

## **Information Technology Advisory Committee**

June 18, 2018 4:30 – 6:00 p.m.

Room 2750, John Stanford Center

2445 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98134



### **Meeting Notes**

#### **Call to Order**

Co-Chair John Krull called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. Roll call is as follows:

- Committee Members Present: Jacob Marzynski, Avery Wagar, Nina Arens, Jessica Dorr, Burke Fewel, Margarita Guadalupe, Troy Hilton, Srilatha (Bobbie) Manne, Jason Morrison, Rebecca Spivak, Melissa Westbrook, Roy Zimmermann, Pauline Amell Nash, Christine Billroth, TuesD Chambers, Elizabeth Ebersole, Casey Johnson, Nick Hernandez, Brad Shigenaka, Marika Wong
- Committee Members Absent: Molly Meck, Ahmed Yussuf
- Staff Present: Chief Information Officer John Krull, Carrie McKenzie, DoTS Principal Project Manager, Instructional Support Resource Teacher Gary Cranston, Instructional Support Resource Teacher Karen Meyer, Information Security Manager April Mardock, Technology Support Manager Colleen Halvorson, Systems Operations Manager Jim Young, Library Instructional Materials Program Services Manager Marian Royal, Principal Martine Floe, Administrative Assistant Joe Valenti, Executive Assistant Danielle Johnston.
- Guests of the Committee meeting introduced themselves.

Committee members unanimously accepted the proposed agenda.

Committee members unanimously accepted the May 21, 2018 meeting minutes.

Jessica Dorr arrived at 4:38 p.m.

#### **Regular Agenda Items**

Chief Information Officer John Krull began by stating that the Spring Program Report had been published, incorporating feedback given by the committee, including the additions of status and percentage complete, and executive summary sections. Additionally, he noted more substantive financial highlights along with a section focused on future plans and initiatives.

Melissa Westbrook asked about the relationship between technology and MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support) which she defined as an overarching methodology of implementation of educational support. Mr. Krull responded by discussing how data is being used to inform instruction, as well as the Technology Department providing data through Homeroom which is rolling out to schools. Mr. Krull spoke about the Atlas data warehouse, which is managed through the Business Intelligence team and primarily focused on equipping principals and

leadership with actionable data. Before concluding his remarks, Mr. Krull made it clear that he did not want multiple versions of data going around and asked that feedback regarding the program report be shared through email in which he would reply with all committee members included.

Next, Mr. Krull reviewed the current budget, the 2018-19 proposed budget and the five year budget history and forecast. He explained that most of the budget comes from the Buildings, Technology and Academics (BTA IV) levy, while mentioning 15% comes from the General Fund before highlighting how the department budgeted between capital and operational funds.

Srilatha Manne arrived at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Burke Fewel asked if levy money carried over if it was not all spent to which Mr. Krull replied yes. Ms. Westbrook expressed the hope for a plan between Technology and Finance if the upcoming Building Excellence (BEX V) levy does not pass before Mr. Krull acknowledged and introduced Brad Shigenaka.

Margarita Guadalupe arrived at 4:46 p.m.

### **Special Attention Items**

Mr. Shigenaka began with an acknowledgment to the student representatives on the committee for bringing up the issue of student email addresses before opening the topic up for group discussion. He started off by inquiring about why students do not currently have email addresses assigned to them. April Mardock responded saying back when the decision was made, many students had outside email addresses so it was not necessarily a case of access. Ms. Mardock continued, noting current mechanisms being in place to allow for communication between students and teachers before speaking to the costs associated with email accounts for all students. She went on to discuss security concerns, particularly the lack of controls that once existed preventing children from contacting adults outside the network. Jacob Marzynski noted Outlook's ability to integrate current systems that Seattle Public Schools uses before Ms. Mardock informed the committee the decision to not provide individualized email address was made 10 years earlier.

Elizabeth Ebersole responded noting that students in a previous district had Microsoft email accounts that prevented emails from outside sources being received, while also mentioning the controls available today to help make student emails more secure. Moreover, Ms. Ebersole highlighted concern around third party tools wanting to be accessed in the classroom, leading to students using personal emails to sign up exposing them to outside risk. Bobbi Manne asked if Ms. Mardock would recommend emails for all students to which Ms. Mardock replied that she would be much more open to the idea given the forensic tracking now available.

Nina Arens mentioned that many Ed Tech computer science programs and applications require email addresses and that sometimes state mandated initiatives are prevented by district firewalls. Avery Wagar asked if there was data regarding use of Schoology to which Mr. Krull replied 35 schools were not using it. Roy Zimmermann asked if the district had conducted a pros and cons

of providing district emails to students with Ms. Mardock replying that three years ago the pros and cons were discussed with cost being a major factor. Jason Morrison expressed the importance of email as a communication tool and how it could be used to prepare students for entering the workforce. Ms. Mardock then mentioned the costs associated with student emails, highlighting the cost of legal monitoring alone costing \$100,000.00 before noting the actual creation of student's accounts could be done quick. Nick Hernandez noted the multitude of benefits enterprise accounts could have before Rebecca Spivak inquired about the possibility of piloting student emails before rolling it out all at once.

Casey Johnson arrived at 5:10 p.m.

TuesD Chambers added that the way teachers provide instruction needs to be top priority before both Mr. Wagar and Mr. Marzynski spoke to the level of integration Outlook affords with its calendar sync and planner system.

In response to the discussion as a whole Mr. Zimmermann suggested a subcommittee be organized to make a better-informed decision. Mr. Shigenaka agreed and made a motion to form a sub-committee to research issue of student emails and make a recommendation at the next meeting, which was approved unanimously. Ms. Manne inquired about deliverables and a potential timeline. Mr. Shigenaka explained that the details could be worked out later in the meeting when sub-committees were scheduled to be addressed.

Mr. Krull then suggested moving on and breaking the committee up into two groups, those interested in devices and those wanting to learn more about infrastructure. Carrie McKenzie detailed the exercise and asked anyone who was interested in learning more about infrastructure to go to a separate room to discuss related future projects and initiatives.

In the student learning group, Mr. Zimmermann asked about AV systems and what that included to which Colleen Halvorson replied it was related to sound systems in every classroom. In response to a comment from Mr. Marzynski around pairing sound at secondary schools with Bluetooth speakers, Ms. Halvorson mentioned that a Request for Proposal has been conducted to determine what devices and equipment should be purchased before Mr. Zimmermann commented on how knowing what teachers prioritize as far as future projects and initiatives would be helpful.

Marika Wong brought up the fact that all digital curriculum has to be ADA compliant and curriculum adoption needs to be viewed through a lens of equity for all. Marian Royal, Library Instructional Materials Prog Services Manager responded that challenges exist in procuring all curriculum digitally due in part to the network ability to support alternative technology, also acknowledging that the desired format is not always available. She followed her comment up by mentioning how alternative technology is helping to ensure access of curriculum to all students including "text to voice". Ms. Arens asked about the difference between Instructional Technologists (IT) and Technical Support Specialists. Ms. Halvorson explained that every school is assigned a support specialist while the IT's serve more than one school and work between the schools and John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence. Ms. Manne inquired about the term laptops, asking if it was fixed and there was no possibility of tablets. Ms. Halvorson

mentioned the recent laptop deployment for all certificated staff who received a laptop model that allowed for the screen to be folded back for use as a tablet if needed. Mr. Marzynski commented that cyber security should be a top priority before Troy Hilton asked what the goals for technology literacy and graduation rates were with Ms. Halvorson replying the goal was to equip students to be college and work ready. Martin Floe commented that if the District was looking to implement a one to one program, he would like to see chrome books supported as they require less support and have benefitted his population at Ingraham. In response, Mr. Hilton brought up the point that computer science work may become more challenging with the use of chrome books since they are tied to google suite.

Ms. Ebersole highlighted the standards OSPI mandates and skills that students are expected to have based on their grade level, adding that teachers are unable to meet the requirements based on lack of equitable access. Christine Billroth noted many are teachers not using devices to their full potential suggesting lab and situational training to help expand the education spectrum to which Mr. Hilton agreed. Ms. Ebersole suggested establishing a subcommittee for Professional development (PD) with best practices being included while also mentioning the size of Seattle being a challenge to address. Ms. Manne added that a solution has to be integrated with hardware and software available, or its useless. In response, Ms. Arens highlighted the importance of sufficient training regarding applications and systems the District uses mentioning PowerSchool and Schoology specifically before adding that educational technology support needed to be available in every school to address equity with Curriculum and Instruction a key partner.

Meanwhile, in the infrastructure group, committee members took time to individually review the list of projects and rank them. April Mardock and Jim Young answered clarifying technical questions about the projects and our current systems. However, the committee members agreed that without proper background knowledge, they were unable to make informed recommendations.

Avery Wagar expressed the need for reliable wireless internet access and network availability at schools. Melissa Westbrook inquired about which projects might be the highest priority to the district, to which Ms. Mardock explained that the answer would depend on who you asked. It was also explained that all of the projects on the list have been vetted and prioritized by the different business owners in the district. After a suggestion from Jason Morrison that staff meet with companies such as Amazon and Microsoft to help plan and map our infrastructure, Jim Young shared that staff have regular technical and strategic meetings with our vendors. The committee found that prioritizing was also difficult without having information on estimated costs for items.

As the committee reconvened, Gary Cranston provided the committee an overview for the key feedback gathered regarding devices highlighting PD for teachers, instruction that integrated technology and integration between systems and departments. Mr. Cranston went on to discuss the challenges of having eight Instructional Technology Specialists to support all 104 schools with Ms. Wong seconding the concerns mentioning the challenges encountered working in Special Education due to the same shortfall of support. Ms. Wong added that integration with MTSS tools could greatly improve the support students in Special Education receive.

April Mardock reported back from the infrastructure group that there was some discussion, but that without costs and status of existing system, the group felt it was unable to provide informed feedback. There was a desire for scale of cost to be shared for these projects as well, so committee members would be able to take into account if a project was \$200,000 or \$2,000,000.

Ms. Billroth made note that the non-readers in the district who do not qualify for Special Education also need access to support devices and curriculum.

Mr. Shigenaka mentioned that at the next meeting, having a line item with the approximate cost next to future initiatives would help to drive the ranking of importance and need before Jessica Dorr added on having criteria clearly articulated for prioritization would also be valuable.

Mr. Krull mentioned that ideas for sub committees could be discussed through the committee email address before Ms. Arens suggested establishing a subcommittee for Curriculum and Instruction to help decide what the technology being purchased would be used for noting the difficulties associated with providing advice without knowing what certain tools are supporting. Pauline Amell Nash asked if Technology Services had a strategic plan with Mr. Krull replying that the hope was to have Instruction leading with Technology supporting. Mr. Krull added that it would be a good idea to have Kyle Kinoshita, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction at the next meeting to talk about how Instruction is driving the use and value of technology.

Rebecca Spivak departed at 6:08 p.m.

Mr. Krull offered to have his staff conduct research related to student email instead of sub-committee over the summer, to which the committee agreed.

### **Board Policies and Procedures**

Mr. Krull then concluded the meeting mentioning the committee would not be meeting in July, reminding everyone to read the following School Board Policies up for review: 2021, 2022 and 2023. Ms. Westbrook suggested brainstorming ideas for subcommittees through email including operations and digital citizenship.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

### **Next Meeting**

Monday, August 20, 2018