

On Wed, Nov 18, 2015 at 5:25 PM, Adam Rak <adam_rak@yahoo.com> wrote:

Craig, Carol and Tom,

Since I will not be there for tomorrow's meetings, I wanted to provide some feedback on draft technology plan. First, thanks for putting this together. It provides a good path way forward for the District as the next iteration of the plan.

1. In comparing the two plans, it seems the new draft is lacking specific timelines and metrics. I like the cleanness of the new plan, so perhaps including that as an addendum would be the right approach.
2. It would also be helpful to see the progress from the previous plan as it appears to me that the new plan builds on that. For example, I know that we have chosen Illuminate, but it would be good to stress that, that decision was part of a process laid out from the previous plan.
3. I think we should not be specific about the types of technology we are using for a forward looking plan. It is fine to talk about mobile computing, but I wouldn't limit ourselves to chromebooks and iPads. Technologies change and we should have the the ability to adapt.
4. 1d. Appears to be a limiting sentence that personalized learning can only be accomplished through project based learning, which is not the case. Certainly project based learning can be personalized, but that is not the only option for personalization.
5. I think you need more specifics around data privacy and protection. This section is not robust enough. Perhaps the intention is for this to be covered more specifically in a privacy policy, but things like privacy and security training of staff who handle personal data should be included.
6. The 3.a.ii is not inclusive enough to truly protect the Districts networks and data. Firewalls and content filtering is limited in its capabilities. This should include things like anti-virus, intrusion detection, etc. The district should also designate an individual responsible for cybersecurity and it should focus more on data protection, as that is what is the most sensitive and valuable. Ultimately, this statement should focus more on the level of security and use the technologies as an example.

Thanks,

Adam