

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)
January 30, 2007 – 1st Meeting – 2:30pm to 4:20pm

Agenda:

Quick review of ITAC's purpose/mission/tasks

Discuss the (draft) school improvement plan and the district improvement plan to see how they relate to the technology plan.

Discuss Technology Budget spreadsheet(s).

Meeting Notes:

Attendees: Kim Florek, Laura Facticeau, Anita Goddard, Kate Messmer, Tara O'Brien, Rebecca Phelps, Jenny Kirouac, Penny Walker, Katie Walker

Kim gave a quick overview on the committee's first order of business, which is to align technology funds with curriculum/school/district. She mentioned that reviewing the school improvement plan and the district plan were only parts of this task. She asked each person to think of their own departmental curriculum goals and identify technology needs.

After reviewing the proposed school improvement plan and the district improvement plan, the following items were identified as **potentially** having a financial impact on the technology budget:

Possible Costs:

1. Electronic school wide "calendar". (School Improvement Plan, Goal 1, Action Plan #3). It was discussed that there needs to be a clear definition of what is meant by "calendar, since we have so many. Kim also mentioned that we should talk to the Superintendent to see if our implementation of such a calendar would be consistent with their efforts to put a multi-district calendar on their web site.
2. Parent access to PowerSchool ((School Improvement Plan, Goal 1, Action Plan #9). We would need to upgrade the PowerSchool server to accommodate any further load on our current system. Since the PowerSchool server is used by the other school districts, we would need to look into a multi-funded purchase that would be equitable.
3. Connect-Ed (School Improvement Plan, Goal 1, Action Plan #10). We flagged this as a potential cost not knowing if the Superintendent's office is going to continue funding this system.
4. Web site maintenance (School Improvement Plan, Goal 1, Action Plan #5). In addition to the stipend position (which is not paid for by the tech budget), there might be server space charges or other possible expenditures to ensuring our site is maintained.
5. Study Island MCAS preparation software (School Improvement Plan, Goal 3). We need to get a better idea of who is committed to using this program with their students. We purchased enough licenses this year for all of 7th and 8th grade math students, but only a fraction of those students are using this software.
6. Electronic Portfolios (District Improvement Plan – Assessment). The use of electronic portfolios was discussed in the context of assessment. Specifically, a previously discussed portfolio option for SPED students and/or students who have a certain grade point average as an alternative to a final exam. The group recognized that further discussion is necessary to determine the use of a "portfolio".
7. Curriculum Mapping (NOTE: from the school improvement plan that addresses NEAS&C, but NOT talked about at the meeting. Kim added this after the meeting adjourned). There are software application that assist with curriculum mapping that we and/or the superintendent's office might use in the future.

Kim handed out next fiscal year's technology budget (FY 08 – academic year 07-08) for review and discussion. Kim explained how she arrived at the numbers and asked each person to review it in terms of their own departmental technology needs. Committee members will follow-up via email, before the next ITAC meeting, with departmental technology related needs. Kim also explained that this was a budget “projection” still in the process of being “approved” via the budget cycle. It was not an “approved” budget.

Anita Goddard shared her Audio Visual budget projection (request) for next fiscal year (FY 08). She emphasized the fact that her budget was something she submitted to the principal, but that it was not necessarily “accepted” by him. She explained that he might not agree and has, in the past, cut this budget even before it made it to school committee. Anita explained the history of the building project and how it effected our ability to put ceiling mounted data projectors in all classrooms. The building project only covered a fraction of the installation and it has been her hope to be able to outfit the remainder of the classrooms over a period of time (years). However, to this degree, that has not been possible. As an alternative to ceiling mounted data projectors, Anita also included an alternative budget for non-ceiling mounted projectors.

Rebecca Phelps asked who's responsibility/budget it was for things like stage lights, stage equipment, etc. Anita said she has been keeping an eye on all of that and has submitted requests to have things like the lights fixed. It was still unclear if there was an “official” area totally responsible for these items.

Kim spoke of ITAC's role in terms of equitable solutions to the distribution of technological resources. For instance, if there was not enough funds to purchase both anti-plagiarism software and a video streaming software service, ITAC should discuss what an equitable solution might be. Also, when we get the funding to purchase more data projectors ITAC should come up an equitable way to distribute this equipment.

The group also talked about the usage of such services like Turnitin and Study Island. Kate Messmer will talk to her department about their plans to use the software next year and get back to the group/Kim. Jenny Kirouac will talk to the math department about their intentions to use Study Island and get back to the group/Kim.

Jenny Kirouac mentioned that Tony Ryan had a grant specifically targeted for Math related MCAS initiatives. She said Math wanted to use that money to buy data projectors. Kim asked if it was MCAS or Math MCAS specific. Jenny thought Math MCAS. Kim mentioned the need to know the difference just so the group had a clear understanding. Kim used this as an example of why ITAC is involved by pointing out that if MCAS money was available, in general, perhaps English or Science might have a need and ITACs role would be to inform others of potential opportunities. ITAC would also be aware of Math's procurement of data projectors so that when prioritizing the AV budget, they could adjust it as necessary.

Kim talked to the group about the two reasons we have a Technology Plan.

1. DOE and eRate requirement

In order to receive eRate funds we have to have a Technology Plan. eRate money is used to cover the cost of our internet connection. Furthermore, we need to include the following points in our Tech.Plan:

- a. Goal/Vision
- b. Mechanism for technology needs assessment
- c. Professional Development Plan that addresses technology

- d. Identify a budget for all non-eratable costs
- e. Mechanism for evaluating the Tech. Plan

2. HRHS – A Guide to technology implementation

Our Tech. Plan should be aligned with our academic priorities and act as a guide when making technology related decisions.

Action Items:

Members will review the Tech budget and email the group with technology needs for their department so adjustments can be discussed/made.

Kim will follow up with Tony to clarify MCAS grant money question.

Kim to follow up with Jim C., Anita and Karen T. to see what budget is used for repairs and maintenance costs to the auditorium, etc.

Next Meeting Date: Monday, February 26th, 2:30pm-4:30pm

We will adjusting the tech. budget to reflect any identified needs, as well as take an in depth look at the Technology Plan.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:20pm