

MINUTES

TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE

Classroom Technology Integration Subcommittee

Date: August 8, 2011
Time: 1:40 p.m.
Place: WW55
Members: Stefani Cook, Chuck Winder, Brent Lloyd, Heidi Rogers, Desiree Laughlin, George Boland, Alan Millar, Wendy Horman

The committee discussed the trip to visit Microsoft. Twelve people will be able to visit Microsoft on August 30-31. People from the other subcommittees may want to go. The committee will discuss the trip further with Camille Wells who is making arrangements.

The committee discussed the morning's Q&A session with Joe Morelock from Canby, Oregon.

Jacque Hyatt from the State Department of Education (SDE), proposed that the committee create a "parking lot" to put down ideas to discuss later. The items were:

- Instructional Coaching
- Permissive use policy
- Internet access
- Professional Development – money to districts

Scott Woolstenhulme, Director of IT Department at the Bonneville School District, presented for the committee and took questions. Woolstenhulme administers the technology grant in his district. The teachers apply for the grant and request technology for their classroom. Smartboards were the most requested. If the teachers do not have the basics it is hard to integrate the other pieces. The district was able to approve 90% of the grant requests. The Bonneville grant application has been sent to the committee members via email. The teachers really wanted professional development on the devices. Woolstenhulme taught the teachers himself. It was cheaper in-house. The districts need individual coaches more than anything. The technology professional development will be part of the teacher goals for next year. The teachers have added in an assessment piece so they can evaluate the student growth.

The committee discussed the flexibility with technology purchases. It could be a challenge if the schools have invested heavily in one area of technology because it will be difficult to make them switch to another model.

The committee discussed the district application process and the reasons behind requiring this process.

Districts could use the WISE tool to tie in student outcomes that are already in use. The SDE can help with the design of the tool. The committee can contribute as to what those key components would be.

A letter of intent needs to be sent to all the schools. Later there can be webinars and regional visits.

The next steps discussed were a list of key components that would be included in the application. The committee decided to call the application The Classroom Technology Integration Plan.

The key components included:

- How will this technology enhance student learning?
- Student engagement and ownership
- Educator as innovator as change agent
- Learning and mastering the common core state standards
- Academic focus
- Linked to instructional goals
- Tools identified and budget
- Evaluation of impact
- Goals, objectives, outcomes
- SAMR – substitution, augmentation, modification, redefinition
- WISE ways that link to the plan areas
- What is your permissive use plan?
- Link to 21st century student
- How will the technology be used to support the instructional goal?
- How will special education/limited English proficiency students utilize the technology?
- Long term plan (3-5 years)

The committee would also like to have definition of technology integration, a common language linked to things already used in planning and school improvement, clearly identified expectations and a rubric for the review process.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.