

BSEP Instructional Technology Question 3-16-23

1. I am requesting additional information be shared on the following line items taken from page 2 of the technology instruction pdf shared Tuesday night.
 - a. ● *A decrease in the school technology equipment and supplies allocation from \$8/student to \$6/student to reflect the actual use and a shift of some costs to the District level.*
 - b. Specifically -
 - i. What does the current \$8 per student fund?
While the original intention of this line item was to pay for things like printer paper, projector bulbs, parts for chromebook repairs, and instructional software subscriptions, in response to needs identified by schools, expenditures have been expanded to other classroom technology expenditures.
 - ii. What will be unfunded by reducing the per student funding to \$6?
An evaluation of the current year and 2021-22 expenses by sites indicates that there are no recurring/ongoing expenses that will be unfunded by this reduction.
 - iii. Why is this written as funding is limited to *equipment and supplies* for technology rather than access, training, event participation for students, etc.? I didn't see that in the measure that this funding may only be used for supplies and equipment - perhaps you can you point me to the part I'm missing Rather, in my re-reading of the measure I'm seeing "...providing instructional technology", and "access for students to computers and instructional technology". Is there a part I missed that clarifies instructional technology must be used solely for equipment and supplies?
Please see response to number b.i..
 - iv. The technology director mentioned twice that the *base level of student technology needs* were already met, can you please clarify what is meant by a "base level" WRT student technology support?
There may be some confusion here, this was referring to the baseline that we have recently established for the classroom technology standards, which are now being funded and maintained at a district level. Many of these items were not uniformly provided by the district in years past, and schools were left to find their own funding sources for these items. This year the baseline classroom standards are:
 - Student Chromebooks
 - 1:2 in grade 3
 - 1:1 in grades 4-5
 - 1:1 in core subject classrooms 6-8
 - 1 cart per 2 classrooms grades 9-12
 - Teacher Chromebooks

- Video projection & sound in all classrooms
- Document Cameras
- Lending libraries of iPads (120 districtwide)

The classroom standards for future years are being evaluated by the Technology Advisory committee, and will be included in the committee's proposal document to be voted on in May.

Additionally, many of the software subscriptions which schools had purchased on their own in prior years are now being funded districtwide from a central office budget, so this need has decreased for schools.

- v. Where is this additional \$18,716 being deployed (this figure is based on the published BUSD student population - 9358)
Please refer to the plan document, some expenses have increased and some decreased. Increased expenses include the digital equity measures, Follett Resource Manager, increased costs for existing software platforms, and the change of 1 computer tech to 12-month status to support summer school
- vi. Have we discussed with the schools, what they would do, if they had the additional funding? If not, why not?
The budget for the school equipment and supplies was originally added to this budget plan by the technology director, and that number has fluctuated each year as we adjust the balance based on spending and identified needs. Traditionally, the Principals are advised of the amount allocated that year after the plan has been approved.
- vii. On Page 6, final; paragraph under the Technology Software and Equipment for Schools heading - the document states the decrease is due to "*actual usage by the schools*" - please clarify what this means and provide the data that shows the unused capacity.
This is in reference to the fact that many of the schools have not utilized the full allocation in prior years. In the cases where the funds have been fully spent, it is almost universally not being spent on recurring costs, but rather is being spent on adopting new technologies such as Chromebook carts beyond the baseline standard, Amazon fire tablets, etc.
In the prior year (SY21-22) schools had left more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of their funds unspent. The allocation was decreased for the SY22-23 plan. As of this writing schools have spent \$15K of the \$78K allotted for this item in the SY22-23 plan. The availability of this funding to Principals is communicated multiple times throughout the year in multiple ways.
- viii. Lastly, I spoke with the principal at my school. He said he is part of the technology advising committee and was unaware of the decrease planned in funding. However the technology director mentioned the committee was made up by principals and voted for the reduction. Can you help me understand how this gap can be explained?
For clarification, the discussion with the Technology Advisory Committee

was referenced for two specific areas: 1) Identifying a better process for the evaluation and selection of districtwide software subscriptions and 2) Identifying metrics/processes for evaluating the efficacy of Instructional Technology implementations. It was not communicated that the TAC discussed the BSEP funding for the schools, nor that they voted on specific items included in any plan or budget. The committee is brand new this year, and currently the timelines of the committee do not align with the timelines for the BSEP plan. The committee will not be voting on any formal recommendations until May, while this plan was due in March. Moving forward, the work of the committee will inform subsequent budget development activities.

2. Please provide insights as to why the Follet Resource Manager expense is warranted at this time, namely -

a. Why (specifically) does the current system need to be replaced? In the meeting it was said to be inefficient. What does that mean?

The school libraries use a system called Destiny from Follett to check out books to students. This system is designed specifically for checking out library books, and has a number of limitations on use and reporting. For many years, the library team has been bending this system to also allow the checkout of musical instruments, but the processes required are more time-consuming for staff in entering, tracking and reporting on the resource usage. In recent years, as the District added the service of checking out Chromebooks and Hotspots to students, the librarians have also had to spend extra time bending this system to adapt to that use.

Follett has a separate system called Resource Manager which is specifically designed for use with these alternative types of checkout resources. Resource Manager is designed as an "asset tracking" software to better assist school districts in not losing valuable assets. Moving these non-library-book resources to the Resource Manager system will save significant time for librarians and administrators throughout the year.

b. What does it currently cost us using the library checkout solution?

The librarians would still continue to use Destiny for daily checkout of library books, so this is an additional product and expense, it is not a replacement.

c. What is the benefit of making this change now? For ex - why not change to Follet Resource manager in the new BSEP funding in 24-25?

The librarians are already being forced to complete extra work to accommodate these tasks in the Destiny system. Putting this in the plan for 23-24 will allow us to do the implementation tasks over the summer and begin the 23-24 school year with the new system in place, alleviating some of librarian workload. If we wait until the 24-25 plan, librarians will be forced to continue this extra work through the next school year.

d. How long should we expect to have to pay this additional \$8K expense?

The additional \$16K annual expense (\$8K of which is paid by Instructional technology and \$8K by VAPA), is perpetual, and will be needed as long as we

use this system to checkout and track musical instruments and student technology devices.

And is the expense \$8K or \$16K? Page 6 under Technology Software and Equipment to Schools refers to this expense as \$16K?

The total annual cost is \$16K. This will be split between the Instructional Technology Budget and the VAPA budget. Each budget will provide \$8K of the annual expense.

- i. A new \$8K annual expense (\$22K first year) to purchase Follett Resource Manager to streamline student checkout of musical instruments, Chromebooks and hotspots (50% funded by VAPA)

3. Page 1, section 4 may have a typo - A new digital equity section has been added to the plan which includes \$20K to fund internet access for disadvantaged students and \$20 for family technology workshops such as digital citizenship and access to parent's digital tools.

- a. Does this mean to say \$20 for family technology? Or \$20K? Or per family?

This will be corrected in the second version of the plan. The actual cost is, \$20K annually, and breaks down to \$20/month/student.

4. Please clarify what portion of the Instructional technology budget is made up by BSEP vs the other funding programs listed - Bond Funds, State and Federal Grants,. Hillside sale etc. . Secondly, please clarify funding restrictions that would prevent any of these other funds from being used to fund initiatives currently funded by BSEP.

This budget breakdown is not a simple question, as these funding sources are not allocated the same way, and do not have the same funding restrictions. I.e.; Hillside sale is a one-time pool of money. Federal ERate grants are matching funds for specific purposes. Bond funds are issued in tranches every few years and a part of that tranche is given for technology. I would be glad to meet to go over this, but I don't think we can effectively summarize that in this document.

Of the funds mentioned, only the General Funds could be used to pay for staffing expenses, which are the bulk of the BSEP expenses. However, the bulk of the general funds allocated for technology are already being used to pay for other staffing, there are no uncommitted general funds that could be used to fund these BSEP staffing expenses.

5. Page 4 - Data and Outcomes -

- a. What outcomes does the Technology Instructional program intend to measure?

The current write up defines a list of possible quantifiable metrics. Please clarify the outcomes intend for the Instructional Technology program rather than what might be quantified. Essentially - its hard to know if what is being measured is meaningful without knowing why your measuring it.

2022-23 represents the first year for including performance measures and data in the BSEP Annual Reports and Annual Plans. Moving forward we will continue to refine our performance measures and data reporting to align with program goals. Progress will be communicated to the Planning and Oversight Committee and gathering committee feedback will be ongoing.

- b. Please clarify who and what the TSA (Teacher on Special Assignment) is and why Instructional Technology fund is supporting it?

Jennifer Nguyen, our Instructional Technology TSA, conducts a variety of classroom technology training and support-related activities. These include coordinating the activities of our Technology Teacher Leaders, creating instructional technology training materials through monthly newsletters, other documents, and videos, and conducting direct classroom instruction on things like digital citizenship.

6. Please clarify why we anticipate more teachers will want to build on technology learning and skills and what data we have that demonstrates these activities on the part of teachers?

- a. Page 5 TTL - *“... and it is anticipated that teachers will want to build on the technology learning and skills that they have acquired to provide more effective use of these technologies in their lesson plans in the years to come”*

This statement reflects a general observation of increased usage of technology in the classroom each year.

7. Like most of the funding allocations, TTL's seem to be assessed by size of student population. Is there data to show the TTL at King (for ex) was at 100% capacity because of the larger student population and that is what is warranting the request for the second TTL at King? Please correct me if I'm wrong but I don't believe TTL allocation has to follow other funding modalities?

The technology teacher leaders maintain ongoing logs of all of their activities which they submit each month. These logs are assessed by the Instructional Technology Leadership team, and used for a variety of functions, such as including the metrics provided to the P&O committee, identifying areas where a TTL may be underutilized, and where a TTL may need additional support.

It is important to understand that TTLs are full time classroom teachers who are simply receiving a stipend to conduct these additional activities. 100% capacity would not be an accurate representation, since they already have a full time job to perform, and are expected to perform these activities above and beyond that full time job.

8. Page 7 - Program Measures 21-22

- a. Is there a current view of these numbers? How have they changed YoY?

2022-23 represents the first year for including performance measures and data in the BSEP Annual Reports and Annual Plans. As such, 2021-22 is the first year of reported data. Because we are mid-year in 2022-23, we will not report data until the year has been completed and numbers are final. We expect 2022-32 data to be included in the 2022-23 Annual Report and then again in the 2024-25 Annual Plans.

- b. In the Professional Capacity section I'm not sure how to interpret the data for “knowledge “skills” and “Recruitment and Retention” Can you help me understand how to look at this table WRT to knowledge “skills” and “Recruitment and Retention” please?

As stated above, 2022-23 represents the first year for including performance measures and data in the BSEP Annual Reports and Annual Plans. As shared verbally in the presentation on 3/14/23 by the Director of Local Resources, a standard template for all programs was developed to be included in every BSEP

plan and report. There are some cases where the three categories may not be applicable to a particular program. 2022-23 being the first year of use, it is likely that the template will be updated to better reflect the goals and performance measures for each program.

The Professional Capacity section, as with the other sections, includes a general description of the type of program activities that can be represented by program measures in general. It is not to suggest that each program will have measures that corresponds to each of the examples provided in the description e.g. Recruitment and Retention.

- c. Without goals and associated outcomes we have no way of knowing if any of these data points are useful, valuable, or good for the students. When will we have outcome attributable data please?

As stated above, 2022-23 represents the first year for including performance measures and data in the BSEP Annual Reports and Annual Plans. Moving forward we will continue to refine our performance measures and data reporting to align with program goals.

- d. Diversity and Inclusion -

- i. Are these numbers unique individuals or frequency of use?

Unique individuals within each category. However, a single student may be included in more than one category. I.e.; a student may be included in both the English Learner total and the Special Education total.