Kim Harrison, CETPA CTO Mentor Candidate

CONTEXT:

To demonstrate my ability create and revise policies using standard district Board of Education reporting, I participated as part of a group in the creation of the "Greensheet" artifact. In addition, I also worked with my group to evaluate the infrastructure section of the Technology Plan for Fresno Unified using the criteria set by the California Department of Education.

LEARNING OUTCOME:

This artifact addresses the following Learning Outcomes from the *Technology Policies, Standards, Plans* class.

TPS-09. Demonstrate the ability to apply what was learned regarding policies and procedures to create or revise a policy.

TPS-10. Demonstrate the ability to apply what was learned about technology plan requirements to evaluate an existing plan and to create a new one.

REFLECTION:

The artifacts for this session included a revision of board policy regarding student privacy and an evaluation of an existing Technology Plan. Both of these activities were group projects begun in class and finished offline. The members of my group included myself, Philip Neufeld, Joe Barney, Michelle Albanese, and Michael Garbette. To create the board policy revision, a "greensheet" template was provided to the group that captured the following information: who the memo was to and from, the support staff assigned to the project, the subject, a recommendation, information about the subject that includes background, known issues, and what is being requested, legal references, fiscal impact, the meeting date for the board, the agenda item, and what type of item it will be on the agenda. My group had experience in presenting this type of write-up for board policies and drew upon that experience to draft a board policy on privacy. The second artifact, the evaluation of the Infrastructure section of an existing technology plan, used Fresno Unified School District's plan as the sample and the California Education Technology Plan Criteria and Guiding Questions to form the basis of our evaluation. As a group, we examined the section of the Fresno USD plan that related to Infrastructure, Hardware, Technical Support, Software, and Asset Management and identified areas in which the plan adequately addressed the criteria and those that did not. We also include recommendations regarding

an alignment of the technology plan to Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) goals since it had been created prior to the implementation of LCAP.

The two artifacts demonstrates the ability of our group members to understand and apply the information regarding creating and revising policy as well as how to evaluate an existing plan. In my role as the technology leader for my district, I have revised existing board policy and administrative regulations related to Student Use of Technology (BP6163 and AR6163) and specifically regarding how Internet Safety is being taught in our classrooms. The board policy had not been updated since 2005 and did not contain this information required as part of E-Rate compliance. In bringing this to the board, I drafted my "title" using Agenda Online which includes the name of the item, the requested action, the rationale for the action, the financial impact, and the type of item it should go to the board as. We also track our board items as they relate to our district goals as part of the Strategic Plan. My board item went to the board as first read on April 14, 2016, and was approved on April 28, 2016, by the board of trustees. In creating my board policy, I spoke with my mentor and other technology leaders to learn about the process and used the sample language from California School Boards Association (CSBA).

In addition to revising and creating board policy, I am also responsible for the writing of the district's Technology Use Plan. In 2014, I worked with various stakeholder groups to craft a vision for technology use in the district through this plan and as part of that process, I used the information from the California Department of Education to assess the adequacy of the plan prior to submitting and receiving approval. As we are in the last year of the Technology Use Plan, I am once again convening a group of stakeholders to formulate a new plan to take us through the next three years. In the coming months I will bring district information to the stakeholder group made up of teachers, administrators, and parents that includes student achievement data, Brightbytes survey data, the English Learner master plan, and the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). At the time of the writing of the 2014 plan, these resources did not exist and so there was not a clear alignment; however, going forward these plans should reflect common goals as they all address the same needs.

Following working with my peers to draft the two artifacts for this session, I learned how others approach these responsibilities that are part of the job of a Chief Technology Officer (CTO). I thought that our group worked well together and included the commonalities of the processes that we have in place in our respective districts to complete these two artifacts. The structure of the greensheet reminded me of the importance of giving the board of trustees a complete picture of the item before them so that they can make the most informed decision regarding changes to board policy. The

prompts for the evaluation of the technology plan reaffirmed my plan for alignment to the LCAP as we begin drafting our vision for technology over the next three years.