

MLOOC MEETING SUMMARY

JANUARY 21, 2025

The committee discussed changes to positions and roles, confusion over documents, the role of LTEs (Library Technology Educators) in supporting instruction, the need for accountability and quantification of student impact, the importance of LTEs in providing access to programs and technologies, the merging of governance plans, and the creation of a specific policy for the committee.

Members in attendance: Chip Ecks, Lyman Kaiser (V), Jan Rennie, Velvet Stepanek, Rebecca Kluck,
Mark Holthouse (V)

Ex-Officio in attendance: Brandan Comfort, Kim Gilstrap, Lauren Nelson, Nicole Ottmer

Guests in attendance: Melissa Smead, Director of Instructional Technology and Library Services
Susan Strizich, Community Member

- The Director of Instructional Technology and Library Services, Melissa Smead, presented the work of LTEs in supporting high-quality instruction.
 - The LTE program is aligned with student learning and evaluation rubrics for all teachers.
 - LTEs writing the same MSLs aligned to Colorado academic standards for consistency and positive student experience.
 - LTEs are responsible for teaching research and digital literacy MSLs (Measure of Student Learning), with flexibility based on school needs.
 - LTEs are crucial in supporting student learning, providing targeted lessons, and correlating them to standards.
 - LTEs should have specific work outlined for them and not be used for tasks outside of LTE work.
 - The LTE department reports under academics and is responsible for coaching and development.
 - Principals have control over how many students are impacted by LTEs, which should be tracked for accountability.
 - The LTEs are essential in providing access to programs and technologies, for the student body.

Recommendations:

- There is a need for context and data to tie the program's impact to student outcomes.
- The number of students affected by the program should be quantified and shown to be beneficial.

The committee needs a clear Governance Plan that includes procedures, committee structure, and specific work products. The Governance Plan is owned by and has been referred to the Board of Education.

- The original Spending Plan from 2000 and the approved 2017 Governance Plan needs to be reviewed for clarity.
- The committee should focus on operational procedures and leave any changes within the Governance Plan to the board.
- The Governance Plan should be included in board policy rather than an independently separate document.
- The recently drafted "policy" should be merged into the Committee Charges, or the Governance Plan, for simplicity and clarity.
- A specific policy should be created for the committee, with detailed bylaws supporting it.

AI-Generated Suggestions for Action Items (from LTE discussion):

- Collect the MLS data and calculate the number of students impacted by the LTE program, on an annual basis. [1:05:39](#)
 - Show the frequency and duration of impact on different grade levels [1:11:31](#);
 - Provide evidence of how the LTE program is benefiting students [0:56:49](#);
 - Contextualize the data by providing information on access to programs and technologies [1:12:22](#);
 - Tie data sets to direct student outcomes, particularly related to information literacy standards [1:12:39](#);
 - Address concerns about improving student outcomes and accountability [1:13:19](#)

TO-DO TASKS FOR FEBRUARY MEETING

(AI-Generated Suggestions for Action Items)

- Kim to distribute a copy of the original 2000 MLO Governance Plan and a copy of the Assessment Recommendations from the last review in 2022 to the MLO committee [0:15:29](#);
- Review & discuss the distributed recommendations from the previous assessment [2:08:43](#) (*Have we adopted the recommendations?*);
- Invite David Allison to talk about the security piece of the MLO [2:11:03](#);
- Discuss the need for a standard PIP Reporting Outline.

Watch the recorded meeting [HERE](#).