

**San Diego Unified School District**  
**i21 Digital Policy & Tools Subcommittee**  
**March 13, 2014**  
**Instructional Media Center Conference Room**

Present:	Barbara Allen .....	SDUSD Chief Information & Technology Officer
	Kent Christensen	Apple Account Executive
	Harlan Klein .....	SDUSD Principal, Muirlands Middle School
	Darryl LaGace (remote) .....	SDUSD Consultant, ITSS
	Ileana Ovalle Engel .....	Cox Director, Government Affairs
	Mark Provo .....	Lenovo PC Specialist
	Jennifer Roberts .....	SDUSD Teacher, Point Loma High School
	Mike Senise .....	SDUSD, Resource Teacher, ITSS
	Matt Spathas (remote) .....	SENTRE Partners, Managing Principal
	Darrell Stewart .....	Intel, Public Sector Programs Manager
	Jeff Thomas .....	SDUSD Site Administrator, Serra High School

**Welcome and Introductions**

Barbara Allen called the meeting to order and those in attendance introduced themselves. She asked the group to review the topics and make final suggestions for defining high level recommendations before presentation at the full committee meeting scheduled for March 19. They should be what could be and what should be. – Let’s dream big.

**Power Point**

Cornerstone – Equity and Access

- Tools to best support 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning environments
- LOGO as a model for 1:1 device and mobile access
- Policies – current and considerations for modifications to accommodate the next phase of i21NOW
- Digital Literacy for all stakeholders
- Overarching questions
- March 19th meeting presentation

Overarching questions

- How do we ensure equity and access the district moves towards 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?

**Discussion**

Nets for students are the standards for evaluating skills and knowledge that students need to learn effectively and live productively in an increasingly global and digital world.

SDUSD will ensure equity and access to all district students by providing effective digital tools and resources with individual devices that have 24/7 broadband wireless connectivity.

Matt shared information from other subcommittees. The broadband subcommittee came up with an aggregate with the district, county, and other districts but also a collaborative model. The notion is that broadband access is no longer an option but a requirement. It ties into what this group is discussing. The Infrastructure committee is talking about being able to support whatever is put out there. We can’t hope it works most of time; it must be up

and running all of the time. The more types of devices you put out there, the more support will need to be provided. The more diverse the platform, the higher the associated costs, whether wired or wireless. Darryl added that as you look at mobile and broadband connectivity, devices will need to be capable of handling both types of signals. The specifications will need to consider the direction of the other committees. He agrees that we need to consider the cost. Increasing the diversity will increase the support and the amount of professional development required for teachers. Matt stated the broadband committee has put together a vision statement along with some considerations and recommendations. The key was connectivity anytime, anyplace.

SDUSD already has a model where we buy 1 or 2 different student devices every year over a five year period, so every year 20% of devices are replaced. Jen suggested making a purchase of new devices once every five years, focusing on just two devices instead of ten, which would still provide some flexibility. But the constraints of cost and getting everyone trained during the same time frame would be difficult. Devices could be unique for different grade levels. Mike suggested different devices for K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12. Jen shared her observations from a visit to Coronado; all the kids had different devices. The reality is the students went into Google docs and did their work, no matter what device they were using; one student on an iPad mini switched to a device from the cart, but that was the only student. Matt shared that e3 has one device and students must keep them charged and bring them every day. There is no log-on or cables, and everything can be projected onto the screen. Classroom design is important. He thinks five years is too long for replacing technology; three years is a more realistic shelf life. At e3 they spend \$250 for each device annually, then add \$50 for breakage and \$50 per year for support. This is part of their general budget. But should students be literate on multiple devices? Is that the optimum? Will there be a liability issue if students bring their own devices? What if they get lost or stolen? There needs to be security for the devices, for example, when the students are at PE. The lockers are not adequate.

Darryl suggesting adding to the digital tools a guiding statement at the end that what is deployed will come with adequate support. The other challenge is Google docs is one element that goes with multiple devices. It would be great to have a transformative, universal device that gives students a place to work on multimedia and allows them to do applied knowledge. Students need to be able to do video editing, which is difficult on netbooks. Netbooks do not capture video like a tablet does. But tablets aren't ideal for doing other things they need. English departments want keyboards, while history department prefer iPads. One "size" does not fit all. Elementary students' needs are different than those at high school; different devices are needed at the different elementary grade levels. Jeff noted that some non-core classes at the secondary level (ex. yearbook, marketing) need powerful machines with large screen sizes and keyboards. Maybe we can envision a way to plug a device in at the student desk and dock it so they can view it on a larger screen. They can do work on their device and bring it to a classroom lab to polish it. Harlan feels 10" is the minimum screen size and if they are using spreadsheets it would need to be bigger. Things could be accessible on the cloud, not on individual devices.

Harlan asked if a lease option has been discussed. It could make more sense especially since technology changes so often. That is something the finance committee should address, and bond dollars are involved. Five years is a long time to expect the devices to last. It is not just the hard drives lasting but students are hard on them; some hinges are getting broken. Year 3 netbooks were more rugged, but is about breakage as much as anything. Matt said if students damage their devices at e3, they don't get back their own machine. Students don't want to lose what is on their own devices. At e3 out of 300 devices they have had just two incidents in 45 days.

At e3 ten percent of the equipment is overstock so students can swap out their devices when needed. Students can also reimage their devices; if that doesn't work, another device is available. Harlan feels devices should work for all content areas; teachers should not be picking the devices they want. Jen suggested it be a little bit of both. Perhaps in addition to every student having their own device, there are devices available for checkout. Just because they carry around one device doesn't mean they can't have access to another device. A cart could be available in a shared workspace for 3-4 classrooms. But if we are sending home 100,000 devices, is this realistic in terms of support? Are we going too far? The devices should be adaptable.

Darryl noted that the selected devices should be selected by grade level and should resonate with that school or community. The 10% idea is good so students don't have "down" time. Harlan said that the replacement becomes the student's new device, with the same battery and charging system. Although teachers have their own biases, it is more appropriate to select the device by grade level. If there are multiple devices, students will focus on the device; by allowing just one device you stifle creativity. The district needs to provide some standard devices, but students should be allowed to use whatever device they are comfortable with. It shouldn't be about the computers, but what the students are doing on the computers. It would be good if the network is built in such a way to allow for some flexibility, allowing students to bring devices that suit their needs. Barbara asked about a blended district environment: having a district standard (1-2 devices) but allowing students to buy them if they want to. A parent purchase option was suggested, but that may not be allowed as funds come from bond money. Parents have already paid for devices though the bond so how can they be asked to pay for them again?

### Comments for the Document

- Different form factors for certain grade ranges.
- A managed, blended district-supplied/student-owned device model based on the current district standard.
- Support in this blended environment must be well thought out.
- Classroom management must be part of the decision.
- What are the minimum capabilities the device needs to have?
- The two choices are a district-supplied device or the student's own device.

The subcommittee recommends the district consider: (slide 7)

- Devices that are able to use and access resources that are cloud-based as well as content that might be stored on the devices.
- Identifying a process to determine school "readiness" for a school-to-home program.
- Legal implications – free public education – Williams Act.

The Williams Act will determine whether or not it will be in the cloud. On individual devices, if students need to collaborate with another student, it needs to be available. Harlan likes the idea of grade-level devices and leaning to use multiple devices. There should be things that can be done on netbooks and iPads or whatever device they are using. Being flexible is important. Kids are comfortable with PC and Mac platforms. If we are looking at 24/7 access to broadband, there may be a sizable portion of our district that might choose to opt out. Are parents comfortable with their kids using the devices at school, home, and/or anyplace? Darryl said if 100 kids are accessing the net on one cell tower, that is too much. Getting all connections in one place creates too much noise and it sometimes doesn't work. Blocking Instagram at her site helped.

Jen asked if data is available about what is being used. It should come from both sides, not just the district telling teachers what they are getting and then showing them how to use it. We need to know, for example, if they are using OneNote, Promethean boards, and how much students are using their devices. What is working well and what is not? How is this being used in the classroom? What would they like to see coming in? Teachers need to give input on a regular basis or the district will be seen as tone deaf and unresponsive.

Darryl said that there is a broad shift from a cart model to every student getting their own device. Second bullet is not everybody is ready at every school to have the kids take devices home. Are the kids ready? There is a learning or culture curve to overcome. At some point we have to get them there. But it must be equitable. It isn't fair to hold up the students because the teacher isn't ready. The budget will dictate that as well as the community. So we need to decide if everybody is going to do this at once or if it will be phased in. Many devices are essentially the same, but which provide the operating system for free. We have Apple and Lenovo devices getting out, then in 3, 4 or 5 years they will be replaced. We just got the software needed from Apple. It takes time to get this out in a scalable fashion. When you send home iPads, there needs to be a management system so the kids aren't downloading a whole bunch of apps. That needs to be in place before the devices go home. This dovetails with what the infrastructure committee is discussing. Management needs to be done without disrupting instruction.

#### AUP's for students and staff (slide 4)

- Shift from acceptable use policy to responsible use policy including Digital Citizenship.
- Establishing requirements for educating students, staff and parent/guardians about responsible use and a consistent accountability system and progressive measures.
- Review district policies and procedures to support digital environment that is consistent across the board.

#### Requirements for instructional materials selection/procurement

- Compatibility with Digital Delivery model.
- Licensing review and real cost for today and upgrades.

Who sets policy – a group of folks or a handful? It limits our ability to execute. Should it be a broad range of individuals who works on the Responsible Use policy?

Most middle schools do not allow students to use their cell phones outside of the classroom and devices must be kept out of sight. But we will need policies about wearable technology and risks. Technology that is built into their clothing cannot be put away. They will start doing things covertly. Some kids want their devices taken away so they have an excuse to not do their work. There is already a problem with cell phone theft. Technology is not stolen just for another's use but to be re-sold. If kids bring their own devices, then does liability becomes our responsibility? Good question for legal dept. We need specific new polices to address this. Student policies and staff policies are not consistent. SDEA will need to be brought in at some level. This is a contract negotiation year so it is a good time to address this. Can the district pre-test applicants for technology skills? Will the district provide technology training for substitutes who request it? Should teachers being evaluated be required to take a technology test to prove they are competent, and then be provided with training in areas they need help? Competency needs to be defined. The District must initiate this conversation; the union won't. It is hard to meet our goals if we don't have people who understand 21<sup>st</sup> century teaching and learning. Change is more readily accomplished when you don't have things that will hold you back. Principals and central office staff should also be required to get training.

Differentiation is big on the curriculum side. We want a robust learning management system and the device must work with it. Things must be consistent. We now expect teaching to be done using digital tools, and policy must reflect that. Right now the policy is inconsistent. The Board will need to provide guidance or give us a statement of what they want. The curriculum committee should come up with the appropriate direction to take on this issue and infuse technology in the work they do with schools.

Procurement should take into consideration the cost up front and to maintain the equipment whether perpetual, subscription, free or premium.

#### Review current policies (slide 5)

- Privacy Policy
  - o Review/develop information privacy policies.
  - o Overarching policy about district, student and staff information.
- Digital tool use – CIPA requirements.
- Move toward open/safe access to collaboration tools and digital content.
- Hiring policies that support expertise in a digital environment.

A bill is going through the State Senate (Steinberg) that will affect all schools in the state that makes sure all student information is private and protected and not shared. A lot of what we are discussing may be trumped. An example was given about access to the parent portal student information. Some schools exercised great caution and had parents come in to get onto the parent portal login, some sent it home with the kids, and some mailed it home. Some parents cannot or won't come to the school to get this access. Once you give it to the parents, they can give it to anyone they wish, but we cannot give it out to just anyone.

Schools must use great caution to keep student information private. For instance, schools cannot tell callers whether or not a child is enrolled at their school. Anything you put out there can be tagged. What is somebody else going to use this for? This will open us up to all kinds of things. We don't want to divulge the slightest information about anybody. Privacy screens are available for computer monitors but not many schools are using them. A student's cum folder must be kept locked up; student work cannot be displayed with a grade posted on it. It is hoped that the photo release information will be accessible on PowerSchool so we have easy access to the information. A systematic system is in place for an alias student where they can go into an online environment. We are doing is that in My Big Campus so that is our walled garden. How does the age of student affect the privacy policy? Students in Coronado have access to YouTube. SDUSD is different because we have lots of free or reduced lunch students making us eligible for e-rate. Who should be responsible for monitoring this, the teacher or the principal? There is so much that has to be monitored; some restrictions are necessary. Charter schools could open it up. Darryl stated that technically we could do that today with everything we have in place. But we have to have policies that hold someone accountable. There should be a decentralized approach to monitoring and a centralized approach when it comes to responsibility. Who wants to take that risk? If they want to take off the filters, they must accept responsibility. It can go down to a class or a period if somebody is monitoring the students and a policy is in place. The teacher could take control of it. Even when students are on a home network through global proxy, information will be sent back through the filter. Mike noted that the infrastructure already has the ability to support these policies yet is flexible enough based on what we want to do for learning objectives.

Barbara will get out our final document out to everyone so all can review and provide input prior to the March 19 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.