

STUDENT TECH THINK TANK

September 3, 2015

3:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Bellingham – Central Services – Room 205

Meeting called by: Kurt Gazow / Mike Copland

Type of meeting: Think Tank

Facilitator: Greg Baker / Kurt Gazow

Note taker: Carol Stewart

	Kurt Gazow		Matt Whitten
	Mike Copland		Meg Weber
	James Everett		Erin Graham
	Paul Clement		John Farquhar
	Molly Foote		Amanda Blue
	Tommy Lingbloom		Jake Squires
	Brian Pahl		Eric N. (SHS Student)
	Chuck Devange		Leigh H. (KMS Student)
	Nancy Hudson		
	Simone Sangster		
	Jackie Brawley		
	John Getchell		
	Lynnelle Larson		

Attendees:

Internal note: updated 9/9

AGENDA ITEMS

Topic	Presenter	Time allotted
✓ Introduction / GTKY	Greg Baker	20m
✓ Framing and Focus	Greg Baker	15m
✓ Research Review; Professional Development	Mike Copland	15m
✓ Big Picture Scheduling	Kurt Gazow	15m
✓ Unpacking Current Levy Projects	Kurt Gazow	10m
✓ Group Q&A / Discussion	Kurt Gazow	35m
✓ Logistics & Next Steps	Kurt Gazow	10m

NOTES

Student Technology Think Tank

Committee Notes No. 1

September 3, 2015

Call to Order:

Kurt Gazow, Executive Director of Technology, opened the meeting at 3:02 p.m. and thanked the group for volunteering their time and introduced Dr. Baker to the committee.

Introduction/Get To Know You:

Dr. Greg Baker, Superintendent of the Bellingham Public Schools, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking them for participating in this committee. Dr. Baker asked each member to introduce themselves and say why they are interested in this committee. Answers include deep passion about the topic, observation of the power of integrating tech in the classroom, wanting to make sure whatever technology is rolled out is useful, interest in making sure the infrastructure is given adequate information for a big expansion, and a feeling we are behind in classroom technology use.

Framing and Focus:

Dr. Baker told the group that we bring a think tank group together when there is a complex 'something' that needs different prospective. He asked the group to bring back their best thinking.

He explained to the group that in February we're going to present two levies to our community: one for maintenance and operation and the other a capital levy. The current capital levy pays for staff, rebuilding infrastructure, and buying new computers to get to 3:1 ratio. The next levy may include a 1:1 initiative. Dr. Baker acknowledged that some students have a device (smartphone, tablet, etc.) that they use now, so 1:1 may really be 1:1 plus. How do we roll out a 1:1? Before this goes out to the community to ask to support it, he wants the group to help wrestle with the thinking.

Research Review; Professional Development:

Dr. Mike Copland, Deputy Superintendent, started by asking the team to turn to their neighbor and talk about the last new technology they learned – why did you get it and what did you use it for? He wants the team to come back to the question – what is the purpose?

Mike Copland then showed the team a video of a quick snapshot of the [Mooreville School District](#) and how they have used 1:1 and did a debrief with the team about what they learned.

Mike explained that as a group they will get to see 1:1 at a school and talk with staff and students about the impact of technology in the classroom. He asked them to take an index card and write about what they want to know what is working at that school.

The Think Tank was assigned to read chapter 5 from [Every Child, Every day](#) and at the next meeting on September 10, they'll have a discussion. He also asked the group to post suggested reads online. There will be an online environment for sharing so the committee can connect digitally.

Other suggested reading is *The Project RED Roadmap for Transformation*. Copies could be downloaded at [Project Red website](#). Printed copies were available at the meeting.

Big Picture Scheduling:

Kurt Gazow discussed next week's schedule. Brian Pahl, Ed Tech Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA), will talk about professional development. Time will be spent discussing training considerations and how to prepare the staff to do this well and what's needed for training.

There will be two guest speakers for the September 17 meeting, including Sonja Delafosse, who will talk about experiences she encountered while teaming with several local school districts on 1:1 programs. She'll discuss what worked and what didn't. The second speaker, Mark Sparvell – has a different, international perspective.

Kurt discussed the travel plans on September 30 and October 1 which includes a visit to Sammamish High School and learning how they implemented their 1:1 program. The focus will be on spending time in the classrooms observing and talking with students and teachers. Then the team will head to Kent to observe the implementation side of rolling out the 1:1. How did they process that? How did they manage professional development? On October 1, the team will debrief at Microsoft.

The end goal is a recommendation to Dr. Baker about how we are feeling as a team and community as a concept. Are we trending in a particular direction?

On October 5, there will be an in depth work session to unpack all the visits and reading that the team has done. The goal is not to answer every single question but rather to validate if our district should pursue a student technology program like 1:1, and if so, make some framing recommendations.

Unpacking Current Levy Projects:

Tech Levy concept – if the team endorses the 1:1, then we are going to the community to ask for funds for the next tech levy. Kurt then showed a slide with an overview of current [Tech levy](#) projects.

Group Q&A / Discussion:

Q: Will we talk about home environment.

A: Yes

Q: Will we still have computer labs in schools?

A: There will still be programs specific for computer labs.

Q: Are we working with the assumption that it's going to happen? It seems inevitable.

A: We are wrestling with this as a question. What does this mean for Bellingham Public Schools? Are we going to do this or not? Is it at the High school and Middle levels? Is the community ready to take on the financial part? We want to do it well.

Comment: How it is packaged is important. We need to be clear about home access and to solve the digital divide to use devices at home.

Kurt Gazow showed a slide with Potential Timeline for 1:1. We cannot collect funds on the year a capital levy is voted on. Kurt explained how the current levy that passed in 2012 was collected on 2013, 14, 15, 16. The funding is obtained in two major collections over the year. This levy recommendation that goes to Dr. Baker will inform the final levy package presented to the voters in February, 2016.

More questions were written on index cards and collected at the end of the meeting. See Key Questions document below.

Logistics & Next Steps:

Kurt asked the members to take the materials home to read Chapter 5 of *Every Child, Every Day* and familiarize themselves with *The Project RED Roadmap for Transformation*.

Kurt encouraged members to use the shared the One Note document and Brian Pahl offered to assist anyone who needs help using the document.

An email travel confirmation will be sent out to the group within the next week.

Meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

STUDENT TECH THINK TANK

Key Questions for schools implementing 1:1 technology model

- ☐ What kind of training do the teachers and staff have with technology?
- ☐ How did you work to ensure your teachers felt supported? Did they embrace the change only? Or why not?
- ☐ Are all teachers required to embrace the technology or are they able to make a compelling case for why their teaching is superior without it?
- ☐ What issues or concerns of the District that might be addressed by 1:1? How does 1:1 fit in with strategic plan?
- ☐ What is the problem we are trying to solve with 1:1?
- ☐ What are the opportunities for public/private partnerships funding?
- ☐ Besides grad rates, how do you measure success? How (if at all) has your concept of homework/in class work changed?
- ☐ How do you manage software needs for 'technology heavy' classes that require unique programs? (license for each student)
- ☐ How did you address needs of digital divide vs. students that already have resources?

Other Thoughts:

- ☐ See the full vision of how a levy process works was extremely helpful in understanding the time gap between passage and implementation.
- ☐ What are the drivers when considering the impact of 1:1 initiative with respect to the infrastructure that is building based. For example:
 - Curriculum that requires specialized software
 - Online testing - use 1:1 devices for testing
 - Loss prevention – cost sharing with families for insurance
- ☐ Would money we would use to initiate foundational professional development to prepare our staff and students be supplied to us via the levy funds or another source of funding to facilitate the PD?
- ☐ Do we consider changing the language of the 'tech levy' if we plan on the purpose to be a curricular initiative – rather than a tech initiative? Premise here is that a 1:1 initiative means different things to different people.
- ☐ How do we ensure the vision (if we move this direction) of moving to a 1:1 is a curricular initiative with the teaching/learning being the primary focus – not technology – for all of our members of our system?
- ☐ Levy logistics – maybe a school house rocks style video? "I'm just a bill"

Questions Gathered from Student Tech Think Tank, Meeting #1

These are responses to the question **"Imagine you are going into a school or district that has made the 1:1 decision and implemented. What would you want to know?"**

- ☐ How has this improved your teaching experience? Or not?
- ☐ How has this improved your learning experience?
- ☐ What would you do differently if you could?
- ☐ What types of classes will use this technology?
- ☐ Repairs? Cost of Training?
- ☐ What does it look like at the elementary level?
- ☐ What are kids learning now that they weren't learning before?
- ☐ How has 'what you assess' and 'what you give feedback around' changed? (Not just **how** you assess)
 - Reading
 - Math
- ☐ How is technology a tool for thinking not just skill development?
- ☐ How can we provide common ground/standards/guidelines to ensure coherence and enable educators without stifling freedom, innovation and creativity?
- ☐ What training did staff have?
 - Ahead of time?
 - Ongoing?
- ☐ How long did staff have devices ahead of time in order to learn?
- ☐ What preloads (software apps, etc.) go on to the computers?
- ☐ What did the training for students look like?
 - A day or two before school started?
 - Integrated into classes?
- ☐ How do people provide internet access for students who can't afford it?
- ☐ What applications? Materials? Texts?
- ☐ What resources currently in use don't transfer digitally?
- ☐ Resolution path for tech issues?
- ☐ How to support faculty development?
- ☐ What are the PD needs for staff (how much/how often?)
- ☐ Specific examples of how technology is used day to day in class?
- ☐ What is the research regarding 1:1 programs? How are you measuring effectiveness?
- ☐ How do you plan to adapt over time, both with PD and hardware needs?
- ☐ Differences between focus on devices vs. content?
- ☐ What adaptations have you made to ensure authentic learning?
 - Authentic means – students doing their own work.
 - Authentic means – that as teachers we can assess and intervene/support student growth.