

**Wyoming School-University Partnership
Governing Board Meeting
July 13, 2010**

Minutes

Present:

Board Members: Dave Barker, Judy Ellsworth, Paige Fenton-Hughes, Jay Harnack, Michelle Hoffman, Bruce Hunt, Joe McCann, Kay Persichitte (via conference call), Ray Schulte, Audrey Shalinsky, Marlene Tignor, John Weigel.

Partnership Staff: Audrey Kleinsasser.

Guests: Kelley Pelissier (Wyoming P-16 Education Council)

1. Welcome and Introductions:

Dave convened the meeting at 10:05am. As a number of participants were new to Partnership board meetings, Dave asked all participants to introduce themselves and share something fun/different they did this summer.

2. Minutes and Financial Report:

The first order of business was to review and approve the meeting agenda, along with consent agenda items including the April 8, 2010, meeting minutes and the April-June Partnership bills. Michelle Hoffman moved to approve minutes and financial support, Paige Fenton-Hughes seconded.

3. Setting of the 2010-2011 Calendar:

The Partnership Governing Board will convene four to five meetings during the 2010-2011 school year:

1. If needed, the September 2010's meeting will be scheduled via a Doodle poll and may employ distance communication.
2. Thursday, November 4, 2010 – 7:30 - 9:30am. Meeting will be prior to the Partnership's Wyoming In Praise of Education conference at the Best Western Ramkota Hotel and Conference Center.
3. Thursday, January 20, 2011 – 10:00am - 12:00pm in Casper.
4. Thursday, April 7, 2011 – 10:00am - 12:00pm in Casper.
5. Thursday, July 14, 2011 – 10:00am - 12:00pm in Casper.

Ray Schulte raised the possibility of the Partnership board commenting on the recalibration process, as the Partnership's grounding focuses on democracy in education. October may be an ideal time to review and comment on the process. No action was taken.

Additionally, November's election of state superintendent may provide an interesting opportunity for the board to invite candidates to discuss issues and concerns. October would be good time to do this. No action was taken.

4. Partnership and NNER Grounding Activity:

- a. **November 4-5 In Praise of Education statewide conference**
- b. **Larry Cuban's *Hugging the Middle* book discussion**

Dave initiated the grounding by over-viewing the Wyoming Partnership's connection to the National Network for Education Renewal (NNER). Last year the Partnership sponsored the participation of Wyoming presenters at the annual conference through a \$20,000 scholarship initiative. From July 18-22, Paige Fenton-Hughes, Francisco Rios, and Kevin Roxas will be participating in the annual NNER summer symposium convened in Seattle, with individual registrations paid by the Partnership. The Partnership also receives three complimentary registrations, generally used by executive committee members, for the annual conference. The 2010 NNER conference will convene in Normal, Illinois, October 7-9. Dave encouraged board members to attend and participate.

The July board meeting packet included a copy of Larry Cuban's *Hugging the Middle: How Teachers Teach in an Era of Testing and Accountability*. Dave initiated the discussion by focusing on several excerpts board members were asked to read in advance. Cuban observes that one of the oddities of an educational reform movement that started in 1982 with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* is that classroom teachers are both the problem and the solution. How can that be? Bruce added that in comparison to many states, Wyoming does not have anything to fix. Bruce said that schools are the voice of the status quo, that we would need a consensus to change things, a consensus that currently does not exist. Michelle continued, citing Cuban's example of the medical profession being

under fire just as the education profession is under fire. She observed that many consulting firms are making large amounts of money, offering all variety of professional development and programs designed to fix the kinds of problems Cuban identifies.

Observed Paige, if teachers who hug the middle have the best change of helping the most students, most of the time, that might be okay, unless you're part of the 15% of students not being helped. She continued, by remarking that it's not the money, in Wyoming we can't complain about money allocated to K-12 education. Rather, it's the messages we send to parents about student absences, about dropping out at age 16. School has to be about all of us, not just the school and teachers.

Jay turned the discussion to Cuban's distinction between good and successful teaching and a variety of top-down initiatives (Hathaway, Common Core, Race to the Top) that focus on college track curricula. Jay, along with Michelle observed that elective courses keep learners engaged, that not every high school student knows what they want to be, an expectation that seems to be gaining intensity through these initiatives.

Marlene explained that LCCC is in a unique place with a 30% enrollment increase anticipated for Fall 2010. She said that the college is seeing students they never saw before, students enrolling fulltime because they seek the financial aid. LCCC is also seeing a dramatic increase in students requiring remediation. She also observed that many students really don't need, for example, a three-hour course to be ready for college level math. What they do need is a three- or four hour review. The same might work for English.

Ray returned to the topic of designing schools based on what students need. He observed that what the federal governing wants isn't necessarily what others want. Ray emphasized that parents want their children to like school and for school to be fair. Schools, then, have to be worth liking and sometimes they are not that. One solution is for all of us to talk with students more, ask them to reflect on their behavior and actions.

To make schools engaging and fun is a tough conversation to have with legislators, observed Jay, but shaping a conversation that leads to learning is important. We have to convince legislators that we need to test critical aspects that will make a difference to students – the causes, not the symptoms.

5. Site Swap Program Input/Development:

With materials in the packet about the Spring 2010 life sciences site swap, Audrey Kleinsasser sought feedback about continuing and/or expanding the project. Board members discussed the project and also wrote ideas on note cards to give Audrey. Marlene suggested that one focus on the site swap would be to better inform secondary and postsecondary faculty of each others' common concerns in dual enrollment courses. Audrey will follow up with board members who are interested in the project and continue working on 2010-2011 opportunities.

6. Lunch

7. Updates: Consensus Group, Dual and Concurrent Enrollment

Kelley Pelissier, executive director of the Wyoming P-16 Education Council, and Joe McCann of the Wyoming Community College Commission led a discussion on the work being done by a group of about 40 stake holders on the issue of dual and concurrent enrollment in Wyoming. The group was convened by Sue Riske, Rae Lynn Job, and Kelley Pelissier. Over the next few months, the conveners will be conducting focus group sessions to gather feedback about a set of statements developed by the group of 40. During this meeting, the Partnership Governing Board served as one such focus group. Governing Board members in attendance received materials at the meeting. For those who did not receive materials from the consensus group conveners, the "Introduction: Consensus Statements and Focus Group Questions" document is available at <http://webdev.uwyo.edu/wsupdate/info.asp?p=14341>. Board members talked through statements about eligibility and quality and took a straw poll, information that Kelley and Joe will take back to the larger consensus group.

- Regarding Eligibility (pages 3-4), the group voted that Option 2 (7 votes) was the best of the three, versus Option 3 (1 vote) and Option 1 (0 votes).
- The board also discussed the wording and logistics of the Quality section of the document (pages 5-6), which Kelley noted for incorporation into the document.

8. Updates: Around the NNER; Around the Partnership; other reports

The four-page document entitled “Wyoming High School Graduates at UW” provided interesting statistics about UW student enrollment and graduation rates. The document engendered good questions and clarifications about applicants and fully enrolled students.

9. Adjournment:

With no further business, Dave asked the board to complete its meeting evaluation forms. The board meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

Notes prepared by Brenna Wanous.

**WSUP Governing Board Meeting Evaluation Form, Transcribed Responses
July 13, 2010 – UW/CC Outreach Building, Casper
N=9**

1. What worked well in this governing board meeting?

- Intros for everyone since we had new folks.
- Sharing time.
- Having junior college folks.
- Book discussion.
- Discussion of site swap (great idea).
- Like the grounding.
- Open discussion – good flow.
- Cuban book.
- Dual/Concurrent enrollment.
- Grounding activity.
- Really good discussion of Cuban book.
- Lots of participants.
- Quality communication within topics.
- Agenda was good, loved the discussion time.

2. What did not work well during this governing board meeting?

- Needed time to discuss more of the agenda.
- Too little time for director’s report.
- Concurrent enrollment – need to have materials in advance.

3. What do you look forward to in governing board meetings, in general or specifically related to this particular board meeting?

- Grounding.
- Anything we talk about and share.
- Discussion of books, trends and timely issues.
- Grounding.
- Networking, discussion.
- Hearing from board members who represent different constituencies.
- I enjoyed the meeting and look forward to the next meeting.
- Discussion on topic

4. **What do you not enjoy about governing board meetings, in general or specifically related to this particular board meeting?**
- Concurrent/dual enrollment – not enough background to engage in discussion.
 - Not ready to vote on dual or concurrent, but its okay.
 - Different points of view.
5. **What can we do to improve upcoming governing board meetings?**
- I like Dave's idea of using the doodle tool for planning.
 - I like pairing the meetings with conferences already in Casper to reduce travel.
 - Room was almost too crowded.
6. **Do you find the pre-mailed board packets helpful or not necessary, in general or specifically this board packet?**
- Helpful.
 - Yes.
 - Excellent – 1 week in advance is great.
 - Very helpful – could also be sent electronically to aid in sharing.
 - Yes, very helpful.
 - Yes.
 - Packets contain lots of info – I appreciate them
7. **Please rate the length of the governing board meetings:**
- a. too short – 0
 - b. right amount of time – 9
 - c. too long – 0
8. **Please rate the frequency of the governing board meetings:**
- a. not frequent enough – 0
 - b. right frequency – 6
 - c. too frequent – 0
 - d. Not sure – 2