**Meeting Minutes**

**Wyoming School-University Partnership**

**Governing Board Meeting**

**Thursday, April 4, 2013**

**10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

UW Outreach Building

951 N. Poplar Avenue, Casper, Wyoming 82601

Those in attendance included the following board members, guests, and staff.

***Governing board members:***

*Dave Barker (Platte 2), Boyd Brown (Campbell 1), Kathy Hitt (Fremont 1), Shon Hocker (Big Horn 1), Paige Fenton Hughes (Partnership Chair), Dee Ludwig (Eastern Wyoming College), Rick Luchsinger (Niobrara 1), Kay Persichitte (UW, College of Education, dean), Ray Schulte (Goshen 1), and Audrey Shalinsky (UW, College of Arts & Sciences, associate dean)*

***Guests:***

*Jim Rose (interim director, Wyoming Department of Education), and Leslie Rush (UW, College of Education, teacher education)*

***Staff:***

*Audrey Kleinsasser and Beth Wiley*

Paige Fenton Hughes called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. She thanked those in attendance and asked everyone to introduce themselves by explaining what they appreciate about the Partnership. Several board members commented that they enjoy a chance to form relationships with other educators around the state, and the opportunity to discuss the deeper purposes of a free and public education.

After introductions, Paige introduced Jim Rose, the interim director of the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE), also the executive director of the Wyoming Community College Commission. Because of other obligations, Jim had to leave early, so the agenda was amended allowing him to speak first.

Jim thanked the Partnership for the invitation. He gave a brief overview of what is currently happening at the WDE, including information about the accountability legislation. He informed the board that the state has completed the 2014 NCLB flexibility waiver request to the federal governing. In addition, the WDE is undergoing an external review of its data base management and consolidation needs. The WDE would like to be able to produce data that give the state a good and accurate picture of education in Wyoming.

Jim also discussed the possibility of Wyoming joining the Smarter Balance Assessment consortium as a governing state (currently, Wyoming is an affiliate). Moving toward Smarter Balance likely means a reduction of the state’s reliance on the ACT suite of tests (Explore, Plan, the ACT test).

There was some discussion with board members about science standards and increasing internet bandwidth across the state. Discussion turned to the Common Core State Standards. Jim encouraged everyone present to advocate from their perspective. Kay Persichitte encouraged everyone to move away from educational jargon that people outside of the education world don’t understand.

Jim expressed appreciation for the invitation to the board meeting, and encouraged anyone to email or call him with suggestions or concerns.

There was a short break for lunch. During lunch, retiring Partnership board members (Rick Luchsinger and Kathy Hitt) were honored for their service. Each has received a copy of the book, *The New York Times 36 Hours: 150 Weekends in the USA & Canada* and the board’s warm wishes for a leisure-rich retirement.

Paige reconvened the meeting to discuss the grounding reading by McTighe and Wiggins.

Several board members reported that they had used the white paper with their staff and commented that it was useful because of the emphasis on everyone being accountable. In Lander, Kathy Hitt said this led to the adoption of a common language in reference to reading skills across the curriculum. Kathy concluded that the conversation brought the staff together so they could see how everyone, not just language arts and math teachers, shared and owned the responsibility of the Common Core.

Other board members commented on the potential of this white paper to convey to teachers that they need to unpack the goals and standards on their own to fully understand them. Some districts are assigning teams to unpack the standards at a district level. Rick Luchsinger noted that they brought in outside experts, the Flippen Group, to help their district with math and language arts. Board members agreed that this grounding reading brought up good questions about the Common Core that should be discussed with others in their districts. (As a follow up, Dave Barker decided to share the white paper with his school district.)

Paige asked Audrey K. to present the meeting agenda and supporting materials which included the financial report, the January 30 meeting minutes, and the director’s report. Audrey K. briefly explained each item. Boyd Brown moved to approve the agenda and related consent agenda items. Dave Barker seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved.

Paige then asked Dave to update the board concerning the National Network for Educational Renewal. Dave explained the process the NNER followed over the past year to find a new director and host site. Dave expressed concern that there were only two RFPs received for the executive director position, and only one for a host site to replace Seattle. The NNER Governing Council voting members decided on Wright State in Dayton, Ohio, and kept Ann Foster and Greg Bernhardt as co-directors. There was some discussion among board members about whether or not the Wyoming School-University Partnership should continue to pay yearly dues and be part of the national organization. Audrey Shalinsky expressed some concern about whether the national organization still had a clear direction. Rick observed that the grounding principles of the Partnership were based on John Goodlad’s work with the NNER. Audrey K. concluded that the Partnership board members should maybe begin to consider whether or not they want to continue as members of the national organization, and that the board might be discussing this more in the coming year.

Audrey K. added that the NNER released a few calls for proposals after the decision was made concerning the co-directors and host site. One proposal is with the Groundspark organization to pilot an initiative entitled Respect for All. Kevin Roxas and Angela Jaime from the University of Wyoming, College of Teacher Education, are interested in applying. If they receive the pilot, the Respect for All institute would take place in Laramie in early August. The Partnership would be a co-sponsor and Kevin and Angela would look for matching money. The goal is to include 30-40 participants.

Audrey K. reported that the Partnership received several applications for those interested in attending the NNER Summer Symposium, July 22-25, in Seattle. Applicants include Aurora Chang, College of Education, UW; Kathy Vetter, WEA; Leslie Rush, College of Education, UW; and, Kevin Derby, Goshen County School District 1. The Partnership will support applicants’ participation by paying the $650 registration fee for each.

Audrey K. also reported that the Lost in Transition meetings will be taking place throughout April. Beth and Audrey K. head to Gillette for the math institute immediately following the board meeting. Also in April, the Partnership will sponsor Teaching Writing in Wyoming, world languages, and social sciences.

Paige then presented the proposed 2013-2014 budget, which was included in the board packet. The largest change is a proposed change of job title for the office associate to project manager. This would also include a change to full time from three-quarter time. Kay and Audrey K. both explained to the board that this position would have to be proposed and approved through the University of Wyoming, and the proposal won’t move forward until the Partnership has received their dues for the year.

Rick raised the question of whether or not the Partnership should charge non-members to attend the Lost in Transition meetings. Some discussion followed, but no recommendations were made.

There was no further discussion on the 2013-2014 budget. Kathy Hitt moved to approve the presented budget. Boyd Brown seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved.

Partnership dues letters will be arriving in the mail during May. Paige and Audrey K. both asked board members to encourage those superintendents who aren’t yet members to join. Several board members want to discuss the possibility of asking some other non-district partners to join.

Paige requested that everyone complete a meeting feedback form (transcribed comments appear below) and adjourned the meeting at 1:48.

Minutes prepared by Beth Wiley, April 10, 2013.

**Wyoming School-University Partnership**

**Governing Board Meeting Evaluation Form**

**April 4, 2013**

Session feedback transcribed April 10, 2013

n = 11 responses

*All responses from evaluation forms were transcribed exactly as written.*

Not all respondents answered all questions

1. **What insights or reactions did you have from the discussion with Jim Rose? Was this discussion useful? Why or why not?**

* Jim is very thoughtful but there is so much to do.
* A good overall update – glad to hear about the waiver application
* Good conversation. – Things starting to move forward again.
* I was not present. Darn!
* Great invitation
* So helpful to get info on where the state is re: assessment, SBAC, SLDS.
* Useful – we need to be informed. Very clear objectives – we can see the direction
* Very useful – good to hear his perspective.
* Great to have Da Rose in attendance to hear his thoughts & to share our thoughts. Might want an outside person (influential) in future mtngs to listen to & inform about NNER work.
* Great asset – ever conversation I have had with him has been very positive.
* Good man doing an effective job in a tough position – straight shooter

1. **Did reading/discussing McTighe and Wiggins’s white paper, change or broaden your perspective on the Common Core State Standards? How? Why or why not?**

* Did help me. I am trying to learn more about the implications.
* Yes – haven’t really read a lot about the standards – educational for me. – Good concepts – “Big Ideas”
* Great conversation & reading – good to know where & what everyone else is doing.
* It did – good to hear that other district are struggling with the assessment piece, which really should be first to guide the choice of curriculum??
* Paralleled many recent conversations
* Interesting discussion – helpful to hear district perspectives.
* Helps, as Dave said, to revisit & take another look at the work –
* Was very good discussion item. Broadened my perspective and direction.
* Good concepts to consider & discuss. CCSS is going to be with us so, good selection to read.
* Yes – we used this paper last year and shared with entire staff – good discussions
* We read it in our district – It set up our work very well – good conversation

1. **Do you see the Partnership playing a role in assisting faculty across levels to understand and successfully implement the CCSS? If yes, what are some ways (in addition to the Lost in Transition initiative) that you would like to see the Partnership involved?**

* Arts & Sciences faculty are not familiar with CCSS. We need to help change this.
* Absolutely – Education – Networking –
* Continue Lost in Transition.
* How about some assessment work. Creating & recalculating(?) different types of assessment information based on CCSS so that teachers districts can write assessments.
* Use Partnership members to significantly increase the registrants in the practicum in college teaching course with appropriate curr revision to include CCSS implementation.
* Unsure – it’s a great idea. How might that work?
* I think its critical that we need to assist - - but the WDE needs to take the lead & give direction -
* Not sure.
* Yes – we need that connection.
* Not sure – most districts well underway with CCSS

1. **Do you have suggestions for future topics and/or readings that you would like to discuss at board meetings during the Partnership/NNER grounding?**

* New college Pres.
* CCSS – it is the hot topic in state accountability – second how topic Teacher, Princ. Evaluations – 3rd hot topic
* Not now . . . but will think
* I like the idea of having guests who we can learn from & share our work.
* Not at this time

1. **Reactions, suggestions, recommendations, or anything else you’d like meeting planners to know?**

* Great meeting
* N/A
* Thanks for recognition as a retiring member!
* Thanks, as always, for great prep!
* All good
* Good meeting