

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL
201 N. Scoville
Oak Park, IL 60302

Technology Committee Meeting Minutes
November 10, 2014

A Technology Committee meeting was held on November 10, 2014; Mr. Weissglass called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph Lee, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Toni Biasiello, Faculty Senate Representative Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Thomas Cofsky, OPRFHS Board member; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; and Kathy Ogden-Raino, community member.

Minutes

Dr. Gevinson moved to approve the minutes of the October 14, 2014 Technology Committee, as amended; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Technology Request for Budget Amendment

The Technology Committee was informed the Finance Committee would receive a request for an additional \$400,000 for this year's budget to purchase services and equipment that would be on site June 1, allowing ET to be able to complete its summer work before the beginning of the next school year. When the budget is amended in March, this expense will be included. Going forward, this process will be built into the time. Additional benefits to this schedule may include better pricing, as the District will not be competing with other school districts.

It was noted that this was a one-time incremental charge and from a financial planning and operational efficiency, it is the right thing to do. This item will be moved to the full Finance Committee in January.

Dr. Lee moved that the Finance Committee be notified that the Technology Committee is in support of amending this year's budget in the amount of \$400,000 and that these items will be built into the budget going forward and, thus, not require a budget amendment year; second Mr. Weissglass. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Educational Technology Scorecard Discussion

The purpose of developing a scorecard will be to provide updates on technology projects in support of students and staff, signal new projects and project spend early, assure alignment with the goals of the Strategic Plan, and provide a technology roadmap as a basis for discussion with constituent groups.

The administration recommended the following inputs: strategic plan, educational technology (ET) budget and ET project list. The outputs would be technology project timelines and the technology component of the 5-year financial projections. The process would include categorizing resource utilization and expenditures, determining major projects that need constituent participation, cross walking categories with strategic plan, preparing a detailed budget for the current year and presenting projected roadmap and financial projections for out years. The proposed categories would be instructional (classroom, students, learning and faculty and staff) and infrastructure (automation and operations, data and communications tools, network infrastructure). Within the categories major projects were listed, i.e., classroom standardization, student dedicated devices, learning management systems standardization (skyward, new Google classroom, etc.), faculty portable devices, SIS, Human Resources, Finance evaluation, data warehouse, intranet, website, wireless density, internet access. It was also shown how this would align with the goals of the Strategic Plan.

Discussion ensued. One member commended that the key to success in creating a culture is how the connective tissue is being built, i.e., energy, mutual support. Social capital is necessary to get this embedded in the institution. Another member asked: How are decisions made about the various aspects of projects? How are decisions on technology projects made now that Implementation Teams have been formed? How does decision making occur? How does it work with the administration? Mr. Carioscio noted that decision making was a shared responsibility between DLT, the teacher/leadership position, and Jaime Winchell. The idea was to refocus the effort to work with the faculty to make sure its voice was present in the technology decision. Opportunities are being framed to learn something and to engage the faculty on assessing. While a Technology Subcommittee is composed of Division Heads and the teacher users of Chrome Books, more connected collaboration is needed. More cross disciplinary projects are needed so teachers can bring together multiple skill sets. It was suggested that another category be added: Culture/climate/decision making.

A sample technology timeline was provided for the Classroom Technology Integration Plan (CTIP).

While complimentary that everything in the presentation was a logical outgrowth of the step that preceded it, two members felt what was missing was the evaluation and the facilitation of the evaluation, i.e., \$400,000 for one device. When and how does the District say the choice was a good choice? How would the markets tell the District if it were going in the right direction? What is the users' evaluation instrument? Mr. Carioscio is not a participant of any one Strategic Plan implementation team, but he will offer support for any suggestions that come forward from any team. One member felt that unless Technology starts to make evaluation a more important part of the process. Another member did not like the word "standardization" and suggested using "mass customization". When talking about standardization, one must ask what is its purpose, and that would be to create a foundation where the District can take advantage of mass customization provides.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

Dr. Lee moved to adjourn the Technology Committee meeting at 5:05 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A voice vote resulted in motion

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board