

To: Dr. Michael Fulton
Cc: Dr. Rick Atha
Date: May 2, 2019

RE: Update - Digital Learning Task Force April Meeting Summaries

The Digital Learning Task Force met on April 16 and 23, 2019. The agendas for the meetings included:

1. **April 16 Presentations - School Finance and App Request and Review Process**

At the prior meeting, the task force requested presentations on School District Finances as well as App Review Procedures. Dr. Rick Atha joined the task force and provided a short presentation on the school finance model and the Shawnee Mission District Budget. Dr. Atha as well as Drew Lane responded to questions regarding how personnel, curriculum resources, and technology systems are financed as well as limitations placed on Capital Outlay expenses for expenditures such as salaries.

SUPPORTING (OPERATING) \$235,032,095 61% (State = 72%)	CAPITAL OUTLAY Local-Restricted \$49,063,829 14% (State = 0%)	BOND (DEBT) Local-Restricted \$223,000,000 (\$29.6M) Debt 7% (State = 0%)	FLOW THROUGH State/Local - Restricted \$36,778,870 - 9% (State = 81%)	FEDERAL Restricted \$11,209,925 3% (Federal = 100%)	SELF SUPPORTED Fees, Gifts, Grants -Restricted \$23,813,674 - 6% (State = 1%)
Unrestricted for these purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary & benefits 83% • Student transportation 6% • Supplies & services 6% • Utilities 4% • Other 1% 	Restricted by statute for these purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bond Debt & Apple Leases • Construction • Renovation & repair • Maintenance salaries • Technology and software • Furnishings and equipment • Uniform purchases 	Requires voter approval and is restricted for these purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major construction and renovation of facilities • Equip and furnish facilities • Cannot be used for operations • Bond debt is paid from the Bond & Interest Fund 	Restricted by statute for these purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KPERS flow-through contribution funded by the state • Cost of living weighting funded by local taxes 	Restricted by grant for these purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title VIB special education • Title I reading & math support in our high poverty schools • Title IIA to develop high qualified teachers and principals • Title III & IV 	Restricted by statute for the revenue specific purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food service and summer school • Textbook rental & student materials • Gift, Donations & non-federal grants • Special liability

Dr. Dan Gruman, Coordinator of Assessments and Research and Dr. Darren Dennis, Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment joined the group and provided an overview of the Elementary App Review Process. Apps are requested either by individual educators or through curriculum adoptions using the SMSD Web HelpDesk. Once submitted for review, building principals have the first step of approval at the building level before the app requests moves to a district committee. The App Review Committee reviews requests with the following considerations:

- **Curriculum and Instruction:** Does the app support an instructional need consistent with district goals/initiatives?
What does the app do that is not already available in other applications?
What curricular objectives does the app support?
- **Data Privacy:** Does the app require students to create an account?
What types of data (if any) does the vendor collect?

Can the classroom teacher or the district manage and restrict student accounts?
What information is required for student accounts, and what are the privacy assurances from the vendor?

- **Age Appropriateness:** Is the App developmentally appropriate for the age/grade level?
- **Advertising:** The Committee prefers that apps have zero advertising. However, this is not always possible with free apps.

If advertising exists, is it age appropriate? Does the advertisement cover a minimal part of the screen? If a student clicks on the ad, where does it take the student?

- **Other Considerations:** Vendors may change their terms of service without notice.

Vendors may also change their advertising tactics without notice.

If the committee receives feedback indicating that the benefits of an approved app no longer outweigh the risks, C&I or ICT may choose to revoke these apps and render them inaccessible to students.



A robust and informative question and answer discussion followed the presentations.

2. Discussion - April 23, 2019

The task force reviewed and discussed additional information on concerns for digital learning practices and received an additional handout of recommendations provided by a parent group outside of the task force. The task force continued to engage in discussion around some of the suggested actions.

A request was stated by a member that the task force review specific academic data as well as data on the number of inappropriate app/sites submitted to the district. This led to a robust and engaging discussion around longitudinal data, correlational vs causal vs evidence research, and testing and academic performance. Good conversations were also held around problems with tying data previously discussed to impact, or not, when digital learning was involved. A concern of the majority indicated that application of data for the purposes of data driven advisory statements would be problematic.

Additional discussion captured thoughts that the SMSD could act as a leader in future development of data gathering models around the impacts of digital learning but that this would also require a new understanding or definition of "success". Understanding that kind of paradigm shift would be a much longer term endeavor and outside the current scope of the task force, the group determined to move forward with gathering published research related to the identified topics and develop recommendations without further review of specific student data given the information already available via the District Academic Program Evaluation Report and data publicly available via the KSDE website.

3. Task Force Work

The task force Members formed into 5 research teams, each team was previously assigned an area to research and begin to formulate advisory statements and intended outcomes. Each work group has an assigned collector responsible for capturing the thoughts, progress, and recommendations of the group with respect to their assigned topic. Time was devoted in the April 23 meeting to provide each research team with an opportunity to check-in with the task force and report their progress. Over the course of the April and May meetings, the work will continue to review research in order to inform the final recommendations of the task force.

4. **Next Steps**

The task force continues to engage in research over the next few weeks (within, as well as outside of our meeting time) around each of the key theme areas (Communications, Technology Integration into teaching and learning, Balanced Use, Student Online Safety, and Professional Development). The research will be collected and shared among task force members in order to review the research and progress on advisory recommendations. The next meeting date for the group is scheduled for May 7. Future work will include pulling together the work and recommendations from the respective research teams to review overlap, gaps, and finalize recommendations.

Christy Ziegler, Drew Lane, Co-Chairs