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Section II: Shared Vision for Learning:

In the 2015/2016 school year, the RSU5 Technology Committee worked to develop a vision for how the district would like to see our educational community using technology to improve student learning. The committee came up with the following technology vision statement, which works in support of the district's overall mission and vision statements.

This vision statement will be used in the coming years as a lens to focus district-wide technology recommendations, initiatives, implementations, and goals. It shares the goals of the Maine Department of Education’s updated technology plan requirements: to focus not on technology for technology's sake but on desired student learning and how technology can improve, deepen, and extend that learning. The vision shows explicitly the kinds of learning experiences the district’s educators, parents, students, and community value and want to see in their schools.

Technology Committee Vision (2016):

For the RSU5 community to actively incorporate up-to-date, safe, age-appropriate technology into learning so that all students have the opportunity to become:

- **Knowledge creators**
  - Students construct knowledge and make meaning for themselves and others by using digital tools to curate data and information.

- **Creative Communicators**
  - Students communicate clearly and express themselves creatively for a variety of purposes using the tools, styles, formats, and digital media appropriate to their goals.

- **Innovative Designers**
  - Students use computing or digital tools within the design process to solve problems or create new, useful, or imaginative designs or products.

- **Empowered learners**
  - Students take an active role in choosing and pursuing their learning goals, leveraging technology to plan, convey and achieve them.

- **Computational Thinkers**
  - Students identify and explore authentic problems using algorithmic thinking to propose or automate solutions.

- **Global collaborators**
  - Students use digital tools to learn from others and effectively work in teams.

- **Digital citizens**
  - Students operate in a manner that demonstrates their understanding of the opportunities, responsibilities, risks, and foundational skills required to live, learn, and work in an increasingly digital world.
Section III: Shared Leadership:

RSU5 invites members of the community to participate in the revision of the district’s Technology Plan. This committee consists of teachers, tech leads, school and district leaders, librarians, parents, and school board members. Student representation will be included in future revisions.

A. The plan for applying technology to the Vision for Learning

RSU5’s Technology Committee created a vision for learning with classroom technology in 2016. The process to create the vision took place over a number of meetings and resulted in the vision statement listed previously in this document. In prior revision efforts, the committee’s vision statement guided the work of the committee through the revision process.

B. Identifying models and examples of technology use that furthers the Vision

During discussion at Technology Committee meetings, team members shared examples of successful uses and practices with classroom technology. These examples helped drive the initial work of the committee during the visioning process.

C. Planning professional learning opportunities

A separate district level team drives professional learning opportunities. The Assistant Superintendent/Curriculum Coordinator coordinates this team. Membership includes each school principal and other district Administrative Team members as needed. This team is represented on the Technology Committee.

D. Selection of devices, apps, programs, and other tools

This is a school-based decision with information shared by teacher, principal, and school-based tech or leadership committee. If application and software will be adopted district wide, the Technology Committee will review and make a recommendation to the Administrative Team. For example, the District Technology Committee recently recommended the adoption of uniform Internet safety and awareness curriculum, Common Sense Media. The recommendation was brought to the Administrative Team by the Technology Committee for common adoption in each school.

E. Filtering and blocking policies

RSU5 meets the CIPA requirements and utilizes a locally hosted universal threat management system. RSU5 intends to push beyond the walls of the local area network to provide similar filtering through an end point security solution.
F. Appropriate Use Policies and policies related to discipline and corrective measures for inappropriate use

This is normally a school-based decision with input from teachers, school administration, the technology department, and parents. At times, these discussions will include the Administrative Team and the School Board of Directors.
PLEASE NOTE: The data in the following four sections is representative of grades 7 to 12 only. Grades Pre-K to 6 were not assessed in 2016. Interventions and Next Steps may apply to all grade levels.

Section IV: District Learning Technology Data and Action Plan:

Section IV, Part A: Student Learning & Teacher Practice (MLTI Report: Student Learning Experiences)

Results of the Data

The data show the majority of teachers self-report they believe computers and technology enhance daily life. The majority of teachers and students self-report they use technology in the classroom almost daily. However, when asked about the type of work, they self-report it is not reflective of 21st century skills, such as data analysis, solving authentic problems, and producing creative and collaborative projects.

62% of students report never being asked to create animations, demonstrations, models, or simulations.

Students self-report higher instances of 21st century learning experiences than teachers. This implies students are encouraged to be in charge of their learning and are self-directed. They are using the technology tools available to solve problems and assignments without being specifically directed by teachers. For example:

36% of students report being asked to collect and analyze data at least weekly.

10% of teachers report asking students to collect and analyze data at least weekly.

Implications

The data imply students are frequently using computers to support their learning, but not all teachers report using classroom technology to support instruction as often. This implies there are some subjects and/or teachers that are more reliant on the use of classroom technology than others. Teachers need support in finding ways to teach and develop learning activities using classroom technology to develop and foster 21st century skills like communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and authentic problem solving.

It is possible the iPad, as the 1:1 device, does not support 21st century skills such as data analysis, solving authentic problems, producing creative and collaborative projects, creating animations, demonstrations, models, and simulations. It is also possible teachers are not aware of ways to leverage the iPad for 21st century skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Parties Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a comprehensive professional development plan with dedicated PD days and embedded PD through the PLC model.</td>
<td>Complete hiring process of new Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster a climate and culture of sharing</td>
<td>Build district and school consensus</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate iPad as 1:1 device</td>
<td>Survey stakeholders; Evaluate options; Deploy laptops</td>
<td>District Technology Committee; Tech Support Team</td>
<td>Fall, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Results of the Data**

Technology use is not discussed specifically during the observation and evaluation process; however, it is apparent teachers feel encouraged in their schools to use technology for teaching and learning. Teachers want to learn more about the effective use of technology for teaching and learning. Students believe that both the school encourages the use of technology for teaching and learning and that it can enhance learning.

- **98% of teachers agree or strongly agree that the school encourages technology use teaching and learning.**
- **69% of students agree or strongly agree that the school encourages technology use teaching and learning**

**Implications**

The absence of technology as a topic during the observation process may be because technology use has been prevalent in our schools for the past 10 to 15 years. It is becoming more seamless in its integration and therefore it is not the focus of a discussion during observations and evaluations. The data show teacher and student perceptions are consistent; both believe the use of technology enhances teaching and learning.
Since students believe the school encourages technology use for teaching and learning less than teachers, this could point to teachers needing more confidence and education on how to implement or encourage technology use at the teacher-student level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Parties Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administer annual classroom technology use survey about perceived and actual use of classroom technology</td>
<td>Create annual end of year survey</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>June, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop specific language about the use of classroom technology to be included in Kim Marshall’s teacher evaluation rubric</td>
<td>Evaluate other evaluation rubrics in Maine districts</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelop a common vision for teaching and learning</td>
<td>Complete leadership hiring process</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate technology integration model</td>
<td>Outline existing staffing model and practices; Make a budget recommendation if needed</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section IV, Part C: Professional Learning (MLTI Report: Professional Learning)**

**Results of the Data**

Teachers self-report that they discuss technology use less than half the time when meeting either as departments or grade levels. The majority also self-report participating in professional development (school sponsored or non-school sponsored) less than 8 hours a year.
• Teachers discuss technology use during department or grade-level team meetings: 48% less than half the time, and another 26% said that they rarely discuss technology use during department or team time.
• Teacher-reported time spent per year participating in non-school-sponsored formal PD: 39% 1-8 hours, 39% none
• Teacher-reported time spent per year participating in non-school-sponsored informal PD: 39% 1-8 hours, 43% none
• 43% of teachers perceive that they receive no professional development for technology.

Implications

This data does not uncover whether or not teachers believe they need more, better, or different PD around technology. It only captures how many hours of technology PD teachers currently access. Professional development focusing on technology use needs to fall in a timely manner just before a teacher needs that tool, not the first day of school or mid-March if they are applying it in April. New PD opportunities need to be embedded into the existing school day through team meetings, PLCs, instructional coaching, and just in time integration support. It is important to see more choices in professional development rather than group technology training where everyone is trained on the same topic, skill, software, etc. The RSU needs to take a pedagogical approach to technology PD efforts.

“Research shows that teachers need at least 14 hours of high quality PD on a single topic for effective classroom teaching.” (DeMonte, 2013 as cited in the BrightBytes survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Parties Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase formal school and non-school technology related PD focused on integration/pedagogy</td>
<td>Complete leadership hiring process; Bring to Administrative Team</td>
<td>District PD leadership team, school leadership teams</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview students about their perceived obstacles preventing the use of technology in school.</td>
<td>Develop questions for students; randomly select students to interview; analyze results; Share with</td>
<td>Technology Integrator and administrators</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the Data

Teachers self-report that they perceive the quality of Internet speed as average or above average, and report the quality of support for hardware repair is average or above average. The majority of students self-report they have Internet access at home. A large percentage of students self-report that they feel there are obstacles preventing their use of technology at school. The majority of those students report school technology isn’t good enough and school rules limit their technology use.

- Teacher perception of quality of Internet speed: 76% said “Above Average” or “Excellent”; 0% said “Below average or poor”.
- Almost all students reported having access to the Internet and wireless at home.
- 9% of students said that not having necessary computer use skills is an obstacle to using technology at school.
- 16% of students said that their classes don’t require the use of technology.
- Teacher’s note that Internet speeds fall evenly under “excellent”, “above average”, and “average” with no response below average.
- 38% of Students perceive that “School Technology Isn’t Good Enough”. It is important to determine if this data is skewed due to the students wanting to use technology for recreational use more than its educational expectations.
- 9% of teachers and students responded, “I don’t have the necessary skills.”
- 16% of teachers and students reported, “My classes don’t require the use of technology.”

Implications

The perceived quality of Internet speed by teachers is above average. A large majority of students report having access to the Internet. Teachers perceive that the filters do not prevent access to websites needed for classes. They report that there is above average support for hardware repair and support. Few students report being members of student groups that provide technology support at school. There are a variety of obstacles that students believe prevent their use of technology at school. It is unclear whether the obstacles prevent them from doing their schoolwork or from accessing their social or entertainment media sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Parties Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create annual classroom technology use survey to poll students and staff about perceived and actual use of classroom technology</td>
<td>Create annual end of year survey</td>
<td>Administration and staff</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student-led tech teams at each school.</td>
<td>Gain consensus among schools to implement this practice</td>
<td>District and building-based leadership teams</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require professional staff to have a technology implementation goal.</td>
<td>Evaluate effectiveness of goal; Gain consensus among schools to implement new practice</td>
<td>School and building leadership</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V: Responsible Use:

Beginning with the 2106/17 school year, RSU5 will utilize Common Sense Media’s K-12 Digital Citizenship curriculum in grades K to 12. Each school in the RSU will offer this curriculum to all students. RSU5 will follow the identified scope and sequence. In addition to Internet safety and digital citizenship, RSU5 is currently evaluating the effectiveness of expanding the local Internet filtering policy to be active at all times on RSU5 1:1 equipment.

RSU5 also offers annual parent informational nights to share information about the 1:1 program in grades 6 to 12. This includes an overview of the program, day-to-day practices and procedures, and information concerning appropriate use and care of the devices.
Section VI: Certifications:

By signing below, the superintendent is acknowledging the following:

- The district has completed one Technology Access Survey per school in the district
- The information submitted in the Technology Access Survey is accurate
- The Learning Technology Plan has been approved by the SAU’s school committee
- The district is committing to work the plan (recognizing that plans do evolve over time)

3158, Regional School Unit No. 5  mcdonoughe@rsu5.org

SAU MEDMS ID # & Name  Superintendent Email

[Signature]

Superintendent Signature  Date

6/13/16
Section VII: Appendices and Related Documents

1. Appendix A - MLTI Report: Student Learning Experiences
2. Appendix B - MLTI Report: Leadership for Change
3. Appendix C - MLTI Report: Professional Learning
5. Appendix E - CIPA Compliance Documentation: IJNDB - Student Computer and Internet Safety
6. Appendix F - CIPA Compliance Documentation: RSU5 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda 2/24/10
7. Appendix G - CIPA Compliance Documentation: RSU5 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes 2/24/10
MLTI REPORT: STUDENT LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Regional School Unit No. 5 (Rsu 05)
Each component of the Maine Learning Technology framework addresses a different aspect of healthy technology integration. This report focuses on classroom factors by highlighting 16 data points from BrightBytes’ Technology & Learning framework that show the intersection of student and teacher perceptions concerning classroom practice. Alignment, or divergence, of these perceptions is an important metric in setting goals and improving learning experiences across the organization. Use this report to better understand how to identify and bridge perceptual differences.

Key Components of the Maine Learning Technology Framework

- Student Learning Experiences
- Leadership for Change
- Professional Learning
- Learning-Focused Access

At the center of the framework is a focus on creating good learning experiences for students, recognizing that the quality of the pedagogy and learning experiences drive student learning and achievement.
Student-reported frequency of computer use in the classroom

- 89% Almost Daily
- 9% Weekly
- 0% Monthly
- 1% Every Few Months
- 1% Never

Teacher-reported frequency of student computer use in the classroom

- 72% Almost Daily
- 18% Weekly
- 5% Monthly
- 5% Every Few Months
- 0% Never
### Students are asked to collect and analyze data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Least Weekly</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Few Months</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teachers ask students to collect and analyze data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Least Weekly</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Few Months</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Students are asked to conduct experiments or perform measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Least Weekly</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Few Months</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teachers ask students to conduct experiments or perform measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Least Weekly</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Few Months</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students are asked to identify and solve authentic problems

- 20% At Least Weekly
- 28% Monthly
- 24% Every Few Months
- 28% Never

Teachers ask students to identify and solve authentic problems

- 10% At Least Weekly
- 27% Monthly
- 25% Every Few Months
- 38% Never

Students are asked to create and upload art, music, movies, or webcasts

- 15% At Least Weekly
- 36% Monthly
- 32% Every Few Months
- 17% Never

Teachers ask students to create and upload art, music, movies, or webcasts

- 9% At Least Weekly
- 26% Monthly
- 42% Every Few Months
- 23% Never
Students think learning is more engaging when using technology

- 25% Strongly Agree
- 26% Agree
- 32% Are Neutral
- 12% Disagree
- 4% Strongly Disagree

Teachers think learning is more engaging when using technology

- 28% Strongly Agree
- 40% Agree
- 28% Are Neutral
- 4% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

Maine’s early and wide adoption of technology through MLTI in 2002 is a testament to the commitment that the state and its educators have to building experiences that not only prepare students for the schoolwork of today but the college and career responsibilities of tomorrow.
Students are asked to create animations, demonstrations, models, or simulations

- 5% At Least Weekly
- 15% Monthly
- 19% Every Few Months
- 62% Never

Teachers ask students to create animations, demonstrations, models, or simulations

- 4% At Least Weekly
- 6% Monthly
- 30% Every Few Months
- 60% Never
Teachers report that the quality of support for problems disrupting instruction is

- 28% Excellent
- 40% Above Average
- 26% Average
- 4% Below Average
- 2% Poor
- 0% None
Teachers believe that computers and technology enhance daily life

- 24% Strongly Agree
- 63% Agree
- 11% Are Neutral
- 2% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree
MLTI REPORT: LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE

Regional School Unit No. 5 (Rsu 05)
Maine’s educational leaders have invested heavily in the necessary infrastructure and devices to support learning. Now, they must work to create ubiquitous buy-in among all stakeholders. This report includes 6 data points from BrightBytes’ Technology & Learning framework to measure the impact that leaders have on the school environment and teacher beliefs. Use this report to identify the areas where education leaders can foster discussions and offer support to positively impact beliefs about technology use.

Key Components of the Maine Learning Technology Framework

- Student Learning Experiences
- Leadership for Change
- Professional Learning
- Learning-focused Access

Achieving the Vision for Learning takes a diverse team of school leaders who can both help build buy-in for the Vision and for the role of technology within the Vision, but also help manage the implementation of the development, adjustments, and alignment required of the Vision.

As research shows, change can elicit a multitude of responses from stakeholders, but an effective leader understands how to bring all members of the community on the journey toward successful change (Waters & Cameron, 2014).
Teachers discuss technology use during classroom observations or visits

- 7% Always
- 20% More Than Half Of The Time
- 48% Less Than Half Of The Time
- 20% Rarely
- 7% Never

Teachers discuss technology use during evaluations

- 9% Always
- 24% More Than Half Of The Time
- 52% Less Than Half Of The Time
- 13% Rarely
- 2% Never
Teachers believe the school encourages technology use for teaching and learning

- 47% Strongly Agree
- 51% Agree
- 2% Are Neutral
- 0% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

Teachers want to learn more about effective technology use for teaching and learning

- 28% Strongly Agree
- 54% Agree
- 15% Are Neutral
- 0% Disagree
- 2% Strongly Disagree
Students believe the school encourages technology use for teaching and learning

- 26% Strongly Agree
- 43% Agree
- 25% Are Neutral
- 5% Disagree
- 1% Strongly Disagree

Students believe technology use in class can enhance learning

- 33% Strongly Agree
- 29% Agree
- 24% Are Neutral
- 9% Disagree
- 5% Strongly Disagree
Jan 1, 2016 to Present

MLTI REPORT: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Regional School Unit No. 5 (Rsu 05)
Developing a professional learning plan that aligns with the Vision for Learning is a fundamental step to achieving success within the Maine Learning Technology framework. This report includes 4 data points from BrightBytes’ Technology & Learning framework to highlight the current delivery and quality of professional learning. Use this report to identify professional development areas that need more attention, ultimately allowing you to create engaging and effective learning opportunities for your educators.

Key Components of the Maine Learning Technology Framework

- Student Learning Experiences
- Leadership for Change
- Professional Learning
- Learning-Focused Access

District-provided professional learning opportunities and supports must be designed to effectively encourage and assist teachers to successfully bolster and broaden classroom practices.
Teachers discuss technology use during department or grade-level team meetings

- 4% Always
- 17% More Than Half Of The Time
- 48% Less Than Half Of The Time
- 26% Rarely
- 4% Never
Teacher-reported time spent per year participating in school-sponsored PD

- 4% Over 33 Hours
- 17% 17 To 32 Hours
- 15% 9 To 16 Hours
- 54% 1 To 8 Hours
- 9% None

For both new and veteran teachers, technology-related professional learning develops competencies, influences teacher attitudes about technology in the classroom, and helps teachers find new tools to support student learning (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012).
Teacher-reported time spent per year participating in non-school-sponsored formal PD

- 2% Over 33 Hours
- 11% 17 To 32 Hours
- 9% 9 To 16 Hours
- 39% 1 To 8 Hours
- 39% None

Teacher-reported time spent per year participating in non-school-sponsored informal PD

- 2% Over 33 Hours
- 7% 17 To 32 Hours
- 9% 9 To 16 Hours
- 39% 1 To 8 Hours
- 43% None
Jan 1, 2016 to Present

MLTI REPORT: LEARNING-FOCUSED ACCESS

Regional School Unit No. 5 (Rsu 05)
Access isn’t limited to physical devices, but includes infrastructure and services to support the use of technology. Maintaining low barriers to its use both in and out of school remains critical to improve classroom experiences. This report contains 6 data points from BrightBytes’ Technology & Learning framework to highlight the level and quality of technology access currently in place. Use this report to identify and improve aspects of the teaching and learning environment that foster a sense of experimentation and encourage higher levels of meaningful technology use.

Key Components of the Maine Learning Technology Framework

- Student Learning Experiences
- Leadership for Change
- Professional Learning
- Learning-Focused Access

All learners—both adults and children—have access to the devices, connectivity, apps, programs, and services they need, as they need them, and with minimum barriers to their learning.

Reliable, high quality technology makes possible things, such as connecting with peers from other parts of the world, increased collaboration, and lifelong learning habits (Mediaplanet & Duncan, 2014).

CASE™ Score Legend

- Beginning 800 - 899
- Emerging 900 - 999
- Proficient 1000 - 1099
- Advanced 1100 - 1199
- Exemplary 1200 - 1300
The perceived quality of internet speed as reported by teachers is:

- 34% Excellent
- 42% Above Average
- 24% Average
- 0% Below Average
- 0% Poor
- 0% N/A

Student Access to Internet and Wireless at Home
Teachers report that school filters prevent access to websites needed for classes:

- 6% Never
- 53% Rarely
- 35% Less Than Half Of The Time
- 6% More Than Half Of The Time
- 0% All Of The Time

Teachers report that the quality of support for hardware repair is:

- 26% Excellent
- 30% Above Average
- 36% Average
- 2% Below Average
- 2% Poor
- 4% None
Student-reported membership in student groups that provide technology support at school

学生们认为以下障碍阻碍了他们在学校使用技术。

- 9% “我不具备必要的技能。”
- 16% “我的课程不需要使用技术。”
- 38% “学校的技术不够好。”
- 45% “学校规则限制了我的技术使用。”
- 22% “我的学校有不同的计算机或软件，我习惯了。”
STUDENT COMPUTER AND INTERNET USE AND INTERNET SAFETY

RSU5’s computers, network, and Internet access are provided to support the educational mission of the schools and to enhance the curriculum and learning opportunities for students and school staff. This policy and the accompanying rules also apply to laptops and tablets issued directly to students, whether they are used at school or off school premises.

Compliance with RSU5’s policies and rules concerning computer and Internet use is mandatory. Students who violate these policies and rules may have their computer privileges limited, suspended, or revoked. The building principal is authorized to determine, after considering the circumstances involved, whether and for how long a student’s computer privileges will be altered. The building principal’s decision shall be final.

Violations of this policy and RSU5’s computer and Internet rules may also result in disciplinary action, referral to law enforcement, and/or legal action.

RSU5 computers remain under the control, custody, and supervision of the school unit at all times. The school unit monitors computer and Internet activity by students. Students have no expectation of privacy in their use of school computers, whether they are used on school property or elsewhere.

INTERNET SAFETY

RSU5 uses filtering technology designed to block materials that are obscene or harmful to minors, and child pornography. Although RSU5 takes precautions to supervise student use of the Internet, parents should be aware that RSU5 cannot reasonably prevent all instances of inappropriate computer and Internet use by students in violation of Board policies and rules, including access to objectionable materials and communication with persons outside of the school. The school unit is not responsible for the accuracy or quality of information that students obtain through the Internet.

In the interest of student Internet safety, RSU5 also educates students about online behavior, including interacting on social networking sites and chat rooms, the dangers of hacking, and issues surrounding “sexting” and cyberbullying awareness and response.

The Superintendent/designee shall be responsible for integrating Internet safety training and “digital citizenship” into the curriculum and for documenting Internet safety training.

The Superintendent shall be responsible for implementation of this policy and the accompanying “acceptable use” rules. The Superintendent/designee may implement additional administrative procedures or school rules consistent with Board policy to govern the day-to-day management and operations of the school unit’s computer system.

Students and parents shall be informed of this policy and the accompanying rules through student handbooks, the school website, and/or other means selected by the Superintendent.
Legal Reference: 20 USC § 677 (Enhancing Education through Technology Act)
47 USC § 254(h)(5) (Children’s Internet Protection Act)
47 CFR § 54.52
Federal Communications Commission Order and Report 11-125

Cross Reference: EGAD - Copyright Compliance
GCSA - Employee Computer and Internet Use
IJNDB-R - Student Computer and Internet Use Rules
IJND – Distance Learning Program

Adopted: February 24, 2010
Revised: June 13, 2012
Revised: November 20, 2013
1. The meeting was called to order at _____p.m. by Chairperson Nelson Larkins

2. Attendance:
   ______Jonathan Dawson ______Melinda McKechnie
   ______Kristen Dorsey ______John Morang
   ______Eric Dube ______Beth Parker
   ______Cori Holt ______Elizabeth Peters
   ______Brenda Kielty ______Laurie Poissonnier
   ______Nelson Larkins

3. Pledge of Allegiance:


   A. Consideration of action to approve the Minutes of January 27, 2010 and February 10, 2010
      as presented barring any errors or omissions.

      Motion:___________2nd:__________________Vote:______________

5. Adjustments to the Agenda:

6. Good News & Recognition:

   A. Report from Student Government
   B. Digital Revolution Presentation – Karen Massey
   C. LSiLL – Will Pidden

7. Reports from Administrators:

   A. Cheryl White – Administrative Update
   B. Beth Willhoite - Administrative Update
   C. Peter Buckley - Administrative Update
   D. Ryan Gleason – Administrative Update
   E. Ray Grogan - Administrative Update
   F. Bob Strong - Administrative Update
   G. Sarah Simmonds – Professional Development Update

8. Superintendent’s Report:

   A. Legislative Update
   B. Community Budget Meetings Report Out

9. Public Comments (related to matters under consideration by the Board):
10. Unfinished Business:

11. New Business:

   A. Consideration of action to establish FY’11 budget priorities.
      
      Motion:__________________________ 2nd:________________________ Vote:________________________
      
   B. Consideration of action to approve a one Principal administrative structure for Mast
      Landing School.
      
      Motion:__________________________ 2nd:________________________ Vote:________________________
      
   C. Consideration of action on the Transportation analysis.
      
      Motion:__________________________ 2nd:________________________ Vote:________________________
      
   D. Consideration of action to adopt the Strategic Plan Framework.
      
      Motion:__________________________ 2nd:________________________ Vote:________________________
      
12. Financial Reports:

   A. RSU No. 5 Financial Statement February 17, 2010
   
13. Communications (Consent Agenda):

   A. Freeport High School 2010-2011 Program of Studies
   
14. Board Comments (Reports from Sub-Committees):

   A. Communications
   B. Finance
   C. Negotiations
   D. Policy
   
15. Personnel:

16. Policy Review:

   A. Policies Packet 10-3 will be distributed for policy book update.
   
   B. Policies Packet 10-6 will be distributed for review with plans for 1st Read on
      March 24, 2010 and 2nd Read/Final Adoption on April 28, 2010.
      
   C. 2nd Read on the Following Policies: Packet 10-4
      
      1. Board of Directors Self-Evaluation
      2. IGA – Curriculum Development and Adoption
3. IHA – Basic Instructional Program  
4. IHBEA – Program for Limited English Proficient Students  
5. IJND – School Web Site Policy  
6. IJNDB – Student Computer and Internet Use  
7. IJNDB – E – Student Computer/Internet Use Acknowledgment Form  
8. IJNDB – R – Student Computer and Internet Use Rules  
9. IJOA – Field Study and Expeditions  
10. IJO – School Volunteers  
11. IK – Student Achievement/Evaluation of Student Achievement  
12. IKAB – Report Cards/Progress Reports  
13. IKB – Homework  
14. IKC – Grade Point Average – Class Rank  
15. IKF – Graduation Requirements  
16. IKFA – Early Graduation  
17. IKFB – Graduation Exercises  
18. IKFC – High School Credits for Pre-High School  
19. IMBB – Exemption from Required Instruction  

Motion:_____________ 2nd:_____________ Vote:_____________  

D. 1st Read on the Following Policies: Packet 10-5  

1. BB – School Board Legal Status  
2. BBB – Unexpired Term Fulfillment/Vacancies  
3. BEDC – Quorum  
4. BID – Board Member Compensation and Expenses  
6. JFBA – Admission of Resident Students  
7. JFABD – Admission of Homeless Students  
8. JGAA – Assignment of Students to Classes – Five-Year Olds  
9. JGAB – Assignment of Students to Classes: Transfer Students and Home Schooling Students  
10. JHCB – Release Time for Religious Instruction  
11. JIC – RSU No. 5 School Department Code of Conduct  
12. JIH – Questioning and Searches of Students  
13. JJ – Extracurricular Activities  
14. JJAB – Student Groups – Limited Open Forum  
15. JE – Student Fundraising Activities  
16. JKB – Detention of Students  
17. JKD – Suspension of Students  
18. JKE – Expulsion of Students  
19. JKE-R – Expulsion of Students Guidelines  
20. JKF – Disciplinary Removal of Students with Disabilities  
21. JKG – Physical Restraint  
22. JKG – Time Out Rooms and Therapeutic Restraint  
23. JLC – Student Health Requirements and Services  
24. JLCC – Communicable/Infectious Diseases  
25. JLCD – Medical Alert List Policy  
26. JLCE – First Aid and Emergency Medical Care
27. JLCEE – Policy Regarding Do Not Resuscitate Requests
28. JLF – Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect
29. JLIB – Student Dismissal Precautions

17. Executive Session:

A. To enter into Executive Session as outlined in 1 M.R.S.A § 405(6)(D) for the purpose of discussing a labor contract issue with the Coastal Education Association.

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________

Time In: ____________ Time Out: ____________

18. Action as a Result of Executive Session:

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________

19. Executive Session:

A. To enter into Executive Session as outlined in 1 M.R.S.A § 405(6)(D) for the purpose of discussing the Durham Educational Support Personnel side letter of agreement.

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________

Time In: ____________ Time Out: ____________

20. Action as a Result of Executive Session:

A. Consideration of action to ratify the Durham Educational Support Personnel agreement.

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________

21. Executive Session:

A. To enter into Executive Session as outlined in 1 M.R.S.A § 405(6)(D) for the purpose of discussing administrator, support staff and teacher negotiations for RSU No. 5.

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________

Time In: ____________ Time Out: ____________

22. Action as a Result of Executive Session:

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________

23. Adjournment:

Motion: ____________ 2nd: ____________ Vote: ____________
RSU No. 5 Board of Directors Meeting
Wednesday, February 24, 2010 – 6:30 P.M.
Freeport High School Cafeteria
Meeting Minutes

(NOTE: These Minutes are not official until approved by the Board of Directors. Such action, either to approve or amend and approve, is anticipated at the March 24, 2010 meeting).

CALLED TO ORDER:
Chairperson Larkins called the meeting to order at 6:33 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Jonathan Dawson, Kristen Dorsey, Eric Dube, Cori Holt, Brenda Kielty, Nelson Larkins, Melinda McKechnie, John Morang, Beth Parker, Elizabeth Peters, Laurie Poissonnier

MEMBERS ABSENT:

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

4. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:

A. VOTED: (1) To approve the Minutes of January 27, 2010 and February 10, 2010. (Morang – Peters) (11 – 0)

5. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

None

6. GOOD NEWS & RECOGNITION:

A. Report from Student Government – Josh Sturtevant, President of the Student Council, reported Students are settling into second semester. Seniors are in classes through April then start their senior projects. The Winter Carnival was held before February vacation with a day full of school spirit activities. The Service Club held a benefit for Haiti and raised $800. The high school Boys Nordic Ski Team won the State Championship.

B. Digital Revolution – Karen Massey, high school Social Studies teacher, and her Topics in the Social Sciences students reported on the sociology research project they completed. The class decided to research media. Students and staff at the high school were surveyed on different types of media they own and also the types of media they use. The students then compiled the survey results.

C. LSill – Will Pidden, Durham Elementary Principal, reported on the Linking Science Inquiry and Literacy Learning grant. This is a three year grant from Maine Math and Science to work on science units. The initial work was figuring out what do students need to learn and how are we doing it. Grade level teams of teachers work together. Deb Bartlett, 4th grade teacher and Adele Hassett, 5th grade teacher, presented work done by two of their classes to help students think like scientists. Students use science notebooks to encourage discussions about the experiment, what they saw during the experiment and the outcome.
7. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS:

A. Cheryl White, Morse Street School Principal, reported enrollment is currently at 260. The students have been working on a community building activities to benefit Freeport Community Services food bank. Nance Comyns will be an artist in residence. Due to schedule changes made in September teachers have been able to come together once a week to work on PLC and RTI, this work is very valuable.

B. Beth Willhoite, Mast Landing School Principal, reported enrollment is currently at 255 down from 259 in September. The musical was held before February vacation with 100 students performing in “Pettingill”. Students are hiking the Appalachian Trail by tracking their physical activity and marking the trail at school. Student Council has raised over $1,000 for Haiti. They are also working with Freeport Community Services on the hand-to-hand food drive. Poet Paul Janeczko will be an artist in residence for three days. NECAP and NWEA reports were sent home to parents today.

C. Peter Buckley, Pownal Elementary Principal, reported on the new “Being Caught Being Good Program” that rewards students for doing something good. The school received a $750 grant from Green Schools which will pay for a garden to be planted, harvested and the ingredients will be made into salsa. The musical “Music Man” will be held at the end of March. Pownal Elementary hosted a RTI workshop put on by the DOE. We have worked with Anita Barnhart on Ready, Set, Science. Two middle school students won gold and silver in the Scholastic Poetry competition.

D. Ryan Gleason, Durham Elementary Assistant Principal, reported they have been working on school culture with the action team. Peer to Peer aggression is an area they are focusing on. January was bullying awareness month and John Jenkins, former mayor of Auburn, kicked off the events. Both parents and students have been involved in the awareness program. K-2 students worked on terminology; grades 3-5 created anti-bullying messages to display in the school; grades 6-8 had in depth discussions; and parents attended a presentation by Chuck Saufler. Next steps will be to send out surveys in March on school culture and finalize the peer to peer aggression rubric.

E. Ray Grogan, Freeport Middle School Principal, reported the students are doing great things but nobody knows so they now have two parent volunteers to communicate what is happening at school. The Alpine and Nordic Ski Teams received the good sportsmanship award. The 6th grade received a grant for physical fitness. The 6th grade has also switched to 1-to-1 laptops by reallocating resources. Five students are participating in Virtual High School courses. Senator Susan Collins spoke with the students in the fall and was impressed with their behavior. We are making a more conscious effort letting other students know when kids are doing good things via student e-mail.

F. Bob Strong, Freeport High School Principal, reported twelve students are taking courses through Virtual High School this semester and 28 students are using Plato. One Acts start this weekend with a student written and directed play. April 9th will be career day at the school with business people invited in to speak with students. A SAT prep course has been offered on late start Wednesdays with 20 students participating. PLC’s are in place and almost 2/3 of the faculty are trained as facilitators. We are scheduling parent conferences electronically. The Program of Studies for 2010-2011 will only be printed for freshmen with online access for the rest of the
student body. Pizza lunches with the Principal and Assistant Principal have been taking place with seniors to talk about their 3 ½ year career at the high school.

G. Sarah Simmonds, Curriculum Director, reported on the February 1st professional day. Teachers K-8 worked district-wide with time built in for people to talk and share information. Teachers K-2 focused on writing instruction. Teachers grade 3-5 and 6-8 focused on being able to access and interpret NWEA data. Grade 9-12 teachers focused on technology and curriculum development. Grade K-8 specialists focused on curriculum assessment and development. The Ed Techs focused on individual learning styles and new Special Education Ed Techs trained in positive behavior.

8. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT:

A. Legislative Update: Superintendent Welsh reported on good news from the Appropriations Committee, corporate income taxes have come in $51 million higher than expected. They are looking at allocating some of the money to K-12 education and Health and Human Services. We will learn more over the next few weeks.

The Education Committee reported out on LD 570. Language is included for an opt-out clause for systems that have been part of an RSU/AOS for at least three years. They also included language about a common election date. School systems are also allowed to ask the question this year whether or not to continue to hold a BVR. We will wait to hear more about LD 570.

B. Community Budget Meetings Report Out: Superintendent Welsh reported five public budget meetings were held during the month of February in conjunction with the parent groups at the schools. The intent of the meetings was to provide information about an anticipated reduction in state subsidy; present brainstorm ideas for feedback; and hear from citizens other cost-savings or revenue producing ideas. The meetings were well attended by a diverse group of taxpayers and staff members. The following themes emerged as a result of these discussions: class size; academic offerings; volunteers and donations; administration; transportation; facilities; wages and benefits; participation fees; and revenues. The notes from each of the meetings will be posted on the RSU5 website. Budget presentations to the Board will begin on March 9th and 10th followed by two months of budget work. The last steps will be the Annual Budget Meeting and the BVR votes.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Hank Ogilby, CEA President asked the Board to consider the feedback received at the public hearing before making a decision on the transportation analysis.

Tom Hudak, Freeport resident, mentioned a potential liability insurance issue with contracted bus service.

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

None
11. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Consideration of action to establish FY’11 budget priorities.

No action taken.

B. **VOTED: (2) To approve a one Principal administrative structure for Mast Landing School.**
(Morang – Parker) (11 – 0)

C. **VOTED: (3) To adopt Option #1 of the Transportation Analysis.**
(Larkins – McKechnie) (10-0-1 Dawson)

D. **VOTED: (4) To adopt the Strategic Plan Framework (Holt – Peters) (11 - 0)**

12. FINANCIAL REPORT:

A. RSU No. 5 Financial Statement February 17, 2010

13. COMMUNICATIONS (Consent Agenda)

A. Freeport High School 2010-2011 Program of Studies.

14. BOARD COMMENTS (Reports from Sub-Committees):

A. Communications – Betsy Peters reported the committee met on February 4, 2010 with Kristen Stetson, a professional graphic designer, from Pownal. Kristen presented a draft design for the RSU5.org website. The goal is to have this new design ready prior to the FY’11 Board budget meetings which begin on March 9th.

B. Finance – Eric Dube reported the committee met on February 10th and February 24th. At the February 10th meeting the committee received a presentation from John Hepfner of Maine Natural Gas. Maine Natural Gas is planning to install gas lines that will be available for Pownal Elementary, Morse Street School and Freeport High School. They provided a cost/benefit analysis of converting our current oil burners to gas. During the next month we will be gathering more details for a full presentation to the Board in March/April.

Strategic indicators planning meeting dates were discussed as well as a process for committee member selection for the task force. We will invite one member from each community, and review requests from others. The first meeting has been scheduled for March 2nd.

The anticipated budget shortfall for 2010-2011 is $900,000 with $420,000 in stimulus funds. An additional finance committee meeting was held on February 24th to present the draft budget to the committee and review the presentation to the Board on March 9th and 10th. Several community budget meetings have been held. The RSU will be going out to bid for audit services and insurance for new contracts beginning with the 2010-2011 school year.

C. Negotiations – Nelson Larkins reported a meeting was held for Pownal support staff negotiations, no additional dates have been set. We meet with teachers on February 25th.
D. Policy – Cori Holt reported the committee met on February 12th to finalize packet 10-4 for 2nd read/adoption for action tonight. The committee received feedback on the health-related policies in packet 10-5. The committee considered and responded to this feedback. There were some recommendations regarding consistent procedures that need to be developed for all schools. Administration and staff will work together to develop these procedures. The revised packet 10-5 was prepared for 1st Read tonight and 2nd Read/Adoption targeted for March 24th. Policy packet 10-6 was reviewed and compiled. It will be distributed tonight with 1st Read scheduled on March 24th and 2nd Read/Adoption targeted for April 28th.

15. PERSONNEL:

None

16. POLICY REVIEW:

A. Policies Packet 10-3 was distributed for policy book update.

B. Policies Packet 10-6 was distributed for review with plans for 1st Read on March 24, 2010 and 2nd Read/Final Adoption on April 28, 2010.

C. Voted: (5) To adopt the following policies: Packet 10-4 (Holt – Poissonnier) (11 – 0)

1. Board of Directors Self-Evaluation
2. IGA – Curriculum Development and Adoption
3. IHA – Basic Instructional Program
4. IHBEA – Program for Limited English Proficient Students
5. IJND – School Web Site Policy
6. IJNDB – Student Computer and Internet Use
7. IJNDB – E – Student Computer/Internet Use Acknowledgment Form
8. IJNDB – R – Student Computer and Internet Use Rules
9. IJOA – Field Study and Expeditions
10. IJOC – School Volunteers
11. IK – Student Achievement/Evaluation of Student Achievement
12. IKAB – Report Cards/Progress Reports
13. IKB – Homework
14. IKC – Grade Point Average – Class Rank
15. IKF – Graduation Requirements
16. IKFA – Early Graduation
17. IKFB – Graduation Exercises
18. IKFC – High School Credits for Pre-High School
19. IMBB – Exemption from Required Instruction

D. 1st Read on the Following Policies: Packet 10-5

1. BB – School Board Legal Status
2. BBBE – Unexpired Term Fulfillment/Vacancies
3. BEDC – Quorum
4. BID – Board Member Compensation and Expenses
5. JFAA - Admission of Resident Students
6. JFABD – Admission of Homeless Students
7. JGAA – Assignment of Students to Classes – Five-Year Olds
8. JGAB – Assignment of Students to Classes: Transfer Students and Home Schooling Students
9. JHCB – Release Time for Religious Instruction
10. JIC – RSU No. 5 School Department Code of Conduct
11. JIH – Questioning and Searches of Students
12. JJ – Extracurricular Activities
13. JJAB – Student Groups – Limited Open Forum
14. JJE – Student Fundraising Activities
15. JKB – Detention of Students
16. JKD – Suspension of Students
17. JKE – Expulsion of Students
18. JKE-R-Expulsion of Students Guidelines
19. JKF – Disciplinary Removal of Students with Disabilities
20. JKG – Physical Restraint
21. JKGA – Time Out Rooms and Therapeutic Restraint
22. JLC – Student Health Requirements and Services
23. JLCC – Communicable/Infectious Diseases
24. JLDA – Medical Alert List Policy
25. JLCE – First Aid and Emergency Medical Care
26. JLCEE – Policy Regarding Do Not Resuscitate Requests
27. JLF – Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect
28. JLIB – Student Dismissal Precautions

17. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. VOTED (6): To enter into Executive Session as outlined in 1 M.R.S.A § 405(6)(D) for the purpose of discussing a labor contract issue with the Coastal Education Association. (Dube – Morang) (11 – 0)

Time In: 9:10 P.M.  Time Out: 11:05 P.M.

18. ACTION AS A RESULT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. VOTED (7): To concur with the Level II decision of the Superintendent of Schools in the Coastal Education Association “Contracted Nursing Services” grievance and to endorse the findings and reasons noted in the Level II Superintendent’s response and to instruct the Superintendent of Schools to draft a Level III response based upon discussion by the Board members. (Poissonnier – Parker) (9 – 2 Dube, McKechnie)

19. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. The Executive Session as outlined in 1 M.R.S.A § 405(6)(D) for the purpose of discussing the Durham Educational Support Personnel side letter of agreement was tabled.
20. ACTION AS A RESULT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION:

None

21. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. The Executive Session as outlined in 1 M.R.S.A § 405(6)(D) for the purpose of discussing administrator, support staff and teacher negotiations for RSU No. 5 was tabled.

22. ACTION AS A RESULT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION:

None

23. ADJOURNMENT:

Voted: (5) To adjourn at 11:08 P.M. (McKechnie – Parker) (11 – 0)

Shannon L. Welsh, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools