

**MEETING OF
THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY
JANUARY 29, 2014**

Nevada Department of Education
755 N. Roop Street, Ste 201
Carson City, NV

Lincoln County School District
LCSD Administration Building
1191 Edwards Street
Panaca, NV

Clark County School District
Curriculum & Professional Development Center
3950 South Pecos McLeod
Las Vegas, NV

Elko County School District
Administration Building
850 Elm Street
Elko, NV

Humboldt County School District
Administration
310 E. 4th Street
Winnemucca, NV

White Pine County School District
Great Basin College
2115 Bobcat Drive
Ely, NV

Pershing County School District
1150 Elmhurst Avenue
Lovelock, NV

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call:** Chairman White called the meeting to order at 8:40am. Roll call was read and the attendees present are as recorded below.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carson City

David White, Chairman
Arnie Maurins, Commission Member
Bruce Meissner, Commission Member
Ji Wang, Commission Member
Dale Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction
David Gustafson, Member

Ely

Irene Chachas, Commission Member

Las Vegas

Mike Amie, Commission Member
David Flatt, Commission Member

Panaca

Nick Poulson, Commission Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Paul Anderson

The Commission has a quorum.

STAFF:

Kim Vidoni
Amanda Pinter
Evelyn Barragan

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Carson City

Jacque Ewing-Taylor, UNR
Janis Horn, Mineral CSD
Spencer Watson, Education Superhighway

Las Vegas

PG Schrader, UNLV

2. **The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman White.**
3. **Public Comments.** Chairman White asked if there were any public comments or questions to address at the beginning of the meeting, there were none.
4. **Discussion and possible approval of 11/1/2013 minutes:** Commissioner Maurins moved to approve the 11/1/2013 minutes, Commissioner Chachas seconded. Motion carried.
5. **Presentation of State School Speed Test Month Results:** Chairman White introduced Spencer Watson with Education Superhighway. Mr. Watson thanked the Commission for allowing him to present during the Commission meeting. Education Superhighway is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to provide capacity building services to enable America's K12 schools to upgrade to high speed internet for online assessment and digital learning tools. They have mainly been working with state education agencies and school districts to collect data about how ready schools are today for digital learning, and to effectively plan for upgrades. Education Superhighway conducted a National School Speed Test month, which measures internet speed at every K12 school, and builds a statewide picture of how ready schools are in terms of connectivity. 550 schools across Nevada participated in the Speed Test. Overall across Nevada's 17 school districts, 39% are ready for media rich online assessments, 44% are ready for basic assessments, and 17% are not ready for any online assessment. The Speed Test results also showed that Nevada is overall more ready for digital learning and online assessment than the nation as a whole. Superintendent Erquiaga asked how the schools that are not ready for online assessments get ready. Mr. Watson stated he believes it falls on the districts and DOE to use Education Superhighway's information to effectively plan upgrades and to determine high impact activities they can do to improve connectivity. Commissioner Gustafson asked if the bandwidth at the schools was being provided by the circuit or if it was being consumed at the site. Mr. Watson replied that the Speed Test is a test of available bandwidth, it factors in usage at the time but also what other constrictions may be on the network at the same time. It tests the bandwidth of the user's device at the time the test is run. Chairman White asked if each individual school monitors or creates the barriers for device connectivity. Commissioner Meissner stated that each district determines this. Senator Denis asked if Education Superhighway's report could be made available to the commission members. Mr. Watson will forward to Dr. Vidoni. Chairman White thanked Mr. Watson for his presentation.
6. **Update on Biennial Needs Assessment and Evaluation of State Educational Technology Grants:** Dr. Vidoni stated that the evaluation contracts for UNR and UNLV went to the Board of Examiners on November 12th and they were approved. Jacque Ewing-Taylor advised that after the contracts were

approved, they began with setting up accounts within the university. Next, they questioned the online survey, about how districts have changed their goals and objectives based on the revisions to their budgets. It was decided they couldn't make any decisions about dividing the county work load until revised budgets, showing exactly where the money was going, were received. This was done in December 2013. Clearly, some districts were investing in hardware, which does not require much evaluation, whereas districts investing in professional development require a much lengthier evaluation process. Once all revised budgets were received, Dr. Ewing-Taylor, Dr. Schrader and Dr. Thornton reviewed and came up with equitable distribution of counties. Dr. Thornton and Dr. Ewing-Taylor will be evaluating Washoe, Douglas, Carson, Churchill, Elko, Lyon and Mineral Counties. Dr. Schrader will be evaluating Clark, Lincoln, Nye and White Pine Counties. Together, they will come up with common instruments that will be used strictly for professional development and any student data that needs to be gathered. Superintendent Erquiaga asked if the reports will show what monies were spent on hardware and what monies were spent on professional development. Dr. Ewing-Taylor informed that is correct. Chairman White thanked Dr. Ewing-Taylor for her update. Dr. Schrader gave a brief update on the State Educational Technology Needs Assessment. He has met with several technology experts in Clark County who provided rich feedback on the original and existing survey. Revisions will be made, but it will not be a complete over haul. One issue they noticed is overgeneralization of some technologies. Dr. Schrader will have an update to provide the Commission in the next couple weeks, and is on time for final delivery.

- 7. Discussion on the Future Role of the Commission and the Results of a District Survey on the Grant Review Process:** Dr. Vidoni stated that at the September meeting, it was suggested that feedback be gathered from the districts about the Grant Review process. Dr. Vidoni and 4 district representatives created a survey that was sent to the primary contacts of 12 districts; 13 responses were received. Dr. Vidoni mentioned that the districts understand how difficult it is to allocate the funds; however they also believe there is a need and room for improvement in the grant process. Some improvement suggestions were to better align the RFA with educational goals of the State and to spell out the rules of the competition. The majority of districts were not happy with the review process. Districts were split on whether or not every district should receive funds, 1/3 should fund every application, 1/3 should not fund every application, 1/3 were not sure if every application should be funded. The final question in the survey asked whether funds should be aligned to state educational technology plan. Some districts expressed concern that the scope of funding has become too broad and could be more directly linked to the state educational technology needs. Chairman White gave reassurance to districts that he appreciates the honesty of the feedback. As difficult as it is to read, he would like the Commission to take the positive comments, do some work and make things better for districts. Chairman White asked Superintendent Erquiaga for feedback, help, and guidance about what he thinks about the future of the Commission. Superintendent Erquiaga stated that one of his assignments from the State Board of Education, is to examine the more than 1 dozen Councils, Commissions and Committees that advise or impact the Department of Education by statute. One question he has for the Commission is does this Commission need to be a statutory Commission that exists in perpetuity or is it a body that is called into being when necessary? Superintendent Erquiaga added that technology is in everything we do in Education and the Commission's input is critical. Another piece is specifically, where does technology play a role as intervention? Nevada has Proficiency and achievement gap problems, where can technology be used to close the gap. He asked the Commission member to look at Educational Technology plan and figure out the overarching view, and give him the surgical applications or interventions that are recommended. Commissioner Maurins asked if the Commission is bound by statute to award money on a competitive basis. Dr. Vidoni stated that she believes it is not bound by statute. Senator Denis believes the Commission should look at all needs and come up with a way to fund programs that would move the State in a positive direction. Mr. Wang added that he did a little research on the duties of the Commission. The first duty is to establish the State Educational Technology Plan, second is to develop Statewide Technical Standards, and third is to

allocate funds to school districts in support of Educational Technology. Mr. Wang believes the Technology Plan needs to be followed, the Statewide Technical Standards need to be developed, and the Commission needs to talk with districts and teachers to find out the real needs of teachers in schools.

- 8. Discussion and Possible Action on Revision of Commission's 1:1 Plan:** Dr. Vidoni stated that Leslie Wilson and Mike Gielniak from the One-to-One Institute in Michigan will be in Nevada on Feb 12th & 13th to help revise the Commission's 1:1 plan. The current plan was approved by the Commission, and in order to revise this, the Commission will need to allow permission. Dr. Vidoni also mentioned that the agenda has been finalized and sent out to the registrants. The first day, stakeholders will get a broader picture of what resources are available and planning the larger vision of 1:1. The second day, the group will break up into work groups to work on creating the plan. The focus will be on effective uses of technology for creating opportunities in professional development and implementing Common Core State Standards and SBAC. This group will submit a report to Superintendent Erquiaga by early June. Commissioner Maurins asked if the revised 1:1 plan would be brought back to the Commission for approval. Dr. Vidoni stated, yes it would. Commissioner Maurins moved to allow revision to the current 1:1 plan, seconded by Commissioner Chachas. Commissioner Poulson asked if any Commission members would be present at the meetings. Dr. Vidoni stated Chairman White, and Commissioners Maurins and Flatt would be present. The motion passed.
- 9. Review and Possible Approval of Commission's Digital Learning Day Award RFA:** Dr. Vidoni stated that the RFA for the Digital Learning Day Award is not much different from last year. The one change is the timeline; the award will be given out to winners at the Commission's summer meeting. If approved today, it will be released on January 30th. Commissioner Chachas moved to approve the Commission's Digital Learning Day Award RFA, seconded by Commissioner Meissner. The motion passed.
- 10. Comments from Commissioners:** Chairman White stated that the meeting was very informative; he believes there needs to be more discussion about the Commission. David Gustafson stated that the real value of the Commission comes from helping districts work through their technology issues, not just giving out money. Commissioner Amie agreed that there needs to be more discussion about the future of the Commission. Commissioner Poulson asked what role the Commission will play in helping districts fulfill technology requirements from SBAC. Superintendent Erquiaga stated he believes there is a role for the Commission in the way of helping those schools with technology requirements and issues.
- 11. Public Comments:** No public comments.
- 12. Adjournment.** Commissioner Chachas moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Meissner. The motion passed.