STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE
INNOVATION AND COLLABORATION WORK GROUP
July 15, 2014
MEETING NOTES

Present: Dr. Cori Mantle Bromley, Chair; Don Soltman, Bill Brulotte, Katie Graupman

Not Present: Senator Roy Lacey

Others present: Royce Kimmons, Doceo Institute; Alex Macdonald, State Department of Education; Marilyn Whitney, State Board of Education

Alex Macdonald, Director, Instructional Technology, State Department of Education reviewed the 2013 technology pilot programs for the committee and the "lessons learned" thus far.

By way of background, Alex said that following the defeat of Students Come First which had included laptops for every high school student, the legislature appropriated a $3 million for technology pilot programs. The purpose was to choose regionally and demographically diverse schools for projects that could be scalable across Idaho. The grant application also requested anticipated outcomes.

In 2013, grants were awarded to 15 schools which purchased iPads, laptops and Chromebooks spanning all grade levels and content areas. Each school was asked to report to the Legislature every six months. Mr. Macdonald's report is attached.

The group discussed whether student achievement increased as a result of the technology devices. Mr. Macdonald said that it was hard to measure due to other factors such as the success of deployment, integration, and professional development. Dr. Kimmons confirmed that Mr. Macdonld statement reflects the larger literature that looks at 1:1 devices. While there may be some small increase in achievement, usually the devices do not reflect the intentions of the goal. Instead, schools need to make a cultural shift which takes time.

Tracie Bent, who served on the technology grant selection committee, said she was frustrated at not having results from the 2013 grants before choosing 2014 recipients. Reports from the projects did reflect lessons learned which can be used for best practices, but did not reflect that the devices could be used as a tool for increasing academics. Ms. Bent said that it would be helpful to articulate to the legislature that devices will not increase scores on IRI or SBAC, but they can be useful to increase student engagement.

Mr. Macdonald added that some of the second year projects used strategies learned from the first year, such a parent orientation night, setting policies on insurance plans, remote filtering and take-home devices. But none of the second year proposals stated that they were modeling another district. Some districts that had 2013 projects wrote proposals in 2014 for a different school.

Dr. Kimmons said that the good proposals started with vision and pedagogy; weaker proposals started with the technology but did not say how they would serve as a model for other schools outside of their local context. Some applicants did not have the personnel in place to meet the

needs of the technology, which is often the most costly piece to them, and that placed poorer districts at a disadvantage.

Ms. Bent said that all of the 2014 proposals were weak in scalability or sustainability after the grant. She recommended that the State not spend more money on technology pilot projects that just provide funding to districts. Mr. Macdonald agreed.

Dr. Kimmons said that it is valuable to empower districts, but he did not know if the technology pilots produced results that could inform larger policy. That would require a rigorous research process which the districts are not equipped to do.

The committee discussed the technology pilot project testimony. They questioned the wisdom of continuing a third year of technology grants, and concluded that the projects were too informal to be useful. A technology person is key in successful deployment of devices, both someone to fix things, and another person as coach to refocus pedagogy. Connectivity to rural areas is a recurring need.

Robin Nettinga, Executive Director, Idaho Education Association (IEA) joined the committee to discuss the IEA's vision for professional development and site-based collaboration. Ms. Nettinga said that the IEA had put together a whitepaper document with the kinds of changes it believed would create world class education in Idaho. Research has shown that job embedded professional development is especially important. Ms. Nettinga said that she had taught 16 years in Nampa, and no job embedded professional development existed; whatever professional development was offered was eliminated as the funding stream suffered. Educators were left to obtain professional development on their own for recertification. Professional development needs to be job embedded throughout the school year.

With the implementation of the Idaho Core Standards, Ms. Nettinga has met with hundreds of teachers and all echoed the same theme: they need time – not to learn the standards, but time to collaborate, plan and teach in a different way. Katie Graupman said that her peers had reported that some collaboration sessions were productive and others were not. She suggested that some guidance on collaborative sessions would be helpful. Ms. Graupman said that collaboration was more engrained at the elementary level, but not as much in the high schools. Ms. Nettinga agreed. Dr. Mantle-Bromley also noted that rural high school teachers would need a way to connect with other teachers.

The committee discussed some of the problems encountered in finding collaborative time for teachers. Bill Brulotte said that in Twin Falls, planning days were the first cut in 2009 and urged that funding be restored so that collaborative time does not take away from instructional time. Ms. Nettinga said that it is not uncommon for teachers to work on collaboration in the summer, but it is also important that it happens during the school year when teachers are able to learn, talk, and then put into practice in the classroom the ideas they have learned.

Teacher collaboration time needs community support so that parents understand late starts and early release time. Local business also need to support an earlier school start date before Labor Day.

The National Council of State Legislatures has recommended job embedded professional development.

The committee discussed how regional centers might be used in rural areas. Katie Graupman suggested that the Idaho Core Coaches work once a month in regions to provide collaboration on Idaho Core Standards. Bill Brulotte said that in Twin Falls, schools were divided with larger and smaller schools working together. Oregon and Washington have sophisticated regional service districts. Unfortunately that idea has not been well received in Idaho, as some districts fear an attempt a consolidation.

In preparation for the July 28 Joint Structure & Governance Committee presentations, the committee reviewed its charter to expand on the Governor's Task Force Recommendations, specifically on:

#8 Statewide electronic collaboration, ISEE and SchoolNet
#10 Technology devices
#17 Site-based collaboration and job-embedded professional development
#18 Training of school boards

#8 Statewide electronic collaboration, ISEE and SchoolNet

Since the June 12 Joint Committee report, the committee met with Roger Quarles and the Office of Performance Evaluation (OPE). Roger Quarles has recommended that the State Department of Education no longer act as middle man between the schools and the state because they do not have the capacity, time or ability to best serve the districts. Mr. Quarles believed that districts could choose their own management systems and those companies could report to the state. Those companies have the IT specialists and research and development dollars to solve problems at the district level. The State does not have that capacity. They agreed that they could not recommend one statewide system, but envisioned a multi-vendor system where each vendor has been vetted for its ability to meet both district and state requirements. The committee agreed that it needs to wait for the OPE study, due in January 2015, before making further recommendations. The committee further agreed that the Data Management Council, chaired by the State Board of Education Director of Research, oversee the entire longitudinal data system and report to the Board and the legislature.

#10 Technology Devices

Dr. Mantle-Bromley said that today's conversations had reinforced the idea that every district needs two types of experts, a technical expert, and an instructional coach as part of job-embedded professional development.

Marilyn Whitney explained that the 2015 Legislature had appropriated money for IT staff which was included in $8 million for classroom technology, and $3 million for the technology grants. She said that the Governor would be looking for specific recommendations from the committee that would impact his budget request, so if the $3 million for technology grants are no recommended for 2016, then the committee might consider if that sum should be rolled into the $8 million for technology.

Dr. Mantle-Bromley said that she did not think that Chromebook and iPads are innovative, but probably are necessary. She suggested recommending an evaluation of the reports, but concluded that the pilot projects were not going to lead to "ah-ha" moments. She further believed that the

majority of districts were disadvantaged in the selection process, as much depended on the skill of the grant writer.

Ms. Whitney advised that when the High Expectations group toured the Snake River school district, they found that, despite being hard hit during the recession, they had found the money to roll out technology devices. Don Soltman agreed that the money would be better spent on broadband. Ms. Whitney said that the Idaho Rural Partnership is studying rural infrastructure needs. She further advised that the State has received $2.6 million to update broad band in rural districts. Bill Brulotte suggested a clear statement that a school's ability is dependent on the State's ability to get broadband in rural areas.

Ms. Whitney also advised that the Career Ladder/Tiered Licensure committee is recommending a different funding mechanism for IT personnel. They recognized that the current funding model creates difficulty for districts to retain IT personnel. They have turned over the subject to High Expectations which is exploring the funding model.

#17 Site based collaboration and job-embedded professional development
The committee agreed that additional days were needed in the school calendar year for collaboration and professional development. Bill Brulotte wanted to ensure that the time was not construed as part of professional development for Idaho Core Standards. He thought 3 additional days was a start, though Dr. Mantle-Bromley and Katie Graupman would have liked much more. Ms. Whitney suggested that tying collaboration time to student achievement would play a key role in approval.

#18 Training and development of Superintendents and School Boards.
The committee agreed that it needed no further action on this area, except to recommend that the State track whether or not districts are providing training. They will support the efforts of Accountability and Autonomy which is updating the language of HB521.

Next Meeting: July 28, 2014, afternoon
Agenda Items: Alex Macdonald to discuss the 21st Century Classroom;
Discuss feedback from morning session;
Review committee report for missing pieces.

Lessons Learned:

1) Instructional technology is virtually useless without connectivity
2) Districts and schools know the tools they want

3) Leadership is paramount in success

4) Technology integration coaches or specialist have been so valuable

5) Technology individualizes education, and promotes a student-centered learning environment

6) Next Generation Learning Environments have several technologies available to students

7) Use a technology integration model, such as the SAMR

8) Realize that the technology integration paradigm shift takes several years

9) Schools can maximize device potential with Learning Management Systems (LMS)

10) It is cumbersome to find digital textbooks/resources that match all platforms (interoperability)

11) Teachers and students need to understand digital citizenship, and digital footprint

12) There can be an initial slight decrease in student achievement, but grows exponentially over time. This is often times hard to measure.

13) There is an overwhelming, and dramatic, increase in student engagement and participation

14) Smarter Balanced testing can be completed in days, not weeks

15) Students are able to be more creative, engage in deeper concepts, and can foster critical thinking

16) Cloud based application use (Google Docs) is more and more prevalent…and effective.

17) Learning curves differ between students and teachers (students are digital natives)

18) Fiscal savings exist by moving to a digital environment

19) Teaching is now *facilitated learning*

20) Managed services can be advantageous, but the right vendor for the right district is needed

21) Remote filtering is successful

22) Durable devices and tablet covers are essential

23) Mechanical keyboards for tablets should be made available to student use

24) Capabilities for projection or screen sharing is the key to instructing in a collaborative environment

25) Predominantly districts are implementing iPads and Chromebooks

Emerging Guidelines:

1) Parent orientation by school principal is essential
2) Need to establish student discipline procedures and prepare teachers to implement them
3) Professional development in situational awareness and classroom management practices needs to be established
4) Districts can create insurance programs where staff and students purchase insurance to cover loss, damage, and build a reserve for future replacements.
5) Understanding that projects need to have a focused and scaled deployment plan
6) Recurring teacher collaboration time (weekly or monthly) is essential
7) Districts should implement digital citizenship course/curriculum/trainings
8) Districts need to develop policies that ensure appropriate care of devices
9) Investigate "student as support" model for Tier 1 support and training
10) The school level (teachers and students) needs to formulate what a Next Generation Learning Environment *does*.

Recommendations:

#1: An essential component of successful technology integration is an Integration Specialist/Integration Coach. These personnel provide the sustainable job embedded PD that is critical for teachers.

#2: There is a high cost of wireless connectivity, and state can look to provide funds for all schools. State should look to take advantage of the modernization of E-rate from the FCC.

#3: Provide funding for districts to enter into their own managed service contracts, with devices of their choosing. State can provide statewide contracts on a handful of devices through Department of Purchasing.

All grants and legislative reports are posted at:

http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/tech_services/grants_contracts.htm