

**MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 17, 2009 COMMISSION ON  
EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
BOARD ROOM  
700 EAST FIFTH STREET  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA**

**VIDEOCONFERENCED TO:**

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
BOARD ROOM  
9890 S MARYLAND PARYWAY  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jhone Ebert, Chair  
Dr. Essington Wade, Member  
David Flatt, Member  
Dr. John Newman, Member  
Arnie Maurins, Member  
Ji Wang, Member  
Bill Slentz, Member  
Assemblyman Mo Denis, Member (arrived 10:32 a.m.)  
Dr. Keith Rheault, Ex-Officio

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Dan Stockwell, Ex-Officio  
Dori Jensen, Member  
Senator Mike Schneider, Member

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF PRESENT:**

Dr. Kim Vidoni, NDE, Educational Technology Consultant  
Christina Borino, NDE, Grants & Project Analyst  
Jane Crawford, NDE, Administrative Assistant

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Carson City Location:

Alan Medeiros, MIS Department Director, Lyon County School District  
Jerry Atkins, Technology Coordinator, Storey County School District  
Pat Miller, Interim President/CEO, KNPB Public Radi

Las Vegas Location:

Jhone Ebert, Clark County School District, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum & Professional Development Division, Commission on Educational Technology  
Lee Solonche, Director, Distance Learning, Las Vegas PBS  
Pamela Jones-Jernigan, Grant Writer, Clark County School District  
Loretta Asay, Coordinator, Instructional Technology, Clark County School District

Ely Location:

Mark Bechtel, Assistant Superintendent, White Pine County School District  
Jennifer Farnworth, Technology Specialist, White Pine County School District

Elko Location:

Susan Neal, Software Training Specialist, Elko County School District  
Joe de Braga, Director, Curriculum, Instruction and Technology, Elko County School District

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Jhone Ebert called the meeting of the Commission on Educational Technology to order at 10:02 a.m.

1. **ROLL CALL:**  
Members attendance as indicated above.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Led by Member Slentz
3. **APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES:**

Member Slentz made a motion to approve January 21, 2009 meeting's minutes, with minor edits as indicated. Member Flatt seconded the motion. The motion passed.

4. **INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONERS:**

Jhone Ebert from Clark County School District was introduced by Dr. Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, as the new Chair of the Commission on Educational Technology. As a new member to the commission, Mr. Ji Wang introduced himself as an English Second Language (ELL) teacher in Douglas County and the Technology Coordinator for Douglas County School District. He stated he is honored to become a member of this Commission.

## **5. UPDATE ON TECH PLAN ACTIVITIES SINCE THE PLAN WAS APPROVED AT THE LAST MEETING.**

Dr. Vidoni, NDE Consultant, Educational Technology, stated that the Tech Plan is adding structure and focus to the efforts in the districts to move forward.

The committee has been busy reviewing the Computer and Technology Standards to which they identified three major goals: Infrastructure & Connectivity. The committee's first step was to identify liaisons in each District to form an action group to implement the goal. The next target was identifying resources in the schools and districts. Dr. Vidoni discussed how by using SETDA Standards for 21<sup>st</sup> Century classrooms to create a survey for collection of information on current equipment across the state (see Agenda Item #5). The survey will also be used for reports to the USDOE and the Nevada Report Card. She said that the data collection should be completed and available after May 8.

Professional Development: Dr Vidoni continued discussion of using Centra for online and webinar sessions, which are a cost effective method of conducting meeting, with a group, formed to identify technology resources in schools and districts and to help develop statewide policies on EdTech Standards. Using a template, developed by Dr. Vidoni for use by School Districts and State Sponsored Charter Schools, this template will eventually lead to a standardized format for all district Tech Plans that align with the State Improvement Plan. Dr. Vidoni was pleased to find out that some districts have taken the initiative and created statewide discussions on how to address the evaluation of 8th grade technology literacy, which is a Federal Reporting Requirement.

Dr Vidoni continued by saying that the third goal of integration of the Tech Standards into other content standards has not yet started. Approval of the Tech Standards is needed before integration can start. Funding, upgraded schedule plus personnel updates will also be needed. Using instructional integration through professional development will improve our standing. These actions step are outlined in the technical standards plan

Chair Ebert asked for comments or questions.

Member Newman asked regarding school survey question #24, if 'graphing calculators' could be added to handheld devices.

Dr. Vidoni answered that it could be modified on the next year's survey.

Member Wade asked about information collection for Clark County School District. Dr. Vidoni stated that was by design, Clark is collecting their own data in a different manner.

Member Wade: Will the technology survey data collection from all districts be aligned with the School Improvement Plan? Dr. Vidoni answered that it certainly an idea that makes sense.

Assemblyman Denis did not see any questions regarding miscellaneous information about whether the rural counties have enough infrastructure, electricity, etc.

## **6. REVIEW OF COMPUTER AND TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS**

Dr. Vidoni gave a history of the advisory and review task force for Education Technology Standards. The committee was formed in late September and included three of the Commissioners from the Tech Standards commission. The task force has held three face-to-face meetings plus a number of on-line meetings using (Centra) an additional meeting was video-conferenced. Dr. Vidoni thanked Clark County for hosting the on-line meetings. A draft copy of the revised Standards has been posted on the web and the window for public comments is open at this time and will be open until May 3. After public comment is closed, the advisory committee will review comments and to prepare documents for presentation to the Academic Standards Council, that meeting is on June 16<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Ebert solicited comments.

Member Slentz commented that in reading Technology Counts, they identified Arizona as the #1 State in the area of Technology. In comparison, our standards look very good. The one interesting notion is that Arizona has gone one step further by stating performance objectives for their instructors within their Standards. Do we need to look at something like this?

Dr. Rheault explained that previously, in other academic areas, once the Standards have been adopted, NDE staff then develop performance indicators.

Dr. Vidoni advised the advisory committee has already talked about this and is looking forward to doing that.

Member Wang stated that the new Standards have clearly defined the role of Technology in the classroom. Sometimes Technology Standards are misunderstood by teachers and administrators and considered a *new subject* at the district level. In this new model, technology needs to clearly define these as a tool that should be implemented in the classroom, not as another set of content standard. Technology standards should then be integrated into other core content standards so teachers can implement the technology and core subject standards as one, otherwise it will not happen.

Chair Ebert added that the State Technology Conference is being held May 8<sup>th</sup> & 9<sup>th</sup>. There will be 400 teachers and administrators in attendance, perhaps the Committee could extend the feedback to include the Las Vegas conference in May, set up a computer at the conference and have a session at the conference so live feedback can happen.

Dr. Vidoni agreed that this could provide important insights to share. The Clark County Staff for this conference has included the information regarding the survey in their registration packets.

Chair Ebert asked for any public comment. There was none.

Due to time constraints, Assemblyman Denis stated asked to go to Agenda # 9

## **9. UPDATE ON LEGISLATURE BILLS THAT MAY AFFECT COMMISSION.**

Dr. Rheault stated that there will either be a lot of money or the extreme would be eliminating the Commission. The CET Operating Budget for 2010/11 is \$8067.00 per year. The Governor's recommended budget still includes \$4.8 million in Grant Funds, Budget Account #2699. The State Library research database funding is at \$472,000, which is a 14% reduction all of these are pending until May 6 meeting. Some of the state funds may be reduced due to \$4.2 million available in Federal Funding.

Assemblyman Denis stated as the economy continues to worsen he prefaced his comments by the fact that we still need \$500 million just to get to the Governor's budget. Assemblyman Denis will continue to fight and educate the Legislators that there is a need to continue other formula funding for innovation for Educational Technology Commission. Legislators feel that since the Commission is getting stimulus money, nothing else is needed.

Dr. Rheault addressed SB19, stated the Commission on Educational Excellence previously had a \$90 million trust fund for individual school improvement plans (white boards, computers, etc.). Currently there is no funding for this program in the Governor's budget. This bill also limits some of the funding available for Technology by prioritizing remedial programs geared toward support of eighth graders moving to ninth grade.

Dr. Rheault, citing SB163, addresses cyber bullying. This bill will affect CET in regards to safe & secure use of computers. If this bill passes we will need to review ethical use of computers and a plan to prevent of plagiarism in addition to safety & security which is now included in the Technology Standards. The Commission will need to do a detailed review to make the intent of SB163 in carried out in our Technology Standards.

SB326 eliminates all State Councils, Commissions & Committees. This bill is 186 pages long part of which would eliminate the Commission on Education Technology but it has not cleared the Senate Health and Education by required date of April 10. The reason it has not cleared is that Senator Cegavske is going to get behind SB330 since it has most of the aspects of SB326.

Dr. Rheault told the Commissioners that they should look at SB330, sponsored by Senator Horsford, which is moving forward. In addition to the elimination of the State Board section 31, would eliminate this Commission and also the remediation trust fund,

placing duties directly under the Department of Education; Sections 32 and 33 eliminate the Educational Trust Fund. The Academic Standards Council, Parent Advisory Council, Commission on Educational Excellence, Teacher Licensing Board, are also eliminated.

Under SB379, Section 1, creates a one-shot program to create a funding pool of monies that the school districts would apply and compete for. Their program may or may not include Educational Technology. This bill is still moving forward. The pooled programs would include all-day Kindergarten, programs that incorporate educational technology with the plan as established by the Commission, peer medication, geographic alliance, school counselors & support teams. Senator Washington stated that this bill is needed so that the District can establish priorities or needs. Section 4 states that the Commission will make recommendations for the allocation of all funding pooled from the programs included in Section 1 would be put into the Educational Technology Trust Fund. The Innovation and Remediation Trust Funds would be eliminated. Dr. Rheault did ask for clarification of the bill which gives this Commission review and approval of all of the above type programs and he was not sure that the Commission wants to be involved in approving application whose subject matter and or relevancy is unknown to this Commission

AB19, requirements for grant application bill is technically dead. This Bill did not clear the Assembly Education Committee by April 9<sup>th</sup>.

Member Maurins questioned why they would put all those funds into the Education Technology Trust Fund Dr. Rheault replied that right now all the other trust funds are scheduled to be eliminated.

Chair Ebert asked for any updates on the use of Stimulus Funds and the possible reduction in the current Governor's budget proposal,.

Dr. Rheault advised there is \$4.2 million in additional Federal Technology funding but those dollars probably will not be available until after Oct. 1<sup>st</sup>, the beginning of the new Federal Fiscal Year. It will be distributed 50% formula, 50% competitive. The Title IID program was scheduled to be eliminated but the omnibus bill reinstated it. Nevada is scheduled to receive \$1.6 million in funding under Title IID. That funding should be available at the start of the fiscal year, July 1. Previously the amount was split 50% formula, 50% competitive to Districts, and the program will probably keep same distribution. Dr. Rheault suggests using the previous application process.

Chair Ebert asked if there any information on the Race to the Top?

Dr. Rheault responded that the Race to the Top is \$5 Billion in Stimulus Earmark funding available to the Secretary of Education to be spent under his discretion. Dr. Rheault met with the Secretary in Washington, DC and has participated on 2 or 3 conference calls with the Secretary. The USDOE has explained that they are only interested in large grants consisting of a consort with a common goal. Secretary Duncan only wants to award 8 to 10 grants total from the \$5 billion, approximately \$400 to \$500 million per

grant. He is encouraging the states to get together to work on common core standards, not national standards, but all states would agree to recognize the core standards for English and Math. The more states participating in the consortium, the better the chance of receiving funding. To form this consortium Nevada would partner with states such as California, Arizona & New Mexico, to identify if there are items we can work on together. In conversations Dr. Rheault has had, possible ideas include an ESL program or a program to address the High Dropout rates. Dr. Rheault has also asked WestEd, (a regional lab paid for by the Federal Government to provide services to California, Arizona, Nevada & Utah) to look at the possibility of forming a consortium grant specifically for the Western States. Chair Ebert offered that some of these commission members could help with an effort such as ELL.

Dr. Rheault stated that we might want to, considering our 49<sup>th</sup> or 50<sup>th</sup> place ranking in Educational Technology, look into forming a consortium with the states that rank in the bottom 10 in the Ed Quality Counts list. In receiving this money great strides could be made on a common issue. Secretary Duncan wants to limit the number of awards because he doesn't want 50 states doing in 50 different things for the same type of programs. The Federal Department of Education is starting to talk about application information and priorities for the funds. Dr. Rheault expects to see the application in about another month. The funding will not be available until the new Federal year starting in October.

## **7. REVIEW & POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF RFP FOR USE OF STATE EDTECH FUNDS.**

Dr. Vidoni referred to page 6 of the RFP which is the timeline. The Commission is set to review applications on July 30 & 31. This RFP has not changes from the last time the Commission used it.

Dr. Rheault asked about the timing of the RFP at the beginning of the new school year. The grants will be approved for a two year period.

Member Slentz commented that this rubric point system to judge who should get the award, seems to be judging the writing ability rather than looking at the actual needs of the districts. Is there a better way to look at this?

Dr. Rheault explained that the Commission adopts the point system for the rubric, as part of the application review there is an assessment, maybe there are points specifically to the assessment to bring out the needs of the district. In the Executive Summary, Section B, the information is combined, maybe that could be broken out. Section D, District Characteristics Pages/District Needs, to get some points to that. Anything is possible if the Commission wants to modify this.

Dr Newman commented that having been a member of several grant review teams, the teams needed and appreciated specific guidelines to follow. Sometimes it is hard to

discern what the needs are. An articulated vision along with needs and specific outcomes should be apparent.

Chair Ebert reiterated the need for a clear vision of what the district will be using the funding for and the expected outcome. The Commission has, in the past, as part of the process provide the district an opportunity to verbally provide additional information. Through that process, we have been able to clarify the intent. It is very important that Dr. Vidoni and her staff provide technical support to the districts those that may need assistance. This would help ensure the applications are complete and there is no guessing as to what the real intent is.

Dr. Vidoni agreed that having a technical assistance webinar or seminar would make a lot of sense. She suggested that Clark County might be available to host a Centra meeting to accomplish that.

Motion made to approve the application with the addition of needs assessment by **Member Slentz**. Seconded by **Member Flatt**. **Action: Approved**  
Chair Ebert: **Motion carried.**

Discussion was had, Member Wade suggested adding the Needs Assessment to the District Characteristics/Needs Assessment so we don't have to add an additional section. Make it a subsection of D.

## **8. DISCUSSION ON CROSS-DISTRICT PRICE SHARING.**

Member Flatt asked if the districts are price-sharing? According to state law, we have to share prices. This may be an easy way to help each other out from county to county.

Dr. Vidoni stated that it is an area we have been working with districts. A survey was done this spring covering vendors and products and is in the process of assembling the list. Clark has not always been getting the best prices.

Dr. Rheault commented that NDE using the same sharing principal for textbook adoption. The publishing house agrees to provide materials to every district at the negotiated price. State Purchasing has a list of pre-negotiated technology equipment providers already. There is a purchasing consortium located in Minnesota that has negotiated state-wide contracts.

Administrative Assistant Jane Crawford suggested looking for the WSCA Contract on the State Purchasing website & review. Look for the 'Good of the State' contracts.

## **10. SET DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

Next Commission Meeting will be August 6 & 7, 2009.

Chair Ebert stated that this would be a face-to-face meeting to discuss applications. The submitted applications would be FedEx'd to Commissioners, they would most likely arrive July 21st. When reviewing the applications, do your due-diligence & take your time, check all the content. The work needs to be done within the timeframe.

A Work Session needs to be scheduled for the Commission on May 9<sup>th</sup>, in Las Vegas, coinciding with 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference.

#### **11. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:**

Chair Ebert commented that this has been a very productive meeting, great comments.

#### **12. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Lee Solonche, Vegas PBS volunteered the information that her station has varied resources throughout the State, resources for visually or hearing impaired for schools or individuals at no charge. They also have statewide licenses for items such as GED preparation series, available to any classroom. There is a website, [www.vegaspbs.org](http://www.vegaspbs.org) and DCMP link on the homepage or I can be contacted directly: [lsolonche@vegaspbs.org](mailto:lsolonche@vegaspbs.org) or 702-799-1010.

#### **13. ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion to adjourn made by **Member Flat**, Seconded by **Member Wade**, Motion carried.

The meeting of the Commission on Educational Technology adjourned at 2:55 p.m. on April 17, 2009

Respectfully Submitted:

---

Dr. Dr. Rheault Rheault  
Superintendent of Public Instruction

---

Jhone Ebert, Chairperson  
The Commission on Educational  
Technology

Trancribed by:

---

Lori Johnson