

**CNETC GOVERNANCE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 9, 2005**

ATTENDING:

BILL SLENTZ, CHURCHILL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY REPRESENTATIVE
LISA FONTANA, DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE
JENNIFER BYINGTON, ESERALDA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, VIA VIDEO
RICK HARDY, LINCOLN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, VIA VIDEO
SEAN MOYLE, LYON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
STEVE COOK & CHRIS HEGG, MINERAL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
ROB ROBERTS & GINGER OLSON, NYE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, VIA VIDEO
DAN FOX, PERSHING COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

LAMONT JOHNSON, UNR GOVERNANCE BOARD REPRESENTATIVE
JACQUE EWING-TAYLOR, CNETC PROJECT DIRECTOR
KEN GIBSON, TITEN PROJECT COORDINATOR
JAN NEAL, GRANT FISCAL REPRESENTATIVE
MARY JOHNSON, GRANT FISCAL REPRESENTATIVE
SAM LABEL, STUDENT WORKER

MINUTES:

I. eMINTs versus the Consortium Model

The main topic of discussion was determining whether we as the CNET Consortium should proceed beyond the June 30, 2005, year end and how we might approach Mark Knudson, State Department of Education, to request future funding. It was brought out by LaMont Johnson, UNR Consortium representative, who recently met with Mark, that Mark was strongly considering using eMINTS in funding technology in the state and that the focus would be heavily directed at student achievement. He was also told that the state would likely no longer fund the consortia--that the rural superintendents do not value the consortium and do not believe it basically has a future.

The eMINTS (enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies) program is said to "transform classrooms into places for learning where teachers and students use multimedia tools to better understand the world, work together and achieve at new and higher levels." There apparently has been some research data that show that the program has had some success in increasing student academic achievement in Missouri. It was also brought out that the program has been adopted in Utah.

LaMont explained that if eMINTS were the direction the state chooses to go, there would be a concentration of funds so that a district may get funds for one or maybe two classrooms instead of funding for a number of schools. The investment would be approximately \$40,000 per classroom and the focus would be to get that classroom totally immersed in technology

Rob Roberts, Nye

CNETC has been around for three years. We've had some lofty goals that we have not really benefited from. It has not been as productive as it could have been. I would support a new model to make us as technologically advanced as possible--and from an outside professional like eMINTS. We have difficulty finding substitutes when we pull teachers out of the classroom. I would like to see a different venue.

LaMont Johnson, UNR

My understanding is that five rural districts would be invited to participate in eMINTS, and each district would have two classrooms involved. The rest of the money would go to Clark and Washoe.

Rick Hardy, Lincoln

Our current model is so broad that there are hundreds of factors that may influence student academic achievement. We as a district would have mixed feelings about putting the money into one or two classrooms. If we are going to demonstrate student learning, we as a consortium are going to have to narrow the focus. Otherwise, I don't think the option list is very long.

Perhaps our focus could be more directly aligned with student achievement, helping teachers use data in the classroom. If teachers could track student achievement better, this would mean changing the focus a bit than, say, using digital media in the classroom. I would support the current model and do some tweaking.

Rob Roberts, Nye

I would concur and support Hardy's statement if we could show that one system of change could create positive growth.

Lisa Fontana, Douglas

To build capacity within a district, it would be nice to look at something narrow and focused.

Steve Cook, Mineral

With the eMINTS program's demonstrated success, is it the technology or is it the focus on student achievement that has made the difference? It could very well be the extensive focus on the learning.

I would want to see specifics about how the technology has made a difference in student achievement.

I am afraid our district would be left out if such a small number of classrooms are selected for concentrating funds.

I would also suggest that as a consortium, we change our focus from the train-the-trainer model.

Sean Moyle, Lyon

How long would the money be available under the new direction? I have a concern that out of all our classrooms only one or two are going to receive the benefit. I am strongly opposed to focusing on one classroom's students and teacher without spreading the wealth a bit.

Our RPDPs are currently focusing on the administration. I do not like the idea of focusing on a few classrooms or a few teachers.

Bill Slentz, Churchill

How would it be determined what classrooms would receive the funding?

LaMont Johnson, UNR

The plan to date is not that advanced.

It seems that what we really need to consider today is the "consortium model" versus the integrated learning system model.

Jacque Ewing-Taylor, UNR

The question then is, Can this narrowing of focus and more closely aligning our objectives with demonstrating student achievement be done within this type (consortium) setting or should it be done some other way?

Rick Hardy, Lincoln

I agree. I suggest that we could pull this off as a consortium and pull it off as what it is designed for: We need to use research-based strategies that have been shown to work. Maybe we could have trainers come to the sites rather than have people leave.

Lisa Fontana, Douglas

Discussed the value of site-based training and stated that it has worked very well in Douglas—not with district trainers, of course.

Rick Hardy, Lincoln

The TOSA model in the southern Nevada RPDP does just that—a couple of specialists do on-site training.

Lisa Fontana, Douglas

Can we collaborate with RPDPs on this?

LaMont Johnson, UNR

I believe that the only way we can make any influence on the decision for eMINTS or any other proposal is if Mark gets the word that this is the direction we want to go. In my conversation with Mark, he said he had not “decided” about eMINTS, leaving me to believe we have some time and he may be open to input. The only opportunity we will have to write a grant on a consortium model is if Mark gets word that this is the direction we want to go.

Rick Hardy, Lincoln

Does this decision rest solely with Mark?

LaMont Johnson, UNR

My impression is that Mark has not convinced Frank South.

Rick Hardy, Lincoln

If this group wished we could have a motion of unanimous support. We would like to narrow our focus and tie technology directly to teaching and student achievement for us all. We as superintendents should follow it up with phone calls and further discussion at a superintendents’ meeting

Rob Roberts, Nye

In my mind our current structure is like the tail wagging the dog. Our current direction is not at students but at teachers.

If the entire focus is on student achievement, the whole thing has to be redirected, especially from our perspective.

What is the most expedient way to get Hardy's suggestion accomplished?

Jacque Ewing-Taylor, UNR

The RFP is supposed to be out in February or March.

LaMont Johnson, UNR

The bottom line is, Can we do something as a consortium? Will we have an opportunity as a consortium to make a proposal? The next step would be coming up with the strategies we are going to use.

A meeting of the superintendents would be a great opportunity to discuss this and to get Mark's reasoning.

Jacque Ewing-Taylor, UNR

My sense is that timing is very critical. Maybe a phone call from each of the superintendents would be the best route. If there were time, I think it would be great to discuss Rick Hardy's motion at your next superintendents' meeting.

Jacque agreed to draft a letter to Mark Knudson for the superintendents' approval today, stating where we stand and the direction we would like to go--per today's meeting.

II. District Trainer Activity Update

Jan Neal, UNR, provided a district trainer activity update as of February 28, 2005, which showed how much of the budget for each trainer had been used. Each superintendent/representative received a copy of the update.

III. Governance Board Meeting Schedule

Steve Cook suggested that we come together at the beginning of the grant or school year and that the Project Director, Jacque Ewing-Taylor, provide monthly updates. Then, if something critical arises, we could call a face-to-face meeting. It was suggested that we provide about three dates as choices for the meeting because of superintendents' heavy schedules.

IV. Other: Substitute Pay & Future District Trainer Trainings

Mary Johnson, UNR, requested that the superintendents/representatives submit invoices on their district letterhead if they wish to be reimbursed for substitute pay for their district trainers.

Jacque pointed out that two trainings are scheduled:

- 1. April 14 & 15, Thursday-Friday
The One-Computer Classroom
Reno, UNR**
- 2. May 19-20, Thursday-Friday
School Readiness (Model used by NNETC, Elko)
Northeast Nevada Educational Technology Consortium,
Elko**