TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1

Analysis of Compliance with Unitary Status Plan

Section IX: Facilities and Technology

An Annex to the Annual Report

for the

2016-2017 Academic Year

Fisher, Mendoza, et al. v. Tucson Unified School District, et al.

United States District Court, District of Arizona

74-CV-00090 TUC DCB and 74-CV-00204 TUC DCB

submitted to:

Honorable David C. Bury, United States District Court

prepared by:

Tucson Unified School District No. 1
Gabriel Trujillo, Ed.D., Superintendent

TUSD Governing Board:
Michael Hicks, President; Dr. Mark Stegeman, Clerk;
Adelita S. Grijalva; Kristel Ann Foster; Rachael Sedgwick

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Facilities Conditions

A. USP Requirements

> USP Section IX(A)(1). *The District has developed a Facilities Conditions Index ("FCI"), which rates the condition of school buildings along multiple structural dimensions and provides a composite score for each school. By July 1, 2013, the District shall amend its FCI to include, at minimum, the following: (i) location, number and condition of portable classrooms, and (ii) existence and repair status of heating and cooling system (identifying evaporative or air conditioning).*

In the summer of 2013, the District submitted a revised FCI to the Special Master and parties for review and feedback. The District incorporated their feedback and suggestions, and submitted a new revision in October 2013. This successful collaboration resulted in a final, approved version that was used during SY 13-14 to assess and score each of the District's school sites. The results were reported in the District's Annual Report for that year. [AR 13-14, App. IX-4, ECF 1691, pp. 79-81.]

When the District initially created the FCI, it did not yet have a Technology Condition Index ("TCI"). Instead, the FCI contained an assessment of communications technology at each site. Technology communications systems are now evaluated by the TCI (discussed in section VII below), which duplicated the FCI assessment for this category. Accordingly, during SY 15-16, the District's Architecture and Engineering team reduced the weight given to the communication category from 15 percent to 5 percent, with the 5 percent reflecting the facility-related responsibilities rather than the technology infrastructure. The team then increased the grounds category, which includes playgrounds and athletic fields, from 5 percent to 10 percent. Although revisions to these

weights are not significant, they are more accurate. The District does not believe that the changes have yet substantively affected the allocation of any District funds for repair and improvement. [AR 15-16, ECF 1958-1, p. 379.]

The FCI provides an overall composite condition rating of the facility. The FCI scores the condition of a series of facility components, using a rating scale from one (low) to five (high). The composite score is derived from the individual component scores, by weighting each component by a percentage. The current weights are: grounds (10%), parking lots and drives (5%), roofing (20%), building structures (30%), building systems (20%), special systems (10%) and technology-communications systems (5%). A school site's composite score is derived by multiplying each component score by the weighting percentage, and adding the resulting amounts together. The FCI also tracks which sites are racially-concentrated sites, as directed by the USP. [AR 15-16, App. IX-3, ECF 1968-1, pp. 61-65.]

> USP Section IX(A)(1)(con'td). *In addition, by July 1, 2014, the District shall develop an Educational Suitability Score ("ESS") for each school that evaluates: (i) the quality of the grounds, including playgrounds and playfields and other outdoor areas, and their usability for school-related activities; (ii) library condition; (iii) capacity and utilization of classrooms and other rooms used for school-related activities; (iv) textbooks and other learning resources; (v) existence and quality of special facilities and laboratories (e.g., art, music, band and shop rooms, gymnasium, auditoriums, theaters, science and language labs); (vi) capacity and use of cafeteria or other eating space(s); and (vii) current fire and safety conditions, and asbestos abatement plans.*

Immediately after completing the amended FCI in October 2013, the District formed a committee to begin working on the ESS. The committee researched similar

tools used by other districts to use as a baseline for understanding the unique needs of the District along with the unique requirements of the USP. Those resources included tools used by the Kentucky Department of Education, the Wyoming Department of Education, the Boston Public Schools, and the Houston Independent School District, which was seen as the most appropriate program model for the District. The committee used the research to help develop criteria to evaluate the seven components identified by the USP. [AR 13-14, ECF 1686, p. 202.]

The District expanded the ESS beyond minimum USP mandates by including additional critical educational spaces, such as exceptional education resource classrooms and self-contained classrooms. Recognizing that the non-instructional spaces at schools also play a critical role in the overall suitability of a school, the Committee added to the checklist these needed auxiliary spaces for counseling, tutoring, and health services. In January and February 2014, the committee piloted the ESS at Safford and Booth-Fickett schools and made further revisions based on the results of the pilot. [*Id.*]

The ESS was finalized via a collaborative process involving all of the parties in this action. In the fall 2014, the Plaintiffs asked the District to change the proposed ESS structure to weight the scores more heavily towards the classroom and less on the non-instructional space. The District agreed, and the final ESS was approved by the Special Master and the parties in late 2014. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 311.]

The ESS allows the District to assess the educational effectiveness of the design of school facilities under an educationally relevant set of guidelines. The ESS evaluates all seven categories listed in the USP. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 310.] The weighting of

individual component scores is more heavily directed towards classroom and instructional space and less towards non-instructional space: general classroom are given a weight of 17%, but non-instructional space receives a weight of 2%. As in the FCI, each score is multiplied by the weight factor, all are added together, and then divided by 100 to get the composite score. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 311.]

The District assembled a team of former administrators to ensure ESS determinations were made with consistency and by personnel well-versed in educational facilities. The Architecture and Engineering Department worked with the Professional Development Department to create a two-day training course for the team. [AR 14-15, App. IX-5, ECF 1852-4, pp. 31-49.] Each evaluator received a copy of the manual, the ESS Rubric, and School Site Plans. In addition to the training materials, the team created a set of questions to query school administrators prior to site visits by the team. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 311.]

The evaluation team attended training in January, 2015, and developed a solid understanding of the criteria used to assess the components identified by the ESS, and collaborated to be sure there was uniformity in the scoring process. [AR 14-15, App. IX-6, ECF 1852-4, pp. 50-53.] In January 2015, the Evaluation Team performed the first evaluations of the ESS at ten randomly selected schools, and then reconvened to make adjustments and recalibrate on how to record the data. The team completed District-wide school evaluations by February 25, 2015. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 312.]

> USP Section IX(A)(2). *The District shall assess the conditions of each school site biennially using its amended FCI and the ESS.*

The District initially assessed facilities under the amended FCI in SY 13-14, ad reported the results in its annual report for that year. The District reassessed all facilities during SY 15-16, and adjusted the FCI to reflect current conditions, which included approximately fifteen changes to facilities since the prior assessment, including the repurposing of some sites, the sale of portables, and configuration changes. The adjusted FCI results were reported in the District's Annual Report. [AR 15-16, App. IX-16, ECF 1968-1, pp.166-68.] The next scheduled full re-assessment will take place during SY 17-18.

In the interim, as known circumstances change (a roof leak develops, or some other event affecting the FCI score for a school), the index is dynamically adjusted to reflect those developments. The District has reported the current FCI each year in its annual reports. The current FCI for SY16-17 appears at ECF ____, Appendix IX – 1, IX.C.1.a Facilities Condition Index SY2016-17.

The team completed initial ESS school evaluations in SY14-15, and reported the results in its annual report for that year. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 312.] The next District-wide ESS evaluation was conducted in SY16-17, and reported the results in its most recent annual report.

> USP Section IX(A)(3). *Based on the results of the assessments using the FCI and the ESS, the District shall develop a multi-year plan for facilities repairs and improvements with priority on facility conditions that impact the health and safety of a school's students and on schools that score below a 2.0 on the FCI and/or below the District average on the ESS. The District shall give the next priority to Racially Concentrated Schools that score below 2.5 on the FCI.*

The District submitted a proposed Multi-Year Facilities Plan ("MYFP") to the Special Master and Plaintiffs. The District recommended, and the Plaintiffs agreed, that the ESS and FCI tools should have separate flows rather than a combined flow. The District evaluated the FCI scores to identify the schools with the lowest scores and rank them according to the flowchart defined by the USP. In the same manner, the District evaluated the ESS scores to identify the schools with the lowest scores. Based on analysis of the FCI and ESS scores, the District then defined the projects needed to raise the FCI or ESS scores and quantified the dollars needed for each project. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 312.] This resulted in a list of repair and improvement projects prioritized by the criteria listed in the USP. The MYFP generally assigns priorities in the following order: (1) resolution of health and safety issues at any school, (2) schools that score below 2.0 on the FCI or below the District average on the ESS, and (3) racially concentrated schools that score below 2.5 on the FCI. The MYFP was approved by the Special Master and the parties. [ECF 1777-1, pp. 5, 3.]

Actual completed projects are dependent upon the capital dollars available for improvements. Given a defined level of capital dollars, projects are completed in the order defined by the MYFP. The current MYFP is posted on the District website and in the record at ECF 1968-1.

B. Multi Year Facilities Plan in Action

> MYFP Requirements. *In essence the MYFP provided that the District would prioritize all repairs and improvements projects across the District according the requirements of USP Section X(A)(3), using scores from the FCI and ESS.*

Capital funding for the District from all sources has suffered a significant downturn over the past several years. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 307.] As a result, the District has had funds only for the most pressing issues. The following chart lists the repair and improvement projects completed since the development of the MYFP, and the MYFP priority level for the project:

Project Name/Description	**USP/MYFP Priority Level**
Miller Elementary Roof	health and safety issue
Valencia Middle School Boiler Retube	health and safety issue
Tucson High Boiler Replacement	health and safety issue
Pueblo Gardens Elementary Roof	RC school below 2.5
Pueblo Gardens Elementary Parking Lot	RC school below 2.5
Bonillas Elementary Roof	RC school below 2.5
Bonillas Elementary Parking Lot	RC school below 2.5
Van Buskirk Elementary Roof	RC school above 2.5

The District also used the FCI to guide the selection of schools for the Adopt-A-School initiative for SY 13-14 and 14-15. Six school campuses were selected for the Adopt-A-School initiative. Three of these schools are racially concentrated, and two are integrated schools. On designated weekends, community, and TUSD volunteers pitched in to do basic repairs and clean-up on the following school campuses: Holladay Elementary, Davis Elementary, Pistor Middle School, Santa Rita High School (SY 13-14, AR 13-14, ECF 1686, pp. 200-01.); Pueblo Gardens Elementary, Lineweaver Elementary, Gale Elementary, Cavett Elementary, Bonillas Elementary and Myers/Ganoung Elementary (SY 14-15). Typical work completed was general grounds cleanup, restriping of cement courts, indoor paint repair, exterior paint repair, and planting of trees and shrubs. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 310.]

C. Assessment and Conclusion.

The District amended its FCI as required, developed and implemented an ESS as required, and used the results in framing an MYFP as required.[1] The District has followed the MYFP in determining how to spend its admittedly limited repair and improvement funds in a manner consistent with the goals of the USP. The District has complied in good faith all respects with the USP requirements.

II. Technology and Technology Conditions.

A. The District has followed the USP Requirements in equitably and materially upgrading technology conditions throughout the District.

> USP Section IX(B)(1). *By July 1, 2013, the District shall develop a Technology Conditions Index ("TCI"), which rates technology and technology conditions in schools along multiple technological dimensions and provides a composite score for each school. The TCI shall include, at minimum, the following: (i) student access to computers and other learning devices (e.g., smart boards); the location of computers and learning devices (lab or classroom or both); (ii) availability of wireless and broadband Internet in a school; (iii) availability of research-based educational software or courseware; and (iv) teacher proficiency in facilitating student learning with technology.*

Initial review indicated that no other district in the country had created or implemented a TCI. The District evaluated prospects for finding an outside consultant with sufficient background or expertise in this area to justify floating a Request for Proposals. Discussions with several vendors revealed a lack of current experience in both the design and implementation of a TCI instrument. The District thus undertook the

[1] The District has also included USP-required information about its facilities operations in its annual reports. [AR 13-14, App. IX 1-11, ECF 1691; AR 13-14, App. IX 1-11, ECF 1852-4; AR 15-16, App. 16-20, ECF 1968-1; AR 16-17, ECF 2057-1.]

project in house. A working TCI prototype was developed by February 2014, submitted to the Plaintiffs and Special Master, and approved. [AR 13-14, ECF 1686, p. 203.]

The TCI creates a composite score for each school, made up of multiple technological dimensions. These dimensions included a complete inventory of the District's technology hardware and their condition (*e.g.*, computers, printers, scanners, smartboards, response-devices, projectors, document cameras, multi-media devices). These dimensions also included software resources available to teachers such as instructional support, credit recovery, assessment, and Microsoft Office software. Based on this information, the District calculated a weighted composite score as a whole and for each school. The weighting for each component of the TCI is listed below:

Classroom technology inventory (equipment and software)	26%
Lab technology inventory (equipment and software)	26%
Software use	5%
Teacher proficiency (comfort and use of classroom technology)	42%

[AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, pp. 314-15.] Teacher proficiency and comfort with technology in the classroom were both assessed to gauge aptitude and ease of integration into daily routines. Technology Services created a proficiency survey, which was administered to District teachers. The survey requested teachers to rate their comfort level utilizing instructional technology on a scale from zero (not comfortable at all) to five (the highest comfort level). Additionally, teachers were provided the opportunity to explain their current comfort level regarding instructional technology, which was captured in narrative format. [*Id.*]

> USP Section IX(B)(2). *The District shall assess the technology in each school biannually using the TCI.*

The TCI has been updated continuously, starting in SY 13-14, with new data based on current conditions and new purchases, reflecting the substantial continuing investments in technology made by the District.

> USP Section IX(B)(3). *Based on the results of its assessment using the TCI, the District shall develop a multi-year Technology Plan that provides for enhancements and improvements to the District's technology, with priority given to basic maintenance and required repairs and to Racially Concentrated Schools that score below the District average on the TCI.*
>
> USP Section IX(B)(4). *The District shall include in its professional development for all classroom personnel, as more fully addressed in Section (IV)(J)(3), training to support the use of computers, smart boards and educational software in the classroom setting.*

The District analyzed the results of the 2014-15 TCI and developed the MYTP. The District submitted this plan to the Court in February 2015. See Multi-Year Technology Plan [ECF 1778 and 1778-1.] There were no objections to the MYTP from the Special Master or the Plaintiffs. The MYTP contained two primary recommendations.

1. Technological Upgrades. Based on an analysis of the TCI classroom and lab resource inventory scores, the MYTP recommended that fourteen racially concentrated sites, whose ratings fell below the District average, receive computer hardware upgrades over a three year period. [AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 316.]

2. Teacher Technology Liaisons ("TTLs"). To address issues with respect to teacher proficiency, the MYTP provided for at least one classroom teacher at each school to serve as a TTL with up to two additional liaisons available for Elementary and K-8 schools with student populations of 400 or more. High schools with student populations of 1,100 or more received three or four TTLs. Based on a train-the-trainer model, TTLs

received training either in person or online regarding how to integrate various hardware and software applications to improve teacher use and proficiency with technology in the classroom.

B. The TCI and MYTP in action demonstrate the District's compliance.

In SY 13-14, despite the fact that the TCI was not yet complete, the District was able to complete a partial assessment using the TCI with regard to computers in classrooms (other technology tools were not yet included in the survey). Looking at only distribution, location, and quality of computers at school sites, the data indicated that at the end of SY 13-14, 20% of racially concentrated schools, and 18% of non-racially concentrated schools, scored below a "3"[2] on the TCI instrument. These initial numbers were encouraging in that overall disparities appeared to be relatively small. The table below compares the mean TCI scores between racially concentrated and non-racially concentrated schools across elementary, middle, K-8/K-12, and high school categories:

Average TCI scores SY 13-14 (computers only)

Grade Level	Racially Concentrated	Not Racially Concentrated
Elementary	3.29	3.60
Middle, K-8 & K-12	3.34	3.44
High School	3.00	2.18

[AR 13-14, App. IX-6, ECF 1691, pp. 106-09.] Average scores for all racially concentrated schools were at or above the 3.0 threshold.

[2] The 2013-14 TCI weighting defines a score of "3" as being in Acceptable Condition: "Technology rated at 3 has had proper preventative maintenance and attention to work orders keeps it in acceptable condition. The hardware is compatible with essential TUSD technology and network environment. It is supportable, with replacement parts available from the manufacturer. Accessories are available. The software works and is relevant. Any safety and/or ergonomic issues are very minor. The technology supports the educational mission." [AR 13-14, App. IX-5, ECF 1691, p. 84.]

During SY 14-15, the District completed the full TCI for the first time. The completed TCI was reported in the District's Annual Report for that year. [AR 14-15, App. IX-8, ECF 1852-4, pp. 58-64.] Average composite scores increased substantially. Thirty-nine schools scored below the District average rating of 3.67. Nineteen of these schools (49%) were racially concentrated and twenty (51%) were not. The average TCI score by school level and racial concentration status for computers is provided in the following table:

Average TCI scores SY 14-15		
	Racially Concentrated	**Not Racially Concentrated**
Elementary	3.58	3.72
Middle, K-8 & K-12	3.68	3.65
High	3.72	3.64
District	3.67	

[AR 14-15, ECF 1918-1, p. 315.] This shows substantial equality across all schools. Using data generated from TCI instrument scores, the District made informed decisions regarding much needed hardware upgrades at District schools. As a result, during SY 14-15, the District provided $1.8 million in technological improvements to all fourteen racially concentrated schools identified in the MYTP as below the District average. [*Id.*]

Results for SY 15-16 continued to show improvement. The overall TCI composite rating for the District increased from 3.67 in SY 14-15 to 3.9 for SY 15-16. The District attributed the growth primarily to two factors: new device upgrades and improvements in teacher proficiency with technology. The District increased the number of available laptops for use in the classrooms at schools identified as racially concentrated and elementary schools, based on the results of the SY 14-15 TCI. As the District deployed new devices to the approved campuses, it identified and excluded "legacy" hardware, which dated from 2005-08, from the TCI inventory. The legacy hardware did not meet

the minimum Arizona Department of Education specifications for conducting AzMERIT online testing and were no longer deemed to be within acceptable limits of current software platforms. The second contributing factor was an overall increase in teacher technology proficiency from 3.9 in SY 14-15 to 4.1 in SY 15-16 for an overall growth of 7 percent. [AR 15-16, ECF 1958-1, p. 380.]

Results improved again in SY 16-17. The overall TCI composite score for the District increased from 4.34 in SY15-16 to 4.60 for SY16-17, growing by 6 percent (ECF 2067-1, pp. 67). In fact, every school site showed at least a slight increase. The District attributes this growth primarily to two factors: new device upgrades and improvements in teacher technology proficiency. For example, the District increased the number of available classroom computers at all schools.

As the District deployed new devices to the approved campuses, it also identified and excluded "legacy" hardware (hardware procured during SY2005-08) from the TCI inventory. This legacy hardware does not meet the minimum Arizona Department of Education specifications for conducting AzMERIT online testing and is no longer within acceptable limits of current software platforms.

The second contributing factor was a 5 percent overall increase in teacher technology proficiency, from 4.37 in SY2015-16 to 4.58 in SY2016-17. [*Id*]. This increase stems from efforts to prepare teachers and school staff to complete assessments. Teacher technology liaisons (TTLs) delivered more than 3,000 hours of professional development instructing teachers how to use and facilitate online assessments (ECF 20167-1, pp. 68-72). Learning objectives for the TTL meetings included online assessment and other instructional technology skills. The wider availability of document cameras for teachers, along with focused professional development on their use, also contributed to higher teacher technology proficiency. In addition, the increase in teacher TCI proficiency scores was more impressive during SY2016-17 because the proficiency measurement instrument (the Teacher Technology Survey) was a more rigorous

assessment than it was in SY2015-16. In fall 2016, the District revised the survey to include more in-depth questioning than the spring 2015 survey. As teachers become more proficient with and immersed in instructional technology, they are able to embed what they have learned into their classroom instruction proficiency.

In SY 14-15, only seventeen of the 36 racially concentrated schools rated above the TCI district average; by the end of SY 15-16, the District had increased this number to 30 schools. In SY 15-16, 34 of 50 non-racially concentrated schools exceeded the TCI district average, up from 29 schools in SY 14-15. The TCI score for racially concentrated schools grew by 77 percent compared to those for the non-racially concentrated schools, which increased by 17 percent between SY 14-15 and SY 15-16 (*see* Table 9.1 below). The District attributed this increase to the approved procurement in SY 14-15 of student laptops and desktops for those racially concentrated schools that fell below the TCI 2014-15 District average, together with the procurement of one Computers on Wheels (COW) housing 30 laptops for all elementary schools. The District attributed the slight decrease in 16-17 to the overall increase in teacher proficiency scores, which in turn increased the TCI district average in general.

Number of Schools Above the TCI District Average

Campus Integration Concentrated	**SY2014-15 - Schools Above TCI District Avg.**	**SY2015-16 - Schools Above TCI District Avg.**	**SY2016-17 - Schools Above TCI District Avg.**	**% of Growth SY2014-15 vs SY2015-16**	**% of Growth SY2015-16 vs SY2016-17**
Racially Concentrated	17	30	28	77%	-7.1%
Non-Racially Concentrated	29	34	25	17%	-36%

ECF 2057-1, p. 403] The District developed and implemented its TCI as required, and used the results in framing a Multi-Year Technology Plan as required. The District has followed the MYTP in determining enhancements and improvements to the District's technology, with priority given to basic maintenance and required repairs and to Racially Concentrated Schools that score below the District average on the TCI.

C. District Technology Initiatives

Computer-Based Student Academic Assessments

In SY2015-16, the District began the transition from administering paper-based student academic assessments to online testing. The District conducted quarterly benchmark testing using SchoolCity, the District's assessment software, and piloted computer-based state AzMERIT tests at sixteen schools. In SY2016-17, the District administered the state AzMERIT online at all schools. Students in grades 3 through 12 took more than 152,000 tests in mathematics, reading, and writing using desktops and laptops. In addition, the District completed a College Board pilot program for administering the SAT online to 180 students for the first time.

Technology Investments

The District deployed more than 10,000 laptops—Computers On Wheels (COWS)—before the start of school for SY2016-17. The District also deployed 589 projectors and 1,082 document cameras and completed much-needed projector bulb and printer maintenance on the campuses.

Wireless Access

As the District continues to increase the concurrent use of technology in classrooms by students and teachers, the need for more robust wireless access requires additional wireless access points (WAP). To address this need for more wireless access bandwidth in the classroom, the District is investing approximately $425,000 of capital funds and is applying for $875,000 of E-Rate funds to provide and install 1,475 WAPs in all high schools. Due to the importance of wireless access bandwidth in classroom and

campus common areas, the District is considering updating the TCI with a WAP category to ensure equity across all campuses.

D. Technology Instruction for Teachers

During SY2015-16, the Instructional Technology Department (ITD) met its objective in increasing the number of teachers that meet District technology proficiency in the classroom. During SY2016-17, ITD continued its efforts, supporting the use of technology in classrooms in three primary ways: utilizing teacher experts (TTLs) to support the development of their colleagues' skills and confidence in the use of technology in the classroom, developing online resources, and supporting the administration in online assessments.

Under the 2014-15 Instructional Technology Professional Development Plan, the District created a cadre of TTLs to assist teachers in building their knowledge and use of technological resources in the classroom. Each school site recruited at least one teacher based on a formula of approximately one TTL to every 400 students, with no less than one TTL per school. The TTLs met with teachers in small groups, one on one, and in professional learning communities at their campuses to provide ongoing and sustainable training in the most efficient manner. This process continued through SY2016-17.

The District conducted TTL meetings twice per month throughout the year to ensure that all TTLs had flexibility within their schedules to attend and participate in the after-school meetings. The ITD used these meetings to provide training for the TTLs in the targeted topics as identified through the teacher technology proficiency survey (Appendix IX – 6, TTL Training Objectives).

<u>Needs Assessment and Training Development</u>

When the ITD increased the rigor of the SY2016-17 teacher technology proficiency survey, the department was better able to identify the needs for additional professional development for AzMERIT, Synergy, and SchoolCity (online benchmarks), as well as mastery of new document cameras and how they can be used to deliver

instruction (Appendix IX – 7, Teacher Technology Proficiency Survey). The ITD also focused on building teacher proficiency on the use of core applications of Microsoft Office in preparation for Office 365 and Engage New York. The ITD worked with the TTLs to communicate training objectives as identified through analysis of teacher technology proficiency survey data, TTLs, and teacher feedback.

TTLs assisted in formalizing the methodology for developing teacher-centered technology trainings (PD) for introducing new technologies and applications as follows: TTLs experiment with new technologies and applications. TTLs and the ITD then make recommendations on which content is relevant in assisting the delivery of instruction. TTLs then monitor and adjust specific training content to meet the instructional technology PD needs of individual teachers. Once adjustments have been made, this PD is promoted and utilized by TTLs as a resource as they conduct trainings at their sites. Two primary examples of this are illustrated by the PD provided on the use of document cameras as well as instructional technology PD on Windows 10 for teachers. In both examples, once the TTLs became familiar with new technology and developed relevant instruction content targeted to the use of the technology in the classroom, TTLs trained teachers and teachers shared best practices with fellow teachers, thereby supporting a collegial and productive teacher-driven learning community.

In addition to the needs stated above, the ITD gleaned through individual teacher feedback from the survey and direct feedback from the TTLs a significant need for training in the K-8 districtwide intervention online application known as SuccessMaker. In response to this need, the ITD conducted SuccessMaker training for 344 certificated personnel in June and July 2016.

The ITD also found a high number of teacher requests for training on the basic navigation of Windows 10 on the newly procured COWS. The ITD addressed this request by developing online professional development materials for TTLs in their support of staff. The ITD developed additional professional development opportunities

following the initial implementation of the Synergy online gradebook to provide enhanced support for teachers in using this program.

Instructional Technology Training Implementation

With established training objectives in mind, the TTLs coordinated instructional technology PD training at their respective schools. The TTLs worked to identify the current level of teacher proficiency and then built upon the existing skills to raise the level of the teacher's proficiency in technology. The ITD encouraged TTLs to communicate the new training objectives with the site administrator(s). Each site administrator then determined the most efficient manner in which to address these objectives.

As part of the ITD PD, teachers had the opportunity to observe TTLs modeling lessons during professional learning communities (PLCs) and had access to online resources available through the ITD website. The TTLs maintained a record of training their teacher colleagues at their respective campuses through SharePoint, logging more than 14,000 hours of instructional technology PD in SY2016-17.

In support of the TTLs, the ITD provided and facilitated instructional technology PD across the District at individual campuses. TTLs and/or principals requested additional support from the ITD assisting in facilitating large group training at campuses, as needed. Based on training requests from TTLs, teachers, and principals, instructional technology PD training objectives included document cameras in instruction, tablets for instruction, Windows 10 in the classroom, Synergy gradebook, common formative assessments, interactive whiteboard training, and SuccessMaker.

As mentioned above, teachers needed professional development in understanding the navigation and administration of the AzMERIT online assessment for grades 3-12. The District qualified for districtwide administration of the assessment through the Arizona Technology Readiness tool. Testing during SY2016-17 took place at all District

campuses. In support of this effort, the ITD leveraged the TTL infrastructure, assisted in training additional teachers, and provided support for these online assessments.

The ITD also created and managed a teacher technology online discussion board, which serves as a way for TTLs to coach each other and share best practices. The department also initiated a video archive to highlight best instructional technology practices. The District further utilized TTLs to provide initial and refresher Synergy gradebook training for District teachers in June 2017.

Teaching and Learning Summit

The ITD held the first annual districtwide Teaching and Learning Summit in March 2017. The ITD collected data in the form of lessons incorporating technology from across the District. These lessons were the products of teacher learning from the TTLs regarding delivery of instruction with technology. The District displayed these lessons at the summit and utilized input gathered from teachers across the District to design an additional instructional technology PD opportunity for teachers using current Office products to prepare them for utilizing Office 365 in the classroom.

The Teaching and Learning Summit showcased lessons that incorporated technology in delivering instruction in areas such as Engage New York, Synergy, SuccessMaker, SchoolCity, project-based learning, online early interventions, and use of COWs for instruction, to name a few. ITD held this event, another opportunity for best practices collaboration, on March 14 and March 16, 2017. On display were examples of what teachers learned from their training with TTLs and how they implemented what they learned into their instruction. In addition, TTLs conducted breakout sessions to share best practices on several topics:

Implementing Document Cameras into Instruction,
Online Assessment, Electronic Response Devices in Instruction,
Using a COW for Real World Budgets,
K-5 Math Online, Engage New York, and
Interactive Stories Using an Interactive Whiteboard.
Additional Supports

Open Labs

The ITD held four open labs for TTLs. Held at different locations throughout the District, the hands-on labs were designed to help TTLs enhance and increase their skill set with the District's instructional technology so that they were better equipped to assist teachers and continuously build upon their own knowledge. ITD opened these labs on September 28, 2016, October 26, 2016, November 23, 2016, and January 25, 2016 (Appendix IX – 15, Open Labs).

Communication with Principals

The ITD executed a feedback loop to principals through a campus data dashboard (Appendix IX – 16, ITD Dashboard Example). The dashboard shows how each teacher at their respective campus performed on the survey and the training TTLs conducted with the teachers. Additional data points highlighted the TTL engagement at their campus by showing the requests for instructional technology PD. An outcome from the TTL meetings was that some TTLs began to proactively schedule meetings with their principals after attending a monthly TTL meeting. During this meeting, TTLs had the opportunity to review and update their principals on what they had learned as well as schedule technology PD for the upcoming week. The TTLs will continue to update their principals in SY2017-18.

In sum, the District has complied in good faith with the technology requirements of Section IX of the USP.

III. The District has met the USP Reporting Requirements for Section IX.

> USP Section IX(C)(1). *The District shall provide, as part of its Annual Report: (a) Copies of the amended FCI, ESS and TCI and (b) a summary of the results of the FCI, ESS, and TCI analyses conducted over the previous year.*

The District has provided these items in each of its annual reports beginning in the year in which the index or score was developed or amended. The following table lists the citations to the record.

School Year	Citation
SY2013-14	ECF 1691, pp. 2-40; ESS and TCI not yet developed.
SY2014-15	ECF 1691, pp. 2-40
SY2015-16	ECF 1968-1, pp. 62-124; pp. 128 -133; pp. 169-232
SY2016-17	ECF2067-1, pp. 1-3, pp. 5-7; pp. 66-67.

> *USP Section IX(C)(1). The District shall provide, as part of its Annual Report: (c) a report on the number and employment status (e.g., full-time, part-time) of facility support staff at each school (e.g., custodians, maintenance and landscape staff), and the formula for assigning such support.*

The District has provided this report in each of its annual reports since the USP was entered. The following table lists the citations to the record.

School Year	Citation
SY2013-14	ECF 1691-1, pp. 2-6
SY2014-15	ECF 1852-4, pp. 54-57
SY2015-16	ECF 1968-1, pp. 251-256
SY2016-17	ECF 2067-3, pp. 18-25

> *USP Section IX(C)(1). The District shall provide, as part of its Annual Report: (c) A copy of the multi-year facilities plan and multi-year technology plan, as modified and updated each year and a summary of the actions taken during that year pursuant to such plans.*

The District has provided these items beginning in the year in which plan was developed. The following table lists the citations to the record.

School Year	Citation
SY2014-15	ECF 1777; ECF 1778
SY2015-16	ECF 1968-1, pp 1-58
SY2016-17	ECF 2067-1, pp. 8-65; ECF 2067-3, pp. 26-83

> *USP Section IX(C)(1). The District shall provide, as part of its Annual Report: (d) For all training and professional development provided by the District, as required by this Section, information on the type of training, location held, number of personnel who attended by position, presenter(s), training outline or presentation, and any documents distributed.*

The District has provided this report in each of its annual reports since the USP was entered. The following table lists the citations to the record.

School Year	Citation
SY2013-14	ECF 1686, pp. 206-207; ECF 1691-1, pp. 7-137
SY2014-15	ECF1848, pp. 322-328; ECF 1852-4, pp. 65-74
SY2015-16	ECF 1958-1, pp. 383-383; ECF 1968-1, pp. 257-263
SY2016-17	ECF 2057-1, pp. 404-408; ECF 2060-5, pp.88-131; ECF 2067-1, pp. 68-87; ECF 2067-2, pp. 1-17