



**District-wide Technology Committee Meeting**  
**Wednesday, November 4, 2015; 4:00 p.m.**

---

**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Superintendent Douglas Sullivan (Administrator), Mrs. Leslie Ross (Board), Mrs. Tanya Rude (Board), Mrs. Jackie Glaser (Prairie Rose), Ms. Jenifer Leslie (Hagen), Mrs. Jill Nelson-Wetzstein (Lincoln), Mrs. Ruth McCabe (Lincoln), Mrs. Andrea Dvorak (Heart River), Ms. Emily Bren (Roosevelt), Mr. Christopher Kovash (Berg), Mr. Caden Brewer (Technology Specialist), Mr. Mitchell Murphy (District Technology Coordinator), Mrs. Laura Hondl (Technology Specialist), Mrs. Kristi Meidinger (Heart River), Mrs. Cill Skabo (Community), Mrs. Laura Kelly (Jefferson), and Mr. Tracy Sipma (DHS).

**Others Present:** Wanda Anderson (DHS Building Technologist), Ms. Stephanie Anderson (Berg Building Technologist), and Mrs. Twila Petersen.

**Members Absent:** Mrs. Barb Bonicelli (Hagen), Mr. Brian Ham (DHS), Mr. Damian Sobolik (Berg), Mrs. Rebecca Bautz (Prairie Rose), Mrs. Amber Remark (Jefferson), Mrs. Lexi Steiner (Roosevelt), and Mrs. Stacy Northrop (Technology Specialist).

**Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order by Superintendent Sullivan at 4:00 p.m.

**Review Meeting Norms** – The meeting norms were available on the agenda.

**Additions/Deletions to the Agenda Items** – There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

**Approval of October 7, 2015, Meeting Minutes** – Mrs. Meidinger moved to approve the October 7 meeting minutes, as presented. Mrs. Dvorak seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Business Topics**

**ETC Grant Update** – Superintendent Sullivan summarized that the ETC Grant is being reviewed by a subcommittee for possible submission to the DPS Budget Committee. The subcommittee has had three meetings. Mrs. Hondl explained after careful consideration the subcommittee feels the best utilization for the grant is at the high school. The grant will provide funding for five additional carts or 150 machines. This would put two more carts in the high school science and English departments. She added the grant would also include professional development. The InStep training provided by Mr. Holkup from EduTech is the professional development that is being proposed. The deadline for the grant is December 1.

**Kayako Report** – Mr. Murphy reported the amount of closed and open work orders. Dr. Sullivan noted there have been complications with the internet that Mr. Murphy has been emailing notifications to the buildings in case there were questions. The internet complications are part of a massive statewide failure. Mrs. Skabo inquired if there is an agreement regarding the system being down and not up and running within a certain time frame where there would be a reimbursement or

compensation. Mr. Murphy responded there is not an agreement if the system is down. Mrs. Skabo said the District is at its mercy. The system was down three days which is a long time. Mr. Murphy said that it is an ongoing issue. If this section of the state is having issues they will reroute the traffic elsewhere. Mrs. Skabo recommended a service agreement to cover when the system is down for a long period of time.

1-to-1 Initiative – Dr. Sullivan said the 1-to-1 initiative has been discussed at several meetings. This is part of the strategic plan. This committee needs to decide how this looks for Dickinson Public Schools. There are school districts that put a device in the hands of every student. Mrs. Meidinger provided information regarding brain skills and fine motor skills in relation to technology. Dr. Sullivan noted this committee needed to decide if the 1-to-1 initiative would be working upwards or downwards. He asked the committee members to break out into groups and discuss the implementation level and the movement of upward or downward, how the committee foresees moving forward and also the professional development. Dr. Sullivan noted from past experience it would take a lot of professional development. The committee members broke out into four different groups. Following was the feedback from the group discussions.

One group felt the initiative should be departmentalized, similar to using the high school core and starting there and rolling backwards. A question was posed what the standards suggest for the use of technology and how much time. Another question asked was the definition of a 1-to-1 initiative. Mrs. McCabe explained the 1-to-1 initiative in Sheridan, WY. The types of devices used was discussed. Mr. Murphy said he has attended a face-to-face conference on 1-to-1 initiatives where there were different school districts at the session. Grand Forks uses ChromeBook. Committee members discussed KeyBoarding Without Tears and a suggestion was made to do a survey asking if the teachers like this program.

Another group suggested scheduling appointment devices, a percentage of time at certain grade levels and explain how often they would be used, 100% or 25% were examples. It was also noted that the type of software used on the device would be important. The group suggested a 1-to-1 at maybe the 6-12 grade level adding that grades 4-5 would gradually increase usage.

A third group suggested implementation at the new middle school. The professional development was a concern since some teachers have jobs over the summer and lives outside the school day. A question was posed if there would be time during the school year. Would a stipend be provided?

The last group to provide information felt that the definition of the 1-to-1 initiative would be important and how this correlates to the vision. Underneath the definition should be information regarding the types of devices used, how many devices would be provided, what is the goal, where is this leading to, the technology support provided, the cost for the initiative, and the professional development involved. Another member in the group said they supported the initiative being implemented at grades 9-12 and moving downward. Experience from the 1-to-1 at the high school would provide information for the kind of devices to use. This will also help those students to be college ready. There was discussion regarding the capability of the infrastructure handling all the wireless computers. Another suggestion was accountability being built into the evaluation. One teacher said that there are teachers that are totally bought into the idea and others that do not like change.

Dr. Sullivan summarized that it appeared the definition needed to be identified. Mrs. Ross added that the definition would be different at different grade levels. Mrs. Ross said there is only so much money in the technology program adding that the professional development goes hand-in-hand.

Superintendent Sullivan asked committee members to talk about the 1-to-1 initiative in the building and draft some definitions and bring them to the next meeting to save some time at that meeting.

Strategic Plan – This topic was tabled.

Next Meeting – The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, January 26 at 4:00 p.m.

**Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes provided by Twila Petersen.