



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County School Board Governance Committee Meeting, Tuesday, June 16, 2026

Date Tuesday, June 16, 2026
Place Fairfax County School Board, Virginia
Length 2h 4m (video)

- Official meeting video (YouTube): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jVOyz96MOII>
- Official School Board page (FCPS): <https://www.fcps.edu/about-fcps/leadership/school-board>

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-27. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:01:28] We're gonna start in just a minute,

[00:01:29] so we start on time, thanks.

[00:02:21] Alrighty, this June 16th, 2026 meeting of the Fairfax County School Board Governance Committee will now come to order at 4:00 p.m. We will first turn to the minutes. So we'll vote to approve the minutes of May 19th, 2026 of the Governance Committee.

[00:02:37] Do I have a motion? Mr. Frisch moves to approve the minutes. Is there a second for the motion? Dr. Anderson, any discussion? No, all those in favor of the motion minutes? I am, Dr. Anderson, you. yes okay that is unanimous adoption of the minutes from may 19th thank you okay so we have one topic on the agenda and that is the intentional use of technology policy discussion we posted the current working version of the policy which was from march 17th we also posted two red lines that

[00:03:15] two committee members provided so that was mine and robin ladies we had a thorough discussion on on Thursday night's school board meeting about aspects of instructional technology.

[00:03:31] So, you know, I asked prior to this meeting, you know, what were folks' expectations, desires for this discussion? Because, you know, we do have the premise of trying to get a policy approved.

[00:03:48] There's areas where agreement isn't yet met. So a thought is, you know, one, what do we have to clarify that might have been lost in translation over conversations, over emails, and even in the updated red lines.

[00:04:07] Secondly, we have to acknowledge the large amount of community input we've received, most recently, about artificial intelligence and the request for a sizable number of parents to be cautious of that.

[00:04:24] So we have in the past on the committee talked about separating the two main topics at hand, you know, the AI and the educational tech. and a few meetings back, the consensus was to keep it as one policy. So we are here today, but things change and evolve.

[00:04:41] So perhaps one area to talk about today is, do we want to split those policies? So that's one thing to just put out there. And remember, we do have the work session just a week from today.

[00:04:56] So if we're thinking about what can we shore up to bring to our colleagues on Tuesday and pinpoint for discussion, that will help us move toward a final product. So happy to hear thoughts, other ideas. We'll go with Dr. Anderson and then Mr. Frisch.

[00:05:14] - Okay, I think it would be, I'm just gonna turn, 'cause that's where the bulk of the people are, so I'm not gonna turn this way anymore. I've got a situation here. I could only move in one direction.

[00:05:30] I think it would be to the surprise of no one that I would love to bring in a motion to bifurcate these two policies, because as I shared earlier, many meetings ago, there are two huge components and we would be better served if we were to disengage them from each other.

[00:05:49] In addition, I would love, and this is I guess to Chair Marin, I would love for us to have the opportunity, if it were to be that we can bifurcate these, because that has not been the conversation to date, that we can just go through and really hone in on what components belong in each of the segments of each and really come out of this meeting with some content for each, and then turn that into a document, or rather two documents, which could then be brought to the work session.

[00:06:21] Not wordsmithing, but just getting the content and just kind of organizing that in a way that makes sense, that is agreeable to everybody here. But I am very much in favor of bifurcating the two. - Thanks Dr. Anderson, Mr. Frisch.

[00:06:37] - So my thinking has kind of evolved towards having two, but in maybe a different way. colleague about what would it look like if we had a policy that governed instructional technology for students, and that would be inclusive of AI when used by students or if used by students.

[00:07:01] And then the second policy would be technology used by staff, because I think a lot of the conversation that we've had, at least in recent weeks, has been around the types of technology that staff use. And I think that there's heightened concern around what students have access to and what students are being asked to use. But there's all kinds of different areas that staff use technology in, including AI, that I think would benefit from policy clarity. AI, as it

[00:07:39] relates to students, is a piece of the technology puzzle that has to be addressed. So I can see that as living in a policy that is student-centered on instructional technology and perhaps having a separate one for for staff I'd also be open if that's not where the board ends up being I'd be open to having what some of us have talked about as you know an ed tech and then in separate AI policy but I

[00:08:08] think it makes more sense to have the thank you miss lady I think interesting in terms of separating between teachers or staff, should I say, faculty and staff and student use, because I do think they're vastly different, as the PD plan versus the digital literacy plan, like those are very different, but I don't want it to be an ed tech versus AI plan,

[00:08:46] because that to me, I mean, AI is a tool. I don't want a separate AI plan. I don't think it's going to serve them well. If we were to separate them, I would probably do it more like Dr. Anderson has recommended, which I think is similar to Ms. Anderson's recommendation, which one is intentional use of technology and one is an ed tech.

[00:09:22] This is where people get stuck in the weeds. But ed tech, they're tools, just like AI is a tool. And correct me if I'm wrong, I've got them. But then intentional use is very different, right?

[00:09:38] That's when you're talking about what's age appropriate. That's when you're talking about, you know, and again, you know, I'm a huge believer that we have to lead with instruction and then we implement the technology. And I tried to codify that in my drafts that, you know, any purpose on technology in any capacity, it has to be enhancing instruction in some capacity.

[00:10:03] And so if you read my draft, that's the main goal and that's what we need to be doing. That's how we need to be teaching the use of it. So I'm not sure where I stand in terms of separating them as ed tech versus intentional use or staff versus kids.

[00:10:23] I'm open to hear more from my colleagues. - Thank you. And just to clarify, Dr. Anderson, I understood what you were saying was the separation would be ed tech and AI, but I heard something different as Ms. Lady summarized it. Can you clarify, is that correct?

[00:10:40] - I think I was a little bit loose in my language. The ed tech piece, I think we all are working with the same understanding. The AI component is the intentional use and all of that. So you can still put it in that bucket.

[00:10:55] I didn't necessarily wanna just hone in, it's gonna be the AI policy, but it will have all of the things that we do in terms of utilizing what is available. I'm just gonna take this opportunity to also say, I think under each of these buckets, we have the opportunity to specify a staff component and a student component, because I'm thinking back on some other policies where we've done exactly that.

[00:11:19] Like the grading policy, I think we had some pieces there, as well as the trust policy policy. - Well, I'll go ahead and take a turn before we go to a second round. So I'm really open to doing whatever will work for the most people and is reasonable.

[00:11:41] The challenge I have is that we put a stake in the ground months ago to do one policy, and now we're revisiting that, and that's fine, except that if we keep revisiting, we'll never get to the product. That's my fear and my anxiety that I bring to it.

[00:11:58] So I'm wondering, do we identify ways that we would want to split it and bring that to Tuesday's work session? That's one thought that I have. The other thought that I have is, it's kind of unfortunate that we're having this meeting on the second to last day of school because the input I've heard about what our children are doing in school in these last days, especially our secondary students, has been so disheartening.

[00:12:28] Watching a movie, being on their phone. One high school today reported that they had a backup in responding to parent early pickup requests because so many kids were trying to get pickup because there's nothing to do in school.

[00:12:47] This gets to the heart of why parents are clamoring for this and why we need to be responsible. And so when I look at this policy, my biggest hopes for this policy and goals is that we specify what the expectation is and what will be enforced.

[00:13:05] At least now we know that devices are not required to go home because we enforced that on Thursday. I have emails saying one thing and the other until now. But now everyone knows that laptops do not have to go home in elementary school.

[00:13:23] the only thing that's clear and so I just keep it like the AI is a whole other animal but I would like to know our teachers allowed to show a full-length Disney movie in class as apparently happened in school this week how our apps decide how how do we evaluate that Lexia actually works and does a first grader need it does a third grader need it power teachers using data to

[00:14:02] inform their instruction and how can AI help them because I do have concerns especially about unintended bias I mean I visited classrooms I talked with teachers I see great things but because I'm not seeing some real fences about quality control it's so hard for me to continue to talk about the vastness of what's possible so I want this policy to be really specific about what's allowed and what's not very specific so we're just clear for starters that's the end of

[00:14:41] my turn so I saw dr. Anderson and then we'll go back to mr. Frisch and then Miss lady thank you you mentioned about a path moving forward this is kind of what I'm envisioning not sure where people are one for us to make a decision are we going to split so that drives everything else in my mind's eye and again I would love for us to split and we could just kind of come up and firm up with the language in a little bit.

[00:15:09] We've made that determination, and I think I'm hearing that. I heard that from Ms. St. John Cunning last time, and I'm hearing splits. The how is kind of still a little bit of a debate, but I'm hearing that we can split. Once we do that, and we kind of have our marching orders, I think that we might be very productive if we talked about the technology use and go through each of the components that exist.

[00:15:36] And we have plenty of resources that we've spoken about that have just come up that people continue to share with us where we could go through each of the components like in the purpose, what are the non-negotiables that the purpose should have?

[00:15:52] And do we have agreements on this? Anything that is going to be that has an objection, we just put in the parking lot for next time. And we go through the definitions, we go through the philosophy. I'd like to think we can go through each of these two documents, both the intentional use and then the technology piece in order to be productive out of this meeting and to have something tangible for the work session.

[00:16:25] So that's what I'm envisioning. Does that, did that come out the way that I had hoped it came out? - I have to admit, I'm still not clear what you're saying when you say intentional use versus ed tech. I don't know, I just don't understand that.

[00:16:40] - Let me just bring it to what Ms. Anderson had shared with us. She shared with us two copies, two versions. One said use of technology, one said innovation in instructional technology. - Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't realize you were using documents that weren't posted, so I'm not-- - I think these were posted last time, but I'm just wanting to answer the question.

[00:17:03] It doesn't have to be these titles. - If you could just explain it, I just don't get it. One is the educational technology in terms of how is it that we view the use of educational technology in our classrooms? What is artificial intelligence? What are we expecting?

[00:17:19] And then the other one is around the innovation, which is probably the more AI-heavy one, in my mind's eye, in terms of what are those guardrails that will be available. And it doesn't have to be just AI. It could be some of the other things that you've just talked about.

[00:17:36] So we just have to determine if we want to separate them first. - If I may, and I'm realizing now there were Ms. Anderson's, I didn't make that connection.

[00:17:52] So I'm happy to continue to listen, I'm still not clear. I did see Ms. Anderson put her placard up and then we'll go to Ms. St. John Cuning. - This will be the only time I speak up here, but I just wanted to make clear as to the reason why I was suggesting, and Dr. Anderson, I wasn't here the day that you guys voted on this.

[00:18:10] I had left already because I needed to go to a speaking engagement. So the reason that I am advocating for there being two is I do think we need guardrails around educational technology and the things in our classrooms that are appropriate and are not. And I also want us to make sure that we are agile when we have new technologies that are coming forward.

[00:18:29] We already know that there are new things on the horizon that are potential opportunities for our kids. But unless we have guardrails, I don't want us to have to go through another year-long process because we will be behind the power curve and our kids will already be using the technology before we have a plan.

[00:18:46] And so the reason that I split it into two, and I'm not suggesting that either of my drafts was fully correct. I'm just suggesting that it was a place to start thinking about how we can create a framework that is similar to some of the things that we've been doing with AI.

[00:19:01] How can we create a framework for implementation or decisions that we're not going to implement? And then also understanding that it's actually works in concert with the educational technology so that we wouldn't violate anything that we have stuck in the ground as these are the guardrails that will be required.

[00:19:19] So those are the two things that I was hoping that we could accomplish. So I agree with Dr. Anderson that having two policies in my sense works well here. I also agree with Mr. Frisch that you can have aspects of staff use and you can have aspects of student use in the policies themselves.

[00:19:37] I didn't break it up that way, But it also created, the way I created these was also by utilizing the different drafts that both Ms. Marin had brought forward and Dr. Reed had brought forward throughout the course of this. So it was trying to incorporate all of those things because in my opinion, version five of the draft that the superintendent brought forward included a lot of the types of things that we were talking about.

[00:20:00] So that was the framework for how I created those two policies. And like I said, they were just a starting point. It doesn't necessarily mean if they were the right answer. - Ms. St. John Cunning and then Mr. Fresh.

[00:20:18] - I do think in this whole process we have evolved, probably me the most, because I'm the least tech savvy. But I think that there was a lot of confusion because first we were talking about an AI policy. And I think as we were talking about an AI policy, we started going into these other areas and talking about tech.

[00:20:39] And I think there was a lot of confusion because some of the things that the public was hearing about what's being done was just being done with educators versus. And so then I think that there was that kind of a confusion. So I think we have to delineate that.

[00:20:55] I think it's moving rapidly. I like the idea of two separate policies. I mean, 'cause I've heard from a lot of teachers, I was at a school this morning, where this teacher just said to me, like, please tell me you guys aren't gonna do this because this is how I use technology.

[00:21:13] And it was not AI, it was other things. And so, you know, and we do focus, as we should, on our events. But we also have to remember that the teachers are having to use these tools and know how to use them. And there's so much involved when we're talking about technology with our teachers, how they learn it, how they use it, what's appropriate, just in terms of teachers, not even, like, how it's going to be pushed out.

[00:21:38] So I think that that's where there was a lot of confusion. And then we evolved from AI to tech and to make it broader. So I do like that idea. And, you know, I mean, I was at a school today.

[00:21:57] They were not watching movies. They were actually giving me a petition. And I do remember when I was in school, those last days, and we did not have computers, but we did have projectors. Oh, my God, I'm so old. And so, you know, that was a fun time at the end of the year.

[00:22:19] I'm not going to knock our kids having fun on the last day of school, watching a movie or anything. This is not like something that happens all the time. And it was not tech heavy. Maybe projectors were technology forward back then, you know. So, again, I think that we can't put everything in the bucket of, oh, our kids aren't learning because of tech and they're watching a movie.

[00:22:44] Well, I used to watch movies. It was fun for me the last day of school. So, that's all I want to say. Mr. Frisch and Ms. Liding. We had the TV cart, the giant television. It was short on Disney movies, however.

[00:23:02] In terms of the separation, Dr. Anderson's mention of how we've done some of their policies is interesting because, you know, like, for example, the trust policy delineates out what specific responsibilities people have.

[00:23:20] I could see a world in which, because initially when we were talking about like two policies, we were talking about AI and ed tech. AI could be seen as shorthand for like emerging technologies, right? So if it was divided along the lines of like emerging technologies, like how do we do that?

[00:23:42] And that's obviously going to be AI heavy. At the same time, tech, which is more the practical application and what we're looking for is like the rules around if it's going to be allowed or not allowed,

what the instructional benefits are, etc. That would obviously also have AI in it, but it wouldn't be exclusive to AI.

[00:24:01] Within each of those, you could have policy prescriptions around student use and staff use. What I didn't get to in my first comments that Ms. Marin asked for was like, how do we move forward from here?

[00:24:18] I think if the committee wants to have a bifurcated policy, that's the first question I think that Dr. Anderson identified as needing an answer. The second thing I think we could do is, what are the questions we want our colleagues to answer? the work session about each of those, assuming that we move in this direction, each of those policies, right?

[00:24:44] I don't know that I'd wanna eliminate something just 'cause we don't agree on it. It could be put in there as a consideration that we'd like the board colleagues to weigh in on, right? Maybe we put those as like a separate category for discussion.

[00:25:00] Yeah, parking lot, or sandbox as they say in the tech world. So I'd be open to including the things, here are the things that we would be sending on to you if this was a draft policy, but then here are the things that we also talked about if you all wanna weigh in on that.

[00:25:18] So I think that'd be one way of approaching how to set up the work session for success, and we could go from there. - Okay, Miss Leidy. - Yeah, a couple things. One, before we had one-to-one, the end of the year, they showed movies.

[00:25:40] It has nothing to do with technology. The other thing I'm gonna say is that We have really sort of changed what end of the year looks like because of our reassessment policies, because we don't allow cumulative finals anymore. Like it's been a game changer based on things that came down from instructional services.

[00:25:57] So it's kind of crippling in a way to a high school who's got a set exam schedule. Many people are doing cumulative projects on that day or the last few presentations of something that the entire class has been working on. I am not a fan of movies.

[00:26:13] I am not a fan of having something that's set aside and it's your seventh period class and you're doing nothing when you get there, but that's a separate problem and I don't think it has anything to do with technology because it's been systemic. I mean, it's just, especially AP classes, a lot of teachers are like, they took their AP in May, so I'm trying to get them ready for next year's course.

[00:26:36] The other things I wanna share is, I don't know if people realize, But like we're talking about an ed tech, if the system, if an individual school has an idea that they want to or has a grant, like a code up grant, and wants to use that grant to buy something that is interactive technology made by Lego, for example, they have to put a petition in, I don't know what the terminology is, to ask it to be reviewed.

[00:27:09] because even though there is a rigid review process for any new technology, and often that review process, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Sethi, can take a year-plus amount of time to get all the vendor answers and to get that reviewed.

[00:27:24] Is that correct? Well, we aim to do it quickly, but given the backlog, it can take time. And it starts with actually instructional reviews, which look for the efficacy of the tool, then security, then privacy, then procurement, and maybe accessibility moving forward.

[00:27:41] Thank you. I just wanna uplift that in the room because I don't think that our community understands the rigidity and the process to how anything gets approved before our kids can interact with it. And that is true, it has to be instructionally sound.

[00:27:58] What's the agency of that? How does it help student agency? And then going through the security, just as he said, I don't need to summarize it again. So I just wanna put that out there. And then the other thing is, I think that there's, and this is where I might not 100% agree with my colleagues, but I don't, I'm comfortable with some really clear things in the policy, but because this is such an innovative situation, there are people in our school system

[00:28:32] who have an unbelievable instructional focus and strength and help teaching teachers how to put instruction first and then utilize technology to help kids learn.

[00:28:48] I would never want to limit them because they're farther ahead than someone in that same job or that teaches that same class at a different school. So that's where this policy is a struggle for me because I know there's places where people are using this for passive reasons, which I disagree with, but I also know there's places there's amazing amazing work going on and some of what what the the folks have asked us to put in policy i would never agree to because it would limit them so i'll go ahead go ahead and take my

[00:29:22] turn but that difference is what kills me i am so tired of that difference it's not acceptable the variety of experiences in terms of quality it's it's just not okay i was at dogwood elementary today. They did their IB, PYP exhibition. Sixth graders were there telling me all sorts of wonderful things, being engaged. Excellent second day of the school, last day of school. The principal said this was such a great thing. The kids had more time to prepare. Great. So that principal and her staff

[00:29:56] chose to do it that way. Why do other schools choose to do things that aren't? I get it. We're all tired. I don't, you know, it's just this lack of consistency and clarity that is a problem. my seventh grader came home on monday and i said what did you do in school and he said well nothing there's nothing left to do because we turned our laptops in that's fundamentally changing how a child thinks they learn they can't learn without a device so for me colleagues i

[00:30:34] don't think there's agreement here or articulation on what is the appropriate use of technology in learning and how do we know I'm getting back to my roots in this Schoology I was talking with a sixth grade parents today who was at the PYP exhibition and I was like oh you're gonna have a sixth grader going to seventh just let me give you a heads up it could be a tough transition because all of a sudden you're in Schoology there's no consistency required within a school across a grade level of what is posted how it's used the kids are not intentionally taught

[00:31:10] how to use Schoology. We did just update that contract with zero discussion or feedback from the superintendent on how it's going and how it's going to improve. So again you know we said earlier we started this conversation with AI but repeatedly the conversation comes down to this very basic thing. How is technology being used in schools? Because it's not just AI, it is all these things.

[00:31:41] things. So in terms of separating the policy, look, we just rattled off that going from a TV cart to an overhead projector was technology. That's innovation. So how do we even start to know what innovation is? It's like watching a kid walk. You don't know they did it until after they did it. So what policy applies? I would be satisfied if we could create a real policy that says very specific things like, well, what I

proposed in the motions, that devices will be stored away, that devices won't be used for indoor recess, that full-length feature movies won't be showed.

[00:32:20] Just saying. You know, there's very specific things, not lofty goals, but specific things, because we're not even getting that right. Okay, Dr. Anderson, and then Mr. Frisch. - Okay, I'd like to make a motion, but before I do that, I just want to briefly be responsive to some of the conversation.

[00:32:41] Multiple things can be true at the same time. all of I'm hearing things that I with across fronts but we also have to come to the conclusion that and this is your phrase dr. Reed you know we're school system not a system of schools a lot of efforts are being placed in a lot of efforts are being placed in in various areas in order to provide a consistent experience kind of leveling the floor we're never going to be able to fully define the ceiling on all of those things but the floor is different in a

[00:33:16] lot of places that's why there's investment and math textbooks because of the huge differential of experiences that you've observed and I was in one of the schools where you observed it so that already exists I don't want to add to it we want to continue that move of tightening the vast experiences that our students have because this one teacher is brilliant and i was i've also said this in my in my area and because this is what has happened when um dr zuluaga was the razz it was always a concern that

[00:33:52] because all of the work had to be initiated by the clts and schools where you had really not just talented but experienced teachers they were miles ahead with group of groups where everybody was brand new or there was a long-term sub so we need to find a way to deal with the fact that we're going to have the differences in experience or even interest as a system and I see us being able to do that so to that end I would like to propose these two terms that we bifurcate into an intentional

[00:34:27] use of technology that speaks about some of the things you've just discussed the the what, how do we review it? And the second piece is the innovation of technology. And that one's going to be the more AI heavy one, as well as perhaps other future things, because we don't yet know what those things are.

[00:34:49] But again, putting whatever those guardrails are around each of these, that is my motion. - Okay, Ms. Dr. Anderson moved. Do we want to articulate it more clearly?

[00:35:06] - Okay, our deputy clerk will be putting it up on the screen and then I will ask Dr. Anderson

[00:35:14] if she wants to speak to her motion and we'll go from there.

[00:35:47] - Dr. Anderson, is that reflective of what you had said? - Okay, I'll stop moving. Intentional use of technology.

[00:36:02] - Very similar sounding words are gonna-- - That's the first one. And then innovation and technology.

[00:36:25] And I'm fine with intentionally even being educational if that sounds like it's better educational use? - Why don't we go with it for the time being because it helps, it's easier than innovation and intentional. - So let's leave educational use of technology and then innovation and technology.

[00:36:44] - Thank you, do you wanna speak to your motion? - Just very quickly, because I'd like to get to the work, there will be overlaps because that's how this is. It's just like the very reason why we had 900 different calendar policies, we were able to bring some in and some remained separate.

[00:37:00] there will be overlap. They're not going to be clean, you know, because they're related topics. That's it. - Thank you, Mr. Frisch. - Yeah, I think this gets to the point we've been talking about.

[00:37:19] And I don't want to wordsmith what the names of the policies are because I think that's something that can be settled down the road. But use of educational technology sounds good. And I think broadly speaking as described, I think it probably checks the box that most of us have talked about in terms of what two policies would look like.

[00:37:45] - Thank you, Ms. Lady. - So since we're in this space and we keep, well, in my opinion, instruction, instruction, instruction, instruction has to be the priority of all we do.

[00:38:00] So to that end, I would do use of educational technology and instruction and innovation in instructional technology. I think the word instruction needs to be in there because otherwise we're not leading with instruction, which is the biggest complaint that we get. - Can you repeat that again?

[00:38:15] - It would be, I'm just, in all full disclosure, it's what Ms. Anderson put together. - Oh. - 'Cause it makes sense to me. Use of educational technology and instruction. - Can I just ask, just for the purposes of the conversation being easier, having two of almost the same words starting with I, was just, can we make the point, but just for the ease of education?

[00:38:37] - They don't start with, both start with I. - I was trying to not have innovation in one and instruction in another 'cause it was confusing. I thought I saw agreement that that was a good idea, I'm okay. I think instruction should be in both, because that's the focus. That's what everyone is upset about, is that this is not all enhancing instruction. So you don't have to agree with me, but using tech in instruction and innovation in instructional technology or emerging technologies in instruction, I don't know, but.

[00:39:05] So with that, okay. No, you don't have to do emerging. Go back. If there's no opposition, we can modify the language if you want, or do we have to do it formally I just like to keep the conversation going and not get like Carl said we can talk about our to our colleagues I'm just making the point that this is about instruction and I've been critiqued on some of the things that I have put in my draft and my belief system is this is incredibly about instruction and I have seen this use this used as a Maserati in instruction

[00:39:38] and yes there are places where people need to do a better job but I'll stop there okay I will take a turn on this motion so this is the thing we have an instructional materials policy haven't updated it in the five-year period we also now have this educational review tech committee and i will say miss lady in the draft that you put putting the committee front and center i really disagree with because it's not the committee's job to do this it's you know the school board

[00:40:17] overseeing the superintendent and that committee was established in a conversation that was i think about 45 minutes on a day the board was not expecting to vote on something so i just i'm and it was community engagement and it's being positioned in your version as like the be all end all driver and i just don't i don't see that that's not how we've done things i think that as a board we've been remiss in not reviewing the instructional policy which has a process for how materials are selected um we just did it for the math materials we did it for literacy i mean there's other things and are we creating a whole new way of approving

[00:40:57] instructional materials when we have a thing under policy and we have committees there that we rely on so the bottom line is if we have enough of these buckets right now would it be helpful to kind of

suss out what goes in the buckets as a way to move forward otherwise I am happy to hear others ideas for how to proceed with the conversation we do well right okay dr. Anderson I see your

[00:41:34] placard and then yes please go yes again I am NOT against using the words instructional but as the first one stands it doesn't really resonate with me and I don't want a wordsmith here use of educational technology and instruction that doesn't make sense the word educational is supposed to be instructional so I don't think it's necessary to have the instruction at the end and we're evolving into making this clearer so that we can in our philosophies and our purpose ensure that the instructional piece stands up this

[00:42:11] is just the title it's not gonna be the only time to talk about that so if I had my druthers here I would take out an instruction at the end of the first piece but I don't want this to stop us from moving forward because use of educational technology I think can inherently speak to instruction in the second piece I am fine with that addition okay mr. Frisch I think we could probably wait on solidifying the names until we've filled in the buckets I think we are largely in agreement about what the big the bigger umbrellas

[00:42:48] are right one is about innovation ish and one is about the use of the technology right so let's just kind of think of that I also do want to defend And the Educational Technology Review Committee, as you know, forums often have votes attached to them.

[00:43:07] This one was publicly noticed in the way that they're always publicly noticed. And the ask in the written version of the forum was extremely explicit and detailed. One of the things that the board approved by, I believe it was unanimous vote, 11 board members in support, was including the ETRC in the policy.

[00:43:28] So we'll have to determine which policy it goes into, and additionally, the forum asks that the governance committee not only include it, but include it along the dimensions that the forum topic prescribed, so that it's in alignment with what the superintendent has moved forward and with which we've all appointed people to.

[00:43:50] I'm just thinking about, you know, we've been challenged, what are we making, what are we basing our work on? What research? Input. Have we talked to teachers? Have we read research?

[00:44:05] Do we have input from medical doctors? What does the superintendent say? We also already have a committee that's been providing us input for years, and that's our Student Health Advisory Committee. And so I can't say that I've reviewed the recommendations thoroughly from all the past years to know what to bring to the table here.

[00:44:29] You know, look, again, what I know is that it's the Wild West in our schools. You walk in a classroom, they're doing devices, walk into another they're away one fourth grader I know has homework on a device the next one I know goes to a school where there's no homework if it's good for kids it's good for kids put it in policy it's really challenging for me to do this work without hearing from our superintendent of any opinion on this should elementary school kids have homework should elementary school kids bring home laptops is Lexia what's it gonna cost to put devices away I just

[00:45:09] kind of feel like for me, I'm in a little bit of a vacuum and trying to make up good stuff on all the input I can. What do you think? Do you think educators need us to create a policy for how they use intentional tech? Or is that more of an HR 4000s policy thing? You know, I don't know that we have an employee code of conduct like an SR&R. Does it go in there? I mean, there's so many questions. I just, what

can we get to that's really concrete and ideally could be in place for the new school year. I think can we make some kind of a statement about what is the intended use of

[00:45:48] one-on-one devices in elementary school? Should we say have an use of educational technology policy and it says a time limit? At least it's a start. Do we want to codify the motions that were proposed on Thursday? I mean we're not going to solve this here. Again we're trying to gin up stuff for Tuesday, but what information do we think we want to know? What do we feel qualified to make policy on, and where is the superintendent going to help fill us, fill in the gaps? Because I don't know,

[00:46:27] I mean, separating it to two, I said what I said at the beginning. I'll go with whatever works if it's appropriate, but I still don't think that we're clear as a body on what the appropriate use of tech is. What are we going to put in there? Are we just going to put in there that it should be appropriate or are we gonna decide that appropriate means kids aren't on at 60 minutes a day like I know it's not quantity but what is it I think this is the crux of the discussion I'm not saying it is either miss lady but there is not agreement or articulation on what the appropriate use of technology is in

[00:47:05] learning and how we know dr. Anderson thank you if I may offer we could certainly start to dig down in some of those questions that you've just posed once we make a decision on are these two separated separate policies so I would offer for us to vote on this motion so that we could start to tease out what belongs in the use of instruction of educational technology what belongs in innovation of instructional technology are you calling the question yes okay

[00:47:42] the question has been called let's go ahead and vote on the motion so the - The motion is I move that, oh, do we have to vote on that? - Yeah. - Yeah, we have to vote on it. Should I call, should we call? We have to vote on the call to the question. Does everyone agree that we are going to?

[00:47:58] - And you don't need to. - Can we vote on this motion? I'm gonna call the motion.

[00:48:15] I move that we bifurcate, oh wait, I'm gonna read the motion and then we're gonna vote on it. It's been moved by Dr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Frisch. All is in favor of the motion. I move that we bifurcate policy into the use of an educational technology policy and an innovation instructional tech policy.

[00:48:35] see Mr. Frisch, Lady, St. John Cunning, and Anderson. And I'm going to say no, but I'll go along with what you voted. Okay. Two policies. May I make a suggestion? Dr. Anderson, would you like to... And then, Ms. Lady, did you have another comment, or is that moot now?

[00:48:58] Just a thought. Like, I felt like you may have been asking Dr. Reed questions, but then there wasn't really a pause. So, if you're asking her questions, can we make sure that we all understand that you're expecting an answer versus... - Thanks for the clarification, we'll do.

[00:49:14] - And then I was gonna describe what intentional usage looks like, but you can read it in the policy draft I created. - Okay, all right, so we have two policies. Dr. Anderson, you had wanted to make a comment?

[00:49:29] - Yes, just kind of, again, just moving forward, because I think we've been working under the umbrella of one policy. I would like very much, now that we have settled on two, for us to take the first piece, which is use of educational technology, and start to tease out the content needs to be in the purpose what's the content that needs to be in the what are the what's the content for definitions what's the content

for philosophy just so we could start to build because now we have to separate what I think a lot of work has been placed into putting together if we could start to build that

[00:50:06] then we could start to separate the two just starting with the use what do we want to see in the purpose of use again not wordsmithing it to the death but just the the content that is to be key that would be my suggestion and hopefully If we do it for the first policy, we could just turn it around and do it for the second policy.

[00:50:28] Well, one thought could be is that we start with the standing committee policy and section by section say, is it in one or two, and put things in that way. That would be one way to do what Dr. Anderson has proposed. Other ideas? Sure.

[00:50:45] We could just go through the document and say, okay, like this definition of AI is going to go in use or innovation and go from there. and perhaps I also say maybe the clerk needs to organize herself so that she could toggle back and forth as to what's going to be in which maybe you might give her a minute that was my question mr. which draft will we be looking at as we go through and look at each section let's go with the standing committee

[00:51:24] draft March 17th so the purpose thoughts maybe people just jump in here if we're looking at the May 19th purpose that purpose aligns very clearly to the educational technology

[00:52:00] piece others I think that should move into policy one their agreement there yes Carl okay sure yeah this lady um I think that's fine but since they're delineated out I don't know whether it should

[00:52:30] include something regarding um that was fast um because it's a use of educational tech I don't know if it should include something related to selection of but that I think is where the committee needs to be codified of both perhaps and again there is a very very specific deliberate process selection now so okay if I may

[00:53:07] so one thing is can we try and figure out where we could place these things knowing it won't be perfect right now and we can even come back later in the conversation but second it probably sounds like it would be helpful to know what the instructional decision purpose is do you think I'm fine with the purpose that was in the draft policies that were posted mr. Frisch I think I was simpatico with where you were going just now miss Mary which is if we just chuck them into the buckets that they seem to most likely align with we can read once we have the two kind of buckets we can say okay now is anything missing from the purpose is there anything that we don't agree on that we

[00:53:47] need to have the best the board dive into on the definitions are there any things that we need to etc and I know our clerk is taking real notes I have the policy up it's on board docs it's the May 19th one so I'm just gonna read down that policy so definition section we had four definitions are for artificial intelligence AI literacy digital devices and generative AI and I am aware there a change to digital literacy that was proposed so maybe we chuck that in the first bucket policy

[00:54:22] bucket you know maybe we can simply chuck things into one or the other well anyway so ai and ai literacy will clearly go into the second policy right innovation and technology okay the ai definition and the generative ai definition could probably will likely end up being in both i would I would imagine.

[00:54:47] I agree that generative needs to be in both because as we've already been told, existing tools have some component of generative. They'll touch on them for different reasons, but they'll still both still

need to be defined. Yep. Okay.

[00:55:03] For what it's worth, I probably would put generative AI only in the innovation one and not in the EdTech. I agree with that. I'll go along and get along. We can always take it out after. So definitely AI in the use of EdTech and then as well innovation.

[00:55:24] but then additionally generative AI and then AI literacy. - And if we're just sort of chiming in, like having a meeting, that's fine. I know at one point we were talking about human in the loop.

[00:55:40] I mean, I think that from an ed tech perspective, that's the number one thing that people wanna make sure is that if there is any utilization by staff of AI, that there is a human in the loop. - Sure, so that would go in the-- of the ed tech, I think.

[00:56:06] - The other thing to think about when it comes to definitions, This is probably something else that we can revisit when we're done with what's going in which one, because it only makes sense to include definitions for things that we are using in the language of the policy, otherwise you're defining things that don't exist in the document.

[00:56:21] Okay. The philosophy is just going to be a whole other animal, I don't think. Each one will have a philosophy. Yeah. And we didn't do the -- And the one that we have would just be separated. Well, the one that we have -- The one that we drafted was separated. We tried to talk to both. Yeah. And now we could just separate. Was that one ever shared?

[00:56:37] I shared with Dr. Anderson. Yeah, we didn't share it here only because we were kind of moving in a different direction. Well, we were ready, but last meeting we only got through most of the calendars. Oh, that's also true. It also, it was an attempt, at least at the time when I initially came up with the first draft, it was bringing both of these together.

[00:56:56] That's why it seemed so lengthy. And now it's an opportunity to separate the two, which we couldn't have done until we just voted just now. So if we move down to responsibilities then, Evidence-based practices is one of the responsibilities in there.

[00:57:16] - So sorry, may I ask a question? Digital devices, did we decide, is this policy one or policy two? - We're not there yet. - Oh, I was looking at the May 19th. I was just going down. - The definitions. - Oh, did you see that? - My apologies. - Yeah, that we were just going down that list and just kind of chucking them. - Oh, sure.

[00:57:33] Sorry, I missed that one. It seems the first one. - Was the first two or number two? - The first two or number two? - I mean, digital devices, it's hard to miss. I don't, it could be in both, I don't know.

[00:57:51] - It seems to go in the first one. - Okay, so one it is. Okay, then philosophy, we'll come back with that separated one, responsibilities, evidence-based practices, A, that should definitely go into one, actually both, may not be the same thing.

[00:58:23] Digital literacy instruction? I mean, it looks like B and C would go into the first one. Is that accurate? People agree?

[00:58:43] We've got digital literacy instruction and intentional device usage. Where did A go? A went into the first one. All right.

[00:59:04] B is access to AI in general of AI. This is where it comes down to, like, is it innovation or are we talking about use, right? And so I see a world in which section in the innovation policy that speaks to this issue that is access to emerging technology, but I can also see that since we already, you know, this is specific to AI, it could be in the instructional technology policy.

[00:59:33] Other thoughts? Where does access to AI and generative AI go? - I think two for sure. But again, I think there'll be some overlap.

[00:59:49] It might be raised in one, particularly the generative AI, because we do have that, as I mentioned earlier, and some of their existing platforms, and I'm talking about the ones that have been here for years, because I believe that's what Dr. Presidio had shared, because they're like in a closed system.

[01:00:08] But the access to AI, I think that should go into the innovation, number two. - Okay, so access to AI and generative AI is going, I don't know that I heard agreement or more excitement for one or the other, both.

[01:00:33] I'm gonna lean on those who wanted to bifurcate to make the recommendations. So you're saying it goes into both? - I did recommend number two. - Okay, what number two? - The policy. - Okay, sure.

[01:00:49] - Okay, okay, all right. Family and community engagement, we have someone saying both. - I agree, and I also think We'll be able to bring in the EdTech committee.

[01:01:05] There'll be some language on that. Any other thoughts? As well as the opt-outs of those things. They'll look different. So I have a question. Well, a couple thoughts. One, we've got to put the committee in somewhere. I don't know where it goes. Two, do you feel like we need to codify in the policy how instructional technology products are selected and the approval process?

[01:01:33] Because there is a rigid one, but it's not outwardly facing. but I feel like that's maybe something our community wants is a better understanding of that process. So just a thought on whether we want to put under responsibility selection of instructional tech products because this is the ed tech policy.

[01:01:52] I'll pull up the instructional materials policy. It's policy 3003. It was last reviewed in 2014. I see them as very different. I mean, the process for selecting educational materials, I think, includes the convening committees.

[01:02:10] like I had someone who was on the social studies review, someone was on the basal math, basal for me. I don't think that if we wanna go rewrite that and include the selection of ed tech, I just am thinking do we wanna keep them separated, I guess is my question.

[01:02:27] - This has been a discussion from the jump. There were policies that I put out there and said these are all adjacent to this discussion and we put that aside. But it is the very heart of what we're doing. the instructional material policy says it's for the identification of instructional materials for curriculum, planning, design, and implementation, and it's a joint function of the board, departments, and local schools.

[01:02:52] This is the very heart of what we're doing. I would say, yeah, we want some of that in this new policy, but it should all, this policy is in 2014, okay? So, so much has changed since then, but it's still our instructional materials.

[01:03:10] Our textbooks are online. that is instructional material. And parents are worried about, why can't I get a hard copy textbook? Why isn't my kid reading a hard bound book in the library? Why did I keep? So this is one of those, I think, foundational things where the board should talk about, do we want to address, you know, how do we want to address electronic materials?

[01:03:33] Are they part of the instructional? - What was that policy number? - 3003, it's very minimal. It talks about basal materials and program materials, but again, that's from 12 years ago, before we could even conceive of having stuff that we have. - I guess based on what I feel like I've learned from you, and I think you've done this well, is that there are certain, if we're using these terminologies of technology, that as a parent, I'd rather probably see anything related to tech in the tech policy and not in a, I'm just saying like, I'm trying to think how parents think if they're looking for something.

[01:04:10] I hear your, you know, but I'm thinking maybe. - I agree with you, I just wanna mention, I scroll down to the second page, and it says instructional materials that are used include all audio, visual materials, instructional technology, and texts.

[01:04:29] But this is one of those policies where like. - Yeah, but I think prior to us having tech policy, that's probably where it should have lived. - I know, but this is one of those things hasn't been done, and here we are again. - I'm just gonna jump in here. I think it's a great opportunity to, let me backtrack.

[01:04:45] One, I've said this a lot in this room, that these policies are communications to the public and it's directions to the superintendent. So we don't get paid by the word to, we don't get charged by the word to print them.

[01:05:00] So let's just take advantage and bring things in that make sense and to offer clarity. So I wanna support bringing the language that Robin just talked about into this policy. And if there's another policy, this is also something that you've been very good at doing where we have policies that don't say much and we collapse them into one that actually becomes more robust.

[01:05:22] If this is an opportunity to do that with 30.03 that I have not looked at, then I'd like to investigate that. To answer the question that I was asked, is there a space for us to talk about the selection process of technology? Yes, I think it's more in number two, which is the innovation piece, then I'm sorry, the policy two rather than policy one.

[01:05:45] where we can have that conversation. But that's just my suggestion. But I do want to bring it in. Ms. St. John-Cunning? So I can see both points, and I do see that it's hard sometimes for outsiders, and sometimes for insiders to find the policies, figure out what's going on.

[01:06:07] And I understand exactly what Ms. Lady is asking for, and I understand what Ms. Marin is saying about this already exists. is there a way and you did have those adjacent policies that maybe we don't have to put it in here but say as outlined in policy blank blank blank so then people know that I don't know if that would satisfy because this has particularly been something that there's been a lot of interest in more interest than in the basal math or the social studies or for a lot of reasons but if we already have a policy that takes care of it they as and refer it just a

[01:06:47] suggestion i don't know how that would work if that would work or not so i hear both of you guys that's what i'm saying thank you mr prish so i mean you kind of you get to this rub where if you reference a policy and the policy changes then you have a cascading number of policies that have to change as well at the same time if you reiterate what a policy says and that policy

[01:07:16] changes, you have to do that as well. So I can conceive of, difficulty comes in, that if we were to just the other policy to include something about technology, that's probably something that kicks that piece of the can down the road a little bit while we finish these. I don't know that there's an appetite for that. And as Dr. Anderson was suggesting that it would live in the innovation policy, in my head I was like, well, what about just run-of-the-mill selections of things that,

[01:07:56] re-evaluating things that are up for renewal or that kind of stuff and then as I thought a little bit more I'm like well all those things could be him in the innovation policy having it laid out differently in two different policies you're just asking for a problem right and so I can conceive of an area in the innovation policy that talks about the selection and renewal and review of instructional technology right and how does that fit innovation versus instructional technology well at times we'll be looking for how do we evaluate things that are new to the system at times we will be evaluating things that

[01:08:36] are replacing things that are in the system and at times we'll be talking about how do we assess whether something we've had in the system is still doing what it was intended to do or if it did in the first place right so I can see it living in an in the innovation policy more strongly than figuring out a path have to have it in both. And the EdTech policy, separate from the innovation policy, can reference the selection process, and we can list related policy at the end. So that would be at least

[01:09:12] right now where I think it might make sense to live. I also asked the clerk to send around a link to what she's using so that we can see it instead of having to wait for her to toggle back and forth. thank you I'll go ahead and add to this discussion so you know we know that this is a web of all these things and when we get to a policy that's old and out of compliance it really puts a stop and what we're trying to do you know we had deal with the grading policy calendar boundaries it's really hard work so I

[01:09:50] looked at the 3303 for the instructional materials policy and and And it's all I have is, well, we have a policy out of date. So is the superintendent and the board supposed to be compliant to that policy? I mean, I guess. Well, I went to the regulation for 30.03.

[01:10:07] It's 30.05. It was updated in July of 23. And it talks about instructional materials being approved by the board, print and digital resources that are approved by the board through a formal process for use in all schools.

[01:10:22] Have all of the things in our schools done this? I mean, I don't know. I know when we had contracts like Schoology, but we didn't like have a presentation on it or talk about it or talk about what's happening with it. We just agreed to extend the contract. Is that sufficient enough? If we're in charge of instructional materials, shouldn't we be spending more time on that?

[01:10:42] Or whether it's Lexia or iReady, I know we approved the contract for the Time Magazine one that my kid uses. What about Kahoot, did we approve that?

[01:10:59] This just opens up so many questions, and a part of it is who is deciding what materials and what resources are used in our classrooms? And I think we should have a say in that. I'm not saying we have to propose it, but we're not having a dialogue about it with the superintendent.

[01:11:17] Like, I don't know if the superintendent thinks that devices should be allowed. Or, you know, I see things like there's trainings, but I don't know. Well, I do know that every teacher has not been trained in school. Yet every middle school and high school was given a laptop with Schoology.

[01:11:36] So I'm just struggling to put things in policy here without the board having a commitment to getting really clear on, like, where do we fit in instructional policy decisions, whether it's paper or digital. Because then, I mean, this gets to, you know, the digital literacy instruction piece.

[01:12:00] anyway it's a bigger discussion and that's why also i'm trying to follow how people want to bifurcate this i'll leave it at that um i think dr anderson and then mr presh just two quick things one i i don't disagree with what you've shared just now regarding um what are we approving what we're not approving but it doesn't it doesn't come across to me as an issue language because it already lists it speaks to me as an issue of process and that needs clarification

[01:12:34] because the language is already there in existing policy that the board is to review i think that's a separate discussion in terms of is it everything is it some of the things and what is that process so i just wanted to be responsive to that secondly um i think please tell me if i'm wrong we are on page two of the may 19th contracts we haven't decided on i'm sorry public reporting and contracts we have not decided on i think once we've decided on these two components it will be

[01:13:12] now for us to finish fleshing out at a high level the things that may not exist here yet just going through policy one policy two and determining from the feedback we've been receiving from conversations we've had with colleagues and from the decisions that were just made at the board table last week we need to start to put these things into these two policy buckets for future writing so that we can have a successful session next week

[01:13:44] accurate that we did not finish with FNG you're accurate so could we finish with FNG turn in a bit so I want to go back I think and mr. fish will you next I'm sorry I called him accident start misleading and then yes we can finish finish with FNG?

[01:14:05] - I don't know. - You don't know? - Am I going or is Miss Lady going? - I said you. - Okay. On the question of process, I agree that the policy can speak to the process.

[01:14:22] I also think that the policy can speak to the process as if it's different from a first time adoption to a renewal to considering alternatives, et cetera. We can get into that nitty gritty if we want to.

[01:14:38] and then I'll just speak to these other items as they were so that I don't have to speak to them in the future. These two are ones that I don't necessarily, I'll wanna have a discussion with all colleagues, but these would seem that if we were going to include them in the policy, that they would be in the innovation policy.

[01:15:15] - Okay, Ms. Leidy. - So a couple of things. - Clerk, can you go show a little bit more of what's above that page? So I have a question for Mr. Sethi. We have a digital ecosystem library that I do know that staff can see.

[01:15:36] Is there a digital ecosystem library that parents can see? - Yeah, it does have a public version which people can view on the tools that are currently available. - So we already have annual parental digital consent forms. We have a digital ecosystem library and we have reports on usage.

[01:15:54] So we're accomplishing all of those bullets at present? - Yes, I mean, I think that the terms are used from the system we already have. - The other thing I wanted to make a comment on is, 'cause we can't respond to community participation, I dug quite a bit after having people hold up Lightspeed reports to me.

[01:16:20] Lightspeed reports, I did quite a bit of digging, and as everyone knows, there is a plethora of things that are running on Chromebook to prevent kids from going to the wrong places, to make sure the blacklisted sites are stopped.

[01:16:36] So that's a big thing. It's not uncommon for our kids to not properly shut down, even if they've moved to do something different. And it's my understanding sometimes, like if I just shut my computer but I don't log off it, but it's closed, there's still stuff running on it.

[01:16:55] So even if I put it in a cart, I think it's my understanding, is that true, Dr. Sethi, that something that's in a car but not shut down, right, could still show it's running? - Well, so depending on the settings, but it can, yes, devices can stay on, and it may, like Google would have a couple of checks running all the time on the device, just form of policy pushing technology and tools and updates and security.

[01:17:18] - All right, thank you. I just wanna bring that up because I have, I paid attention to schools where folks shared their reports and then reached out to some people who had kids at those schools and got a very different story in terms of the amount of time their kids were actually on a device and how the report that they see looks like they're on it for longer, but they know that their student is not because their student tells them that they're not.

[01:17:46] The Schoology training comment, we did require a specific amount of Schoology training at the very beginning of this year. And Ms. Marin, a lot of your advocacy because of the frustration that you felt like that people needed to have a certain threshold of understanding.

[01:18:03] Having said that, like any technology tool, it's got all kinds of bells and whistles, and some teachers are incredibly tech-savvy and really able to use all the bells and whistles, and some are using the minimum expectation was. If we wanna raise that minimum expectation, I think that's a different conversation.

[01:18:23] But I do know that that training was pushed out in the fall before school started, it i know some teachers felt targeted as if they were the outreach was only to them and the t specs and aspects had to explain no no this is everybody because this came down from the you know i we didn't make a formal ass but we talked enough out of the diet so um the other thing is um the public reporting um i don't want frg in the policy and i'll give you my reasons why we do not have in other policies anything related to budget we don't have anything around

[01:19:01] budget and those are ELs in my opinion we don't have even in the policy that's you know outdated around materials it doesn't say anything about reporting out what what the mouth books cost so I don't want it in here and then in terms of contracts I don't want to make a special arrangement related to software I want to I want to stick with the procurement process that there is the threshold with which things have to come to the board so that's just my personal opinion on those thank you and madam clerk I think we weren't tracking

[01:19:38] time if you could just read that on my turn I'll go so I was just thinking while I was listening about early education which is my first love where I started in public policy and I got to travel all over and see these amazing early preschool programs and then I had a preschooler who had a reading you know early literacy difficulty and I would go to preschool and watch how you teach a kid to hold a pencil it's not you know it's not innate right days weeks for some kids they have to go to occupational therapy Schoology is that

[01:20:12] pencil Schoology takes time to use and while I'm glad my advocacy has made some change I know for a fact that at schools teachers are make all different folders and all different colors and have different approaches and there can only I feel like often in this discussion about technology, the way I see it, I feel like we're not thinking, I feel like, I think, what I do is I think about how would a seven-year-old be with this? How would an eight-year-old be with this? I think so often we're coming at it from our adult

[01:20:48] brains, and you're in seventh grade, you're 12 years old, you're going through puberty, you're given a device and told to figure everything out now on your laptop. Did anyone explicitly tell you how to do that what's a Google Calendar how do I email my teacher I just think there's I don't find that we're talking enough about what it's really like to teach children to use technology typing I don't understand how we give kids devices and don't teach them how to type even just ergonomic stuff right like

[01:21:25] sitting how do you sit correctly on a laptop and these are all things that are realities for our children you know like I said my son thought he couldn't learn because his laptop was gone. If that's the world we want to create, okay, but if we don't, we want to, because it's not the same as a 20-year-old in that position.

[01:21:46] Something in their brain gets lost. So regarding public reporting and contracts, I feel very strongly that this stays in because just like I find it hard, it's not apples to apples. Comparing to instructional policy and looking at a static textbook is not the same as an ever-evolving tool.

[01:22:07] And I will say it is because the superintendent signed a contract with OpenAI without putting it in front of the board, that I feel very strongly that this needs to go in there. And it does have a value, even if it's not a dollar value. It's unfortunate that the superintendent didn't seek out partnership and say, hey, I'm thinking of doing this. Here's why. Here's what's going to happen. And tell us on the front end, I might feel differently. But we have a job to make sure right now, ChatGPT is being used by teachers, and there's no guarantee that it's going to last, I think, after this school year, isn't it?

[01:22:42] Isn't it June 2026? 27? 28? Okay, I thought it was just a year, but what happens after that is our investment just, I feel very strongly it needs to be in here. This is not an old policy. We're talking about new evolving stuff. We got to evolve our expectations on it, too. Okay, Dr. Anderson, then Miss Lady, it's 520. Just want to check on how we're doing. We're talking about F&G, correct?

[01:23:13] Okay, so Dr. Anderson, and then I guess Mr. Frischford. Sorry, not to want to birdwalk, but I am going to birdwalk a little bit because I think maybe something has changed without my knowledge, because Lightspeed, I'm a very heavy user of Lightspeed to my kids' chagrin, and I do believe I have checked this with you, Mr.

[01:23:30] Sethi, because I've asked you a few questions. I believe Lightspeed, once it's clicked, that's when it's captured, because it will show you that at 12:04, I was on, I don't know, Nike.com. At 12:06, I was on this.com.

[01:23:49] 'Cause I've had this question for you before. I thought it's when you click on the site, that's when it's captured. Has that changed? - The technology would essentially capture whenever sites are being served. Most of them would be by clicks, but there will be some parts and pieces of it which could be running in the background.

[01:24:08] That would not be the majority. It would be some traffic which is going to be available on the computers. but then it wouldn't capture at that time unless there's a click happening because a click is

timestamped. - It's not so much the click, but then the computer, the Chrome browser, is basically asking for a certain website to be sent over.

[01:24:27] So the user physical click is not the action, but the transport between the computer, it gets a little technical, but I can certainly get more details on it. - Okay, it certainly got technical for me, but I will digress 'cause I was working under the fact that the click is what captures it into the report.

[01:24:45] in terms of what we add into this document again going back to what I've said before this is a communication to the public and this is a direction to the superintendent I would find it more than appropriate for anything that lives in an EL to be in here if it speaks to budgetary implications which we do have in other components other I'm sorry other policies so for me it's not a an unusual thing to do if it's the board's expectation and if it also offers clarity to the public that they will continue they'll continue to be

[01:25:22] oversight and monitoring of it so I don't know if I love this language that is here but some language I think makes perfect sense so I'd like to do that and also I would like for us to add the tech committee we talked about family engagement in both but i think the tech committee should also be in both because it's a slightly different role so i'd like for that to be a consideration um as well as i lost my last piece

[01:25:53] so i will come back to that okay um mr frish and the misleading right mr fresh okay um so thinking of these two items plus what we do after we get through these two items i think it would make makes sense to look at things that are not yet on these lists that need to be included or parking lotted.

[01:26:17] Sure, we'll go with that. My advocacy would be that F and G be discussed by the board as part of the parking lot. I don't know if there's consensus on including them or not. If there's not, then put them in the parking lot for the work session. In terms of, well, and maybe I'll end there and think if we pick up these other draft policies that were shared with the committee, we can talk about elements of those that should be included in one or the other or what.

[01:26:50] I don't know what you envision for like the steps after we get through this standing committee policy draft. - Dr. Anderson can remember her question then I'll go. - I just remembered the last piece, the opt out. This was the board vote from last Thursday for us to include that in policy one is the use.

[01:27:14] - Yes, I think that's kind of my last piece right now. - Okay, I agree with putting the opt-out obviously in, and I also think that the committee should go under family and community engagement, which is where it is for boundary, policy, and I think some others.

[01:27:36] Again, I don't think it's the responsibility, it's an advisory committee, and does it set the process for selecting instructional products? again isn't that the board's policy so I I think if anything it goes in in engagement I also think a definition for digital literacy could be added or we had AI literacy but I think also adding digital literacy or changing that adjusting it in the first policy I would like to put something very clear in there about what did we get to intentional device use where are we did

[01:28:14] - Did we skip intentional device use? - No, we didn't. We moved those into-- - How did we? - I talked about it, but it didn't land. - Okay, so under responsibilities, we talked about A and B.

[01:28:30] Then we went to C, intentional device use, but-- Okay, well, I also wanna adjust it, though, to make it to second grade. And I want, well, I wanna adjust it to a bunch of things, so maybe we don't go there, right? We're just gonna go with what's in the original policy.

[01:28:46] That was it. Right, buckets, okay. - We don't have to get in the weeds now, but-- - Yes, so there are things that I would wanna change the language that's currently in there but have we gone through all the buckets all the things of the standing form okay so um right and the opt-out reflects the board's vote so we can put that in so let's think about how we're going to present this to colleagues what we're going to ask about you know what are some questions that we would want to discuss at the work session

[01:29:25] miss levy did you want to pick up from there start with something different well again i mean i one of the areas of the policy I worked incredibly hard on was the intentional device usage I put a pretty lengthy sort of definition prior to the bullets and then I added additional bullets which were monitoring screen time and balance modeling and frameworks designing for learner variability and professional development and I believe they're all essential and I believe that they I'm sorry Miss Lady can you refer to which section is it definitions um it's I have the one that she said I just want to know where to go I believe it was

[01:30:00] under responsibilities see page four so would we want to say for Tuesday that this is a big topic to talk about I mean I think that that's most what's most important to our public so I and I and I know that you know I wanted to make

[01:30:32] sure we included I believe what sort of represents the approach that we're taking to training teachers on making sure using intentional use so and in full disclosure I mean we we have we have our school-based technology specialists all with the expectation that they

[01:30:58] will get certified and ISTE is basically I that definition I believe sort of outlines the ISTE standards which is you have to be deliberate right and then the monitoring screen time the modeling and frameworks the designing learner variability I think those are the reasons why you use technology so obviously I like what I created in that section and I don't think there's much I

[01:31:37] don't I would be shocked if there was any opposition to it because I think it's you know monitoring screen time ensuring schools maintain a healthy balance between digital non-digital learning or experiences across different grade levels particularly in early childhood education like I think this is a lot of what to me is responsive to a lot of the things that the parents for intentional tech have shared okay thank you doctor let's go miss st. John Cunning and then dr. Anderson so I agree with miss lady and I'm usually the one person says is

[01:32:13] like less wordage but as dr. Anderson says we don't have to pay for words I think this is a little bit more concrete about what is it that we're gonna do and I think you're seeing that right there so I mean I'd like to see it included to bring it to the board and then you know if people there for people to red line it if they want to red line it and change it then to try to add it I think it'll give thought it'll give people something to think about is or at least that's the way my brain works that makes sense okay dr. Anderson feedback on I guess the topic of talking about intentional device use I mean we have to

[01:32:52] do that that that's the whole conversation and what I'm wrestling with with my in my mind's eye is is it is it clear enough in terms of parameters let me just try to illustrate with an example the superintendent will develop and implement guidelines and this is where with the first board where it was kind of helpful to have the regulations be developed as the policies were developed I know we don't do that and I understand there's a you know lots of good reasons why but to just kind of see what that's going to look like because

[01:33:31] one of the things that I want to be sure that if our policy if the policy illustrates what I'm sorry states what is here and this is just for an example sake what if the guidelines that are developed in the regulations by the superintendent say that it should be 15 hours a day that's considered to be balanced usage it's a very extreme example just to kind of illustrate my point I'm not saying this is what you would say it just made me wonder do we need to be a little bit clearer but there's no way that we don't have some language here about the device use because it speaks to the fact that we've

[01:34:10] talked about its passive use or that it's not intentional it's just something kids have constantly and if it's not in front of them and it could be put away in the cart when it's not being used we need to have that kind of language i i just i think i'd like to see a little bit more but i don't have it right now but i do think we absolutely need to have something that speaks to this mr fish so i agree that we need to have a conversation about including this because i think this is at the heart of not only what i think people are looking

[01:34:47] for but also uh concerns about where things currently stand right what was the process that at which we arrived here and how are we measuring whether or not it's being used appropriately. So if we're ever going to envision a future where there are less concerns about those things because people understand that there's a process by which we got there, that's how we start it, right?

[01:35:10] And it's gonna take a while, but I think we can get there. And so we should discuss that. In terms of the ETRC, here's what the board approved, I believe unanimously, to direct governance committee to incorporate and formalize these expectations to board policy as part of its ongoing work, ensuring that ETRC's purpose, charge, scope, structure, membership codified as detailed below, and then it goes into the details.

[01:35:35] So whether that sits in under the engagement section, whether it's called out in the engagement section and then iterated out in maybe sub bullets within the engagement section, wherever it belongs, that's what will ultimately have to be included in the policy. So to summarize, here are two things that we could bring in advance for Tuesday.

[01:35:56] One is the intentional device use language. We can share what Ms. Leidy drafted as the proposal in addition to what was included in the standing policy, so that's what's listed there now. With the one change being about what the board voted on to allow for opting out for that third bullet.

[01:36:15] Okay, so that's one thing, right? So we can ask our colleagues, "This is where we're at with intentional device use. What do people think?" The other thing I just heard is a discussion about where the committee lives in the policy, and even if it could be in both policies. - I wasn't quite finished, but it's okay.

[01:36:30] - Oh, I'm sorry. - Because when Dr. Anderson mentioned enshrining the opt-out in the policy, I started thinking about the other items that we voted on, and I think for the purposes of the work session, it would be helpful for the board to discuss how that lives in policy, when it lives in policy, because right now, those requests were for the ETRC to work on certain things and come back with recommendations, which I would imagine we would you know consider and then adopt or not as a board um and uh if we

[01:37:04] put uh a outcome in the policy before we have the recommendation I'm not sure what that would look like um uh but I think that's something for the parking lot area for discussion um and did we get clarity on what F and G were going to be in terms of the conversation there wasn't agreement to include it but I would argue that it is in the current draft so we should put it in one or the other because

there's also things that why did we just go to exercise of choosing whether things would be in one or the other or parking

[01:37:39] lot it if we're just this is the only thing that got parking lot and it happens to be an area that we didn't agree with but I thought when we set out on the conversation it was if we agree then we put it in one or the other if we don't agree then it goes in the parking lot not to keep the board from discussing it but just to indicate to the board that we didn't.

[01:38:01] - I don't know, I guess if I'm, I don't recall honestly, but if that's what people wanna do, I guess, but it's the only one we're putting in a parking lot and I feel kind of funny about it 'cause it's one where there is strong disagreement, so. - I think there's also disagreement in the other sections.

[01:38:17] It's just that we agree that they, in theory, belong in the policy and what those, what that language ends up being, I think is where, like you wanna change one of the years, for example, right? maybe colleagues don't want that but at least we'll have that conversation right well same with this i don't think it should be a parking lot i think it should be a very active driving on the highway discussion like as part of the edtech discussion on how we acquire when i mentioned the parking lot earlier it wasn't to completely remove that component from from consideration

[01:38:52] because as i shared earlier i do think some version of this i'm not in love with this language but some version of this needs to be part of the um of the policy i i don't i refute the notion that if it's in an el it can't be here actually i think it brings greater clarity because the public is like what's an el what do you guys do with that if we're able to bridge those two documents i think there's a space i don't love this language but i think it would be fine to work on the language and then reintroduce that when we're when we meet on today because the parking

[01:39:26] lot was not a discard pile, it was just to keep the conversation moving. But I do have a question, and I think this is the piece that I was trying to illustrate earlier needs clarity.

[01:39:41] The intentional device use, it says the division superintendent shall develop and implement guidelines for the purposeful integration of educational technology. concern that we've had from our community has been essentially the unfettered use of AI this does not give the tightening of the lanes because if the superintendent has decided that AI is good to use then the very arguments that has resulted in all these letters today is not addressed it's wanted to

[01:40:17] put that in the room Miss Lady so my first question is so my this whole thing is in the parking lot it looks like it's not up in the underneath something that's agreed upon?

[01:40:33] I thought I heard consensus from everybody that we needed, we wanted this. - C is, intentional device usage is in the first. - Oh, but not my, not my parts. - Correct, no edits, but from what was from the May draft.

[01:40:49] - Okay, well then, so if you go back above, clerk, Madam Clerk, there's pre-K to first grade, elementary school, and the permission to bring devices home. Now, can you scroll back down, please? Those don't need to be repeated here, 'cause they're agreed upon above.

[01:41:07] I'd rather have my other bullets in there if people are amenable to them. Those are in there, okay. So I would just take out the top three because they're agreed upon, correct. Yeah, there you go.

[01:41:23] Because it's codified above, I don't think we need to repeat it. That's all. - Well, it's not codifying your suggestions. It's just using the base language. - Well, I'm still gonna advocate from what I believe in the bullets above, but we all agree that they'll be debated. - Sure, same.

[01:41:38] - Same, okay. - We're not articulating to the board that like what we're sending you right now is the language that we have wordsmithed and agreed to, right? We're saying that these are the buckets that we want included in the policies. - So, and then the other thing I was gonna say, because in my draft, D is access to AI, generative AI.

[01:41:57] So it's there, Dr. Anderson. It just is not under the intentional device usage. It's a standalone as a D, but it's, you know, it's there as well. So I just wanna point that out. - Why don't we take a few minutes to go through the whole, let's go through number one, let's go through number two, and again, except for the acceptable use or intentional advice use, everything else was from the previous version of the policy, which for Ms. Lady was the only new thing, and then there's other things people have proposed but haven't been adopted.

[01:42:33] So if we scroll to the top of this one, right? So this is the use of educational technology, okay? We've got our definitions, We inserted the new human-in-the-loop definition from the previous version, so that is an addition from previous, but we agreed on it.

[01:42:51] The philosophy is TBD. Responsibilities, what was B? B was digital literacy instruction. I believe we did say we wanted that up there, is that correct?

[01:43:09] That B would go into the educational. Okay, intentional device use. So here, though, again, I thought we did agree to insert Miss Lady's text into that, like a preamble, basically.

[01:43:30] Is that, didn't we agree to that? Is there agreement for that? - I mean, I said that there should certainly be some text under the intentional device use, and I think some of this speaks to that. - Could it be a starting point? - I just don't think it is specific enough, so I'm fine for it to be a starting point.

[01:43:49] - Sure, so why don't we use Miss Lady's proposed text and put that in as a sort of preamble to the first policy. - And then she mentioned D.

[01:44:08] - Yep, hold on. - Great, those are gonna remain the same.

[01:44:26] I think it is in place now, yeah. Although the one, let's just keep going from this one 'cause I think the one below it is not quite accurate. And then the third bullet here, that would reflect the board's vote about bringing devices home with a, so I don't have the exact language in front of me, right, but-- It's on the website.

[01:44:51] Thank you, Madam Clerk, for putting that in. Okay, and then E, we agreed with the family and community engagement would go in. Oh, so we're not putting access to AI? Well, no, because they're one member's suggestions.

[01:45:07] And so while we did do it as the preamble, it's a way to remind ourselves that we need more language. - We have a question about D when you get to that point. - Sure, so D went into the second one. - And I think here's my question.

[01:45:23] D as it stands says generative AI shall be accessible on digital devices per the digital literacy plan authorized by the school board, may not be accessible to students. Is this speaking to what you had talked about, Dr. Presidio, which is it's embedded in some of our software already?

[01:45:43] These are not the generative AI that the concerns are being raised about? - Well, I think we do need to distinguish between the generative chat AI features that we're hearing the majority of concerns about the safety issues and cognitive offloading with those tools, and then other AI functionalities that are built into a variety of software products, operational, and in some instances, instructional, like we've talked about with like Adobe and Canva.

[01:46:14] - Okay, thank you, and this is also a space where I think we could start to delineate in terms of what's applicable to staff and what's applicable to students, because the concern, it's not whether the adults use AI. The concern is not whether or not whatever AI that kind of lives in Lexia continues to stay there.

[01:46:33] The concern is the chat that Dr. Proceso just talked about. So if we can place a disclaimer or caveat just to distinguish between the two, once we do that, I won't have any pending questions on this component.

[01:46:56] - Okay, so we've got, - So D, access to AI and generative AI, though, is in the second policy. Okay, got that. Then we are on letter E, family and community engagement.

[01:47:15] - We didn't quantify what kind of generative AI is in there. - That's right, because we're just putting it in now. It's a placeholder for a much longer conversation. The family and community engagement is there. Then the next one on the policy is public reporting and contracts, and that's gone down the parking lot I see the parking lot though all that intentional device usage language that I believe should not be there because we moved the um preamble language up and then the other

[01:47:49] three are the board members suggestions and then we're going to bring those separately so we did make the exception from this lady's preamble language right so then those unless we want to include it it's up to I mean right we haven't really gotten through the individual people's suggestions on this round so if we want to include it that's fine I don't know whatever's going to make the conversation go more smoothly I mean the members are going to have to understand that there are other comments to be viewed in addition to this breakdown so yeah Mr Frisch one thing that

[01:48:29] maybe we ask in the setting up of the discussion at the work session is that and I think we did this for the I think we did this for one of the policies in the past because this is this is like informing us it's not a I need data from this to make a decision on a future vote right um maybe the next steps document is instructive of other things that people bring to the table during the conversation that we want to get people to weigh in on in advance of anything coming to the board so like let's say that this lady has her item one of the bullets that um she'd like to

[01:49:08] suss out a little bit more and wants to know if the if colleagues want to see that included in the policy that she would put in the next steps for that portion of the work session and then colleagues could do their typical way of weighing in on things that way it might keep us from doing a never-ending like census taking so so two things one the opt-out that's not gonna be at F that's gonna be C third bullet updated so just one of those things ETRC that question is of

[01:49:45] where it goes. So this work session is a week away. So what's going to happen between now and then to help everyone get up to speed? And what exactly are we going to be about that day, right? We talked about the intentional device use and where does the committee live. First we're gonna have to bring

everyone up to speed and say this is where we're at and then it seems like if people have those red line suggestions that we offer them. So like this lady and myself, I know you

[01:50:20] had some Ms. Anderson wants to bring them right can we talk a little bit about is it possible to see like what we want to achieve by the end of the work session on Tuesday knowing that you know that's the last work session before recess and then we start in the fall and like how we might want to be thinking about going into summer and the fall ahead so if we could kind of talk about Tuesday that would be helpful go ahead Ms. Anderson Dr. Anderson and then Mr. Frisch I think by end of Tuesday because of where we are I'd like for us to and we have two and a

[01:50:54] half hours okay I'm assuming because they've all been such lengths I'd like for us to walk out with these two documents pretty much having the content built out again not the wordsmithing not where do we put this period do we like the word like versus prefer not that that could always happen after the fact We can make that, you know, part of the editorial changes that we typically give leave to.

[01:51:23] But in terms of the content, and not everybody's going to have it be reflected in their voice because it just never is. We all are stylistically different. But I do believe, I think there's great hope, and I would like for us to see us walk out of both of these policies fully fleshed out in terms of content, like these are the components, how we organize the different sentences may come later.

[01:51:51] And I do think that given the time, it might be a little challenge to have the next steps and to have it be approved by folks as you suggested. It has worked when we've had a little bit more runway. So I do see that anybody who has things that they want to raise needs to be prepared to bring them up for consensus.

[01:52:10] You know, where they're going to go and what is it you want to say, bring it up for consensus. I think we did that with the legislative agenda. Mr. Frisch. - Yeah, I'm similarly minded that I think the do out needs to be kind of where we've been going here.

[01:52:30] Like these are the things that are going in each of these buckets, et cetera. I think we'll also get a sense of the flavor of how people envision those things living in the policies. I do think that next steps can be used. We just have to decide how long we wanna give people to include things on next steps when we expect people to provide their consensus.

[01:52:52] And then, you know, in the weeks between the work session and the next governance meeting, I presume in August or September, a draft could be pulled together for the two agencies and then hopefully the board could vote on it in the first part of the new school year.

[01:53:08] I did find the draft philosophies that Dr. Anderson had worked up and that I had played around with. And we actually did make two. One was for innovation, one was for instructional tech. So if people wanna look at that and see if they like that, we could also put that in the food for thought category for the work session as well.

[01:53:31] - This is helpful, so what I'm... So I think what could happen is we could have the two documents or if it's, right? So let's listen up. So if we could have the two documents and say, colleagues, would you add anything to each?

[01:53:51] Is there a topic missing from either that you'd want in there? Then what do you think of the red-lined input that some members have provided? Can you come with yes, no, tell me more? And then

what do you think of the philosophy statements? So those are three pieces of homework.

[01:54:09] I do think we need to be ready to talk about, do we wanna say what grades Gen AI should be available, if at all? When we're dancing around it, we could either say we're gonna keep dancing, or I think this, I think that, going to be in disagreement. So in addition to some of the other questions about, well, I guess if we frame it as, would you add anything to either policy bucket, do you agree? Do you agree about what's in the policy buckets, right? About what's in each policy? Would you

[01:54:43] add anything else? Do you like any other red line suggestions? What do you think of the philosophy language? And can we talk about AI and how that's going to be addressed? And I wrote this all out and I can share, but are there any other thoughts?

[01:55:15] I will send the write-up I just did to our clerk here, and then we can combine this content and share to everyone. And if we can talk to our colleagues and say, hey, we need some pre-work done and it's not a Monday night thing, it's like, can we do this a little bit in advance?

[01:55:38] Is it a three-day weekend? Okay, Dr. Anderson. - Just a quick question, can you repeat the last thing that you've said in terms of reaching out to our colleagues? Are you, I just missed it. - I'm saying it would help if we each reinforced to one another that, you know, this is the pre-work for this meeting.

[01:55:57] You know, we need to do this. If we want this meeting to be of substance on Tuesday, people need to come with these thoughts in mind. Do they agree about what we've put together? Would they add anything? Do they like any of the additional red line language suggested?

[01:56:13] What about the policy, philosophy statements? And what's your take on Gen AI? all right thank you for that and my second question is it what i thought i heard from mr frisch's comments and i'm not saying he was making the decision but from his comments about um we will come next week we will have conversations and have a draft after recess essentially is that what i heard no no that okay so let's let's go with that because that's what i thought that i heard that we would have a draft after recess for us to vote upon most likely

[01:56:48] when we come back in august what does that mean in the meanwhile well we won't have school so that's that but how would it how would it potentially impact professional development just like plans like dr reed i guess it's the question to you if this is not done before the end of the school year what how does this impact the business well i mean i think we'd start the year again like we started last year right because we had a draft

[01:57:22] policy last year for ai and we've been essentially in a holding pattern which we would continue so the staff would continue doing professional development for staff uses through the chat gpt for teachers sandbox if you will and there would be no further movement okay for um classroom work but where we are now is where it would remain until this is completed.

[01:57:56] - We've put a hold on everything pending the policy approval. I will say we do have SBITs that are continuing, our school-based technology specialists are continuing their professional development with the ISTE standards because we wanna make sure that our school-based technology specialists have the most current training in technology as they're going to be our staff that support our other educators at each school and in departments.

[01:58:28] But in terms of classroom technology use, everything's on hold, if you will, in AI until we have approval of the policy. - Okay, so here's my second question. From your perspective, and I'm just asking for your perspective, not necessarily what the board is directing you to do, are you anticipating in out years that students would be using ChatGPT?

[01:58:53] Is that kind of where you want it to go? - I have no expectation for that at this point. - So we will decide whether or not we go there? - I believe that's what you're planning to decide as part of this policy.

[01:59:09] - Okay, no, it's just helpful because I just want to know how to navigate some of the questions that Ms. Marin had just asked in terms of when, how much, and in what circumstance. So if it's going to be the board's directive, then I want to be thinking about that. - Well, I believe that's been a clear statement that the board wishes it to be their directive.

[01:59:28] So we're wanting to be really thoughtful about that and make sure we're providing any information in support of that as we have with our state-based research and other documents. We wanna make sure we're providing any support you need in those deliberations, and we're here to provide that.

[01:59:49] - Thank you, and because I have 53 seconds left, here's a support that I would like. When we talk about balance, because that's shown up on multiple drafts, I have that in some of my statements, balance in terms of screen time. What thoughts do you have on this as our educational instructional leader?

[02:00:06] You are a top teacher. - Sure, so I think screen time's an important conversation topic, and I'll defer to Dr. Presidio and Mr. Sethi. I know you've been spending a lot of time in those conversations with staff. If you want to venture that thoughtfully at this point.

[02:00:22] - I mean, I think just briefly for tonight, I mean, that's one of the major topics that the technology review committee is gonna be discussing. We have been doing a lot of research in central office on it, but obviously we want the perspectives of teachers, parents, students, everybody who works in the system.

[02:00:38] But definitely we are prepared to work with the technology committee to bring forward recommendations around screen time guidelines for the start of school year 26, 27. That's what we're intending to do. Assuming the committee can get all of that work done this summer. So we're looking at the balanced use of technology again, really.

[02:00:58] We wanna make sure that any screen time is active, student-centered, based on the use of technology applications that have a research base behind them. And we really wanna move away from some of the things that parents and board members and other community members have expressed concern about in terms of passive overuse of technology.

[02:01:17] So we're gonna be working on that with the committee this summer. - So what I think I'm hearing is, because that work is going to be happening in committee, the board shouldn't predetermine what the screen time, what the balance looks like? - I think that it's, we're in this sort of odd-- - Chicken or the egg, that's-- - We are, and I think that, you know, the committee is a review committee recommending to the superintendent for me to bring to you as a board, right, and if you're on recess, I'm not gonna be bringing it to you until you're off recess, and you're off recess right about the time school starts, so the timing is not our friend at this moment.

[02:01:55] However, I think what Dr. Presidio is saying is absolutely we wanna have those conversations and I think next Tuesday's work session will be helpful in informing where the board may sit on screen time, for example, or grade level expectations around that topic and so I'm really looking forward to that conversation.

[02:02:14] I think it'll be something we can take to the committee And we also, we await eagerly the deliberations among the committee 'cause I think it's gonna be an incredible group of people really focused on what's best for our students and look forward to what the board's thoughts are as well.

[02:02:34] And we're gonna have to figure out how to marry those. - Thank you, I'll pause here. - Mr. Frisch. - Yeah, just to remind folks who might be watching at home and not aware, at the last board meeting, we asked that the ETRC look into this subject.

[02:02:54] And I think that part of that conversation was about, okay, we want it by this date, not to go longer than this timeline. And staff indicated during that discussion that the intent was, as Dr. Presidio had just identified, was to get as much of that work done in advance of this school year as possible so that any changes that could be rolled out more quickly than even the board was asking for could happen.

[02:03:19] So it's good to hear that nothing's changed since last Thursday. and I'm eagerly awaiting the conversation. And that was specific to devices, that particular bullet.

[02:03:34] - All right, well it's 6:02, so let's go ahead and adjourn and we'll see each other on Tuesday, June 23rd.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com