

MLTI Advisory Board Meeting #7

June 23rd, 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 & Computer Science Specialist

AGENDA

What if...

Break

SWOT protocol of potential plans

Break

SWOT protocol of potential plans

What if...

Scenario: Imagine that a significant investment is made in Maine educational technology and a laptop is provided for every student. At the same time the State decides to invest in statewide broadband, which will take four years to become a reality.

QUESTION: If such an investment was made to bridge the digital divide, how might MLTI be designed for the next four years that could support student connectivity until broadband was available?

QUESTION: In addition to connectivity, what might MLTI invest in to support teaching and learning?

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 Plans

2001 Approach

- Maine DOE puts out an RFP for a statewide laptop solution
 - includes:
 - Devices that meet pre-determined specifications
 - Professional learning
 - MDM
 - SAUs could purchase additional devices off of this contract

Adjusted 2001 Approach

- Maine DOE puts out an RFP for laptops that meet pre-determined specifications.
- DOE purchases devices and distributes to SAUs
- SAUs can purchase off of this contract

SWOT notes

- Strengths
 - All inclusive
 - Allows SAUs to get more devices to students more quickly
 - Level playing field
 - Local flexibility with purchases additional devices
 - PD included
 - Uniformity
 - Familiar
 - Continuity
 - Consistency
 - Teachers and students know the device regardless of moves
 - Community
- Weaknesses
 - Does not work for all communities
 - Doesn't address digital use divide
 - Limited to only one type device –Not flexible enough
 - Device and PD together is an issue
 - Not enough support for upkeep
 - lack of local choice for PD and device
 - Did not scale well to future technology
 - Doesn't include teaching and learning tools and services
 - Limited to MS which creates gaps before and after – limiting in grade span
 - PD is optional and too specific to the device
 - No system to confirm that provided was effective
- Opportunities
 - Consistency of device has the potential to aid local/statewide collaboration
 - Learning tools can be added
 - Allows leveraging for SAUs who can to purchase more
 - Potential to have a variety of learning opportunities that are not device specific
 - Potential for lower cost
 - Efficiency of scale
 - Separate PD from device
 - Do it better this time/ great starting point
 - Become proficient with technology
- Threats
 - Desire for local choice
 - Primarily a digital access divide and does not directly address digital learning divide
 - Risk of “been there done this and it didn't work” mindset
 - Language is limiting – too broad
 - PD needs to be good
 - W/o clear vision for T&L it reads as a device buy program
 - Current economy
 - Disruptive to establish conditions in locals
 - Lack of expectations for implementations
 - Will not force the necessary changes
 - Not enough flexibility as marker realities/ environments change

Potential Plans

2-Tiered Approach

Tier 1 (Core)

- Fixed level of funding for students at all levels PK-12
- Schools decide how to utilize the funding for technology expenditures
- State negotiated menu for better pricing for purchasing devices
- Technical assistance and professional learning through Maine DOE (like how other content areas are currently supported)

Tier 2 (Focus)

- Opportunity to apply for increased funding to support grade span focus based on data-identified need(s)
- Funding must support professional learning and instructional coaching (content and technology integration) to target the identified need
- Funding may support additional devices to reach 1-1 and software support

SWOT notes

- Strengths

- DOE based PL
- More focused on equity
- Pk-12
- Local choice and flexibility
- Creates a baseline for all students for access to technology
- Balance of local and state support
- Focused on needs of students in district
- Intentional/ explicit focus on instructional coaches and PL
- More targeted outcome
- Needs based tier 2
- Potential for increasing student learning success
- Based on outcomes has the ability to inspect and adapt
- Attempts to strike a balance with flexibility and state negotiated pricing
- Innovative/ different

- Weaknesses

- Assumes local expertise and ability
- Lack of clarity in terms of what districts can spend money on
- Don't know what funding level is
- Local control – some districts may not take full advantage
- Equality approach
- W/o consistent devices lose in student mobility
- Tier 2 does not promote equity because it is competitive
- Wicked expensive
- Unfamiliarity
- Flexibility makes PD more complicated
- Tier 1 allows districts to spend funding as they see fit – not 1-1
- Vendors are unlikely to commit to much of a price break without order commitment
- Too many districts working on too many things – can't have an initiative focused on "x"

- Opportunities

- None
- Better buy-in from various stakeholder
- Tries to create an opportunity for equity- gives a baseline
- might be able to build some plans that accommodate needs
- DOE could help districts apply for tier 2
- Tie additional funding to requirements
- Creates opportunity for districts to focus on pk-12 implementation
- Of there's a level of accountability has potential for continuity of expectations
- Provide pk-12 PL that focuses on teaching and learning = elevating T&L related to tech.
- Schools could go above and beyond since they decide how to use funding
- Greater potential for collaboration across districts around trying different types of tech

- Threats

- Because it is driven by locals, might it not always go toward technology
- Increase digital divide – less equitable
- Including younger grades
- Ambiguity could lead to misuse
- Least advantaged schools won't be able to take advantage of tier 2
- Absence of unifying initiative could because a funding model
- Threat of insufficient funding creating a watered down program
- If PL is not designed very carefully, because of multiple devices, PL could be less or ineffective
- Shift too much from pedagogy to device
- In equitable to mobile students
- Increase cost of teach on-boarding
- Tier 1 could be seen as a ceiling and not a floor
- Districts may like it but Ed Committee might not be able to get on board

Potential Plans

Grant approach:

- Fixed level of funding for students at all levels PK-12
 - SAUs decide how to use the funds for technology expenditures
 - State negotiated menu for better pricing for purchasing devices
- In order to receive the funding, SAUs agree to a set of fair and manageable deliverables determined by the MLTI advisory board and Maine DOE LTT team. These deliverables would be tied to teaching and learning goals.
- Professional learning and technical assistance would be provided as DOE does for other content areas, combination of in-house and contracted work.

SWOT notes

- Strengths

- accountability connected to T&L
- Flexibility for opt-in for districts
- Give more predictability for districts
- PL not tied to vendor
- Choice of devices
- Accountability connected to ROI
- Allows district fit MLTI within the larger strategic plan
- Forces district to have a plan and allocate the funds to that plan
- Spans all grade levels

- Weaknesses

- Accountability - what will the follow up be?
- Lack of uniformity
- Management from MLTI office
- Opting out – built in rational or what if teachers want and district doesn't
- Proving that district is meeting requirements will take time and energy by district
- Districts don't all have the capacity to apply and report
- MDOE to verify the deliverables
- Districts will have difficulty meeting expectations without significant support
- May be difficult to show that there has been statewide success
- Mobility for students
- Districts that need the funding might lose the funding if they can't do the paperwork
- Could be very expensive
- PD becomes more broad
- Lack of a focused initiative might interfere with building leg. Support
- Vendors might not give price break without guarantee of order
- Lose efficiencies of single device

Opportunities

- Districts put resources where they need them
- Ensure use is tied to vision
- Board and DOE to create model plans
- Statewide PD
- Offers creativity/ innovation to districts
- Build PD and initiatives in the programs not the device
- State to have a vision and for districts to actualize the vision
- Districts focus on age appropriate tech. integration
- Solidify a baseline and move up from there
- Maximum flexibility
- Easy to sell politically
- MDOE oversight = more opportunity for continuous improvement
- Clearer program evaluation model – could lead to highlighting exemplars
- Success depends on expectations

- Threats

- Potential for becoming bureaucratic
- Inability to verify deliverables
- Admin/school boards who are against state help might not allow districts to participate
- Broad choice is a luxury to districts with capacity and a curse to those with limited capacity
- Finding the "just right" expectations
- Plan could be seen as having to do more to get what we've always gotten for nothing
- If funding is not enough could be a problem
- Lack of flexibility in funding – doesn't accommodate the "needs more" and " needs less"
- Device choice could effect the success of the outcomes
- People not liking it and subverting the process
- Equity – some districts will add to funding to get more capable devices and others will just get by with what they can afford
- Change in leadership
- Min. could become the ceiling
- Could be very expensive and if not sufficiently funded could be watered down
- Too many choices could be paralyzing
- Min. might not be sufficient for learning device
- Could be too many additional expenses to support devices
- Disadvantage for smaller schools – don't have the expertise or capacity
- New/ different

