



District-wide Technology Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 26, 2016; 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

Members Present: Superintendent Douglas Sullivan (Administrator), 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. Stacy Northrop (Educational Technology Specialist), Mrs. Kristi Meidinger (Heart River), Mrs. Cill Skabo (Community), Mrs. Laura Kelly (Jefferson), Mrs. Barb Bonicelli (Hagen), Mr. Brian Ham (DHS), Mr. Damian Sobolik (Berg), Mrs. Rebecca Bautz (Prairie Rose), and Mrs. Lexi Steiner (Roosevelt).

Others Present: Wanda Anderson (DHS Building Technologist)

Members Absent: Mrs. Leslie Ross (Board), Mr. Tracy Sipma (DHS), Mrs. Amber Remark (Jefferson).

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 November 4, 2015, Meeting Minutes – Mrs. Meidinger moved to approve the November 4 meeting minutes, as presented. Mrs. Dvorak seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Business Topics

ETC Grant Update – Mrs. Hondl summarized that the ETC Grant was awarded as written. Items purchased were 160 laptops along with six carts to store them. These laptops were imaged and placed in classrooms as of January 26th, 2016. There are nine teachers that will be participating in InStep I and InStep II training offered from EduTech. Mr. Jeremy Holkup, from EduTech, will be contacting the nine teachers to set a time for the trainings.

Mr. Holkup provided a progress report of the tech proposal for Dickinson Public Schools. For the InStep trainings there have been 13 teachers that have completed the program and there are zero that are currently in progress. There are still seven available training spots as part of the original District Tech Proposal. Mr. Holkup has been given names of the nine individuals that will be going through the InStep process as part of the ETC Grant that the district was awarded. Mr. Holkup is wondering if the district would like to tie in the available seven spots for training into the ETC Grant which would give DHS a total of 16 teachers to be trained. Mrs. Hondl stated that there is one Social Studies teacher that still needs InStep training. With the six remaining spots, if they are not tied into the ETC Grant, they would be available for

other teachers throughout the district. Dr. Sullivan asked Mr. Ham to explain to the committee what InStep contains. He stated that Mr. Holkup will set up a time to meet with the teacher. It is usually a ½ day training. Mr. Holkup provides a lesson plan template for the teacher to fill out. He helps decide and implement what technology the teacher will use. He would be available either the day the teacher presents the lesson (with a days notice to Mr. Holkup) or he makes sure the teacher understands all aspects of the lesson. Mr. Ham gave examples of what the social studies department did for their InStep lessons. Mrs. Meidinger asked if there is a deadline to let their administrator know that other teachers would be interested in the InStep training. Dr. Sullivan mentioned that being the training was supposed to be completed last school year and the spots were carried over to the current school year, he would like the trainings to be completed as soon as possible. He asked Mr. Ham to describe the difference between InStep I and InStep II. Mr. Ham described that InStep I was like getting your feet wet with technology in the classroom and InStep II is just further in-depth. He also stated that Mr. Holkup works around the teacher's schedule, so if a time is busier than another, he will work with you. Dr. Sullivan stated that the committee should let their buildings know of the available trainings for InStep. Interested teachers should contact their building administrator and the building administrator will then forward the information to Dr. Sullivan and Mrs. Kathrein.

Kayako Report – Mr. Murphy reported on the internet issues that were occurring in the district. He handed out a summary of the issues that ITD of North Dakota fixed. ITD set a rate limit to 295mbps up and 295mbps down. Dakota Carrier Network (DCN) had DPS circuit set at 200mbps so they adjusted to 295mbps. The main fiber link that feeds all the schools internet was upgraded to 1 gig. We have also upgraded the fiber link that feeds Hagen, Berg, DALC, and CAO to 1 gig. Mrs. Skabo asked if a service agreement was brought up to cover when the system is down for a period of time. Mr. Murphy stated that we do not have a service agreement and it is not an option as the state supplies us our internet. Being the state provides our internet, there are no other options available. Mr. Murphy also stated that the work order program that the technologist uses was updated. Now it is available to use on mobile devices.

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. 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 different groups. Following was the feedback from the group discussions.

One group felt the 1-to-1 initiative should be a device used within the classroom during school hours for grades 5-12 with a modification in grades K-4. These devices would need to be on a replacement timeline and usage built in the teacher's lesson plans.

Group two agreed with group one's definition and suggested there would need to be continuity throughout the district. Example, each Kindergarten class would have the same device. The final suggestion they made for a starting point of 1-to-1 would be specific grade level teachers that would have 100% interest.

A third group stated that there would need to be a budgetary assignment for the devices. They said that there are a lot of free programs/apps but most of them cost and they are unsure who would take care of that cost. This group also agreed with group one's definition of 1-to-1, but would prefer to see it start in 7th grade and move upward.

The 4th group would like to see 1-to-1 start in the middle school as it would integrate with the STEAM initiative that they are working on and then move upward from there. They wondered what would happen to the devices when they get damaged and what repair options would be available. They suggested a check-out option for the devices otherwise they would stay in the building.

The final group suggested that K-2 would be a good start for iPads. Second to third grade overlap/moving to laptops, with full integration starting in the high school and moving downward. Suggested not having a full 1-to-1 in the elementary but increasing the number of devices available for students. With being 1-to-1 at the high school level would prepare the students for college and the work force. A discussion still needs to occur if personal devices can be used.

Dr. Sullivan asked for more clarification on if the committee wanted 1-to-1 to start at the high school and move downward. Majority said yes. There was some discussion about this and Dr. Sullivan stated that the definition at the high school has not been set yet but the English, Social Studies, and Science departments are currently testing a modified 1-to-1. With the current professional development that is occurring at the middle school, Dr. Sullivan stated that the middle school would not be an optimal place to start 1-to-1.

Strategic Plan – This topic was tabled.

Next Meeting – The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, February 29th at 4:00 p.m.

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

Minutes provided by Stacy Northrop and Laura Hondl.