

Bellingham School District
2010-2013 Technology Plan Ad Hoc Committee

Minutes

February 25, 2010

I. Welcome

1. Review of the 2/18/10 minutes... There were no comments or concerns.
2. We made another pass to have everyone sign the thank you letter to Karen Cator, Director of Educational Technology at the U.S. Department of Education for her time and contributions to our discussion and direction. The letter has been mailed.
3. In attendance: Sam Anderson, Cathy Gersich, Ashleigh Bobovski, Sam Promodh, Analisa Ficklin, Eric Paige, Michael Jay, Mark Quenneville, John Getchell, Leslie Rogers, Jeff Thran, Tracy Shaw

II. Our Timeline

1. James reviewed the timeline we have to provide the draft of the tech plan to the School Board: We need to have a draft together for Monday, March 1st. It will allow Karst Brandsma an opportunity to review it and identify any holes that must be addressed before the Board's first viewing. In order for the Board to have it in front of them for the March 11 meeting, the draft must be in Marilyn Grams' hands on March 3 so it may be included in the documents being prepared for the March 11 meeting.

III. Today's Plan

1. James asked the group to review the vision and content of the tech plan draft. There were many great suggestions:
 - i. Pertaining to the vision, James is posting it again to the Google Groups space for more refinement. It really hasn't been addressed since we changed direction and made our focus be information literacy, media literacy, and digital citizenship.
 - Sam A. and Mark Q. brought up the question about where the sentiment for the implementation for the plan was going to be housed and how the budget would be applied to the document. Sam provided a great suggestion to include an action item in the Administrator, Teacher, and Teacher-Librarian goal section to create an implementation team charged with ensuring the tech plan is put into action. Leslie asked if there would be some inclusion/resurrection of building technology committees and/or some structure to facilitate communication between the district and the buildings.
 - James also suggested that he would be meeting with Jim Facciano, John Getchell, Ron Cowan, and Karst Brandsma about the budget implications of the plan – and then would send out the draft as it moves further toward completion with the budget items included.
 - ii. James captured other comments about the draft: the format seemed to be appropriate, many people worked very hard to provide the content (thank you!), some of the evaluative procedures need to be revisited to ensure they convey the

ideal of promoting advancement and not mediocrity, James was concerned there may have been too many strategies/activities for some of the goals and there may be duplication.

- iii. Pertaining to the three goals and examining the items they contained, we broke into three different groups. The charge was to review the strategies, rationale, evaluative procedure and activities/tasks to ensure there is consistency throughout and that there is inclusion of our three main concepts: information literacy, media literacy, and digital citizenship. We also wanted to ensure there were intentional references to implementation.

2. Below are the groups that developed around the goals:

Technology Literacy of 8th Grade

Cathy/Analisa/Eric/Jeff

Technology Integration Skills of Teachers

Sam A./Tracy/Sam P./Leslie/Ashleigh

Technology Proficiencies of Administrators, Teachers, and Teacher-Librarians

Mark/Michael/Eric/James

Since engagement and progress was high, we decided that we needed to allow the groups to continue working together and James would again compile the groups' work and send it out to the Google Group.

IV. Next Meeting...

We decided to pull the March 11 meeting due to the School Board's first read of the tech plan draft on that date. Plan for a meeting on March 18th, 4:00 – 6:00pm. The room will be sent out at a later date.