

**DAC Minutes**  
**January 15, 2015**  
**Foothill Elementary**

*Present:* William Banning, Carol Boyan-Held, Rhiannon Parisse, Ana Huynh, Karen Van Gool, Bridget Braney, Melissa Fitch, Carin Ezal, Sandra Edgar, Susan Zink, Jill Ronkainen, Judy Blue, Laura Zizumbo, Donna Madrigal, Heather Shea, Melissa Renda & Peggy Reagan.

1. *Welcome and Introductions:* Meeting called to order by William Banning at 9:20 am.
2. *Approval of Minutes from December 18, 2014:* Motion to approve by Jill Ronkainen, seconded by William Banning, and all were in favor to approve minutes.
3. *DAC Advisory Reports on Technology Integration:*

Bill Banning began discussion referring to Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) and its 5 objectives. He asked the question, what is technology supposed to be doing today? The goal of LCAP is to *promote 21<sup>st</sup> century learning*. Learning environments should be aligned with the “real world”.

There are 4 C’s- Communication, Collaboration, Critical Thinking & Creativity. Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT)-the plan, the 5-year vision. Three workshops by Alan November have focused on this.

ERATE- State/Federal funding- subsidized technology services and purchases at reduced rate. People felt that EETT plan was obsolete, bureaucratic. Now we monitor how we are doing through LCAP. Now there is no “technology” plan but a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Plan. We need a vision. Last year there was \$80,000 available in technology grants.

Chromebooks vs. iPads- still experimenting. Let’s not let the device define it since it could be obsolete before we figure out how to use it. If we invest in technology, we need consistency and to be able to efficiently support it. It should not be about “tech plans” and specific devices but curriculum. We also need defined standards, re-distribution with expectation that every child at that grade level at every school. How do we get there? We need a plan and still have lots of questions but in trying to develop a plan the goal is that we will find what we want schools/students to have, and an idea on how it’s to be used. Another key is to find teachers that are ready.

Again, LCAP Goal is to promote 21st century learning skills. Standards need to support this. Figuring out what gaps? What capacities? All principals are on a 30-member committee with Yvonne DeGraw, the Board Representative to that committee. Shared “best practices”. Needing consistent device distribution.

Bill Banning asked the DAC reps to share how we are doing at each school. What are we most excited about (highlights)? What advice we would give on the direction of our schools in technology (concerns)? Any desires?

*Heather Shea (Isla Vista):* Advisory- content over quality and she expressed a worry over obsolete technology.

*Melissa Fitch (El Camino):* Using Lexia, Stride Academy, iPads, and Apple TV. Goal is for interactive TV set-ups. Desire is for more access, for more kids and overall *more* technology.

*Karen van Gool (Kellogg):* Karen is new to Kellogg and still learning about what types of technology is used at the school. Differentiation is hard to address. Karen has concern over standardizing, and trying to achieve equity.

Melissa Renda added that Chromebooks have the ability to collaborate. It's a cloud-based application. You can logout and have access to everything, making them easy to share.

*Sandra Edgar (Hollister):* Principal has technology integration as high priority. There is 1 device for every 2 kids. Chromebooks have keyboards so they can practice typing. In K-2, class set of iPads. There has been a change in the role of the computer lab. Lab is for testing. Sandra's desire is to have a professional development plan. Teachers need to learn how these devices are supported. What does/will IT look like? Another concern is what does "equity" look like across the district? Hollister PTA has spent time writing grants and using their own budget money to make technology integration a priority. Will "equity" stifle innovation of early adopters?

*Laura Zizumbo (Isla Vista):* There have been successes through Partners in Education and their Computers for Families program. Many low-income families have obtained computers this way. Laura's desire is for after-school programs that are affordable. For example, Robotics is too expensive for many neighborhood families.

*Jill Ronkainen (Ellwood):* The only PC school in the district. Concern with testing. In 6<sup>th</sup> grade, there is a 1:1 ration. They do a flipped class- the students watch the videos at home, and the next day discuss lecture in class. Younger grades share iPads; upper grades have Apple TV's. Jill's desire is as programs/ technology changes, that the schools stay connected with parents. A question she has was what does this technology integration look like in middle school? How will the kids make that transition? Another concern was that we not lose the physical, hands-on importance of learning. Manipulatives and building a mission are important part of learning so let's not replace all of this with a screen.

*Ana Huynh and Rhiannon Parisse (La Patera):* Concerns are with the wants/needs of the district and for the teachers. In 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades the Chromebooks are at a 1:1. iPads are for the lower grades. The higher percentage of ELAC families puts pressure on

kids. Teachers need to be equipped to utilize technology. They don't want technology for technology's sake. Desire is for teacher development.

*Melissa Renda/Carin Ezal (Mountain View):* Chromebooks for 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades, they share iPads at a 1:2 ratio in lower grades. There is a lap top cart. They are using computer labs to run the test; there are Apple TV's in all classrooms, lower grades have smart boards. They feel like MV is in need of a professional development plan to make good use of technology. They'd like to see information shared between schools on apps that are new and useful. Would like to see a data specific interpretation of what our children know.

*Bridget Braney (Foothill):* Foothill has a computer lab, 30 iPads, and Apple TV's in various classrooms. Smart carts are in all classrooms. Chromebooks and iPads are on order. Bridget started a "technology team" of students that go into classrooms to help younger grades.

4. ***School Report by Dr. Bridget Braney:***

There are two schools on campus- Foothill and Goleta Family School (GFS), which she called a school within a school. GFS is a multi-age school with a child-centered curriculum that has many outdoor school days. These two schools sometimes join together for activities, but are sometimes separate.

Enrollment has been steady at 458 students. There are 30 staff members/21 classroom teachers. 20% are socially disadvantaged, 60% are white/non-Hispanic and English Language Learners make up 10% of population with 14 languages represented. 25% of children were re-designated last year. Foothill is celebrating its 50<sup>th</sup> year.

Foothill has many leadership groups with service-learning opportunities. These groups meet during recess. There are Library Helpers, Leadership Club, Beautification Committee, Ambassadors' Program, and the Tech Team.

5. ***Next meeting:*** February 11, 2015 @ 9:15 to be held at Mountain View Elementary. Discussion will be on summer learning/intervention/Multiple-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) also known as the expansion of RTI.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy Reagan, Foothill Elementary