

**Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Technology Committee
Tuesday, August 13, 2013
Board Room**

A Technology Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, August 13, 2013 in the Board Room. Dr. Lee opened the meeting at 6:34 p.m. A roll call included the following members: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Dr. Tina Halliman, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Community Relations and Communications; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Cindy Milojevic, OPRFHS Director of Student Activities; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Kyle Farley, Jay Lind, Paul Wright and Lauren Blanco, OPRFHS Faculty Members, Ambria Jones, Alison Carraher, Kiley Nelson and Laurand Royal, students; Melanie McQueen and family, Burcy Hines, and Wyanetta Johnson, community members; Nancy Leavy, League of Women Voters.

Student Technology Discussion 1 to 1

Mr. Carioscio stated that the purpose of the presentation was to make the Board of Education aware of some of the issues moving forward with deploying dedicated technology to students and to have a high-level conversation about the initiative. The administration wanted the Board of Education's point of view on the priority and level of District support for this initiative and then to determine next steps.

The District provides approximately 1000 technology devices available for student use

- 6 computer labs
- 6 divisional labs
- Equipment carts
- 3 laptop carts
- 4 iPad carts
- 2 Chrome book carts
- Individual assistive technology devices for all students with an IEP that requires one

This is a 3:1 ratio (3 students:1 computer)

Questions to answer:

- 1) How many students may have access to computers?
- 2) How many students have dedicated access?
- 3) How many students have Internet access?
- 4) Do telephones come close to serving the purpose of a computer?

District 90 currently provides 1:1 technology for its sixth to eighth grade students. District 90 parents have expressed concern that when their students come to OPRF, they will lose the benefit of having this dedicated, school-supplied device. Both Districts 90 and 97 do not know the extent to which students have Internet access. District 90 has access to the library after school. District 97 is going to issue iPads. Peer schools are either already providing this technology to their students or are planning to provide it to them in the near term. As a result of Common Core Standards in spring of 2015, OPRFHS will be required to do a significant amount of online testing and it does not have enough devices to accommodate this testing.

Questions to be considered:

- 1) What is the benefit of providing/supporting every student with dedicated technology (1:1)?
- 2) How will this benefit be measured?
- 3) What if the benefit isn't realized?
- 4) How much will this cost?

There is mostly anecdotal and no uniform agreement that links 1:1 to improved test scores. There have been significant results in Special Education for assistive technology, however. And studies have occurred about student engagement. There is widespread belief that 1:1 levels the playing field for students in need. North Carolina State recently put out a research report on student engagement. What benefit would OPRF assume and how would it be measured?

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that some things mentioned with using IPADS and computers are for instructional reasons and other reasons would be that it benefits college and work. How does the District distinguish between those two uses of the computer and where it impacts education? Mr. Carioscio stated that while Mr. Kirkpatrick had spoken about his experience in his class, it is difficult to separate and measure these two, as students have access to the device and the interaction with device gives organization. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that some colleges do not allow students to bring computers into the classroom as they de-track from the conversation and what is being covered in class. Mr. Carioscio noted that Faculty Senate would be involved in any decision-making. The District must be prepared to look ahead and be aware of the pitfalls.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked about the continuing cost of replacing computers and wiring. Discussion has also occurred about the use of e-textbooks. Is there a transfer of costs from textbooks to the computers? The cost issues to consider are:

- 1) Preparation of the faculty—what supports will be provided to assure the faculty is ready (equipment, professional development)?
- 2) Preparation of the OPRF students and families
 - a. Expectations of the students and families (new procedures, modifications to code of conduct, etc.)
 - b. Financial impact on families (fees, level of subsidy)
- 3) Preparation of the infrastructure
 - a. Base infrastructure is in place - however we need to
 - b. Increase wireless density to support the significant increase in the number of connected devices
 - c. Increase the internet bandwidth to support the increase in devices

The replacement of new generations of computers is built into the technology plan. The District is always looking towards the next generation and in terms of the wireless conversation. The plan is to examine traffic, utilization, etc.

The potential cost offsets would be 1) use of electronic textbooks, 2) offset of computer lab devices as the District would no longer need to purchase and maintain shared student computers.

The Committee then responded to the following questions and discussion occurred.

Question: Given competing demands for resources, how would you prioritize providing students with dedicated technology (1:1)?

Responses: Urgent, begin work immediately
Important, make it a priority
Nice to have, continue to research and gather information
Not a priority at this time that is priority for deployment of 1:1

One member saw this as a low priority because there was no argument that justified the investment envisioned. Two members felt it was about making use of the tools available and they wanted it done as quickly as possible. One member stated that if the District were not moving ahead, then it was falling behind and that the critical link was getting the District in the position of using technology. That is the answer to the question as to infrastructure. The world is using technology and the District cannot fall behind. One member stated that the District already uses computers and did not feel OPRFHS was disadvantaged from other districts. Any teacher may access a cart for their students. More research is needed.

Question: To what extent should the district support providing dedicated technology to students?

Responses: District should provide the device to all students with no additional fees
District should subsidize the cost of the device and charge a reduced fee
District should pass through all costs as technology fee

Equity was a factor for some Board of Education members. If the District did not provide a device to all students equally, to what extent did that create an issue for the faculty and others who are trying to provide consistency for students? One member felt the taxpayers needed to be considered in this equation and continued that the District should bear at least half the cost or two-thirds with a provision that would make it possible for every student to take advantage of whatever was decided. While technology is in the world today and the District must use it, no one has said which technology and how it will be used. One member believed whatever was decided upon should be accessible to all students in a way that the taxpayers can afford.

A question was raised about students bringing their own devices. What programs would only be allowed on the District's technology? Presently the school requires students to buy their graphing calculators. Mr. Carioscio stated that BOYD(Bring Your Own Device) was an option but there is still the equity dilemma. The administration will explore a number of options. Other districts have implemented BOYD successfully.

The next steps will be to 1) further define benefits; 2) further define costs; and 3) report to the Board of Education.

Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary