

Digital Learning / One-to-World Framework

Created by the Utah Technology Coordinators Council (TCC) with input by the Superintendents and a consortium of stakeholders

Draft 11-10-2014

Public education's framework to engage students in achieving excellence

Purpose

1. Change/improve the **culture** of public education, classroom instruction, student engagement, teaching and learning processes, and accelerated digital learning
 - Provide systemic support for **student engagement** and **classroom innovation**
 - Access (both teacher, student and home) to **quality digital curriculum**, learning management support structures, collaboration systems, formative assessment systems, ongoing access to proven software, instructional practices research, etc.
 - **Prepare** students for college and careers including an emphasis on **higher-order problem solving** across the curriculum
 - Broaden **STEM career path** options for students
 - Support the drive toward on-demand, **24/7 learning** and the **flipped classroom**
 - Reduce the **end of year testing window** to the last few weeks of the school year
 - Achieve cost efficiencies through **consortium** purchases, local planning and shared **coordination**
2. The full implementation of this framework supports the Governor's Education Plan: **On PACE to 66% by 2020**

Seven Governing Principles

1. Require **accountability frameworks** for each phase of the change process
2. Technology supports, not supplants, excellent teaching. The key to quality instruction is the teacher.
3. Public schools are managed by **elected local boards** with their own policies, priorities and constituents who prefer **local control** of the education system for their students
4. Changes to processes require **thoughtful planning** and preparation to maximize success
5. Sustained **ongoing funding** and negotiating **multiple state contracts** provides economies of scale in support of local purchasing control
6. Build on the **infrastructure investments and planning teams** (including administrators, teachers, parents and students) LEAs have in their schools
7. Provide flexible **implementation frameworks** for LEAs to craft their technology vision for teaching and learning that includes meeting their needs for equipment, software/curriculum, professional development, infrastructure upgrades, technical support and refresh
8. Leverage **LEA expertise** in crafting technology processes and digital curriculum for evolving local needs

Cost

This framework is currently partially funded by local LEA budgets, and as part of a **shared funding model**, current annual LEA/Charter School investments are **not** to be supplanted. Based on Project Red national averages, the total **annual** cost for **high** access is about **\$500 per funded student**. LEAs can deploy this framework with varied levels of access.

For example, an LEA may plan for varied levels of access across grade bands:

- **High** access for grades 5-12 (376,000 students): state and LEA **shared cost** \$188 million
- **Group** access for grades K-4 (235,000 students): state and LEA **shared cost** \$58.7 million

UEN **Infrastructure funding** must scale to meet the increased network demands.

Digital Learning / One-to-World Framework

ONGOING FUNDING:

- **Consistent, dedicated, ongoing funding for all LEAs** is necessary for long-term success. *“When funding is in jeopardy, teachers and administrators tend to withdraw from the program and plan for life after the initiative.” -- Project Red*
- **Dissemination formula** for annual dedicated technology funding is determined by the Utah State Board of Education / State Charter Board using framework checkpoints:
 - Set aside state level administration funding (Public Education Leadership Structure, monitoring, etc.)
 - Set aside an amount equal to the percentage of students enrolled in charter schools (about 10% of total students in state) for Charter schools. The **State Charter Board** determines the dissemination formula for charters
 - Distribute remaining funds to District LEAs as a **5% to 15% base** (base is tapered depending on actual funding) with the remaining amount by per-pupil.
 - Guidelines for **“non-supplant of LEA technology funding”** doesn’t penalize districts for previous investments and doesn’t discourage current investment
- Ongoing UEN Infrastructure funding indexed for growth is **separate** from this proposal but essential and required for success

IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW:

- **State** entities, including a statewide advisory committee, adopt policies and procedures to support LEA implementation
- **LEAs** craft their student-excellence plan including vision, goals, benchmarks and timelines
- With peer-reviewed plans and demonstrated **benchmark progress**, LEAs apply for approval for state funding
- Through annual and ongoing program evaluation, LEAs **refine** their evolving work in student access, professional learning, and support infrastructure for their local vision and goals

=====

ADDENDUM - FRAMEWORK DETAIL

GETTING READY:

- **Public Education Framework Leadership**

- State Board of Education in collaboration with the Utah Education and Telehealth Network Governing Board create the **Public Education Leadership Structure** responsible to **support** LEA implementation to provide the needed statewide support and auditing for implementation fidelity.
 - The **State Superintendent** and the **UEN Executive Director** lead the Advisory Committee and work closely with USOE, UEN and LEAs to be the voice of the project to ensure a reliable, scalable, and effective implementation
 - The State Superintendent leads the **annual review** of State Board of Education Technology Standards and Rubrics and leads ongoing compliance monitoring

- **Statewide Advisory Committee**

- Comprised of the following members:
 - State Superintendent and UETN Executive Director as co-chairs
 - Governor’s Education Advisor
 - one member who has extensive **digital content** experience;
 - one member who is a current or former school district **superintendent** who has extensive experience with leading a technology initiative;
 - one member who is:
 - an LEA **principal** and has extensive experience with a technology initiative; or
 - an assistant superintendent for **curriculum and instruction** and has extensive experience with a technology initiative;
 - one member who has extensive experience with **mobile device** infrastructure;
 - one member who is a nationally recognized **change leadership** or change management expert;
 - one member who is a **teacher** who works in a school where a technology initiative has been implemented; and
 - one member who has extensive experience in independent **program evaluation** of technology initiatives;
 - one member who is an LEA **business administrator**;
 - one **rural and one urban LEA** technology representative to appointed by Technology Coordinators Council (TCC); and
 - the executive director of the **STEM Action Center**

- **Advisory Committee Responsibilities:**

- Designate **subcommittee work groups** to help with identified instructional, technical, and curriculum needs, etc.
- **Pursues state contracts** from multiple vendors to meet diverse needs of LEAs
- **Defines** implementation evaluator models, gets RFPs developed, oversees implementations, coordinates evaluation and handles PR

ADDITIONAL STATE SUPPORT:

- State Board of Education establishes a **board rule** on the collection, usage and storage of **student data**
- The Utah State Board of Education in collaboration with the Utah Education and Telehealth Network Governing Board develop processes to:
 - Monitor **change management** progress in LEAs with annual visits to the seven areas of the state including ability to require corrective actions
 - **Recommend approval** of annual LEA dedicated technology funding based on demonstrated progress of LEA plan to the State Board of Education
 - **Monitor non-supplant** of LEA funding including LEAs providing ratios of tech support staffing, device and PD
 - Create three year **review** rotation schedule and convenes external peer-reviewers as needed to find strengths and weaknesses of LEA implementation fidelity and next steps for progress
 - **Report progress** annually to the Utah State Board of Education and to the Utah State Legislature Public Education Committee
 - Continue to **develop and expand OER** (Open Education Resources)
 - **Coordinate E-Rate funding** to maximize statewide infrastructure, procurement, and technical standards-setting
 - Ensure funding for **UEN WAN** connections and statewide infrastructure for LEAs keeps pace with increased bandwidth needs
 - Create state policies for **LEA building construction** to include wireless and electrical infrastructure to support this framework

VISION

LEA Planning:

LEA planning for implementing the framework is based on the **annual LEA planning process** and begins at the LEA school board level setting student achievement goal directives for local schools.

(Superintendents make staffing, etc. decisions to support their district plan.) (Three year plans with annual updates, progress reports, and budgets. Modifications are peer-reviewed and receive approval of the State Advisory Committee.)

Annual ***School Improvement Plans*** align to LEA goals with the planning teams at each building including administrators, tech support, teachers, students, community council members, parents, etc.

LEA teams (lead by administrators, and supported by community council members, school board members, teachers, etc.) take the school improvement plans and devise a multi-year deployment timeline to support accomplishment of local school improvement plans by considering items such as:

- Change management
- Sustainability strategies
- Professional development for instructional best practices
- Professional development for technical support best practices
- District and device policies
- Data security
- Technical Support
- Economies of scale

Other Planning Components

- **Three-year previous expenses review** to be completed by each LEA to validate the estimate of the projected cost per-year, per-student (total funding) needed to successfully implement the initiative.
- **Network/hardware inventory** by building and based on year purchased
- A **site wireless survey** by a qualified engineer (pre/post) showing the broadband signal strength and capacity in each school
- Network deployment
 - industry standards/interoperability-ness in consultation with UEN/TCC
- Security deployment
 - industry standards//interoperability-ness in consultation with UEN/TCC
- Device deployment and refresh timeline
- Student technology skills acquisition expectations and checkpoints
- **Home use** of student devices and **home access to school networks** is a local decision
- **BYOD** (Bring Your Own Device) use is a local decision
- High access to **student devices** is defined by local LEAs. It could range from 1 to 1 for all, to a tiered model where grade bands have different ratios
- Tech standards rubric evaluation by building
 - tech portion of rubric involves tech person
 - device portion of rubric involves teachers
 - PD portion of rubric involves administrators
- Matrix of local buildings with baseline rubric and annual progress in rubric movement
 - PD perspective
 - device deployment perspective
 - routers/Wireless/cabling, etc
 - hardware
 - other LAN type infrastructure
- **Annual refresh rates** for aging hardware and infrastructure is determined by LEA plans. The expense of acquiring “back-end” technology, i.e. servers, wireless access equipment, e-texts,

software licenses, and security systems cannot be under-estimated. Economies of scale pricing is negotiated at state contract and/or national levels and supported by UEN/TCC consulting with emphasis on benefiting local businesses and maximizing ERate returns

- **Local implementation planning** is part of the LEA/school improvement plans/trust lands plans etc. and includes local benchmarks
- **Plan Peer Reviews:** All district and school plans are peer-reviewed before presentation to the state Advisory Committee

LEA Application:

- Measurable student **achievement goals** (baseline, measurement model, and progress) congruent with **On PACE to 66% by 2020**
- Change management plan including communication plan (disaster, PR, student achievement, etc.)
- Application also details:
 - Infrastructure,
 - Data security assessment
 - Professional development,
 - Tech support,
 - Devices and associated policies,
 - Digital curriculum policies,
 - Evaluation

LEA Implementation:

- **Ongoing professional development (PD)** for teachers creates/builds capacity of local PD staff and curriculum specialists with digital tools
 - aligned to the **Utah Teacher Effectiveness Standards** and other high-quality PD standards such as:
 - eMINTS
 - ISTE teacher and administrator standards
 - ISTE essential conditions
 - full and appropriate technology weaved throughout all PD events
 - NOTE: Little teacher efficiency is gained by moving classrooms to high access to technology. A teacher who formerly taught 30 students is not able to teach 50 students. In other words, **no significant “cost dividend”** from implementing teaching/learning technology is expected (from Governor’s technology working group)
- Build on LEA and UEN infrastructure/platform/PD Models/Learning goals/investments, etc. while also leveraging **economies of scale**
- Implementation builds **local capacity** in LEAs for PD models such as train the trainer, mentor, etc. and tech support models such as on-site specialists, etc.

TIMELINE

multi-year implementation plan per building

(use the State Board of Education technology standard rubrics to determine **the phase** for **each site**)

- phase 1 - UEN WAN, LEA LAN, teacher technology and PD
- phase 2 - groups of schools/students with full access + continued teacher PD
- phase 3 - all schools/students with full access and begin refresh cycles (ongoing teacher PD i.e. new teachers, needs assessment for current teachers)

Accountability / Program Evaluation:

- LEA Self -Evaluation
 - Each participating LEA posts a semi-annual progress report on the LEA web site
- External Evaluation
 - An external evaluator is retained to insure “progress and fidelity” of implementation
 - To be led by state Universities with Teacher Education programs
 - External evaluation to include:
 - PD review Academic gains review lead by local school boards or community councils
 - Network/security review by UEN/TCC peer-review committees
 - Academic Achievement / College and Career Readiness evaluation
 - Cost savings through coordinated procurement and economies of scale
- State Superintendent provides compliance and monitoring support