

**CNETC MINUTES OF GOVERNANCE BOARD MEETING
DECEMBER 18, 2002**

ATTENDING: MARK KNUDSON, NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
KAREN STEPHENS, NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AMANDA BURROWS, REPRESENTING PERSHING COUNTY S.D.
WANDA DAPRON, REPRESENTING ESMERALDA COUNTY S.D.
ROB ROBERTS, SUPERINTENDENT, NYE COUNTY S.D.
STEVE COOK, SUPERINTENDENT, MINERAL COUNTY S.D.
LORELL BLEAK, SUPERINTENDENT, LINCOLN COUNTY S.D.
NYKKI HOLTON, ASST. SUPERINTENDENT, LINCOLN COUNTY S.D.
LAMONT JOHNSON, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
MARY JOHNSON, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
JOHN DAVIDSON, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
KIM VIDONI, INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR
JACQUE EWING-TAYLOR, PROJECT DIRECTOR (ILL; PARTICIPATED BY
TELEPHONE)
NO SUPERINTENDENT OR REPRESENTATIVE FOR LYON COUNTY S.D.

MINUTES: *PLEASE NOTE THE BULLETED AND HIGHLIGHTED ITEMS AND
ALSO PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS.*

I. REPORT ON FIRST DISTRICT TRAINING WORKSHOP

LaMont explained that he had had difficulty in determining how to present this workshop to trainers with such diverse backgrounds and with varying degrees of skill in using technology as a tool in the classroom. He mentioned that *flexibility* was the key and that he had to continually revise as he presented. The same will apply when these district trainers train teachers within their districts—*flexibility* is the key.

It was mentioned that there had been some difficulty with the WhiteBoard during the training, but that the project now has a LCD projector as backup for future trainings. (Also Mark Howard of Tonopah H.S. notified the project that the problem with the WhiteBoard was found and corrected.)

LaMont was concerned that he felt some negativity from a few participants. Nykki Holton reported that Lincoln's representative said that he had already had PowerPoint training. LaMont explained that the intent was not to learn PowerPoint but to learn how to do a WebQuest—PowerPoint was simply the presentation tool. In that regard, Wanda Dapron, one of the district trainers, stated that she felt it was a valuable workshop for her as a teacher to learn how to use WebQuests in the classroom and that she did not get the impression it was a training on how to use PowerPoint. Amanda Burrows also mentioned that her district trainers knew it was a WebQuest training; she also mentioned

that one of her trainers, Shelly Parrish, already uses WebQuests in her teaching.

- **THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO CONTINUE THE SECOND PORTION OF THE WEBQUEST TRAINING ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, AT TONOPAH HIGH SCHOOL.**

LaMont stated that he would send out some detailed information about this second workshop to the trainers and that those who already use WebQuests in teaching certainly do not need to attend. They can go forward in teaching their colleagues how to use this tool. And this is the case for all trainings; if the district trainer already has the skill being presented, he/she does not need to attend the workshop.

Wanda DaPron mentioned that, when she goes to do the training in her district, one of her big limitations will be that she has only one monitor. It was suggested by Rob Roberts that she use a large TV and obtain the appropriate hookup device for her computer. LaMont mentioned that that is exactly what one of Elko County's elementary teachers does; she has a one-computer classroom and therefore bought a large-screen TV to use in presenting to her students.

A. STIPENDS FOR TEACHERS (IN ADDITION TO THOSE PAID TO DISTRICT TRAINERS)

During the first training workshop, several district trainers mentioned that it would be difficult to provide training to their teachers without some incentive for their participation.

- **LAMONT MENTIONED THAT HE WOULD WORK IT OUT SO THE DISTRICT TRAINERS RECEIVE THREE UNR CREDITS FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION AND THAT THE TEACHERS RECEIVE ONE UNR CREDIT FOR PARTICIPATION WITHIN THEIR OWN DISTRICTS. HOPEFULLY THIS WOULD BE INCENTIVE ENOUGH FOR TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE. OF COURSE, THERE WOULD BE AN ASSOCIATED COST. THE FEE FOR ONE GRADUATE CREDIT FOR THE TEACHERS WOULD BE ONLY \$50 BUT COULD NOT BE APPLIED TOWARD A DEGREE.**

Mark Knudson mentioned that, as previous staff development specialist for the Northeast Nevada Technology Consortium, he was faced with the same dilemma--it is nothing new. He stated that, while it would be problematic to pay teachers for participation (since the grant application was based on the NNTC project), we should not get discouraged, because we may even have a more diverse group of teachers to work with than he did. When Jacque put the grant proposal together, she had to come up with a designated dollar amount, but by no means do we need to stick with how

it was allocated in the budget. He will be happy to sign an amendment to use the funds differently. He encouraged the Consortium to use the money creatively and to adjust the budget to the needs of the Consortium. He also mentioned that, if a trainer ends up with only three people in a workshop, that is fine. Don't set quotas.

Mark mentioned that state in-service credit can also be made available to participants and that, while it does count for recertification, in some districts, it does not help with salary increases. An application simply needs to be filed with the appropriate State office along with a resume of who does the training. To receive the one credit, 7.5 hours of instruction time are necessary—but homework time counts. A list of who attended the training has to be submitted.

It is hoped that either the one UNR or one state in-service credit will be enough incentive for teacher participation in the trainings done within the district.

- **IT WAS ALSO REQUESTED THAT THE SUPERINTENDENTS CHECK WITH THEIR RPDPs TO SEE IF THEY COULD PROVIDE MONETARY SUPPORT FOR ANY NECESSARY SUBSTITUTE PAY FOR THIS PROJECT.**

B. STIPENDS FOR DISTRICT TRAINERS IF TRAINING OCCURS DURING THE WEEK—CAN THIS BE LEGALLY DONE?

It was mentioned at the first training that Lyon County S.D. teachers and the three trainers could not receive a stipend for training during regular school days/hours since they are already receiving pay from the district--their district considers that double-dipping. Mark Knudson stated that indeed this is not double-dipping according to State DOE standards and that it is "legal" for the Consortium to pay stipends to trainers; however, we must respect each district's policy. LaMont mentioned that any trainer faced with this problem could simply be paid for preparation time and workshop homework assignments. He also encouraged the district trainers to provide feedback as to what they feel their training needs are.

C. TRAVEL \$\$ MORE THAN BUDGETED

Mary Johnson mentioned that in the Consortium budget \$100 per workshop had been allocated for travel for each district trainer. However, based on the first workshop, the average cost for 12 participants was \$141.67. It was asked whether the superintendents could use other than Consortium funds to attend Governance Board meetings, particularly those held in conjunction with the regular monthly superintendents meetings (to offset this additional cost of district trainer travel). The

consensus was that the superintendents were counting on Consortium support for their travel.

- **IT WAS ALSO REQUESTED BY THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVES THAT ANY TRAINING DONE WITHIN THEIR DISTRICT SHOULD GO THROUGH THE SUPERINTENDENT TO ASSURE THAT THE TIME, PLACE, AND TRAINING ARE APPROPRIATE.**

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT

Kim Vidoni, independent evaluator of CNETC, presented a detailed needs assessment report. She mentioned that there were substantial problems getting appropriate raw data from On*Trac for her statistics.

The information for this report is based on

- A. On*Trac information (<http://ontrac.ccsd.net>) (Only two people from Mineral County completed the assigned On*Trac survey and so no data were reported for that county.)
- B. 22 personal face-to-face interviews
- C. Surveys administered at the first district training in Tonopah on December 7, 2002

Kim mentioned that there are 1,290 educators in the Consortium districts and that 606 people responded to the On*Trac survey; 77 teachers in Lincoln County completed the survey!

Kim reviewed the various tables and Mark pointed that Table 18 on page 27 is very important to the project as well as Table 12 on page 9. He complimented Kim on her thorough presentation of the data and stated that this assessment will be key to future funding.

Kim pointed out that, in the evaluation as well as the interviews, the common comment was, “We need equipment!” The district trainers expressed concern that they might receive Consortium training in areas where they don’t have the necessary equipment to support it.

Mark indicated that the state has historically paid for equipment and the U.S. DOE has paid for professional development. The tables seem to have turned, however. Wanda DaPron remarked that to keep good teachers around there is going to be a need for both—equipment and professional development. Steve Cook stated that he has plenty of equipment but now needs to get the training up to speed.

III. FUTURE WORKSHOPS

LaMont presented Pershing County S.D. district trainer Shelly Parrish's idea to the group for a workshop in her district in which she would involve her students in the actual presentation. It was mentioned that, if the district trainers had ideas like this, they would be welcomed. While there were some who felt it would be difficult to travel the distance to her school, the consensus was that this workshop would be helpful to the trainers and we would consider it for perhaps the March training. It was suggested that a compressed video might be done for the few who could not travel the distance or, alternately, that the district simply send only one trainer. Amanda Burrows stated that it was a great idea for a teacher to involve her students in the training; this would certainly alleviate the problem of obtaining and paying a substitute.

Some other topics for consideration for trainings were minor troubleshooting and electronic portfolios.

Mark Knudson mentioned three forthcoming projects for which people may have an interest:

- A. The National Leadership Institute (in DC) sponsored by the State Educational Technology Association
- B. Connected University—a project adopted by the State Department of Education and provides online professional development. The State is going to pay for 23 licenses to participate in this program. Let Mark know if you are interested.
- C. Intel's "Teach to the Future." There may be some state money available to travel to this training.

