job of communicating. There is a lot of misunderstanding about what the university offers. Future questions might be how does the College of Education encourage faculty to conduct applied research in school settings?

Paige observed that there is a lot of information in the report. There also seems to be a disconnect between what K-12 schools see as professional development and what the university sees as professional development. Kathy Hitt mentioned that she hadn’t thought of the university as a place to get professional development for her district, but now she would. Kevin Mitchell agreed, and added that the attitude in Wyoming seems to be districts look to themselves instead of reaching out to find out what other districts are doing, and possibly sharing the cost.

Ray Schulte asked if the survey revealed what format educators prefer to receive professional development. Kay answered that most people prefer a face-to-face delivery format. However, they will use other formats if those are the only ones available. The university tries to provide multiple formats and is still looking for a balance.

Audrey K. commented that part of the goal of this report was to help inform Provost Myron Allen and others about the professional development options open to educators at all levels. The education profession often uses insider talk that outsiders don’t understand, and this is an opportunity for us to discuss what we do and how we do it. Allen Trent added that these conversations should be about timely topics. For example, he would like to see districts communicate more with each other about current “just-in-time” topics, such as the Common Core State Standards or evaluations for teachers and other employees in school districts. Kevin Mitchell, Ray Schulte, Kathy Hitt, and Michelle Hoffman all expressed an interest in trying to make evaluations equal across districts and the state.

Paige asked for any further questions or comments. There were none. Paige thanked Kay, Allen, and Audrey K. There was a short recess for lunch.

Paige reconvened the meeting after lunch and asked Audrey K. to discuss the upcoming Lost in Transition events. These events are about building relationships and fostering communication among high school, community colleges, and the university in Wyoming. All information for these events can be found on the Partnership website at www.uwyo.edu/wsup.

Paige moved on to John Anderson’s update about the community engagement initiative. The initiative has really been student run. John reports that in Torrington, the students have a burning desire to help feed people and receiving guidance from John and Mary Kay Wardlaw from Cent$ible Nutrition at the University of Wyoming. The Torrington students will be coming to Laramie April 18 to see a working soup kitchen and tour the UW campus. The partners from the Berry Biodiversity Conservation Center visited Worland High School to help the students with their city park project. The Pinedale students are working with UW partner Terry Burant towards a youth night coming up April 19. More information was in the Partnership March newsletter and will be posted on the website.

Paige asked Kay to discuss the handout in the board packet about national board certification for teachers. Kay pointed out that the College of Education has a standing agreement that K-12 faculty members who are pursuing national board certification and earning a master’s degree from UW can substitute their national board certification for a Plan B master’s thesis.

Audrey K. then discussed the upcoming NNER conference in October. The Partnership has committed $20,000 in scholarship money to help Partnership members present at the conference. Applicants must talk through their proposals first as step one of the application process. More information about the conference will be upcoming. Because the conference will be in Denver, the Partnership is planning on a large number of participants from Wyoming.

Paige thanked everyone for coming and asked all participants to complete evaluation forms. (These responses were transcribed and follow.) Paige adjourned the meeting at 1:15pm

Minutes prepared by Beth Wiley

April 6, 2012

**Wyoming School-University Partnership**

**Governing Board Meeting Evaluation Form Responses**

**April 5, 2012**

 (All responses from evaluation forms were transcribed exactly as written.)

1. **What is an insight or reaction you have to updates about the NNER transition period and the information shared by the NNER’s Greg Bernhardt, Ann Foster, and UW’s Audrey Shalinsky?**
* Learned more about Greg’s ideas of future
* It was valuable to get this update and Audrey K. had a great idea when she suggested a Wyo. Conversation about hosting the NNER.
* It clarified what the process is and information is always good.
* Exciting times – looking forward to NNER based in a new home.
* The considerations of change provide an opportunity for some exciting choices for the next version of the NNER.
* CHANGE – is always difficult. I hope the leadership takes this opportunity to grow.
* I do think we should talk about hosting the NNER somewhere in WY.
* Will look forward to the updates.
* The use of acronyms that I am not familiar with make following the conversation difficult at some points.
1. **What insights or new questions did the document and discussion about the College of Education’s professional development plan for K-12 educators offer?**
* How sad that more teachers didn’t respond to the survey. The large number of offerings from UW was astounding.
* Amazed @ the amount of projects/programs that are offered! Thanks for sharing.
* How can we partner more to meet the needs of teachers and the university/community colleges?
* A good discussion about PD & how to meet a wide area of needs from different levels of professionals in education.
* Wow! Great synthesis of UW opportunities for P>D. – mega-chart is very useful.
* Great insights and feedback.
* I am glad to learn college of Ed is a viable source of PD.
* Flexibility on the part of C.O.E. is critical to providing assistance to districts.
* Different definitions of p.d.
1. **Please list two things that were important or worked well in today’s governing board meeting.**
* Info on transitions summits
* Clear presentation on budget
* Efficient use of time
* Nice meal
* The warm up activity was thoughtful
* Like the College of Ed info
* Opening activity
* Opportunity to network
* Shared professional development experiences
* College of Ed – PD – chart
* Once again – the opportunity to visit about “education” with great people is very rewarding.
* The topics discussed were very relevant.
* Important that we stayed on task . . . .
* Pretty much everyone contributed in one way or another . . .
* Information/data presented (nbpts, lost in transition institute/colloquiums, University of Wy. Prof Dev. Task Force Plan) –
* Discussion – I love having these conversations!!
* I appreciate the information on U.W. Professional Development
* ? Why don’t districts rely on UW more for professional development?
1. **What did not work well during today’s meeting?**
* None – great conversations
* n/a
* I think we could have extended our professional development discussion . . . .given more time.
* No suggestions
* All was good.
* Introductions were a little long
1. **How might we improve the meeting? (e.g., board member engagement, information prior to the meeting, the meeting site, the agenda, printed materials supporting the agenda, the pace, time frame)**
* All is good.
* Opportunities for districts to share current initiatives and issues
* n/a
* Would like to have more conversation around professional development.
1. **Is there anything else important for meeting planners to know?**
* Good Job!
* Not at this time.
* Thank you!
* Very well organized –
* Meal was terrific!
* Location good . . .
* Packet excellent –
* Thanks