

Technology Advisory Committee  
July 17, 2006  
Walnut Room, Education Center

| <u>Members</u>                   | <u>Present</u> | <u>Absent</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Kathleen Caine                   | x              |               |
| Carlos Carrillo                  | x              |               |
| Sanjay Dalal                     | x              |               |
| Maile Ferreira                   |                | x             |
| JoAnn Garvarini                  | x              |               |
| Robert Hou                       | x              |               |
| Narasimhan Lakshmipathy          | x              |               |
| Candy Lindskog                   | x              |               |
| Piyush Malik                     |                | x             |
| Hiu Ng                           | x              |               |
| Nanci Pass                       | x              |               |
| James Phair                      | x              |               |
| David Richards                   | x              |               |
| Chinmoy Roy                      | x              |               |
| David Thornley                   |                | x             |
| Milt Werner, interim chairperson | x              |               |

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

### Old Business

2. Modify the “three areas where technology can provide help”. Modify old 9A and add 9D:
  - A. Provide FUSD with the current status of technology. This includes infrastructure (network, hardware, software, storage) and current “pain points”. This will leverage the work that MIS and the Technology Committee have already done.
  - B. Quantify/Evaluate/Demonstrate/? The benefits of using technology. Technology can be used at the district office and at school sites. Primary and secondary schools have different needs. Different teachers and classrooms have different needs. Encourage and enable teachers to use technology.
  - C. Quantify/Evaluate/Demonstrate/? Articulate the role of technology.

D. Define a road map, a plan of action.

The minutes were approved after the above revisions.

### New Business

3. **TAC Communication tools.** Postpone decision. Meantime try the blog tool set up by Sanjay. Email will be the primary means of communication.

#### 4. **Website Update.**

There is a district website where we should post details of the committee's work including meeting minutes. The communication that goes in is normally "cleaned" by Gary Leatherman to give the contents a uniform voice. He will not be available until the end of August. In the meantime, the group decided that we should at least list the members of the committee. It was also decided that we should come up with a mailbox (name TBD) through which the public can communicate to the committee.

Kathleen Caine volunteered to prepare the details for the website.

#### 5. **Technology Update.** There was none this time.

#### 6. **Deliverables.**

The group decided that it would write up recommendations as they evolve and present this as a record of the group's work to the board. This is in contrast to writing up a formal report.

A corollary is the capturing, regularly, of highlights of the topics discussed.

#### 7. **Goals for the Committee.**

In delving into the goals, the group came up with the following categories that need to be explored.

- A. General/survey.
- B. Curriculum. This was one of the original categories that had come up from previous committees.
- C. Professional Development. This was one of the original categories that had come up from previous committees.
- D. Infrastructure. This was one of the original categories that had come up from previous committees.
- E. Support. This category refers to need for support for any technology used/proposed.
- F. Communication. As technology has evolved it has different groups operating in a silo without coordinating with other initiatives in the district. One example that came up was the selection of computer-based/electronic textbooks. When making the selection, the committee deciding on this did not think of the impact it would have on the infrastructure. The dependency was realized much later.

8. Examining each of the above categories against the 4 items discussed in the last meeting will provide a comprehensive framework to look into all aspects.

Will the above framework of discussion make the group overlook topics like what will the school of the future look like?

The framework may not be perfect but provides a basis for deeper examination of issues.

9. **Sub-committees.**

The group felt it was too early to think of concrete work that could be spun out to sub-committees.

10. Action Items

A. Investigate further the six categories by analyzing each category under current status, quantify/evaluate/demonstrate benefits, articulating the role of technology and defining the goals for the future.

11. Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

These minutes were compiled by LP Lakshmipathy. Any errors are his alone.

Technology Advisory Committee  
 Aug 14, 2006  
 Walnut Room, Education Center

| <u>Members</u>                   | <u>Present</u> | <u>Absent</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Kathleen Caine                   |                | x             |
| Carlos Carrillo                  |                | x             |
| Sanjay Dalal                     |                | x             |
| Maile Ferreira                   | x              |               |
| JoAnn Garvarini                  | x              |               |
| Robert Hou                       |                | x             |
| Narasimhan Lakshmipathy          |                | x             |
| Candy Lindskog                   |                | x             |
| Piyush Malik                     | x              |               |
| Hiu Ng                           | x              |               |
| Nanci Pass                       | x              |               |
| James Phair                      | x              |               |
| David Richards                   | x              |               |
| Chinmoy Roy                      |                | x             |
| David Thornley                   |                | x             |
| Milt Werner, interim chairperson | x              |               |

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm. Thin attendance however delayed the start of actual TAC business.

Old Business

2. **Minutes** : The minutes from 7/31 were reviewed and approved as amended

3. **Reports to Board**: This was previously an open item. Besides the final report in December, Milt Werner informed the TAC that the board would like to get regular updates on TAC progress. This is both positive and encouraging.

4. **Goals for the committee**: These were not revisited

5. **Technology Update**: No Update this time

6. **“Survey” to assess Current needs**: Structured survey approach reaffirmed. Principal facilitated workshops would still be the prime vehicle for getting inputs for the

TAC, however the list of survey questions will be a guiding factor. Some members have started blogging their list of questions while others were expecting discussion at the meeting. To keep the discussion meaningful, all were urged to blog /email their inputs and for the next meeting, the TAC will have a LCD projector to go over the submissions in real time.

**Action items:**

- A. Milt Werner to arrange for a LCD projector and wire/wireless connectivity to internet in the walnut room for 8/28 meeting

## New Business

**7. Email Filters @FUSD.** The district has a conservative approach to spam management due to unsuitable nature for students and hence has email filters which sometimes unintentionally block out a large number of external communications including emails from parents. This was raised in TAC emails as well as brought up by Milt . Nanci provided her insights to the issue of blackbox lists that block filters. A question was raised if there can be different levels of filtering for different individuals in the FUSD. Since there is no teacher specific computers in elementary schools, all computers are shared and hence even with different levels of filtering, no universal solution seems obvious, However, it was felt that Carlos , who understands the network topology of the FUSD best should be present for this discussion to be fruitful.

**Action items:**

- A. Milt to ensure Carlos is present during the 8/28 meeting
- B. Carlos to provide an update on this issue in next meeting
- C. Carlos to provide a “Network Map “/topology that provides picture of data security
- D. Needs assessment should bring out Network and security needs of schools and FUSD

**8. Hiring Director of IT for FUSD:** The position is now renamed from Director (IT) to CIO to finally **Chief Technology Officer** and the District is a month away from making the hiring decision. It was also noted that though the TAC would need to work with the newhire, that person may have some learning curve - spending time with Carlos to come upto speed.

**9. Needs Assessment Survey Content Development:** Discussion continued on the matter of survey/needs assessment with the following key points:

- A. Listening to teacher wants and needs is important hence we need to reach out. JoAnne felt that Teachers on TAC could provide much input rather than going out to the larger community. However it was felt that need to go out to school and

community members is strong and let us not deviate from our initial agreement of conducting these TAC member facilitated sessions/workshops

B. Dave Richards mentioned that we should ask “What do you want (to do with technology)” without mentioning Technology so as not to bias respondents who may be technology averse or technology shy

C. Background information/Questions should be given in advance to the ‘meet and greet’ that would facilitate easier inputs collection.

D. A Concern raised was how to reach out to students and parents who do not use technology much. A possible solution is to ask the principal while forming the focus group to pay attention to this and ensure representative participation from that niche as well. Another suggestion was to include a survey in the welcome packet for first day of school, asking the students to get the survey back. This was deemed unsuitable by TAC Teachers and Principals citing student laxity and behavior patters

E. Methodology of the Needs Assessment/Inputs gathering survey:

- i. Inputs would be collected via Focus groups – 10-15 invitees per session
- ii. Principal to pick representatives from Students, Teachers and Parents
- iii. Each site will be visited for the focus group by one or two TAC community members.
- iv. Pilot Focus groups to be conducted as soon as possible after school re-opening. Further sessions will be fine tuned based on the feedback
- v. Structured set of questions to guide the focus group will be used– this will guide the formulation of formal survey (to be conducted for a wider audience at a later point of time)

## 10. FUSD Board Status update:

Next board meeting is Sept 13 for which 2 “volunteer” TAC members would create and edit what would be our update to the board. Rest of the TAC will review and approve the input on Sep 11 meeting

**Action:** Who are the lucky volunteers?

## 11. Action Items

- A. Create communications to the principals giving heads up regarding TAC, Objectives, mission and nominations for upcoming Focus group facilitated by each of them. **Owner: Milt Werner**
- B. Provide the tAC members Technology ‘Goals’ or standards – **Owner :JoAnn Garvarini**

- C. Arrange for a LCD projector and wire/wireless connectivity to internet in the Walnut room for 8/28 meeting **Owner : Milt Wener**
- D. Provide Update on Network /spam filter issue as outlined in #7 above :Owner: **Carlos and Milt**

12. Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

# TAC Update to the Board

September, 2006

# TAC Update

- Superintendent Gephart kicked off TAC on June 6, 2006
- Acting Chairman nominated – Milt Werner
- Bi-monthly Meetings scheduled
- Goals and Decision Process defined
- TAC Ground Rules identified:
  - Provide FUSD with Current Status.
  - Quantify the Benefits.
  - Articulate Role of the TAC.
  - Create Roadmap of the Future.
- Presentation by MIS and TAC Faculty Technology Members on current state of Technology, Technology Plan and Needs
- Six Meetings Held since Kickoff

# TAC Update

- TAC Blog Site and Group Email created for Members communication, collaboration and discussion:
  - <http://fremonttac.blogspot.com> [fremonttac@googlegroups.com](mailto:fremonttac@googlegroups.com)
- Discussion and agreement on the E-mail Filters for Faculty members and proposed changes to make E-mail communications easier
- Discussion and high-level agreement on allowing Parents to communicate consistently and easily with the Faculty members
- TAC Execution Plan for the rest of the year agreed
- “TAC Technology Survey” to assess the Technology Needs proposed:
  - Structured survey approach.
  - Principal facilitated focus groups for Faculty members and Parents.
  - Survey to be conducted in September / October 2006
- Survey results will identify Needs, Technology Plan and Roadmap
- TAC will actively collaborate with the new CTO

## Technology Advisory Committee September 11, 2006

| <u>Members</u>                   | <u>Present</u> | <u>Absent</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Kathleen Caine                   | x              |               |
| Carlos Carrillo                  | x              |               |
| Sanjay Dalal                     | x              |               |
| Maile Ferreira                   | x              |               |
| JoAnn Garbarini                  | x              |               |
| Robert Hou                       | x              |               |
| Narasimhan Lakshmipathy          | x              |               |
| Candy Lindskog                   | x              |               |
| Piyush Malik                     | x              |               |
| Hiu Ng                           | x              |               |
| Nanci Pass                       |                | x             |
| James Phair                      | x              |               |
| David Richards                   | x              |               |
| Chinmoy Roy                      | x              |               |
| David Thornley                   | x              |               |
| Milt Werner, interim chairperson | x              |               |

Bryan Gebhardt, FUSD School Board Trustee also attended.

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.

### Old Business

2. **Minutes** : The minutes from 8/28 were reviewed and approved.
3. **FUSD Board Status update**: Sanjay Dalal distributed a copy of the draft presentation for the board via the FremontTAC Google group. Initial feedback was positive, the committee was told that any changes should be emailed to Sanjay asap as the presentation is in just a few days.

### New Business

4. **Meeting Rooms**: Milt Werner is making arrangements for use of larger meeting rooms for future meetings.
5. **Needs Assessment Survey Content Development**:

It was agreed that primary reasons for surveying the community were to help identify and prioritize both short and long term needs of all stakeholders, and to help encourage community support for the school district's efforts to build and fund a solid technology plan.

A compilation of possible survey questions was submitted for review by JoAnn Garbarini. It was noted that not all members submitted questions and that some submitted duplicates. It was agreed that some questions were more suited to the follow up survey for individuals as opposed to the focus group study.

Per Maile Ferreira, the results of the EdTech Profile for FUSD Teachers and Administration compiled in June are online and linked to from the Technology Plan page on the FUSD Web site. FUSD participation rate was 94%, Maile will present a summary at the next TAC meeting.

Some of the questions directed at the teachers were covered in a brainstorming session conducted by Maile's team at the monthly Technology Committee (TC) meeting earlier this year. These responses can also be made available to the TAC.

## **6. Focus Group Logistics:**

After discussion, the following process and administration details were agreed upon.

- **Focus Group Test:** There will be an initial test of the focus group questions with a smaller subset of schools.
  - This subset will represent all attendance areas, as well as include at least one high school, one junior high and one elementary school. Suggested schools were Cabrillo or Durham, Irvington or American, Centerville or Washington.
  - The test focus group meetings will take place within 2 – 2 ½ weeks from today's TAC meeting.
  - Findings will be discussed and questions refined for the final focus group study.
  
- **Focus Group Study:**
  - All high schools and junior high schools will be solicited by Milt Werner to participate in the focus groups. The possibility that a subset of representative elementary schools be used was discussed but not resolved .
  - Focus Group meetings will be limited to one hour.
  - Participants will include at least 2 teachers, 2 parents, 2 students and the Principal with a maximum of 10 participants.
  - Three members of the TAC will attend: one will conduct the meeting, two will record the responses.
  - Each Focus Group will be presented with the same set of questions.

- Questions will be open-ended.
- Some preliminary demographic and technology questions will be included for the purpose of understanding the individuals participating in the focus groups.
- The questions will be provided in advance and participants will be asked to bring their written responses to the meeting. If possible, responses should be provided to TAC members before the meeting.
- TAC members should take care to record responses only and avoid influencing opinions expressed.

Roseanne Pryor, Milt Verner's secretary, will coordinate dates for both the test and the final focus groups with the school principals and notify TAC members, who will then sign up for specific schools.

There will also be a more quantitative survey conducted to a larger target audience after the focus study. This survey will include issues such as connectivity, level of technical knowledge, specific expectations, etc.

## **7. Action Items**

- A. Committee to review School Board Update PPT and provide any feedback by September 13 so that changes may be included in time for the presentation.
  - B. Maile Ferreira, Chinmoy Roy, Robert Hou and James Phair will streamline the list of panel questions and pull out those that would be more appropriate to the follow up survey. TAC members may still submit questions if they wish and should email them to Maile Ferreira.
  - C. Maile Ferreira will prepare a summary of information gleaned from the EdTech survey to present at the next TAC meeting.
  - D. David Thornley and Milt Werner to jointly present Edtech Profile's Student Component at the October Technology Committee meeting and encourage individual schools to participate in gathering student data via the survey.
  - E. Kathleen Caine to send updates for the TAC Web page, including roster, meeting dates and approved minutes, to Jeanette Rauscher at FUSD.
8. Robert Hou will let Bill Stephens, Assistant Superintendent of Business know that the TAC accepts his offer to do a presentation regarding the Sale of Site Funds at a future TAC meeting.
  9. Meeting was adjourned at 9:10 pm.