San Diego Unified School District
i21 Now
Digital Policy and Tools Subcommittee
January 27, 2014
Education Center, Room 2226

Present: Barbara Allen, Darrell Stewart, Kent Christenson, Ileana Engle, Harlan Klein, Darryl La Gace (remote), Jeremy Recktenwald (remote), Jennifer Roberts, Michael Scarpella, Mike Senise, Matt Spathos, Jeffrey Thomas

1. Welcome and Introductions – Barbara Allen

Committee members were welcomed. Those present introduced themselves to the rest of the committee.

2. Review of Subcommittee Purpose – Darrell Stewart and Barbara Allen

Darrell stated that the purpose of this group is to expand our thinking. No idea is too far fetched. He encouraged the group to think completely outside the box, not determining what is better. We want to expand the viability for this project to give students tools to be better citizens. Leave the products at the door.

Barbara explained that starting around the concept of where we are now, we are looking at policies that best support 21st Century learning environments including hardware, software, applications, form factor, support, and policy changes. Equity and Access are the cornerstones of i21. We knew it was a radical idea but it is important that every kid in every classroom and every teacher in every school have access. Mobility is the next step for i21. After three years of Learning on the Go (LOGO) we know what we need to make it successful.

3. Current i21 Devices and Policies – Barbara Allen

The vision and goals of i21 focus on equity and access. We are looking at transforming the learning environment - what would education be like if we took away the excuses. We are transforming the learning environment with quality technology-based teaching and learning tools. What we have done with i21 seemed impossible, but here we are in Year 5. It was important to make delivery of curriculum the best it can be. We looked at a shift in the model for delivering instruction, to make engaging, student-centered classrooms. We are looking at where we are now and where we need to be. Equitable learning was the grand plan when i21 was launched. We need to remember the biggest thing is how to change the way we do things to meet the needs of students.

At schools, this provides a way to jump in to change other things like how we relate to teachers and professional development. We have equipped schools with a new learning environment: teacher devices, student devices, printers, doc cameras, interactive Promethean boards. But it is not about the equipment – It is about how all these devices work together to create the optimum learning environment. As we consider new digital tools and resources, we need to be sure that all components meet requirement that are required by the i21 interactive suite. How does the student device interact with the rest of the technology, the software, Active Engage, Active Inspire, and how does this enhance learning for the students?

To date we have installed 4,432 Promethean boards in classrooms and distributed 5,934 tablets to teachers. We have provided students with 80,228 Netbooks, 28,700 iPads, and 11,300 Android devices. We know how to get classrooms to a 1:1 environment and now we need to think about, dream about where to go next.

The LOGO 1:1 laptop program was piloted at ten middle schools. This program provides mobility of student devices. All students have a device signed out to them for the school year that they can take with them when they leave the school campus each night. We focused attention on the initiative that education doesn't stop at the gate but should be accessible 24/7. This differs from regular i21 schools where students use classroom devices that are kept in mobile carts in each classroom. The vast majority of classrooms in the district use the cart model as opposed to kids who have individual devices so they have access to resources to do the work at home. Students have access to the 3G network with the content filtered (even if they are using their home network). If the teachers can count on the kids having access at home, how does this change teaching? Some textbooks are available online, and as we adopt curriculum, we want to make sure it is offered electronically.

Matt raised the question of why middle schools were chosen for the LOGO project. There are many reasons why this is a good place to start. Students in middle schools are still in a grade configuration, but at high schools they attend classes by subject where a class may have students in several grade levels. Mike Senise taught 6th and 7th grader and noted that innovative things are best received at the middle level because students are flexible at that age, especially at the 6th grade level. These students are willing and capable to cultivate the change. Jennifer commented that most new teachers are younger and start at the middle level and they tend to be more willing to try new things. Jeff noted that at high schools the graduation clock is ticking, so the structure is more rigid. Many high school teachers focus on their own content area and don't flex well when they have to do other subjects or integrate technology. Harlan stated that middle school teachers are more willing to accept the challenge, and their relationship with students has or a more social dynamic. The middle school philosophy is very student-centered with students having the opportunity to try out many different things. Technology might be one of those avenues. Teachers have the opportunity to teach students responsibility. Students have consequences (lunch detention) if they don't charge their devices or forget to bring them to school. Jennifer said innovation takes place faster at middle schools where the campuses are usually smaller and parents are still more involved. Change is slower at high schools.

LOGO provides each student with a netbook with broadband access, a netbook bag with student ID, a charger, filtered internet content, electronic textbooks, and software programs including word processing, video editing, creating flipcharts and electronic notebooks, all compatible with the district infrastructure and supported by the district's IT Department. The student devices remain with the teacher in the classroom at the end of the school year. Jennifer commented that students were dreading leaving the LOGO program upon moving to a new school. Barbara noted that many students exposed to LOGO equipment did not have it available at home. Jennifer wondered if teachers bought their own devices once they left the LOGO program.

Timing is good right now because of common core. Lines are getting blurred. Jennifer Roberts noted that when teachers go to technology training they bring their computers, but when they are asked to attend subject area trainings almost nobody brings a device. They get printed handouts that could be digital. Curriculum workshops need to incorporate the use of digital tools and resources as they approach Common Core instruction. It is important that we demonstrate to teachers how this looks using technology since it is an important part of the new standards and SDUSD is positioned to use it to the fullest. Barbara commented, stating that we need to show teachers how technology and their subjects go together. Matt stated that the vision is about embedding technology into every subject area, how we are going to leverage, transform, reinventing how technology looks and feels. It needs to be part of the fiber of every day teaching.

4. Questions and Idea Sharing

Jennifer – Are we moving toward a system that is not cart based? Are we looking at LOGO for all students?

Matt – This is only possible if we can support it. There needs to be web-based curriculum and web-based assessment. Maybe the answer is no if schools/teachers are not ready.

Barbara – This is a goal, but we do ourselves a disservice if the schools are not ready. That is why ten schools were selected for the pilot. Teachers and administration must be ready to manage a 1:1 take home program. The community has to be ready also. We are talking about an environment that needs a well-designed implementation plan.

Darryl – One big piece that is critical is equitable access to broadband. Remember that the reason some were very successful was because every students could do what the teachers assigned both at and away from school.

Matt – 55% of the district's 130,000 students get free lunch. Those students can be provided with wired broadband for around $7. The district made a decision to lower class size which is a recurring cost of $3 million per year. We need to get the Board to understand this is doable with the size of the district's budget. He thinks we can put together a framework. Sustainability is important. Wired broadband can be available at less than $10 per month at the home of any free lunch student in the district with no contract and no deposit and no credit check required. Some would argue that broadband is food for the mind.

Michael – It's definitely something the way district did it with 3G, whether on or off campus they have filtered access and 100% access to their content. That component is huge. It is overwhelming for other districts to see this. You obviously have to crawl before you walk.

Ileana – What does the 3G, 4G look like as far as connecting our kids?

Darryl – In the LOGO initiative you do have the numbers. It is a bit more sustainable beyond Connect to Compete with a 24-month cap; after that you are no longer eligible. The device team needs to consider this when they look at how this rolls out at the grade levels. We used a model that leveraged e-rate and teleconnect discounts. District ended up spending just $7-$9 per month. We need to determine where they require the access.

Jen – Is it better to provide wired at home or wireless?

Matt – Wired or wireless, every device must be connected. Need to talk about devices that can support a 1:1 take home initiative and then look at policies.

Ileana – Big is good.

Barbara – When a device is issued to the kids, it becomes very personal.

Kent – If you are using multimedia rich, engaging content, think about what can be done natively on the device? If it isn't native to the device, it would take too long.

Jennifer – Not all devices can use all apps. Can they connect to the cloud? Can they get things from My Big Campus?

Jeff – Many use multiple devices. Maybe we need to look at something like a nook to get textbook access. We don't have enough of specific devices (like calculators for math) to give it to those that don't need it.

Mike – Maybe this does make sense. Should the device do everything or not? Should it be curriculum driven?

Jeff – Not every kid at every level may need a full device.

Barbara – The device must fit the task but we need to think broadly as to what activities may be required now and in the future.

Matt – There are many questions for this committee to consider. Should there be one device or three? Is it personal? Do I take it home? This will shape conversations. Standards drive costs down but a standard device may not be best for everything. At some schools everything is on the cloud. Whatever the model is, it must work all the time. Do we compromise? If it is a 1:1 model, part of the conversation is not only policy but also support. If you web enable the curriculum, stuff has to work all the time.

Jeff – In terms of textbooks, teachers want class sets, but kids all have books they take home. Where do they keep it? Teachers need to be able to teach the lesson whether or not kids have the device.

Harlan – Very few students do not bring their devices. Teachers check for devices 1st period and students get detention if they did not charge it or did not bring it. We have made the devices as part of our school culture.

Darryl – Reflecting on iMiddle School, the culture of respect for this environment was built with the community, teachers, and leadership which makes it successful. Maybe some schools are more ready to do this than others. If you are rolling this out to all levels, we might consider some sort of checklist to identift readiness to move forward with a 1;1 take home program.

Harlan – iMiddle was the pilot for a 1:1 take home program before i21. They used a big chunk of school site money (Title 1 dollars) to support 3G connectivity prior to LOGO. At some point LOGO will be sunsetting. They have a number of parents on their budget team saying we shouldn't have to pay for 24 hour access; students can use their parent's wifi. But with 50% not having access, some of the costs could be mitigated. He is committed to making this work for all students. What is the parent accepting of that could reduce some of the money the school has to pay. There is an ideal, but are we willing to acquiesce a little bit to make it compatible in a huge district. All students provided the same access and tools is a must and should be considered if we are looking toward the ideal.

Matt – We need to look more at the "what" and not the "how." This conversation needs to keep going.

Jen – At iMiddle, every kid uses their device in every class, or kids won't bring the device with them.

Barbara – There is an expectation of equity in our district. Is it equitable if one teacher uses a device and the teacher in the next classroom, same subject, is not using a device? Is that equitable for the students?

Harlan – At iMiddle, the expectation is that teachers must teach using the devices. They go out of their way to ensure their usefulness. Students miss out if they are not bringing their devices; teachers set up consequences.

Barbara – We need to think big. If we didn't dream big several years ago, we wouldn't be where we are with i21 today.

Harlan – The ideal scenario is to be a universal playing field regardless of the student's socioeconomic status. Equity eliminates a lot of the excuses. A level playing field is good for everyone. The grand ideal is every student gets what everyone else gets and they all have the same exact universal access. It holds people accountable.

Matt – How were the pilot schools selected?

Barbara – Two schools, MTM and iMiddle, started out on their own as pilots supported by the district. When i21/LOGO started, they were ready to go. The other eight had highly motivated staffs. iMiddle has a higher percentage because of the climate Harlan has created with professional development and curriculum. These are separate conversations we need to have and they hinge on each other. How do you hand out the devices and how do you get parents to come in and commit to the program? The district's digital use policy for devices that go home involves extra steps: parents must come in and sign for the devices and agree to the terms. This helps ensure that they understands the expectations of the program and their students. Harlan has done things they have adopted at all ten LOGO schools.

Harlan – Part of the data that came out of the schools pushed the FCC LOGO grant. There is a good representation of types of schools that were identified for the LOGO pilot.

Darryl – When districts do not have these discussions prior to distributing devices to students, it affects the success of the program, such as what happened at another school district north of us in California. Their focus was just to get a device in the hands of all students. San Diego has incorporated the right steps prior to distribution.

Matt – Was readiness a determining factor? There is no readiness stamp. What is the policy on who gets them first? Do teachers get credentials that say they are digitally prepared?

Barbara – We had two years of experience implementing i21 at school sites before we selected which schools would become LOGO schools. Leadership matters. If I want my school to get there, are we ready as a team to take on this challenge?

Darryl – If you just hand out the devices, that is not going to work, no matter if it has broadband built in or not. It won't be successful if you don't have the dialogue around what it takes to be successful with this program.

Jennifer – We did this right with i21. In order to get their devices, teachers attended a mandatory vision training so they had an idea of how an i21 class might look. At the end of that training session, each teacher got a tablet. tablet. Once everyone had completed that training, they received training on using the Promethean boards just as they were installed in their classrooms. Then came the training on the student devices. Only after this was training was completed were student devices put into their classrooms. If all i21 teachers didn't sign up to attend training, the school didn't get their equipment. Thinks training needs to be incentivized. I21 showed how successful this approach can be. You've done this; now your school is eligible for the next step.

Harlan - There are things you must do in order to get certain things. After that, other training can be added. Incentivizing it is important.

Jennifer – When an untrained teacher moves into an i21 room, it's hard to get them to attend training.

Jeff – Some teachers are resistant. If you have teachers that don't want it, the ones that do are held back by the others. Perhaps schools can get an extra FTE because that is what teachers want. If we cap class size for technology rooms, more would be willing. Some principals feel it is too much work to go after teachers to get trained. Yet for Title 1 money, they jump through many hoops; meeting after meeting and report after report.

Matt – Incentive is needed to encourage schools to adopt and use technology. It's Race to the Top in a different way.

Mike – Looking at readiness path, common core is ramping up. Our district has goals for student achievements. The goals are not just curriculum but also national technology standards. Is the school ready to take the next step? Let's look at school leadership and get everyone involved. This can drive school sites through multiple levels to get to this point. Since the inception of i21, devices were capable of transitioning to the next level. It will be critical, even if we continue with cart devices. Do we want to flip a switch so the devices can go home? This bridges both policy and devices; they are one and the same. Cart devices must be ready to take that leap. If teacher isn't ready to have the devices go home, the students won't have a purpose to use them and will be careless with it. Goals for student achievement need to hit that sweet spot. We've modeled our i21 program on lots of good research.

Barbara – As we look at quality schools in every neighborhood, should an effective digital environment be part of that equation?

Jeff – We need to look at the school as a whole as well. Many teachers don't have devices (PE, VAPA, Counseling, classified). You've got kids stuck in the Counseling Office all day and there's nothing there for them to do. Librarians and library techs need training. They know how to access internet but have no knowledge of using the apps. Think about the entire school staff. They need to be provided with training opportunities and devices.

Jennifer – So many people on campuses do not have devices. They are asking to go to training. How to we get that curriculum moved to the site level? There is a need for a technology coach in each cluster, or even each school (not just a network specialist or site tech), someone who understands curriculum, and who can help them get to use their i21 classroom effectively.

Matt – With 200 schools, we would need 200 people to make sure this works. All 6,000 teachers in the district need to have a device.

Barbara – mentioned that all i21 teachers have a device – over 6,000 have been issued

Jeff – All staff at schools needs training and devices, we all need to know how to do these things. We have the talent on site. If they are all trained, people can get help from various people.

Jennifer – Maybe if you have a certain number of teachers digitally trained, you can get support

Jeff – The district really needs to revamp classified job descriptions. People box themselves into their specific jobs and some refuse to do other things.

Barbara – There are some restrictions on who can attend technology training based on their job description. Some are not getting training because their job description does not include it – this is a union issue.

Jennifer – There needs to be a way to leverage our people.

Barbara – This is a vision we are trying to create.

5. Digital Use Policies

Matt – In addition to the District Acceptable Use Policy, CIPA, and Internet Safety, there should be another bullet that supports what additional policies are necessary for the 1:1 Devices.

Darrell – He sees transformation happening at the site levels, but it doesn't seem to have happened at the district level. Seems like curriculum department is not very involved. Is HR involved? Are facilities involved in supporting digital environments? Is this all part of the discussion? If not you will run into barriers. Transformation is not a one time event.

Michael – There are two separate support models, use models. Where do you want to focus? It's great to establish acceptable use but do they get to take them home.

Harlan – Is acceptable use the same in the classroom and at home?

Michael – There is some overlap, but there will be separation when the device leaves the school. You also have loss considerations. What will you do if device is lost? There needs to be portion of administration involved.

Barbara – CIPA is important if you have e-rate money. We cannot get around this. Internet safety is another part of this. We address this during i21 training and provide a lot of resources. Once the device goes home it becomes really important and takes on a different dimension. All need to be part of policy consideration.

Jennifer -- Is SDUSD's interpretation of what we have to do under CIPA more stringent that other districts? Some places in country have more restrictions and some less restrictions. Is there room for re-interpretation?

Darryl –We have enough experience around it and have a lot at stake around erate funding. We have been very successful in acquiring erate funding and we need to mindful of policies that put our funding at risk. There are a couple things around CIPA and flexibility, such as blocking YouTube. Lots of districts don't apply for e-rate funding because of this. It doesn't say you have to block YouTube, but you must provide monitoring of social media experiences. The larger the district, the harder this becomes and it threatens large amounts of money. This is part of the reason you don't see a lessening of restrictions. Dialogue needs to happen about how we provide access. SDUSD pulled from e-rate is pushing $50-$60 million per year which helped significantly in building infrastructure at our schools.

Jennifer – The more money we get, the less we want to lose it. It needs to be different for each level: elementary, middle and high schools. If high school students work on video production they may need a password and access can be revoked. It needs to be functional and fluid.

Matt – This is a part of the work this group needs to focus on.

6. Overarching Questions

Darrell – Overarching questions are: How do we ensure equity and access as the district moves toward a digital delivery model to personalize learning? Can a blended district-supplied and BYO device model work in SDUSD? Should we consider different form factors for certain grade ranges? Do the district's current policies need to be reviewed to support the move towards a device being issued to each child? As we wrap up, these are some take-away thoughts. Where do you want to start? Does BYOD make sense? It could be put into the infrastructure. If kids can bring their own devices, when they something is blocked they switch to their own device.

Harlan – We started with is a) what is the ideal and, b) what is sustainable? The ideal is everyone has the exact same thing so if a student's computer is not charging properly, they can change it out and not miss instruction. It should be the same device that teacher is using to model, and same operating system. Maybe we cannot ensure this but it is the ideal. It takes other constraints away and you can focus on instructional matters.

Jennifer – It makes more sense if we talk about BYOD to offer schools a choice of maybe three devices. BYOD gets us in trouble with Williams Act. Other laws may apply.

Michael – Take into consideration the district's cost if you have to support different models. Support gets difficult when you have too many device types.

Jeff – Access and transformation are the two things we all need.

Jennifer – She did a comparison chart on a BYOD options and she is willing to share.

Barbara – This is a conversation we should have at next week's meeting.

Matt – Asked what is on the device and what does this device do? His vision is that he would like to see tutoring available on every device where you can have a live chat 24/7. There could be problems if teachers need to download things on many different types of devices. What do the standards look like? Can we support three, two, or one? Support is the key.

Barbara – We have seen this in i21 when teachers transition from a netbook room to an iPad room.

Kent –There may be a consideration for giving a student the option to buy. Perhaps the district could buy the devices, but then give students options to buy (and finance?) at the district's discounted price. We could recoup some of the costs by offering to sell the devices to students. Student can have the fiscal incentive that it would be cheaper than buying at a retail store. A successful program provides equity by the district providing the device, but letting the students have the option to buy.

Jeff – Thinking multiple platforms. The learning should be accessible on all devices.

Mike – That comes out of the standards. How is the content delivered and how is the student going to interact with it? Benchmark for whatever device is being used is what is going to be important. Teacher assigns work that all students can do (no excuses that "my device doesn't do that"). Standards, laptop, desktop, cloud, are all important. How is curriculum being delivered? Digital curriculum is the direction in which things are headed. Devices need to consume and create content that matches our district cloud-based platforms. Ideally those things might be one and the same, so we are not going to ten different places to do ten different things. Think about curriculum delivery with support and tutoring. How do we make it easy for students and teachers to interact in a seamless way that is accessible for both teacher and student?

Jennifer – How will our current devices look like 3-5 years from now? When i21 started, there were no iPads. Rift is coming, and in a short period of time things change. New devices are not just keyboard dependent but human interactive. iPads don't manage Google docs. Each device has limitations – that's why there are different ones.

Jeremy – Maybe that is one of the things we need to touch on. There is a technical advisory group. We need to see if we are on the precipice of another technology shift. Technology changes overnight. It's necessary to have flexibility. We also need to evaluate what is on the market - that is why we shifted from netbooks to iPads. In five years are we still talking iPads or is it something we don't know exists?

Matt – He is on the board of e3 High School which will be a 1:1 school and because it is a charter school they have some latitude. Some decisions they made are edgy. Every student takes a device home. All are insured with a $25 deductable for theft or damage. All devices have full administrative rights. It is mandatory to agree to terms when they check out the device and they are charged $70. Students will get their same device the following year. When they go home there is no filter. A key theme is that digital citizenship is a privilege not a right. If they misuse their device, it will be taken away. 70% of their students at e3 are eligible for free lunch. Parents expressed lots of angst at first. Why are we doing this? Do the students need it? How do I know my child will be

safe? Families need to understand the importance. They had four evening parent meetings to get them to buy into this. This committee needs to touch on insurability.

Darrell – It is important to communicate to families what happens if the device gets lost or damaged.

Jennifer – If devices are too restrictive, students have an incentive to hack into it. Students don't want their device reimaged, so they need abide by the policy. She can discover when her students go onto their own hot spots when they drop off Lanschool. We should remove any incentive for students to use something else. We want the students to find it useful. Perhaps we need to not put up too many walls.

Harlan – The last thing we want is for students to lose access since that is the way we are now delivering instruction at our school. It must be flagrant misuse of policy to lose right to device. Other discipline applies.

Darrell – Some don't want to do the work so they might violate the policy on purpose.

Harlan – However, without the device the kids must work harder to get their assignments done. Ie use paper and pencil.

Jennifer –Kids need training to make decisions on what is not good and why. Part of the problem is teachers not being comfortable with it.

Jennifer – Students were surprised to learn that she could find what they were tweeting or posting on Instagram. We need to teach them how to protect themselves on the internet. If they "like" something on Facebook, anyone can log onto their page and see what they have posted. We also need a policy about wearable tech; i.e., glasses and watches, etc.

Next meeting is February 6.

Meeting adjourned at 6:15pm