

Granite School District

Board of Education Meeting Study Session May 21, 2013

A study session for Granite School District was held in Auditorium D at the Granite School District offices, 2500 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. President Gayleen Gandy called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m., those in attendance:

Gayleen Gandy	President
Terry Bawden	Vice President
Connie Anderson	Board Member
Sarah Meier	Board Member
Connie Burgess	Board Member
Dan Lofgren	Board Member

Excused:	
Julene Jolley	Board Member

The following members of the administration were present:

Martin W. Bates	Superintendent
David Garrett	Business Administrator/Treasurer
David Gourley	Assistant Superintendent
Mike Fraser	Assistant Superintendent
Jim Henderson	Assistant Superintendent
Linda Mariotti	Assistant Superintendent

Ben Horsley, Director, Communications Department, and Merilynn Boekweg, Board Recorder, were in attendance.

STUDY SESSION:

Technology Options Update

Superintendent Bates talked with the Board about the importance of moving education

forward by giving students the opportunity to use one on one hand held devices. While attending the National School Board Association Conference it became evident that now is the time to move toward that goal. Many variables are considered when purchasing and implementing the devices. They must have connectivity, must be able to produce results, and it is essential that they are test worthy for all students. He introduced Linda Mariotti and her team who presented learning objectives on implementing this new technology.

Ms. Mariotti introduced Dale Roberts, Director, Information Systems, and Rick Anthony, Principal and Director of Granite Connection High School/Instructional Technology, to present options available for providing the devices. Joining them were Jeff Darling, Ken Francis and Dale Pitkins from Information Systems.

When deciding which to use it must be taken into consideration the total cost of ownership (TCO) and the route it will take to empower the educators to be comfortable with the technology and be a support for the students. Educators need to be able to use the devices to open up new educational experiences.

Each Board member was given a different type/brand of device to follow the presentation. This allowed them to see the options that each one provided.

Ideally a single device would allow for consumption and creation using a variety of internet/cloud based programs with downloaded programs and applications. Teachers would know how to use the device for teaching 21st century skills. An inexpensive and easy way to provide back-end support for the devices would be readily available. In reality it is far more complicated. Expectations of the devices and how much can be spent to make it happen are important considerations.

Challenges that face this project include the variety of operating systems, browser choices, a pedagogical paradigm shift, and learning to use the device for creation, not just consumption. Student access at school and home was discussed.

The TCO would include the device, the refreshment cycles, cost to support the devices, and provide appropriate professional learning. Wi-Fi saturation, redundancy and connection speed, mobile device management, filtering (Child Internet Protection Act), data storage and yearly license costs also need to be considered. Areas of additional costs included wireless capacity in all schools, additional capacity and bandwidth projects in each school, additional staff in Information Systems and Educational Technology, and constantly changing technology.

The Board was given a Device Mapping Rubric that compared five different devices and their functionality in different applications. The presenters recommended the “identification of two to three devices that allow for the “best” solution based on need. Provide these devices to the students of teachers who have received professional leaning on how to improve learning via 21st century skills (creation). Teacher professional development and teacher enthusiasm drive the shift in instruction.” (Exhibit #13-58)

Board members were concerned with buying devices that were too new or too old. What would the cost of replacing them be and could the future budgets tolerate the replacement costs? Superintendent Bates was confident the budgets could be configured in such a way that the refreshing of the devices would be doable.

The Board discussed the option of providing the devices or using devices student brought from home. Mr. Lofgren asked if there were any large scale districts that had reported success with this shift into technology. Mr. Roberts said it was really too soon for reportable data on the subject. Board members expressed the idea of Granite being a leader in this technology area. It was discussed whether Granite wanted to be early adopters or pioneers in the field considering the costs it would incur.

Dr. Bates said that students learn faster and deeper with technology. Families are leaving the district in search of more options in technology. He acknowledged that higher educational institutions are not preparing new teachers for this new technological trend. This subject has been a topic of discussion with legislators.

Susen Zobel, President, GEA, suggested the administration start with professional development for teachers. A discussion followed about how many teachers feel they are constantly playing catch up with the new programs. She said training the teachers first, prior to the purchase of the equipment, would put them before the curve instead of behind. Dr. Bates expressed his concern that some educators are happy where they are and do not want to move forward without a push. Ms. Zobel suggested that incentives to engage in additional training would produce more interest.

Mr. Lofgren emphasized that as the Board listens to the technology experts, they listen to teacher experts too.

The Superintendent, with the approval of the Board, asked Ms. Mariotti and her team to formulate a recommendation to go forward with this implementation of technology.

Motion: **I move we adjourn.**

Made by: Terry Bawden

Seconded by: Connie Anderson

Called for vote: President Gandy

Results: Motion Passed

The meeting adjourned at 6:30p.m.