



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Curriculum & Instruction Committee Meeting, Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Date	Wednesday, November 6, 2024
Place	Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length	1h 36m (video)
- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): https://player.vimeo.com/video/1027284629?rel=0 - BoardDocs (School Board): https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/loudoun/Board.nsf/Public	

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 2026-10-21. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] - Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to call this November 6th, 2024, Curriculum and Instruction Committee meeting to order. My name is Lauren Chernoff. I'm the chair of this committee and I'm joined by my esteemed colleagues, Dr. Deans and Dr. Rasheed, and we appreciate you being here. We would normally start with public comment, but we do not have any public commenters today.

[00:00:18] So we will move right on into our agenda to item 3.01, approval of the draft minutes for our October 2nd, 2024 meeting. there any edits or changes to the draft minutes with that may i have a motion to approve the minutes so moved can i have a second second all those in favor aye any opposed all right the minutes are approved next we will move on to item four which is our action item so this was an

[00:00:52] information item last time it's review of policy 5130 textbook adoption and i am going to actually asked mr slevin to present some updated information for us on this item mr slevin thank you mr shernoff last month the textbook adoption policy was presented to the committee as an information item as a reminder this is being reviewed due to its five-year cycle we sent the policy out for public feedback including our groups such as msac and we received a number of comments staff proactively took that feedback and made a few changes to the

[00:01:29] the wording of the policy for example we made a definition of textbooks taken directly from major a definition of textbooks taken from the Code of Virginia was included we wanted to be more

inclusive of resources that may come down the road we also added a statement about how the resources are selected for review under guiding principles one we added information about the committee structure and teachers holding majority membership on the committee based on feedback under B recommendations to the superintendent we removed in the timeline many of the comments were related to the old

[00:02:05] regulation that is still posted we are after the adoption of this policy we would we will be going back to the regulation to make updates and we will be sure to be considering those comments as we go through the updating of that regulation for the implementation of textbook adoption so staff would recommend moving to the this to the full board for consideration but we're open comments and questions from them thank you for the update colleagues you have

[00:02:35] any questions or comments I'm just happy that the teachers will be the larger part of the committee since they are the ones to use the resources most yeah I agree and I thank you very much for going through and taking this feedback because when I cross-referenced it it was already fixed in the red line so I really appreciate you guys doing that work on that end that makes our lives easier the only other thing I was gonna say is in the MSAC feedback on item number four they listed about the review committee makes recommendations for

[00:03:13] resources to match specific course and instructional goals that align with LCPS curriculum my only question was would you think it would be appropriate to include and instructional framework since we're integrating that moving forward or does that make it too specific happy to yield to your advice on that but didn't know if that would help clarify some of the other uses of our curriculum and what the goals of that are either way I don't think it prohibits us moving forward to the board I don't have a strong feeling I'm always hesitant

[00:03:51] to add something to policy that's so like current yeah because of future iteration of this when perhaps one or both of us aren't here what are what do they mean by the instructional framework yeah so if it was more broad in terms of the line to instructional vision but that's just always my thought when I'm building policy no worries I just didn't know if you wanted to take the opportunity to reinforce that we're doing that work but I totally get it anything else I would just add that that is the establishing of the selection

[00:04:30] criteria like would be a key part where that discussion would come in and the implementation of the instructional framework within the specific content area that's a big part of the conversation when we're like creating an RFP or evaluating resource from the video list video e-list similar to what we did for our elementary reading okay it was pretty well-defined yeah so we do have a pretty well-defined process for making sure we have an instructional match perfect anything else colleagues with that I will make a motion that we

[00:05:05] move this item 51 I always forget the number thank you policy 5130 to the full board for information can I get a second a second all those in favor aye any any opposed all right that will move on to the full board thank you all right now we will move into our information items we have 5.01 which is the curriculum audit results and tonight I believe that our presenters for this are mr. Jeff Brownsley our director of teaching and learning and I think

[00:05:44] virtually we have joining us mr. Timothy Subba senior associate of insight education group so with that I'll pass it to you can you hear us okay mr. Subba and am i saying your name correctly yes you are

thank you can you hear me okay yes yeah and i'll just uh before we hear from um tim i'll just kick things off by saying that in august of 2024 lcps began a curriculum audit um review this was actually part of the superintendent's entry plan and the purpose of it was to help us understand better the resources that we provide to our

[00:06:18] teachers and the supports associated with it and i'm really uh thankful for mr suba and his team at Insight for their work in working through this. I think he'll tell you a little bit about the process, but it did involve our teachers and getting significant feedback from our teachers as well and hearing what we currently offer and what they would like to see in terms of the curriculum provided to them.

[00:06:40] So I'm going to turn it over to Tim to walk us through the process and some of the recommendations that came from the audit. Great, thank you, Jeff. And our team is really thankful also for the opportunity to work with LCPS. It was a really great opportunity, and the process went really smoothly, so thank you all.

[00:07:00] Good afternoon, committee. My name is Tim Suba. I'm a senior associate at Inside Education Group, and I'm here to talk about our team's work with LCPS and the curriculum audit, and then, you know, if we have time to take any questions from the committee.

[00:07:18] So you can go ahead and advance the slide, please. Just a quick word about us. So we began in 2000, and we work alongside many districts and states in, you know, just a leading voice in the national conversation on the different college and career-ready standards that states have, educator effectiveness, strategic planning, and the like.

[00:07:44] And we've developed programs and resources that are still in use in schools and districts across the country. Next. Myself, I have been in public education for 21 years as a teacher, department head, instructional coach, school leader, and consultant in the last 10 or so years, crisscrossing the country in rural and urban districts, supporting assessments, district strategy, leadership, teacher coaching, etc.

[00:08:19] As Jeff mentioned, I am here to talk a little bit about the purpose, you know, to add on more to what Jeff said about the curriculum on it, our methods, a few celebrations, and then, as Jeff mentioned, the five recommendations that our team landed on, and I'll give a little bit more color to those recommendations when we get to that part.

[00:08:47] so you could advance please thank you so uh jeff did mention the purpose and i'll just add a few more words to that advance please um we so the curriculum audit was meant to just look at the the state of lcps's curriculum materials um all the way down to uh the unit plans and um you know certain artifacts for seven content areas um and that includes the systems and structures supporting

[00:09:18] curriculum right so um in addition to the things what about the people what about the um uh the expectations uh the sequences the organization etc and then of course as uh as mr roundsley mentioned uh the expense experiences of different stakeholder groups we talked to many different teacher groups uh the content supervisors uh and had weekly meetings with representatives of teaching and learning. And then, of course, at the end, had conversations again with those same

[00:09:51] content area supervisors to give feedback on our findings. And then a final meeting with Dr. Ellis and Mr. Slevin and the rest of teaching and learning towards the end. Advance, please. And so all this was to define the pain points, you know, where are there opportunities to think about what the gap is

between where we are right now and where we want to be. And then, course to recommend next steps please. So a quick word about our methods here if you go on to the

[00:10:30] next slide. So in orange there it says to conduct a broad review of curriculum artifacts across multiple subjects and so we had seven different content areas across all the different grades K through 12 and looked at a number of different kinds of artifacts for each content area or course. Many of them were just your standard formative assessments, quizzes, classworks, homeworks.

[00:11:04] We had folks submit a couple of different unit tests and also looked at the scope and sequence and unit planning documents, right? So down in the yellow square there, we looked at those materials that we accessed on a spreadsheet that teaching and learning compiled for us and when we did our analysis there are lots of different industry specific tools per content area that we leaned on so rather than if you look at some of

[00:11:39] these documents out there many of them are dozens and dozens of pages long but we synthesize them to just really get down to the brass tacks of you know what what makes what makes good curriculum for this particular content area right in ELA for example we're looking at text quality we're looking at text complexity whether there are a variety of different items out there etc and then for each of the content areas some of the criteria are different so if you have a copy of the reporting from you can see in the appendix what some of those criteria were I'll talk a little bit about

[00:12:18] what you see there in the blue there in the next slide but we are soliciting feedback from we solicited feedback from lots of different stakeholder groups about their experience with LCPS's curriculum. And then finally, grading the report, which some of you may have seen, containing the findings and recommendations for next steps. Next slide, please. So as I mentioned, in, you know, as we solicited feedback, we sent a survey out to anybody at LCPS who taught either the grade level or content area within, that was included in the audit, and we got a total of five

[00:12:56] total respondents across the seven content areas. And I did mention the focus groups. We had nine groups of teachers grouped by content, the content supervisors, and that follow-up meeting. So we had lots and lots of interaction with different stakeholders across the division. Next, please.

[00:13:13] I did want to make note that there were so many different celebrations, and we are going to get into recommendations afterwards, but I did want to note a few of these as well. So the curriculum review revealed a focus on design, engage, and assess components of the LCPS instructional framework, which you all were talking about earlier today. And a lot of the content areas have already built their organizing principles around this instructional framework. And so the focus on high standards, most of the submissions across all content areas achieve the highest ratings on

[00:13:48] standard alignment. There were, in many content areas, engaging multi-day projects that Push students to read, write, and speak with high levels of critical thinking, and then many assessments with varied item types. It wasn't just your standard pencil paper, you know, multiple choice. There were lots of assessments that were engaging and, you know, had students do a variety of different things, which we like to see, which, you know, good high quality instructional materials contain.

[00:14:18] And then it goes without saying, but the transparency, the positivity, the deep engagement by all stakeholders was just palpable throughout, right? We had a very short timeline, and folks were super,

super cooperative. And the candor and honesty and the goal orientation to just making, you know, something good even better was just palpable throughout.

[00:14:45] Next slide. And so now I'll go ahead and get into the recommendations. If you go ahead and advance. Our first one here is really just about sequencing. If there's anything that you want to take away from this, it's about sequencing. And so we talk about establishing division-wide consistency in yearly overviews and unit plans for all content areas by ensuring that they provide all teachers with clearer sequencing of recommended materials.

[00:15:12] And so in the curriculum review that we did of materials, you know, one of our tool, many of the scope and sequence tools mentioned usability and readability as one of the criterion.

[00:15:28] And in talking with teachers in focus groups and in survey data, they indicated that there's work to do around ensuring that these division-wide materials, namely the overviews, the unit plans, are usable for teachers.

[00:15:46] We had a number of folks think back to their first year, and if they had a unit plan or a scope and sequence that contained too much information that wasn't organized in a way that they found useful, they resorted to finding something that they used to do in a previous district or going next door and just doing whatever their colleague or teacher team had for them.

[00:16:18] And so one thing that we recommended was just, you know, putting together some intercontent teams to think about what is the right level of granularity that teachers will generally find more useful. We would recommend something like a week-by-week scope and sequence where the standards and the materials are more or less defined for teachers to use in whatever course they teach, and putting together an intercontent team to determine, you know, is that the right level of granularity?

[00:16:54] Because right now we're getting indications and data, again, focus groups, surveys, that what exists right now is not specific enough. It doesn't provide enough parameters for teachers to feel confident that they're following the right sequences and using the right materials.

[00:17:17] Next slide. Thank you. And so if that one was about sequence, I would call this one about content. Okay, so account for and organize all division-purchased physical and digital resources. and retire any materials that are not aligned to the standards of learning and the instructional framework. So it's not just about the sequence and having teachers feel confident that they know what they're doing, you know, week to week, day to day even, but it's making sure that everyone knows what's out there and we have access to the things that we need in order to teach the

[00:17:53] curriculum and anything that is not aligned to the new instructional framework or the new and sometimes, you know, just on the doorstep SOLs that are still coming down, that we retire those materials. And so that, you know, means that there is an audit of all the physical and digital materials that are out there and making sure that we just have a good sense of what teachers are using, what teachers want to use, and if there's anything out there that doesn't align, making the

[00:18:30] call to retire those things. Next, we talk about continued opportunities for year-long curriculum based learning and adapting. And so I've put down there, you know, elementary subject contacts, SALTS, high school department chairs, etc., and then interested teachers. So what we're saying here, if you have your report in front of you too, is that we hear teachers saying in surveys and everything that there's a lot, that LCPS has a lot. And I talked about sequencing. I talked about

[00:19:05] the content. But here, this is about just ensuring that teachers feel supported in understanding what's there and supported consistently. Many teachers reported that the only time they have an opportunity to really sit with the scopes and sequences the unit plans etc is at the beginning of the year and then then there's you know um a sort of an opportunity for more support that they you know are seeking more support throughout and so this is an opportunity to do that um you know

[00:19:41] are there ways for teachers to come together more throughout the year um where they would look at the plans and say okay so you know it's the end of quarter one for example here's where we are here's where we need to be here are the resources available to us if we follow the recommendations um the first two recommendations where we understand the sequence and the content um then what we're saying here for number three is that let's create more opportunities for uh uh teacher teams across the division to come together and and and really uh plan together um

[00:20:16] and not just you know have one opportunity at the beginning of the year to look at these things but to do so consistently and teacher teams across the division. In addition to that here, you know, those opportunities might slide deck change there.

[00:21:03] Well, it looks like the slide deck is no longer on the screen, but perhaps we're moving on to, you know, questions that folks might have. All right, Tim, I'm second.

[00:21:19] All right, no worries.

[00:21:46] Thanks, Neil. Okay, so recommendation four, just continue. If we are bringing teachers together, they mentioned across the survey and across focus groups just how much they value that time to get together.

[00:22:05] I know that those opportunities are few and far between and they're very valuable. But if we are going to have cross-school opportunities for folks within the same content area and grade level to meet, let's use those opportunities to continue professional learning on these new and upcoming SOLs contextualized in these division-approved high-quality instructional materials that we mentioned in recommendation too.

[00:22:31] And then finally, thank you, it doesn't stop with just teachers and their salts and their high school department chairs and their elementary subject context, but it requires us to think about how we're developing consistently our principles and assistant principles in monitoring, supporting, and implementing these.

[00:23:05] high-quality instructional materials. We recognize that, you know, content area supervisors and their specialists can't be in the buildings all the time, and so, you know, ensuring that our school-based instructional leaders, namely those principals and APs, have more than a solid understanding of what the expectations around curriculum usage and implementation are will certainly go a long way in helping to implement the first four recommendations.

[00:23:39] And that brings an end to the presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions or take any comments. On our internal next steps, so it's up to the committee whether you would like to have all of the information and then ask questions or whether you'd like to interact with this piece.

[00:24:12] Tim, we're going to go ahead and present our internal next steps and then we'll take questions over the whole presentation. So using the recommendations from Insight, we've started some internal

discussions around how we might respond to that in LCPS and what some next steps for us might be.

[00:24:36] And these are not a formal action plan at this point with timelines or anything like this, having just received the report. But we have had some really good discussions around some things that we could do to fulfill some of the recommendations that Tim just shared with us in that report. So we've kind of broken it down into some key buckets of areas where we want to focus and support the work that's happening in our classrooms with teachers and their resources.

[00:25:02] And the first one we're talking about is clarity. So one of the things that came out through focus groups and through interviews with our content supervisors is that there is sort of some different interpretations of what we mean when we say curriculum. Who are we writing it for? What's the purpose? What are we providing to teachers?

[00:25:20] And we really do want to do some work to clarify that and to make sure that we're all operating on the same definitions of what is curriculum and what are we providing to our teachers to ensure that they do their best work each day. We're excited that on Friday we are having a full day workshop with Heidi Hayes Jacobs, who is a internationally known expert on curriculum.

[00:25:39] She's written 13 different books on that and she's coming to LCPS to work with our content supervisors and the Department of Teaching and Learning to talk about how to streamline the curriculum, which is her latest book. um and some processes that we could employ here which i think really aligns well with some of the feedback that tim just shared in his report i think we really do understand the need for some consistency in the documents that we use if we're expecting our teachers especially at the elementary level to use these documents consistently it's really difficult to have that be um you know english looks different than math looks different than science we want people to be able to find

[00:26:16] information in a consistent place and understand where they're going to find information that That doesn't mean that we're expecting complete uniformity. We know that teaching music is different than teaching math, but there are some common areas where I think there can be some agreement, some common things that we're all sharing and supporting through this work.

[00:26:34] Tim mentioned about unit plans and scope and sequences, and so the more we can standardize those things that we can standardize, I think it supports our teachers and it also supports our administrators who are going into classrooms, different subjects, different times, and we want them to be able to use these documents to make sure that our students are receiving high quality instruction and materials.

[00:26:55] The third recommendation around curation, we know that LCPS has a abundance of resources. And our teachers were pretty clear in saying, maybe even sometimes too many resources. So how we can curate those, we wanna use Schoology, which is our learning management system, to make sure that we're using that effectively and that our teachers have access and know what to find and that the information that's presented there makes teacher access and use as simplified and streamlined as possible.

[00:27:24] Next is collaboration. I love this one, and I think this is one that we all kind of responded to, which is taking both the curriculum development and the professional learning and doing more to bring these ideas together so that we're not just providing teachers with resources, but how to use them in an effective way, what really effective implementation might look like, and that the times that we have, we already do some really thoughtful work with our contacts and SALTS and department chairs where they

take time delving into instructional practices and strategies, but to really make sure we're bringing in curriculum as a part of that and that these are resources that they can take back

[00:28:02] to their schools I think would be really valuable for our teachers and is kind of borne out in the recommendations. And finally, the point about our administrators and making sure that administrators know the expectations around curriculum. We do some of this work already as well, so we have some standing time with our content supervisors with our high school assistant principals where they can meet with the content supervisors and the subjects that they supervise so that they get an idea of what are the resources you should be seeing, what should be happening in those classrooms when you walk in, what does really good science instruction look like, what does really good math instruction look like, and we really wanna get more time with our principals and assistant principals to make sure

[00:28:41] that they're understanding what kind of the foundations of our curriculum looks like and what it might look like when you walk into a classroom. So again, that work has started, but we wanna see that be more widespread and more frequent to help our school leaders understand what really high quality instruction looks like.

[00:28:58] And all of this, I just wanted to point out here at the end that this really does, on the next slide, connect to the work that we're doing with the instructional framework. And I may have shared this slide in a presentation before, but really this helps me understand how all of this work is aligned.

[00:29:13] And on the left there, you'll see our profile of a graduate. Those are the skills, the competencies that we want our students to have when they graduate, and that remains our why. These are skills that students take with them into their next phase of their journey, whether it be college or military or career.

[00:29:29] The instructional framework is our how. So how do we want that instruction to look like? And all of that points towards those five C's and the profile of a graduate in the way that our teachers are working with students in a classroom, but we also need to be thoughtful about making sure that the curriculum we provide teachers the what the stuff also lines up and when these three things come into alignment when we have really solid curriculum that meets the needs of teachers when we're providing really solid professional learning in how we should instruct and it's all pointing towards really relevant and authentic skills and competencies for students that would bring together some some really good

[00:30:08] outcomes for the students in lcps and for our teachers so with that that was all that was kind of our first kind of interpretation of what's in the curriculum audit although we have a lot of work to do to really unpack all of that but we'd be happy to take any questions that you might have thank you so much tim and jeff and i will pass it to dr dean who i believe has a few questions okay we've talked about the connection across from the assistant from the no from the salts and the

[00:30:46] assistant principals, the principals. Have you done any analysis related to student outcomes for specific content areas? And I don't mean within one school, but across schools or the 10th grade. And I know there are teacher assigned grades. I know that. But is there any consistency with student outcomes in 10th grade English from one school to the other? So I think those are the kinds of things that we need to dive into a little bit more to understand to

[00:31:23] have a better idea of how widely used different curriculum documents are and how that points to student outcomes in different schools and this is where we see some of that inconsistency right now and the need to clarify the expectations around these documents how they should be used how they should be

implemented so that we can see where student outcomes may change or differ based on a really strong implementation of high-quality instructional materials provided by LCPS.

[00:31:53] Does that answer your question? Yes. So we're going there. We're headed in that direction. Right. We're headed in that direction. And I think having some greater consistency in what we're doing will help us gather that information more readily. Right. And I think the consultant referenced week-to-week content.

[00:32:12] But week-to-week at XYZ school may not be the same as week-to-week with ABC school depending on the reteaching, the level of reteaching that has to take place because students did not learn the content the first time around.

[00:32:29] So that was a thought about that. And someone mentioned that teachers tend to get together at the beginning of the year. and with all that Department of Ed gave them this year for staff development. I know this question is crazy.

[00:32:48] But could not there be some time other than at the beginning of the year that teachers would come together to discuss their successes and their challenges with this part of the curriculum such that next year there won't be those same challenges from one school to the other that was I know this is a bad time to ask it because of the I think it's a great time to bring it up because soon you'll be talking about calendars and those conversations are often separate but I think if we're ever going to make any changes

[00:33:24] that those conversations need to happen together so hold that thought for when we talk about calendars okay I think seriously though I think it's important to bring it up when you consider the calendar okay and then is there any form or time for a teacher to self-reflect in terms of how it relates to student outcomes I know when I taught biology there was there were certain units that they just didn't get and so I did a lot of self-reflection and got the teacher the biology

[00:34:03] teacher next door and I would change for those units she'd be a unit ahead of me or whatever and she would teach that unit to my students and there were times that her teaching was better than my teaching on that unit I think that speaks directly to our collaborative learning teams that are being implemented at each each level supported through the department school leadership there are many inroads being made between the development of resources around the instructional framework and the approach teachers are taking to their CLT as we call them so the reflection is ingrained in just the collaboration

[00:34:40] through the planning process with our teachers there's work to be done but I'm really pleased to see some of the work happening between teaching and learning and the office of high school education for example and supporting APs and becoming instructional leaders and embedding the instructional framework in those documents yeah I would just say I think that speaks to that last recommendation about making sure we're bringing our school leaders and principals along with us in that last graphic that Neil showed with the why, the how, and the what.

[00:35:11] You know, we've been very, I've said many times that I hope that the instructional framework and the curriculum become foundational documents that are used every day in teaching. And so that when an administrator walks into a collaborative learning team, that's what he's seeing. He's seeing that self-reflection about the instruction that's happening.

[00:35:28] He's seeing teachers talking about the outcomes from a 10th grade English unit. And they're using these documents to help guide and point the direction towards their instruction. So that it really just brings home to second what Neil was just saying, the important work that happens between teaching and learning and our school leaders and to make sure that we are operating with shared goals and a shared understanding of how we're moving forward.

[00:35:57] - Dr. Rashid, did you have any questions? - I didn't have a question, I had more in a comment. I just like the theme of the whole thing, especially when Mr. Suba had mentioned in his gap analysis that the focus group involves quite a number of teachers. And then we spoke about reflection of what Dr. Deans had pointed out in terms of how, you know, what the results would be from that analysis.

[00:36:18] Thank you. And I especially want to thank you, Dr. Deans, for bringing up student outcomes because I think that that's, we have to lead with the end in mind. And that's always what this is about. It's really not about the curriculum. It's about our students and meeting their needs. And through the 196-page document that I tried to come through, I really did try to look at some of those themes.

[00:36:39] And one of the things, one of the great strides I know that we've made in Loudoun is the unpacking of standards and making that the focus, where I think in the past and sometimes we were more focused on curriculum first to match to the standards second, I think we've totally flipped that on its head and we're leading with unpacking those standards.

[00:36:57] And so I was really encouraged to see that across different levels, elementary, secondary, that we were seeing that consistently reported in the feedback and across content areas. So in terms of celebrations, that would be one of mine because that I think helps with the consistency piece because if we're staying on our standards, I think that the curriculum just becomes a supporting character.

[00:37:21] I love the idea of teachers coming together across the division to have time to map out scope and sequence, to plan, to have those conversations about what it's like in their cluster or with their kids. I would just, of course, always going to make a pitch for making sure our EL and SPED teachers are in those conversations and at the table um as well as you know I think it would be an interesting conversation to even include the arts and specialists and different things about how their schedules are and how all that aligns so I love that that kind of came out of this so I think

[00:37:54] that that's a wonderful idea um I want to do some more digging on supporting what um Tim what you said about supporting teachers consistently with the resources even in here it talked about over 230 you know artifacts that were studied and that's just the tip of the iceberg and I tend to agree that we have too many resources they're all can have merit but I think that that money's the water sometimes for teachers knowing what to prioritize so I would really like to see us naming what we are streamlining so I'm anxious to hear how this PD is on Friday and I would love

[00:38:30] to sneak over and meet her but because I read some of her books but I really really think that we have to start saying we are taking this off the table or that is something that you might use sometimes but it's not the main thing but still allowing our teachers to have autonomy I think it's complicated I think we have a lot of good things in place but I do think the direction and the steering wheel is a little bit where we get lost so I'm anxious for this conversation to take off and move forward Tim I thank you for your team and the work it clearly shows that you put in an

[00:39:08] effort to really hear our educators and that's really important to us as a board I'll speak for my colleagues on that one but I really I think this is really valuable information that's going to lead us forward in a good direction so thank you so much you may one last comment just as we look at teacher-assigned grades for student outcomes, we can take it a step further and look at the results on the standards of learning in those content areas.

[00:39:41] Thank you, Tim. We appreciate you joining us. You're welcome to stay if you want to learn about artificial intelligence policy, but we also recognize you may hop off. Love your feedback on AI. All right, thank you, Tim. Thank you, everyone.

[00:39:57] Thank you. All right, with that, we will move to our next information item, which is the introduction of a new policy policy 5430 use of generative artificial intelligence this was something that we had asked for as board members in this committee work so i will pass it over to mr slevin again to give us an overview of this new policy thank you mr shirnoff so we are moving into the stage of the meeting that's hopefully more of a work session both of the this agenda item and the next one is in response to committee request the policy

[00:40:34] that we are diving into is a new policy for Latin County Public Schools I appreciate Aaron Smith our chief technology officer and Mike Henrickson our supervisor instructional technology joining us because this is definitely a cross-departmental effort along with many school-based and central office staff helped contribute to the ideas that went into this policy the plan for policy is to really get your feedback tonight incorporate some of your thinking some of your feedback we will not be sending it out to public comment until after the December meeting when we bring it back with any revisions to

[00:41:13] make sure that we have it in a place that you feel comfortable before it goes out to the public and then we will pick it up as action in the new year so that's the timeline so you all have a copy of the policy in front of you there are a number of sections for the policy first we have our guiding principles this doc these guiding principles are not new these are the guiding principles that came out of our work group as you have heard we have have had a cross departmental group with school-based staff involved developing some AI

[00:41:52] guidance documents and so these guiding principles are directly from those documents we have a general policy section on the use of AI making sure it's aligned to our existing regulations on the selection of online resources as supplemental materials.

[00:42:09] Section C has a monitoring, has language related to monitoring, review, and appropriate usage. For example, AI programs will be reviewed annually to ensure compliance with division policies in state and federal student data privacy laws and compliance oversight.

[00:42:26] Who is responsible? Currently, instructional technology tools are overseen both by the Department of Digital Innovation and the Department of Teaching and Learning, so both of these offices would be involved. We included an annual review of our guiding regulations and documents, and then a reference to academic integrity.

[00:42:52] You may ask about the annual reviews. One of the reasons we're recommending an annual review, and we had some internal discussion as to whether or not that was too much, is the landscape of AI is so quickly changing till we get to the point where we don't feel like we need to keep an eye on what's happening.

[00:43:10] We really need to be looking at these tools that we're deploying on a pretty regular basis. We did receive some feedback around the guiding principle as it relates to bias when it comes to the use of AI, just inherent bias in the tool. And so we did include a cross-reference to our policies related to controversial and sensitive curriculum standards as well as our regulation that includes steps to mitigate bias within use of instructional resources i'll see if mr smith or tenderson have anything to add no i think you did a great job neil uh the only thing that we would add is the annual

[00:43:50] review would most likely align with any tool we were purchasing when we would be renewing that tool so we would make a procurement then through each year when we do that renewal of that tool we we would do that review at that time.

[00:44:12] - All right, colleagues. Did you have anything in glancing at the draft that you'd like to address? Dr. Deeds? - I am subscribed to a lot of education article sites.

[00:44:28] And one of them was that involved the students who are generally disciplined for using the AI beyond the extent that the teacher expects or shared.

[00:44:51] I'm not clear. I see your faces saying, you don't know what I'm talking about. The article actually was from a school district in Ohio, and they said more boys were accused of plagiarizing, more blacks were accused of plagiarizing, using AI to the extent beyond their own even understanding of what they put on in the research paper, et cetera, et cetera.

[00:45:18] So what is it here that would preclude that kind of scrutiny or would maybe not preclude it but would sensitize the teachers to at least consider those kinds of scrutinies when they are considering a student's work?

[00:45:40] So I think the intent is on the second page, lines 45 through 47, in terms of academic integrity. Students are referred to and expected to upload all standards set forth in the LCPS Students Rights and Responsibility Handbook.

[00:45:56] We do have language related to the appropriate use of AI that we would like our teachers to start using within some of our guidance documents, but it's not something that we included in policy. It may be something we need to consider in the student rights and responsibility.

[00:46:17] I don't think we currently have an AI section of that handbook. But we do have very clearly defined, the section, it's on page 62 in the SR&R. We have very clearly defined guidance around dishonesty and assigned work.

[00:46:36] And to me, it fits. I read through it today, and I feel like, I mean, and I don't know if that's an extra step to, I know we don't like to get too specific, so just putting in the SRNR, but maybe having that reference there or having a link to that in the guidance, at least, because I think that that match, when I read that with the lens of AI, I was thinking it matches pretty much like normal plagiarism would match, as long as you're thinking about it in terms of the expectations and the usage and what the purpose of the assignment was.

[00:47:05] And I think that makes a lot of sense for where it should preside. original work definition is original work definition and sometimes ai tools can be used to generate an outline and then the student is to take work from there sometimes it can be a thought partner to answer questions back and forth so just saying the use of ai in a certain instance is bad or good it really depends on the assignment and the

teacher being very clear with what is acceptable and what isn't acceptable when that assignment is given to a student yeah go ahead dr dean sorry to cut you off i just wanted to give you that info where i'm looking okay i had my

[00:47:42] seven-year-old with me yesterday I took her shopping she says my mom said she gave me a budget and every store that we went in she asked me how many more dollars she had to me that was a little overkill for a seven-year-old so and that's because I'm grandma and and ma is younger and and is more flexible with her money um okay so I'm just saying there are different standards of

[00:48:12] acceptance or inquiry from one teacher to the other from one subject to the other so if something needs to be put something else needs to be put in the student's rights and responsibilities handbook so be it I'm not as familiar with it as you are so I'm just saying so be it but put it in there so that there will not be an unbalanced decision about a standard about using it in the

[00:48:45] I think it's a resource that we all feel good about, and including it potentially in the student rights and responsibility is a good suggestion to bring to that team. And I'm sure, as I imagine that document, that there's a place that it would make sense.

[00:49:02] I don't have the exact language in my mind, Mike, but how do we kind of parse out the levels for AI use? So part of the resources we've been developing, one resource is just kind of a framework that helps teachers think about how students might, and also helps students think about how they might use AI on a particular assignment, and how teachers might give specific guidance to students about what's okay and what's not.

[00:49:30] So while there might not be space for it or need for it in the policy, I think there's resources that we are building or continue to build out that can help to address some of the concerns you're thinking about as far as variability in teachers and how they might apply some of these policies.

[00:49:47] Okay, thank you. Dr. Rasheed? Thank you. As a professor at Northern Virginia Community College, with each syllabus that we have, there's a tendency to be wanting to be specific on the professor-instructor's part. And the more specific we got, the more gray areas we hit with what the students started telling the instructor, saying, well, I didn't do this and I didn't do that.

[00:50:11] So what we did was we kind of just, Professors just tend to just put like a little bit of a disclaimer saying it's up to the instructor and that was it. But they did say in it, you know, you are discouraged from utilizing such tools like AI and it's prohibited and is subject to disciplinary action if such and such is proven at the discretion of the professor to be wrong.

[00:50:33] Yeah, I really appreciate the way this conversation is going, because I was in the same vein of kind of trying to wrap my mind around allowing for flexibility for teachers to do what they need to do and to utilize the tool to its maximum capacity as it fits with the learning objectives.

[00:50:50] but also we can't have the shady behavior and as someone who you know has recently engaged AI just myself and it's like addictive like I mean it really is a very powerful tool and can really fine-tune what you're thinking it's like it knows so it's it can be very helpful so I want to walk that line to that end I do think we need another section here and I don't know if it's a section that needs to also be added to the guidance page to match since they do match but I would like to see a section about clear learning objectives

[00:51:26] and clear guidance and expectations of use from the teacher that that that's where that would be accountable that's where the student would be accountable is that the teacher is going to set those expectations and clear learning objectives so that we know exactly I think for parents too they'll know exactly why their kid is using the tool, what its purpose is, how it's tied to the learning standards, and therefore then the teacher can then hold them accountable to those things.

[00:51:55] And I think if we add simple language into the SRNR under the dishonesty in assigned work that includes AI, I would feel more comfortable then because we have clear expectations and learning objectives and also have accountability with plagiarism, and that I think is pretty clearly defined here.

[00:52:17] Colleagues, do you think that that would be something we should add? Those were my main things as well. I had a couple of notes on lines 42 and 43 on the staff and student use of AI.

[00:52:37] I think where it says guiding regulations and documents for use by staff and students, I would like to see some language in there, should be followed and should be made available. I think that just having them and not saying that we should follow them, maybe that's a little bit getting in the weeds, but I think that it's important that we are tying back to those documents in our guiding principles of keeping kids accountable.

[00:53:06] I almost wonder if that Section 3 can really be expanded with what you just mentioned in terms of guidance, expectations. Yeah. Like maybe Section 3 can be expanded more to what I think you were trying to get at with your comments prior.

[00:53:22] And I typed up some language for the expectations. I'm happy to send that on to you all. You'd be happy to take it. Okay. And then the last, I just had a question about lines 15 through 17. Who are we, it says we're building, who are we building trust with?

[00:53:40] We're building trust with the tool? I'm confused by that language. Maybe I'm not understanding who we're building trust with. Where it says trust through listening, listening to the tool, who are, I'm confused.

[00:53:58] So, as you can probably tell, we try to align our guiding principles to our core values. And so, with trust through listening, and I'll ask Mike or Aaron to hop in here, there are some key points around generative AI that are important for tool selection, such as the word transparency.

[00:54:21] Like, one of the questions that I know to ask when I'm speaking to someone about a potential tool is, what is your large language model? like where is the data going and then coming back like are you what are you using google got it and then similarly if we do use this for communication there has been situations where large school divisions have used ai to send out maybe a sensitive message and is there a disclaimer that ai is being used and there's different politics and considerations for that so more of like being transparent about what the tool is actually doing with your data being transparent

[00:55:01] about how you're using it and then when you're using it for stakeholder engagement I think about thought exchange a tool like that yeah like that has really helped us efficiently get stakeholder feedback but we want to make clear that there's not a someone down there summarizing all this we are using AI so does that cover that so it's sort of like citing your source citing your source but also making sure there's transparency about like what exactly is the tool doing behind the scenes. Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful. I was like, who are we trusting? And I think the

[00:55:39] bullet points in the guidance about clearly communicating AI's role, communications limitations, like I think those, referencing those is important, but we might need just a little bit more clarity of language there, or maybe it's just me. I don't know. Was that again? Say that again.

[00:55:55] Number three, in the trust part, just, I think, understanding that, you know, AI is the tool that we're using that you know gonna say that we're using that question do we have anything from the DOE about AI that we could reference here at the end am I

[00:56:28] missing it so we do have a we have an executive order on AI that we can look through and see if there's anything we could reference but I'm not sure if we received anything from the video we specifically we are ahead of the game we We did get some model policies from someone, a consultant we're working with from out of state.

[00:56:50] Okay. But we don't have like a VSBA policy or anything like that. This is really, we're innovating here. Okay. In this committee. And I definitely agree with reviewing it yearly for the first few years.

[00:57:09] Just to piggyback what Dr. Deans had mentioned, I agree also that it should be reviewed annually, but I think you guys mentioned it earlier in the presentation. just wanted to know although it is reviewed annually is there like a committee or is there is there someone specific that reviews it annually and how are they selected so any tool that we would onboard and to be clear at this point there are no student generative AI tools that we have onboarded at this point that is something we're forecasting in the future so we've onboarded staff tools basically two different tools and a pilot of another

[00:57:45] tool for staff use only so we're kind of getting ahead of the student use once Once we do get to that point, to procure a tool for them. But once we go through that process, we have this internal software review process where we would put that through, and it does everything from cybersecurity, accessibility, instructional alignment, the AI, what the AI feature sets are, like Neil was kind of getting to.

[00:58:12] Is it a walled garden large language model? Is it an open source large language model? Is our data feeding the large language model? And then those are the type of things that we would review as part of that. And it's probably about a 20-page document that comes out at the end of that review. All software titles go through that. So any tool that we would acquire or onboard, onboard is the name of the system, we would onboard through that process.

[00:58:35] And my team's involved, Mike's and Neil's teams are involved. We have the assistive technology team involved. We have legal involved. We have procurement involved. So it's a multi-team approach to reviewing those titles when we go to look at them. Is that sustainable annually?

[00:58:53] I mean, I agree it should be annually, but that's a lot of work. For other tools that don't have as rapid change as AI does, I think when we get into our AI work groups, the first thing we do is spend the first 30 minutes what's changed in the last week because that's how dynamic this environment is.

[00:59:10] So when we get into reviewing something that's a much more static use, if it's a textbook that we've procured, it really doesn't need an annual review. We do feel like a software title we bring in that has a generative AI built in probably will need an annual review, maybe not in perpetuity, but at least for the first few years that we have that tool.

[00:59:27] It's one of the areas we're watching because the environment is shifting so quickly between who has a tool, what's available, what's available here, what you're paying for, then what's free. So it's really

kind of hard for us to know exactly what that's going to look like at this point because it is changing so rapidly.

[00:59:43] So we would expect to review these generative AI tools specifically yearly, but not every single tool yearly. Okay. Yeah, I like that you're already tracking those changes and have those look-fors already that will help guide that conversation. My last question is about the regulation that will follow, I'm guessing.

[01:00:03] Are we just going to use the guiding principles and the documents that have already been created, and that will be the regulation, or will it be a separate regulation that links those documents? How are our supporting cast members here going to play into the policy? I mean, I know they're mentioned here in line 42, but beyond that?

[01:00:24] Similar to the document that we're going to be reviewing in our next information item, there may be items within our AI guidance documents that will make sense to become regulations. One of the things that we talked about earlier in this process regarding the development of this policy is we felt there a lot of this policy could live in other policies like the acceptable use policy the online resources of supplemental instructional resources regulation there's going to be AI is not just going to live in one policy okay so I don't have a specific regulation to develop we

[01:01:03] probably need to make sure we're looking at our regulations that do okay mention AI but I could see perhaps the vision for use becoming a regulation, like describing the ethical use, or maybe we end up in a situation where we're like, you know, we really need to go, we need to have our own regulation regarding mitigating bias when it comes to AI, but our focus right now is to get this policy done, and then I think regulations will come from needs that come from use.

[01:01:39] Okay, that sounds good. Dr. Deans? Just a thought. Kids' parents are going to be outside of our use of AI, and to what extent do we restrict their use of it for assignments versus them going to the dad's office and using the dad's AI to generate or create their response?

[01:02:11] Oh, their phone. Yeah, yeah, yeah. So a good designed instruction focused on the process and not just the end result. So there may be times where, you know, we're really getting right to the final product. I have kids in middle school, and I get how that works.

[01:02:28] But hopefully we are incorporating well-designed lessons with checkpoints, opportunities for feedback. Like, that's a healthy way to incorporate AI. If we're going right to the end of the process, then we may run into these issues. So it's all about coaching and feedback of teachers on our instructional design.

[01:02:49] Thank you. and i know we have um an upcoming ai work session i think with the full board correct so i know this will not be ready for that but we will alert the rest of the board that this is coming um and then so we are working on it we'll have a similar work session that that we did within committee um a little bit of hands-on experience a little bit more of a up it'll be somewhat of a repetition for you all as committee members um we will have this draft policy as a attachment i'm I'm not sure if we'll have any updates by then.

[01:03:24] We might have to because Thanksgiving's coming quick. But yes, we are planning that the fourth Tuesday of November. All right. And then just thinking ahead, knowing the personality of our board and how our policy conversations have gone, I do think that it would be good.

[01:03:42] I'm not asking for the regulation to be done now, but I do think it would be good to think about where AI might need to be integrated into other regulations be with the cross references by the time it does go to the full board just knowing that that's probably gonna come up but I appreciate all of your work on this so much I'm excited about it I think it's really important I think it's gonna give us we're gonna set the you know be trailblazers here with this and that's always a good thing so if there's no other questions I guess we will bring this back as an information item with the

[01:04:18] updates that we have talked about today in committee and then after that it will go for public review correct if it's at the point that the committee thinks it's ready to go out we will send it up but we'll bring it won't go out until we bring it back okay that sound good yeah all right thank you guys so much all right we will move on to our last information item of the evening instructional technology integration and we have mr. Mike Hendrickson who is our supervisor instructional technology who will be presenting mike i'll pass it to you all right good

[01:04:55] evening um thanks for the opportunity to come and share a little bit about some of the things we've been working on in response to our last conversation with the board where there was some interest from the committee uh to kind of have some some some guidance and some resources to help schools make informed choices about when and how they're integrating technology into instruction so we've drafted a document that helps to begin begin to frame those ideas it's a it's in it's in draft and we're hoping to take some feedback from the committee here this evening as we continue to massage that and and and shape it into

[01:05:34] something that that it will become so the slides that we'll share tonight just kind of walk through that document so the the the content should be aligned but we're just going to share a little bit about some of the ideas that are in inside of the document, and then we'll take some time at the end for conversation and feedback.

[01:05:56] So three big areas we wanna hit tonight, we wanna talk a little bit about, and these are all ideas that are framed inside of that document. We're gonna discuss the role of technology in student learning. How does technology support the learning process? We wanna discuss categories of technology use.

[01:06:11] How do we make sense of the different ways technology is used inside of classrooms to support instruction? And then we wanna think about some draft guidance screen time in elementary classrooms that was something that was of interest to the board so strategic plan connections here we can see how the core values and strategic goals aligned to this conversation around instructional technology so let's start by just reframing again for the board a conversation we had last time which is just coming to a little bit of a common definition about instructional technology and what do we mean when we

[01:06:50] talk about that term so you know if you could go to the next slide for me so if If you recall, when we're thinking about instructional technology, we're really thinking about action. Sometimes when people think about technology in classrooms, we're thinking about the things that are in the classroom, the Chromebooks and the Promethean boards and the VR headsets or the 3D printers.

[01:07:10] And when we're thinking about instructional technology, really we're thinking about what is happening with those tools. What is the action that's taking place? So it's not really about nouns. It's not about the things that are in the classrooms. It's what is happening with those things that are helping get our students to a defined or desired learning outcome.

[01:07:30] So when we're thinking about how instructional technology supports student learning, we wanted to frame just some belief statements that technology integration supports rigorous teaching and learning. It is a part of the process of rigorous teaching and learning.

[01:07:46] It's not a set-aside or a stand-alone. Technology integration deepens practices aligned with the instructional framework. Technology integration is one strategy in a teacher's toolbox. It's one among many strategies that teachers are going to use in any given school day to help get their students to the outcomes that they're looking to get.

[01:08:03] And technology access ensures that we can match students with the right tool or resource at the right time. So those beliefs drive a lot of the ideas that we're sharing inside of the document we've developed. We also wanted to explicitly call out the ways in which technology integration supports the ideas built into the instructional framework.

[01:08:28] So again, technology integration, sometimes it might be considered by some, or some people might have the idea that it's something that can be added on as an extra after the fact. Like, we're going to do our regular teaching and learning, and then if there's time, we'll do some technology integration.

[01:08:44] But really, technology integration is deeply ingrained into the instructional practices that we want to see happening inside of classrooms every day. So if we want to design student-centered instruction, if we want to have high-quality design, if we want to design engaging learning for kids, and if we want to have a robust assessment process, technology integration can support all elements of that framework.

[01:09:10] So it's also helpful to think about the different roles the technology can play in inside of the learning process, because technology use isn't all created equal. There's different ways that technology is used inside of classrooms for different purposes.

[01:09:29] So this framework here lays out a bit of a continuum, starting with tech for access, moving to tech for flexible learning, and then up to tech for profile of a graduate. And we'll talk about what each of those means in more depth in upcoming slides.

[01:09:44] But those different ways that technology is used support instruction, offers different levels of cognitive challenge, and gets kids to think and engage with their learning in different ways at different times. So when we're thinking about technology for access, this is really about getting rich instructional resources into students' hands when they need them.

[01:10:07] It's making sure that they can get to the resources, the multimedia. It's about the skills practice and things that they can do to practice those more recalled and rote processes. It's completing digital assessments, things that are going to make things faster and quicker and easier in the classroom, generating efficiencies.

[01:10:27] Those are all kinds of technology uses that would fit into this tech for access level of use. Then moving to tech for flexible learning. This is where students are using technology to support their individual learning needs.

[01:10:44] So maybe they're setting and tracking their progress towards specific learning goals that they've set for themselves or set with their teacher. using tools that might meet their unique learning needs, like being able to access tools like text-to-speech or speech-to-text or other assistive technologies,

providing choice and options in how students move through a learning path, engaging in personalized skills practice that are targeted to a student's readiness level.

[01:11:11] These are all examples of things that would fit into this flexible learning category. And finally, the tech for Profile of a Graduate is where students are using technology tools to practice those competencies embedded inside of our Profile of a Graduate, those 5C skills where they're actively doing things and creating things with the technology.

[01:11:36] So designing and creating digital and multimedia projects, receiving feedback from others on those projects, and making revisions to their work as a result of that feedback, organizing and comparing information, solving authentic problems, collecting data, looking for patterns.

[01:11:53] Those are all things that might fit inside of this tech for profile of a graduate. So how does LCPS support technology integration and help make sure that teachers have what they need to design rich learning experiences and use technology and be able to leverage technology as part of those learning experiences?

[01:12:19] One, we provide access to a technology-rich learning environment. We have devices for the students that they can use as they need them, when they need them. We have a robust infrastructure of Wi-Fi access points and network bandwidth and digital resources to make sure that we have everything in place so that when there's a learning need that there's a way to address that learning need using the technology.

[01:12:47] And we help support teachers in thinking about how they integrate technology by providing job-embedded, just-in-time professional learning resources through their partnership with their school-based IFT, their instructional facilitator for technology, who's there to work alongside teachers as they think about new ways to integrate technology into their instruction to reach the intended learning outcomes they're working on with their students.

[01:13:11] And we have a digital citizenship program that provides students opportunities to practice those digital citizenship skills so not that they're not just using the technology as part of their learning but they're also learning about how to use technology and be good digital citizens through that process so in a little bit more depth access to technology we have the devices in in the classrooms we have the digital resources we have that investment in infrastructure we have technology support in the schools both the technology technical support through

[01:13:49] the digital experience specialists and that instructional support through the instructional facilitators for technology. Instruction facilitators for technology are supporting teachers every day through many of the types of activities you see here on this slide. They're co-planning lessons, they're modeling lessons, they're co-teaching with teachers, they're creating resources, they're designing and delivering professional learning, they're supporting teacher reflection about what strategies they're trying in their classroom and how do those strategies work. They're thinking about analyzing the needs of the teachers that they're supporting and also the students in the school as they're thinking about what new skills or or tools or ideas to bring forward to

[01:14:29] those teachers and they're sharing and highlighting some of the great things that are happening in their schools with with technology integration and then our digital citizenship program we leverage the common sense media digital citizenship curriculum and our schools all participate in in this

program and work towards obtaining recognition as a common sense media digital citizenship district or sorry digital citizenship school and then once we reach the threshold of enough schools meeting that criteria to become a digital citizenship recognized school we then can submit an application to become a

[01:15:08] common sense recognized district and we have been able to maintain that recognition as a common sense district for the past past few years so now as we're thinking about how do we support teachers with with with balancing or finding balance in the way technology is used in the classroom this graphic here goes back to that idea that there are different ways in which technology is being used in the classroom there's technology for access technology for flexible learning and technology for profile of a graduate and there's also different types of technology tools that are happening that are being used in

[01:15:45] classrooms some of those tools are high-tech tools like the Chromebooks and the Promethean boards and the 3d printers and the VR headsets but some of those tools are low-tech tools scissors glue paper pencil notebooks those are still technology tools right so so students are engaging with all different types of technology all day long and so this matrix kind of shows how at any given moment a student's learning might slide around to different parts of that matrix some things might be high-tech high cognitive load for doing doing that high-level profile of a graduate thinking some of it might be low-tech

[01:16:22] working on some of that low-level just just just necessary access to content and so in any given day kids are sliding all over this matrix depending on the learning need that the teachers are addressing so when we're thinking about screen time specifically it's important to consider what research is saying and what what expert organizations are saying and when you look at some of the research and you look at some of the guidance from organizations like the ones referenced here on this slide here are some themes that begin to pop out one is that not all screen time is created equal so when we're thinking about screen time for students it's hard to just come up with

[01:17:02] a cut-and-dry here's the right amount for a screen time on any given day because the type this speaking to the second bullet the type of screen time is more important than the amount of screen time so students who are using a device to create something, design something, make something, that's a different process than students who are using a device to watch a video or read an online book, things like that. So we have to be mindful about those different types of activities. And children should engage in a variety of activities to create balance, both online activities and offline activities, and of course across those range of

[01:17:39] cognitive levels as we've shared so far this evening. So what we've try to do is draft some guidance that gives gives elementary teachers a way to reflect on the way they're integrating technology to their practice and and help them think about how much time their students are using their devices and for what purpose those devices are being used and so this is our this is our draft at at that guidance thinking about again framing across those three levels technology for access flexible learning and profile of

[01:18:18] a graduate knowing that as our students are spending time with their devices we want to encourage higher level of cognitive cognitive effort right so those those profile of a graduate type of creative endeavors you know we want to encourage those perhaps more so than some of that low-level recall or consumption but we also know that there is value across all of those activities there there is value in consuming content sometimes you just need to watch a video to get some information or read a text right so it's not that we're saying that there's no value there but we're just trying to provide some some

[01:18:58] some framing for where teachers might place their emphasis and really our hope is that we're providing guidelines that are supporting reflection not necessarily creating hard and fast rules because we

know that as teachers are responding to the needs of their students we want to make sure we're not limiting that flexibility in how they're designing learning but we are giving them some support in how they're reflecting and thinking about that integration and what they're bringing into their instruction and how technology is supporting it so with that unless there's any other anything

[01:19:37] else that the panel might add I think we're ready for some questions so again - And this document was meant to be in response to the request of the committee. We would likely start, after some feedback, start using this with internal conversations with principals and teachers.

[01:19:54] And then eventually, as we get more comfortable, it could inform future steps, such as regulations or policy. But for right now, it would be simply a memo from the Department of Instructional Technology when we get to the point where we feel it's ready to go.

[01:20:10] - Thank you all for your work on this. Colleagues? Dr. Rasheed? I'm just thinking out loud here. Thank you. I know that different students learn at different paces. So when we consider screen time, is there any type of, I don't know, consideration in regards to regulation of that?

[01:20:27] Because maybe one child probably learns better by, you know, being on the screen for a longer time or not necessarily because it's a screen because they have to just kind of be exposed to it more than another student. So maybe you answered this earlier, but is there, or maybe this is at the discretion of every teacher that every student has, but that's more of my concern is that different students learn at different paces. One will require more screen time than another.

[01:20:56] So I think we tried to capture that in framing the flexibility and that these aren't hard and fast guidelines. So once a student gets to 75 minutes, we're going to shut that Chromebook and say, Oh, sorry, we've, we've hit your limit for the day. But, but just, just that, again, not wanting to sort of handcuff a teacher from addressing a need when they have it in the moment.

[01:21:23] So we've attempted to build that flexibility in or make that flexibility clear in the document. If that's something that we feel like we need to make clearer or express in a different way, we're open to that feedback. Dr. Deans, did you have anything? Along those same lines, I know I'm dealing with a 14-year-old, and I know it has much more to do with the screen, beyond the screen.

[01:21:53] But her math, her geometry has been taught totally by screen. And when she gets home, I'll say, well, and she'll ask me for help. Oh, me. And I'll say, okay, well, show me the notes she took today.

[01:22:11] She has no notes. Well, show me the video that the teacher showed today. And sometimes it's there and sometimes it's not. So she is missing a whole 24, well, not 24 hours because they go every other day, 48 hours of any reinforcement because she can't get to the video that the teacher showed that day.

[01:22:33] And that's not in Loudoun, by the way. But I'm just saying some kids learn better with hands-on. It's in Loudoun. It's not in Loudoun. - It's our kids, our kids are the same. - Oh, oh, okay, okay, I'm sorry, my kid is not in Latin.

[01:22:53] And I just know that having tutored her all last year in Algebra I, that writing it down one time is a part of her learning, and then going over it again when Gigi is kicking her butt is another level of learning.

[01:23:10] But if we have nothing concrete to use, we're at a loss. And she goes two days and goes back to school and has And I said, well, you better stay after school, because I don't know what the teacher showed

you. So I think, and I could relate, I have a 13-year-old with a similar issue, with the math teacher using many online resources.

[01:23:34] I do think at some point, guidance documents like this aren't going to meet every individual case, and that's where we do have expectations that schools are meeting with families, communicating needs, differentiating instruction. So if they're struggling with that particular tool maybe instructional just like Dr. Rashid mentions having more time on screen time might help maybe there needs to be an alternative alternative path.

[01:24:00] So I'm not sure if you have a specific feedback for the document but that would be what I'm thinking about for my own students at my house. Yeah I think it's a tough balance. I really don't want to sound like a grump here but I really like struggle with how much technology is used in our elementary schools.

[01:24:22] I'm old school so I know I'm biased that way. but it's a struggle for me. I wonder about the balance and the developmental appropriateness. So I'm very grateful for this document. I think it's a step in the right direction. I really, just like AI, I wanna make sure that we're thinking about learning objectives, that we're thinking about student outcomes.

[01:24:43] What I feel is really lacking from this document is the evaluation of effectiveness for students from the teacher side. - Sometimes I fear that, and I'm saying this, I'm taking ownership of this myself too because I've done it as a teacher, that sometimes technology just becomes a means to an end so you can get something else done, right?

[01:25:07] But if you're working with a small group of students and you're teaching them to do something and you send them off to go do it, you don't just let that go off into the abyss. You check back in with them and see, did they get it? Was the tool effective? Was the teaching strategy that I used working for them? Do I need to tweak it?

[01:25:23] I'm not sure we're always doing that with technology or that we've set that expectation, particularly with some of the programs that we use. I think there's sort of a blind trust that goes into it. I know, you know, with programs like Epic, there's a read to me portion. Well, some kids are just sitting there and having it read to them.

[01:25:41] So is that really independent reading? I don't know. So I'm getting a little bit in the weeds there, but I really want to, I think that that needs to be addressed. I think there needs to be clear expectations what the purpose is making sure that we are naming that that we're tying it to the skills that kids need and that we are circling back to make sure that those skills are transferred that it's that they that the digital tool actually if you know got the skill through to the student and if it's not that we're pivoting and I know our teachers are differentiating all the time but with so much thrown at them and all the resources that they have I think it should be as any curriculum

[01:26:21] standard would be that they are required to do that um i don't know if you guys feel similarly but i just think that there needs to be some kind of evaluation of effectiveness of tools for for individual learners have you seen the penmanship of the kids i'm just again i'm just venting here but with all the typing and you see how they write it's just not as great as i want to say we when we were growing up you had like penmanship but now it's just So, Ms. Scherner, no one could disagree with those sentiments.

[01:26:55] Part of it is the time and effort and manpower to do that when you look at our ed tech catalog in terms of building out an effective evaluation of all the tools that we have in our toolbox. I'm not really talking from an admin level.

[01:27:12] I'm just talking about some guidance for teachers that, like, just follow up and see if those skills are being reinforced and transferred. You're not talking about integrating a new process. No, I'm not talking about more work for you all. I'm talking about having a section in here that just clearly outlines that, you know, when we put kids on a tool or we have them create something or we're teaching a skill using a math program, that we're making sure that kids are absorbing those skills.

[01:27:38] And to what Dr. Rasheed said, you know, if that's working for one kid, great. If it's not, just like we would with any instructional practice that we would teach. I just feel that this document is lacking that classroom-level, student-level accountability piece when it comes to technology.

[01:27:54] Did it accomplish the outcome and the objective that you wanted it to? Does that make sense? I think what I'm hearing is some, perhaps, ways we may incorporate some language around intentionality. Yes. So what I feel like you might be getting at is, are we asking teachers to be intentional and purposeful about the way they're using technology?

[01:28:16] I think the document is trying to get to that with laying out the different levels of use. But I think there's ways that we can perhaps bring something else into the document that asks teachers to be thinking about making sure we're being intentional about knowing what the purpose is for when we're using technology.

[01:28:34] And we're not just using it for technology's sake. That we're using it for a defined learning purpose. Exactly. And I think, too, like also, just one second, comparing it with, like, research-based practice. Like, sometimes it's better to hold a book. and read it to your class than to punch through on a Promethean.

[01:28:51] Like, sometimes that engagement is better, right? So if teachers could just, and I know they are, but if that could be part of this guidance is that they're being reflective of, is this the highest leverage tool in my toolbox at this time? And sometimes we're just playing around with technology. Again, it's a lot of gray area, but I just fear that we sometimes fall into this black hole of, like, just go get on your Chromebook, you know, and it's like, I don't know.

[01:29:16] Go ahead, Dr. Neens. My thought was that needs to be a pop-up every 15 minutes that says to the teacher, check in. Check in with the student. I don't know, really.

[01:29:33] I even found the geometry teacher's house and knocked on her door because she forgot to post what it is she told them to review.

[01:29:57] I won't do that to your teachers in Loudoun. one of the items that I just wanted to add was that we are looking at ways of monitoring screen time so that we can kind of look at things as averages so we've built a very very early preliminary pulling multiple data sources whether that's Compton filter use or Chromebook logs or lcbs go logs or clever logs or rostering things and we so we have all these data sources and trying to paint a picture of like what actual usage looks like and so preliminary data from the first 90 days of school for K through 5 is about 42 to 47 minutes a day is what we're seeing so we're not now there are outliers so

[01:30:36] that's an average but we are seeing on an average across the board that we are in the range of kind of what this guidance document is driving to now that doesn't talk to intentionality and all those other things but at least we're trying to get a some visibility into use across the district because it is we don't all the views that we had previously were like we went to this application and 30 kids went there but it doesn't say how long they're engaged with it what they're doing any of those type of things so I'm more hopeful that we're able to kind of develop that more and then if there are outliers that may be a potential area for conversations but so far it's within the range that Mike has presented I appreciate it that I

[01:31:13] think that that that's a good step in the right direction I want to honor everyone's time so I'll wrap it up with one last thing is a request can we make the ranges 0 to 90 and 0 to 165 so that it is also kind of written in there that if you don't use the Chromebook in a day it's okay again I'm more of a stickler on the other side of it but I you know I don't necessarily think we always have to be on them when you're five so that's we can absolutely look at that I'm thinking about the best way to I think that's that's certainly the intent you know it's about identifying the right

[01:31:51] tool for the job at the right time right and that right tool isn't always a Chromebook and sometimes it is sometimes it's the right tool for that that student but not that student at the at that particular moment so you know there will be days when usage is less you know and depending on the the learning outcomes and the things that teachers are teaching that day and there might be a day when things are slightly more and but we'll take a look at that chart and how we might make sure that that is captured and I admit that just as Miss Chernow said she's old school if

[01:32:23] she's old school, what am I? Am I antique school? Because the kid needs to touch some kids. Some kids need to touch what they're doing from time to time. She needs to write that postulate, that formula, that geometric formula. She needs to write it, not just see it. Thank you guys so much.

[01:32:51] If you can keep us posted on how feedback will be received, I think that would be an important part of this conversation. Also thank you for putting in that recess and free time is minimal screen time. I really appreciate that. Plug for play. So thank you so much. With that we will move to new business. Is there any new business tonight? Dr. Rashid. Thank you chair. It's one of my intentions to bring about I guess talking about details for CPR. It would be great to talk about and know some information about how we currently prepare our students for emergencies

[01:33:28] and perhaps prepare them for, let's say, doing CPR on, heaven forbid, we have to go through that, but doing CPR on someone and if they can be CPR certified by the time they graduate from LCPS. So we can provide a brief update on current practice, and then if you'd like us to bring an information item back, you're looking for a plan, because we do not have certification by graduation now, you're looking for options to move towards all seniors graduating or some seniors or a combination of both?

[01:34:06] So I know currently we have CPR training, but it's not CPR certified. They don't actually get, like, a card from, like, for example, the American Heart Association, and I know that it's renewable every two years. I know it doesn't stay forever, but it would be great if they could perhaps get that in their senior year so that they at least have that first year so when they enter some sort of medical program or some sort, they already have it in their pocket as a startup.

[01:34:30] - Mr. Ranzi, can you briefly give us a rundown on what currently happens? You could use that one right here. - So currently it is a state law, part of the Virginia Code, that students are trained, but not certified, as you pointed out.

[01:34:52] And that happens in ninth grade. So there's a unit in the ninth grade health curriculum where students have the opportunity to practice. They learn about AEDs and other devices. They do hands-on practice with CPR and also classroom instruction, but you're correct, Dr. Rasheed, that it does not lead to a certification.

[01:35:18] That used to be practice in LCPS, but for a variety of reasons, the Health and PE Department moved away from that in the last several years, but we'd be happy to look into options to look into how we might be able to bring that back.

[01:35:35] - Dr. Dease? - Just as we let kids whose parents your permission can knock him that CPR piece is a valid piece as well I'm assuming there would be a budget implication to certifying students for CPR so that would if we do bring it back for information which I'm open to I would like to know what that might be we would bring back structural implications on student schedules and I'll work with mission off for placement on agenda I want to make sure staff has time to put together a robust plan but we have had some conversations about this we've done some early research so we'll bring it

[01:36:13] back at a future CNI meeting that sounds great all right is there any other new business with that this curriculum instruction meeting is adjourned thank you all for your work see you next month



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com