

Information Technology Advisory Committee

August 20, 2018 4:30 – 6:00 p.m.

Room 2750, John Stanford Center

2445 3rd Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98134



Meeting Notes

Call to Order

Co-Chair John Krull called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. Roll call is as follows:

- Committee Members Present: Jacob Marzynski, Nina Arens, Jessica Dorr, Troy Hilton, Bobbie Manne, Melissa Westbrook, Roy Zimmermann, Pauline Amell Nash, Christine Billroth, TuesD Chambers, Elizabeth Ebersole, Casey Johnson, Nick Hernandez, Brad Shigenaka, Marika Wong, Molly Meck.
- Committee Members Absent: Jason Morrison, Avery Wagar, Burke Fewel, Margarita Guadalupe, Rebecca Spivak, Ahmed Yussuf.
- Other Staff Present: Chief Information Officer John Krull, Director of Enterprise Applications and Data Services Nancy Petersen, Information Security Manager April Mardock, DoTS Principal Program Manager Carrie McKenzie, Instructional Support Resource Teacher Gary Cranston, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction Kyle Kinoshita, Library Instructional Materials Program Services Manager Marian Royal, Director of College and Career Readiness Caleb Perkins, Counselor Krista Rillo, Communications Specialist Rachel Nakanishi, 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 June 18, 2018 meeting minutes with an amendment to correct the spelling of Elizabeth Ebersole's last name.

Ms. Westbrook asked about Schoology, mentioning 35 schools didn't have it to which Mr. Krull replied that a list of those schools could be provided as a follow-up.

Regular Agenda Items

Mr. Krull updated the committee on the Summer Program Report, mentioning that an early edition would be sent out to the membership for feedback and noted that the program report would serve as a template for the upcoming Technology Plan due in the fall.

Christine Billroth arrived at 4:40 p.m.

Mr. Krull then moved to the Technology Services budget overview. Mr. Krull differentiated between general fund costs and capital costs, also noting remaining balances. Mr. Marzynski noted that nearly \$1,000,000 was spent from the student learning budget, after which Mr. Krull explained that computers were bought during the summer for schools. Mr. Zimmerman asked about the spending under Instructional Support to which Mr. Krull replied it was primarily attributed to ongoing salaries. Bobbi followed up asking how Instructional Support was different from school

instructional support. Mr. Krull said school support was focused more on technical support whereas instructional support focused on instruction and professional development.

Ms. Westbrook suggested creating a document that divided up the categories to display what funds were going directly to schools and what funds were spent at the central office for operations and other costs. Ms. Arens asked where the cost for potentially providing student emails would come from to which Mr. Krull responded it would come from Infrastructure.

Special Attention Items

Director of College and Career Readiness Dr. Caleb Perkins introduced himself and gave an overview of his presentation on Naviance. Dr. Perkins stated that the purpose of the presentation was to gain feedback regarding how to best communicate the data sharing implications of using Naviance to families and the public. He reviewed why the district chose Naviance and how Naviance will help students.

Dr. Perkins explained that using Naviance requires sharing student data. The data sharing agreement has been intensely vetted by our legal department and is as strict as possible. Data fields are limited but the decision has been made to include additional data fields.

Casey Johnson arrived at 4:50 p.m.

He then went on to explain that there are two opt-out windows for families who are not interested in using Naviance. Ms. Manne asked how families would be notified of the opt-out windows, which was to be discussed after the overview.

He reviewed the current data shared and then explained that sharing additional data will allow students to take advantage of the full usefulness of the tool. Dr. Perkins shared that, in talks with counselors, the usefulness of the tool would be limited unless additional data fields were added providing the example of uploading transcripts currently done manually. Online transcripts would provide for more access along with counselors being able to use targeted supports.

College and Career Readiness Counselor Krista Rillo highlighted the current student to counselor ratio, before mentioning the issue of equity and how Naviance would be able to level the playing field. Mr. Perkins concluded by highlighting the timeline for communications including regional meetings before speaking about the need for transparency and wanting to ensure families were aware of both the pros and cons of using the Naviance tool.

Ms. Westbrook asked if counselors still spend their time working on schedules. Ms. Rillo shared that counselors work on schedules, college access, and social emotional needs. Ms. Westbrook wanted to be sure that college-bound students are not given preferential treatment. She also asked about the opt-out window and reasoning behind not keeping it open through the summer. Dr. Perkins responded that in order for the data loading process to start, the window could not be open-ended and mentioned that there would be a tradeoff of functionality and accessibility if the window was left open.

Mr. Shigenaka followed up asking about the implications of allowing families to opt-out throughout the year. Ms. Rillo noted potential challenges could be the added workload for counselors trying to

provide alternative activities for students who opt out and that flexibility would be provided to students on a case-by-case basis if they did not receive communication regarding opting out.

Christine Billroth asked if students can opt out of having to provide their gender and/or ethnicity to which Dr. Perkins replied he did not know of a technical way to exclude that information. He continued that the logic behind asking for gender and ethnicity was tied to scholarship opportunities determined by those identifiers.

Ms. Manne asked about how Naviance might help students graduate from college to which Dr. Perkins explained that Naviance might help match students to the right college and get them thinking about why they are pursuing a particular path.

Ms. Arens asked about the sign on process to which Dr. Perkins responded that the Clever system was enabled for single sign-on. Ms. Arens followed up to see if students would have access after graduating including access to scholarship opportunities. Dr. Perkins replied that many districts were using Naviance and that it was a good idea to ask them to provide it to students even after leaving.

Ms. Ebersole suggested compiling parent and student anecdotes highlighting experiences with the tool and the value of its use.

Ms. Meck asked if this tool would help students who are not college-bound. Ms. Rillo responded by talking about the career exploration uses Naviance offers including a resume builder, post-secondary training, and financial aid assistance.

Ms. Dorr suggested that future communication of highlight why the tool was selected and how the tool will help create equitable access to students.

Mr. Shigenaka suggested contacting Naviance for success stories could be shared and suggested strengthening communication around the opt-out window and additional data is being provided.

Ms. Westbrook asked if students would have the same access if they did not include additional data fields being requested including date of birth. Dr. Perkins responded that transcripts would not be able to be sent because colleges have to be able to match transcripts to students. Dr. Perkins added that we want to limit the amount of information provided to Naviance to only what was necessary.

Mr. Hilton asked if training for counselors was robust enough to support the use of Naviance with Dr. Perkins and Mr. Krull replied that additional training could be provided. Communication Specialist Rachel Nakanishi added that having the data housed in one secure system is better than having the data shared in email and paper form.

A community member asked if the data is encrypted, which Mr. Krull confirmed it is. Another community member wanted clarification on who gets what data from Hobson, which Dr. Perkins explained that the district was also concerned about data sharing and that the contract has been extremely well vetted.

Ms. Wong noted how helpful having the information being requested already filled in when applying for scholarships and college. She also added that if students are applying for colleges and scholarships, they will have to provide this information.

Ms. Arens noted how valuable the tool could be for counselors. She then asked if students or parents would be the ones deciding who would opt-out of Naviance, which Dr. Perkins responded that the parent or guardian is making that decision. Ms. Arens suggested that in future communications, students should be encouraged to join their parents at community meetings.

Nick Hernandez noted how valuable a partnership between Naviance and Seattle Public Schools could be in terms of allowing parents to control more of their student's data.

Mr. Krull transitioned to the BEX V Technology Planning presentation, which specifically highlighted the list of projects being presented to the School Board, divided into infrastructure, district systems, and student learning.

Ms. Westbrook asked if cost was a factor in prioritizing the projects to which Mr. Krull responded that prioritization was mainly done by the Executive Cabinet using feedback and criteria previously introduced at earlier community meetings.

Mr. Krull continued to review the proposed technology funding and explained that there is a need for feedback on student learning, with wide-ranging opinions on no technology in the classroom to a one-to-one ratio for student devices.

Mr. Krull provided an overview of our current student learning program. He reminded the committee that the forthcoming technology plan would address student learning and emphasize special education, assistive technology, and ADA accessibility. Mr. Krull said the plan will be to provide a minimal amount of laptops to schools and then provide grant money to fund site-specific needs whether it be for additional computers or other technology needs. Teaching and Learning would approve grants that support schools' Continuous School Improvement Plan and this committee would help set guidelines. Mr. Krull stressed using an equity lens to ensure high needs schools would be given flexibility to secure the resources needed for their site.

Mr. Krull noted the intention was to earmark \$2,000,000 every year to replace end of life desktop computers. Krull replied that a fixed price of \$500 was used in the calculation after a question from Mr. Zimmermann.

Ms. Manne asked whether the budget includes equipment and staffing with Mr. Krull responding that just equipment and professional development, not staffing, are included in the budget. Ms. Chambers asked where training for teachers would be paid from with Mr. Krull responding that the staff costs are in the operations budget.

Ms. Arens asked when a computer is considered "aged out" and whether lifespan anticipated per computer would be considered. Mr. Krull stated that the district is using the industry standard of a four-year replacement cycle. Mr. Shigenaka responded by stating that older computers could not always support infrastructure cycles and that staff hours are lost using old equipment that has aged out. Ms. Ebersole pointed out that not all staff received new laptops and are left out of collaborative

efforts. Ms. Wong added that many assistive technology applications that get system updates lead to strain on operating systems causing students' ability for access to be disrupted. In response to a question from Ms. Arens asking if certain computers could be repaired and turned back over, Mr. Krull responded that many of the lower end devices do not receive support from the manufacturers, creating challenges when trying to repair and reuse them.

Ms. Dorr suggested clearer articulation of the criteria used in prioritizing projects adding that a balance between district efficiencies and school flexibility was key.

Ms. Wong asked if support for assistive technology was based on existing spending or being increased with the increased rate of referrals to which Mr. Krull replied that it was increased minimally and moving the cost to the levy budget.

Ms. Manne inquired about funding for professional development. Mr. Krull explained that professional development is included within the operations budget line, alongside grants that would be tailored to specific school needs.

Ms. Arens emphasized the need to have a curriculum plan for what the computers will be used for.

Ms. Billroth inquired if all students will eventually have access to a computer and explained that currently students are having to learn on a limited number of classroom desktop computers. She also brought up the issue of providing professional development across the board, not just for high needs schools. Mr. Krull shared that the long-term plan is to have the minimum amount of computers in schools.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested displaying what is specifically allotted for professional development alongside what grant funds would be available in the recommendation.

Ms. Meck added that more decisions should be site-based to get buy in from parents, teachers, and students. Ms. Meck continued that eight instructional technology support teachers were not enough to support the district and that disconnect needed to be addressed.

Board Policies and Procedures

Mr. Krull shared that he would be working with Dr. Kinoshita to update School Board policies Nos. 2015, 2022, and 2023 in the upcoming months.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Next Meeting

Monday, September 17, 2018