MINUTES

TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE

One-to-One Governance and Instructional Integration Subcommittee

DATE: September 13, 2011
TIME: 8:30 AM
PLACE: EW41

MEMBERS PRESENT: Reed DeMordaunt, Brian Duncan, Christopher Campbell, Christine Donnell Salvatore Lorenzen, Bicker Therien, Rich Wills (for Bob Nonini).

Chairman Reed DeMordaunt called the subcommittee to order and continued yesterday's discussion regarding 1:1 governance. Please see attached One to One Governance Policy Matrix document. School Districts will be provided guidance on policies they will need to address, along with examples of best practices policies. Mr. Campbell raised the concern of other districts who have implemented 1:1 and the need to have additional technology staff. Mr. McCarter added this question to the site visit protocol list to be answered during site visits.

The subcommittee formulated questions to be included in the student survey. This survey will be administered via Survey Monkey.

Chairman DeMordaunt discussed site visits and all committee members present expressed their availability and desire to attend at least one visit. Representative Wills felt that the House Education Committee would also like to have at least one member attend those visits. Site visits will include a pre visit conference call as well as a debriefing with the full subcommittee 2-3 days after the site visit. Ms. Donnell spoke to the importance of having a teacher attend the site visits.

Mr. McCarter will draft language around each of the policies addressed by the committee for discussion in the October Task Force Meeting.

The subcommittee adjourned at 10:30 am to meet with the full Technology Task Force.

One to One Governance Policy Decision Points (updated 8/24)

	Policy Area	State Policy?	Guidance for local policy development?	Collaboration with other subcommittees / experts
1.	Online safety (7, 20)		Capture / glean model policies…	Reference existing statutes / rules
2.	Cyberbullying (8, 39)		Capture / glean model policies…	Reference existing statutes / rules
3.	Take home device (10)	Implications for unfunded mandate if devices remain at school (infrastructure)	Recommend devices go home and are fully charged next school day to overcome infrastructure issues (if they exist) *If districts chose not to have devices go home, then district will be responsible for infrastructure for charging.*	
4.	Local building readiness (electricity- charging stations)	• RFP dealing with wireless will address • LEA's required to provide minimum building readiness to support the 1:1 initiative • Establish a specification for wireless infrastructure • Establish a specification for support of the device (e.g., charging options) • Get definition of "minimum readiness" from Maine • Look into fall 2011 funds for infrastructure • Establish infrastructure "hardship" pool for handful of districts that can't afford to build the infrastructure		Division of Building Safety, Procurement Subcommittee

		(very rural districts in old buildings) • Examine building standards- present day requirements relative to power		
5.	Use outside of Idaho (10)		Employ Maine's language	
6.	Network usage (11-16, 17)		Protect bandwidth for students- must sign an AUP / if open to non-school users a signed AUP is required	Clarify issues with E-rate funded infrastructure- converse with IEN- discuss with Title 2d
7.	Student code of conduct (18, 22, 29-33)		Locally crafted- require signature from students / parents identifying understanding of	Consult AG on non-school user, apply a sticker indicating proper use / etiquette / incorporated in login?
8.	Prohibited activities (15, 18)		Locally crafted item- with examples…	
9.	Availability of access (19)		Locally crafted item- with examples…	
10	Use by members of the public (19, 34, 35)		See #6	
11	Personal (from home) computing devices in classroom		Locally crafted (Genessee example, Wood River), ETA group… With examples, points of consideration	

12	Parental use of device (41)	Intended for student academic growth Uses outside this definition (personal gain, etc…) are prohibited	Locally crafted- encourage parent participation with a focus on education of the student	RFI to include insurance for district / parents to participate in
13	Purpose / responsibilities (11, 12)	Intended for student academic growth Uses outside this definition (personal gain, etc…) are prohibited		Guiding questions from Intel guidebook for change
14	Limitation of liability (12, 20)	State to promulgate language for schools to treat devices as their own property for the purposes of acceptable use policy (search and seizure)	District responsible for liability issues- use Maine language for example	
15	Selection of digital material (14)		Locally crafted- provide examples for parental notification / preview of content / options for opting out / investigating content	Refer to schoolnet integration subcommittee
16	Due process (13)		Locally crafted- provide examples	
17	Search and seizure (13, 14)		Locally crafted- provide examples	Refer to Ebarharti-Maki and Tappen for best practice language
18	Intellectual property rights (20, 36)	Students retain rights to their work if created within AUP parameters- district retains right to use products created by staff		
19	Accounts (student, teacher, administrator) (15, 37, 38)			
20	Teacher code of conduct (24-28)			
21	Monitoring of student activity on device (20)			
22	Personalization of device		Locally crafted- appropriate	

	(music, games, pictures) (21, 40)		digital content for personal use allowed but limited to music and pictures and that which does not hinder network or device	
23	Consequences of policy violation (21 - 23)			
24	Weblog (Maine model)			
25	Other Acceptable Use issues?			
26	Establishment of local Technology Advisory Councils	No state policy	Recommendations for LEAs to create local councils include the scope and composition, (flesh out some guidance), establish minimum requirements for parent orientation content, recommendation to include students and parents in Technology Advisory Councils	Maine examples? Parent involvement overlap with other areas? Guiding questions from Intel guidebook for change
27	Standardization	State-level procurement (finite options based on vendor solution)		Discuss with Schoolnet Subcommittee for standardized assessments- other policy coming out of the Schoolnet Subcommittee related to standardization?
28	Centralization of hardware	• State selects the hardware but allows exceptions / substitutions (e.g., school for the blind). • See asset management language below • Single device is the vision of procurement committee		Procurement Subcommittee- flexibility of device (and add-ons) for accessibility? Idaho will use Maine's language
29	Centralization of software	• State sets minimum and districts are allowed to add	LEA's provided discretion to add software, develop	Procurement Subcommittee-

		• Draft guidance related to minimum functionality. • Define minimum (e.g., word processing, graphic, spreadsheets)- "productivity suite" (pg 23 in background reading from ME RFP) • Guidelines and procedures related to supporting additional, non-standard software that impacts OS	guidelines regarding modification and support- any software additions (purchase, support, licensing, etc…) beyond minimum requirements are the responsibility of the LEA.	base software to meet functional requirements stemming from instructional use, check with Instructional Integration Subcommittee
30	Centralization of PD			Classroom Technology Integration Subcommittee will determine this area
31	Centralization digital content	State policy regarding adoption of Schoolnet and implications for districts that don't adopt		Schoolnet Subcommittee
32	Centralization assessment	State policy to be developed by Schoolnet Subcommittee		Schoolnet Subcommittee- seek policy language
33	Centralization technical support	State policy, tech support is part of the vendor bid offering.	Districts are responsible for support for any hardware or software above/beyond standard solution	Procurement Subcommittee- RFP, part of vendor proposal
34	Protocol for hardware inventory updates	See Canby policy regarding annually with current technology update, language in RFP about evolution of hardware, establish cycle as part of the RFP, (e.g., hardware cycle refresh- 4 years?) compatibility issues -sub-point D- Canby		Procurement Subcommittee
35	Establish policy/ expectations for anti-virus and personal firewall software	• Included as one of the software elements to be included in RFP (pg 54 of reading packet) • Federal law and state statute currently address this issue		Procurement Subcommittee
36	Establish policy/ expectations filtering	• Abide by state (I.C. 33-131) and federal (Children's		Procurement Subcommittee

		Internet Protection Act- CIPA) filtering requirements and develop references / guidance for these areas • Develop policy related to appropriate usage training		
37	Establish policy/ expectations for client management	Request- part of the RFP, each district would need to adopt what the vendor provides. It will be provided as part of the device		Procurement Subcommittee
38	Develop inventory tracking system	Examine ME's asset management system Adopt ME's system and customize for ID, set policy from state level Work with ME and utilize their system, not part of the RFP		Maine SDE
39	component checklists (i.e., external equipment)	Asset management system should have ability to manage	LEA's responsible for managing components	
40	Imaging cycle- restore to base	Minimum software set/load managed and provided with standard package, State work with vendor to create, distribute and manage ability to image the device easily- part of RFP		Procurement Subcommittee
41	Establish procedures for device assignments to students	See ME system, build on existing ID unique id system. State establish a policy regarding device distribution and assignment system		Procurement Subcommittee
42	Establish procedures for device assignments to districts			Procurement Subcommittee
43	Establish roll-out process (standardized or customized based on size?)	See ME system, examine regional distribution center structure, part of RFP?		Procurement Subcommittee
44	Software oversight / restrictions	State oversight and support for basic package, vendor to outline as part of RFP response	LEA's may add on but responsible for determining compatibility and support	Procurement Subcommittee
45	Supplementing basic solution with additional hardware	See above	LEA responsibility to purchase	Procurement
46	Purchasing of additional	State policy-encourage option		Procurement

	devices (Districts, employees, families)	for additional purchasing, structure to avoid competition with traditional market Page 25, 3.3.5 from Maine		Subcommittee
47	Device ownership	• Establish policy about ownership, when does it transfer from state to district and can district transfer ownership to a student? • Establish lifecycle of devices • RFP structured to allow for zero value at end of four years • If device has a value (e.g., $100+) establish guidance regarding disposal through state surplus		Procurement Subcommittee
48	Disposal of devices after four-year cycle	• First provide a mechanism for student to purchase for nominal fee (e.g., $5 - $10) • Second create pool for local districts		
49	Security related to disposal (i.e., clear hard drive)	State establish policy about who is responsible for wiping hard drive Add language to RFP about "end of life" Seek guidance from ME		Procurement Subcommittee
50	Security	Establish acceptable use policy including privacy statement limiting state liability for personal use of devices (e.g., purchases from Amazon.		
51	Mobile device warranty expectations	RFP to provide basic warranty for mechanical issues		Procurement Subcommittee
52	Mobile device insurance expectations	State to provide guidance regarding insurance options RFP- separate break-out of insurance options to leverage state economies of scale with vendors, voluntary	• LEAs to decide whether to offer/require additional accidental damage insurance • Connect insurance to ability to take device home	Procurement Subcommittee

		participation by districts		
53	Accessibility	Establish policy for waivers from standard device should a student's IEP or disability require a special device feature RFP to include accessibility options (e.g., universal design standards)		Procurement
54	Parent involvement / community outreach	• Develop policy language reflecting critical role of parents • Require parent orientation prior to laptops going home (see ME training agenda) • State to develop basic orientation template for districts/schools to customize • Establish minimum to be covered in orientation and training (PD part of RFP to include development of parent orientation)	District required to offer orientation	Professional development related to training for parents
55	Technology support	• Establish standard for support/repair (e.g., Maine's policy regarding 5 minutes and then re-image) • Establish process for return and repair of machine • State guidance regarding encouraging student support capabilities as part of their instructional program	Establish back-up policies-acceptable use policies, personal data on a machine are never the responsibility of the district	Procurement Subcommittee
56	Wireless access / security (open or closed)	• Encourage districts to maintain secure systems that are available 24-7 to all with passwords. • Not a 24-7 guarantee • Policy requirements about open networks and filtering (e.g., youtube videos draining bandwidth) • Filtering part of the RFP	LEAs to have discretion about whether to operate open system (e.g., not password protected)	Procurement Subcommittee, Idaho Education Network
57		•		

58	Power supply / safeguards	• Policy recommendations related to back ups should power go out. • Servers • RFP		Procurement Subcommittee
59	Patching / upgrading process			Procurement Subcommittee
60	Back-end servers and storage			Procurement Subcommittee
61	Anti-theft measures			Procurement Subcommittee
62	Configure classroom furniture to facilitate use of mobile devices and collaboration			Procurement Subcommittee
63				
64				
65				
66				

General questions from the Procurement Subcommittee:

1) Are we purchasing devices or a managed service? (Managed service)
2) What procurement instrument will we use? RFP, RFI, existing contracts or a combination. (Combination)
3) What is the duration of the vendor contract? What are the renewal options? *4 year contract, districts have the option to purchase additional devices.*
4) Will devices be ***recommended*** to go home at night or will schools have to upgrade infrastructure? *It is recommended devices go home. Districts will be responsible for infrastructure if devices are not charged in the evening.*
5) What is an acceptable level of down-time? *Want to handle it the same way as Maine.*
6) What is an acceptable level of customer service support and how will it be measured?
7) What are the instructional goals for the 1 to 1 devices and what software is needed to achieve them?
8) Will devices need to be Virtualized?
9) Will client management, anti-virus and firewall software be a part of the procurement? If so, at what level of standardization?

Student Survey Questions- method of delivery may be focus groups, interviews, surveymonkey

The state of Idaho recently passed a package of education reform laws, titled Students Come First, that include a significant focus on the integration of technology in Idaho schools including a one-to-one ratio of computing devices in grades 9-12 (phased in over time) and technological upgrades for every classroom. The Technology Task Force is responsible for providing recommendations for the implementation of Students Come First and is interested in capturing student perspectives. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey, all responses are anonymous. Your honest, thoughtful feedback is appreciated.

1. Which grade are you in?

2. Please rate the following statements based upon how strongly you agree or disagree with the statement. The scale of responses is from 1 (I strongly disagree with the statement) to 5 (I strongly agree with the statement).

Statement	**N/A Not Applicable**	**1 Strongly Disagree**	**2 Slightly Disagree**	**3 Slightly Agree**	**4 Strongly Agree**
I have personal experience using a mobile computing device (laptop, tablet, etc…) and feel comfortable using one.	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
I am excited about the idea of teachers/administrators receiving mobile computing devices.	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
I can envision how teachers/administrators could use mobile computing devices to make instruction more engaging.	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
I am excited about the idea of students receiving mobile computing devices for their schoolwork.	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
I have some concerns that need to be addressed before I will feel fully comfortable with implementing one-to-one (one device assigned per student) mobile computing devices in Idaho high schools.	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

1. Rate your level of comfortability using portable computing devices? (likert 1-4)

2. Do you have your own computing device? (y/n)

3. Do you have internet access at home? (y/n)

4. Do you currently use a computing device for your schoolwork (likert 1-4, 1= never, 2= sometimes, 3= most of the time, 4= all of the time)

5. How important are the following capabilities when using computing devices for schoolwork?

Uses of Mobile Computing Device	**N/A Not Applicable**	**1 Not Important**	**2 Less Important**	**3 Slightly Important**	**4 Very Important**
Collaboration and communication between teachers and students	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Collaboration and communication between students	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Note Taking	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Task Management/Scheduling/Organization	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Research (Internet, Database, Library Systems, etc…)	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Writing/Journaling	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Uploading/downloading/revising classroom assignments digitally	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Delivering presentations	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Content Creation (Audio/Video)	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Content Creation (Text)	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Digital Textbook (replacing traditional textbooks)	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Access to currently used software applications	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Student Response Systems (conducting quizzes, class polls, etc…)	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Text-to-speech	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Speech-to-text	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
Printing of assignments and materials from device to printers	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

6. What additional computing device functions do you feel are important for schoolwork? (text box)

7. Have you ever taken an online course? (y/n)

8. What are your thoughts about taking online courses in the future? (text box)

9. Do you believe access to a computing device throughout the school day would improve your learning and academic performance? (y/n)

10. Please rank the top five physical attributes you feel are most important for mobile computing device use in schoolwork- (1 is most important)

Physical Attributes of Mobile Computing Devices
Device is lightweight and portable
Device is durable (designed to handle “abuse”)
Device has a large, bright screen with a screen resolution high enough to handle modern applications and web content
Device has a physical keyboard
Device has a touchscreen, and the user can “write” on the screen using a finger or stylus or use an onscreen keyboard
Device has integrated camera(s) for creating video content or accessing video conferencing applications
Device has integrated microphone for capturing audio content
Device has integrated speakers or headphone jack to reproduce audio content
Device has expansion ports allowing external peripherals (i.e. camera memory cards, thumb drives, keyboards, mice, etc…)
Device has a long-lasting battery that can last through an entire school day
Device has wireless networking capabilities

11. If a mobile computing device was assigned to only you throughout the school day, how would you use it to increase your learning? (text box)

12. Would you be willing to take the mobile computing device home at night, charge it and bring it back to school the following day?

Text box responses

13. What excites you most about the one-to-one program (one device assigned per student) including online courses?

14. What concerns you most about the one to one program (including online courses)?

15. What additional information would you like to share with the State Department of Education?