

MLTI Advisory Board Meeting #8

July 15, 2020

Beth Lambert, Team Lead

Deb Lajoie, Project Manager

Jordan Dean, Office Specialist

Brandi Cota, Management Analyst

Jon Graham, Elementary Digital Learning Specialist

Emma Banks, Secondary Digital Learning and Computer Science Specialist

AGENDA

SWOT protocol of potential plans

Break

Implications

SWOT Protocol

Strengths
Weaknesses
Opportunities
Threats

Everyone will get a chance to contribute and we will continue in each round until everyone has shared what they have.

Potential Plan

Student Agency Platform Plan

- **Devices for Grades 7th and 8th (and 6th if budget allows.)**

Building from the years of statewide institutional knowledge and expectations of student devices at the middle level, it would be traumatic for schools to have those taken away. The move to 6th grade would expand the program completing 1 to 1 for some schools while introducing devices to others for the first time. Without the ability to fulfill 1 to 1 for all grades 9-12, secondary devices become problematic.

- **Additional Peripherals and Equipment.**

While the 6th-8th grade section includes device management, cases and peripherals. Secondary schools would receive portable carts of hardware. This might include items like, cameras, 3D printers, robotics, and various tools. The purpose is a direct extension of utilizing devices beyond initial productivity.

Roughly put, K-5 students learn introductory computing while 6-8 are advancing productivity. By high school students should be about creation. Not only virtually, but physically as well. And portable hardware setups are a low cost option to remove the issue of access for high schools.

Student Agency (con't)

- **Lead learner at each MLTI school.**

An educational representative that teachers and students can reach out to for support. The lead learner acts as a MLTI liaison and mentors the student tech team. They comprise a statewide network of educators providing peer support as well.

- **Student Tech Support.**

At least two students per grade level who work with the Lead Learner to support their school. The actions of the student group are determined locally but students are included as part of the overall solution. They will be present and participate in the regional PD events for students and teachers.

- **Consistent PD Events.**

Two day regional events. The first day is for students showcasing the possibilities their devices provide followed up by educator professional development on day two. The first day sets the bar of what students can do and provides a platform for the best exemplars from around the state. The second day helps teachers, now motivated by student expectations, engage with the learning all through a positive framework.

Student Agency Plan Strengths

- Similar to current program, marketable
- novelty that focus on students, focus on PD
- maintains consistency at middle school level
- less effect on local budget
- tech leader in school adds accountability
- student tech teams in each school
- focus on intro level, middle level and high school level
- hardware at highschool level won't be an issue as far as tools etc...
- lead learner
- comprehensive, took elements we talked about and addressed them all
- including grade 6
- reestablishing the lead teacher
- student tech teams with tech leader
- all middle school students would have an MLTI device.
- PD involves students and teachers

Weaknesses

- Relationship between lead tech is not well defined
- Variety of PD, would need more to be a solid plan
- Cost is an issue with including th grade and high
- High schools might not react like we want, they want devices not cameras/ 3-D printers
- More PD opportunities
- More of the same
- Lacks a burning platform or problem
- No reference to connectivity in the community/ Lack of
- PD needs seem very broad
- High school adding other equipment when not 1:1
- What is the accountability for High School Equipment being used, would this be the lead learners responsibility?
- Hard to apply to different situations
- Too many variables hard to measure
- Seems to have a tech focus rather than learning focus
- Opting out or doing it yourself is more like original
- Need define as lead tech is a teacher or student?
- 2 day regional event is a concern
- Student Tech Support/ 2 students per grade level is a lot/ to much for some school and not enough for others
- Seems to prioritize peripherals in the high school
- Elements of Creation in the earlier grades as well as in the High School

Student Agency Plan Opportunities

- Gives opportunity for student agency and students to show what they can do.
- Structure to be able to share/learn more
- empower students
- Plan for expansion as we look at distance learning
- Direct tie to our guiding principles
- Event and the opportunity for students to plan ahead of time.
- familiarity can be an opportunity for people to know what this means and it will be less stressful.
- Student tech is a chance to create student aids that are helping peers with educational needs.
- Extension into 6th grade
- Get beyond the screen and talk about other hardware and tools.
- Expect more from teachers
- Building out the notion of 2 students and tech leads and leveraging students to help us with the tech
- Clearer integration for computer science especially in the lower levels
- Focus more on active learning instead of passive learning/ more creativity
- Push for more budgeting in other grade levels/we can expand and we should
- Leverage an economy scale

Threats

- Optional 6th grade and asking for more money
- Not innovative enough
- Complacency, especially for 7&8th grade
- Low bare for student work at the middle level, middle level can be at the creating level.
- Extra tech at high school could muddy the waters without clear framework.
- Tech leaders, how do we get teachers to buy in?
- Traditional may be a harm
- Having added a few pieces which comes at a cost/ budget is a threat
- Hard to define what is successful/value/how we spend money
- Ignoring present situation
- To much for on equipment and not on connectivity

Potential Plan

Pedagogical Needs Approach Plan

- Focus on supporting a specific statewide pedagogical strategy or approach (k-2 literacy, active remote learning, project-based learning)
- Tiered supports based on need and capacity
 - PD, resources and tools, learning devices, support for or access to a pedagogical coach (RFPs for each of these)
- SAUs could choose 2 contiguous grade levels
- One year commitment – SAUs can opt out or SAUs can be ineligible for non fulfilling program participation requirements in the previous year.
- Funding – combination of local and state funding so that all SAUs receive the same level of provisioning and support.
 - Higher tiers of support would be based on several criteria such as: f/r lunch rates, % of Title 1 students, demonstrated financial need, challenges in capacity due to small size. Details of a fair system of assigning tiered supports based on need would have to be worked out.

Pedagogical Needs Approach Plan **S**trengths

- Educational approach
- Innovative
- Flexibility of being able to choose the grade level and focus
- Separating out the RFP
- Single learning challenge could become the burning platform
- Tier supports/ teachers that need more, get more
- Tier support for equity of funding
- Opportunity to respond to current need
- Accountability
- Does focus more on pedagogy and learning more than devices

Pedagogical Needs Approach Plan **W**eaknesses

- Statewide approach
- Long time to implement
- Inconsistency around the grade levels
- Planning all year with constant change will be complicated
- Difficult to ask 1 year commitment
- Single statewide strategy throws off the local need
- Disregards the technology itself
- Reads as a funding formula and not a program itself, no deliverables.
-
- Putting the cart before the horse/figuring out the mltl pedagogy before the statewide pedagogy
- Staffing of coaches across the state especially with smaller schools
- 1 year commitment does not help long term/hard to plan ahead
- 1 size fits all mix
- Chose of grade level is hard for students that move

Pedagogical Needs Approach Plan **O**pportunities

- Deal with realtime stuff like distance learning and be flexible.
- Grade level choice
- Statewide initiative gives chance for everyone to go in the same direction.
- Flexibility
- One solution is challenging for the RFP
- Provides an opportunity to reach the pedagogical goals through a different method
-
- Develop the tiered system/districts that need more get more
- Some districts might take the money and run - some might just buy stuff others might do great things.
- Gives schools more opportunity to get stuffs that they otherwise wouldn't
- Expand program from learning to teaching and learning/focused on whole pedagogical outcome
- Build an accountability system that is fair to the districts

Pedagogical Approach Plan **T**hreats

- One size fits all means all needs won't be met
- Some districts may take the money and run without solid framework, not delivering anything.
- 1 year commitment may not cultivate a long term buy in
- A lot of districts would opt out and not participate
- Shortage of qualified coaches in rural areas
- Challenging to do long term planning will be hard for the districts
- The central control wouldn't pass the legislature
- No specifics for legislation to buy in
- People that don't want to do will find a way to not do it and will fall apart
- Feels different
- If the pedagogical is different every year, should have the same pedagogical for several years.
- Time/planning
- Imbalance of funds based on financial need



BREAK!

<https://www.online-stopwatch.com/timer/10minutes/>

Potential Plan

Device and PD Approach Plan

4-year Program Cost 56,000,000 (@ 14 million per year)

- Assume 4 grades ~ 70,000 Seats
- $56,000,000 / 70,000 = \$800$ per seat
- Package Price \$573.00
 - Chromebook w/ Management: \$330.00
 - Case: \$25.00
 - 4 year Warranty?: \$100.00
 - Wevideo (4 years): \$20.00
 - Soundtrap (4 years): \$20.00
 - Newsela (4 years): \$60.00
 - EdPuzzle: \$8.00
 - Kami: \$10.00
- $800 - 573 = \$227$ per student left

over

PD program of our own design:

$\$227 \times 70,000 = \$15,890,000$

- Tech Coach for each District
 - $\$15,890,000 / 4 \text{ years} = \$3,972,500$ per year
 - $\$3,972,500 / \$60,000 \text{ year (Salary \& Benefits)} = 66$ tech coaches dedicated to Schools.

Device and PD Approach Plan **S**trengths

- Tech Coaches
- Expanding to 4 grades is great
- More comprehensive than other plans
- Equity in three levels, support, pd, devices, and high quality resources and tools.
- PD is flexible
- Easy to sell to the legislature because its clear and focused on the bottom line.
- Actionable in a years time and doesn't involve a complicated RFP process
- Long term 4 year approach is good
- Very clear and easy to understand from a financial standpoint
- Inclusion with subscription
- Address some equity issues like having a coach for each district
- PD with our own design
- People looking for numbers happy
- Provides a clear budget
- People will see that it is a reboot with new devices
- Goes back to a 1 device for all scenario

Device and PD Approach Plan **W**eaknesses

- One device system
- Training/ support for tech coaches should be included
- Moving to a new platform will be a challenge
- Very device specific
- Does Not address connectivity
- How would the tech coach be set up for the larger/smaller districts
- How will districts collaborate with each other?
- 66 people wouldn't be enough to cover the state
- How will we find 66 tech coaches who are currently employed with the qualifications needed?
- Confusion of PD program and tech coach
- What if the package does not meet everyone's needs/subscriptions/can we have choice?
- Not enough funding for each district to have a tech coach, how would that work?
- This is a technology plan not a learning plan
- Bigger districts needing more tech coaches and smaller districts needing less
- Formative assessment needs to be added
- Does it size fit all?

Device and PD Approach Plan **O**pportunities

- Make the device irrelevant by focusing on online tools
- Easier to sell to the legislature and districts. Easy buy in
- Impact more students by doubling the grade levels
- Own choices about PD gives districts the chance to meet their own needs with PD.
- Job creation that comes with the tech coach roles
- Closing the gap of districts with no tech coach, chance to ask for more funding.
- Tech coaches enabling us to take control of the pedagogy
- Change the dynamic of the program from device driven to device/learning
- Going to a single platform and simplifying support
- Having statewide network of coaches that could open up opportunities statewide
- Research/data with opening up to more then 7/8 grades

Device and PD Approach Plan **T**hreats

- The device specification, we have been using Apple for 20 years so changing the device could be a challenge.
- Local controlled
- Tech coach because some districts wont get them and then those that have them will eliminate them with the hopes the state will pick them up.
- Chromebooks then device doesn't matter because they are the same device type.
- Some districts may not want the subscriptions included
- Connectivity
- Sell the idea of adding positions while districts are struggling to fill the positions they have already
- Primarily technology driven
- With the RFP, we don't know what the device will actually be
- The tech coach will be used inappropriately by districts
- One size fits all, doesn't work
- Budget, 4 times as big as current budget
- Very specific, not flexible

Implications

In small groups:

- Read through the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for your assigned plan
- Go back to strengths. Read through them again. Now list implications for MLTI 2.0 based on the list of strengths.
 - Based on the fact that professional learning being removed from the device RFP was a strength, and implication for MLTI 2.0 would be that we should break the components into separate RFPs and not look for one solution.

Implications con't

- Go back to weaknesses. Read through them again. Now list implications for MLTI 2.0 based on the list of weaknesses.
 - E.g. Based on the fact that assuming local expertise and ability is a weakness of this plan, MLTI 2.0 will need to ensure that there is a plan to build local capacity to ensure the expertise needed is available.
- Do the same for opportunities.
- Do the same for threats.

Group Assignments

Group 1: Device and PD Approach

Group 2: 2-Tiered Approach

Group 3: Grant Approach

Group 4: Pedagogical Needs Approach

Group 5: Student Agency Platform Approach

