

# Board Study Session (Tuesday, April 28, 2015)

Generated by Shelley R Shelton on Wednesday, April 29, 2015

## Members present

Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

## Excused

Michelle Kaufusi

## Staff members present

Keith Rittel, Superintendent; Ray Morgan, Assistant Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Dr. Gary Wall, Executive Director of Human Resources; Jason Cox, Director of Human Resources; Alex Judd, Director of Elementary Education; Chad Duncan, Director of Technology; Caleb Price, Communication & PR Coordinator; JP Pontious, Tech Support; Shelley Shelton, Executive Assistant

## A. 7:30 a.m. Study Session

---

1. Welcome: President Julie Rash

2. Roll Call

3. Logo Options: Caleb Price, Communications & PR Coordinator

Caleb shared the voting results to date:

- 1600 votes have been cast online
- Students at all schools are voting
- Voting closes at the end of the day Friday, May 1.
- 3346 total votes including paper ballots
  - Preliminary results:
    - 1st place design has - 32% of the vote
    - 2nd place design- 29% of the vote
    - 3rd place design - 20% of the vote
    - 4th place design - 13% of the vote
- Each logo was designed so department names could be added underneath.
- Final results will be reported during the May 12 study session.

Caleb also reminded board members of the Foundation Evening of Excellence on Friday, May 8 at Zions Bank.

4. YouTube Filtering & Management: Chad Duncan, Technology Director

Chad introduced JP Pontious, who has overseen the district internet filtering for the past thirteen years. JP shared the following information:

- YouTube is currently a critical resource for teachers.
- Since Google purchased YouTube, filtering issues have also become critical.

### *The History of YouTube*

- February 14, 2005 – YouTube.com domain is registered

- April 23, 2005 – The first video was uploaded (Me at the Zoo)
- May 2005 – First public preview of the site
- December 2005 – YouTube.com is officially launched
- October 9, 2006 – Google purchased YouTube.com for \$1.65 billion
- January 2010 – Encrypted Gmail introduced: Scrambles data and translates it back, making it more secure
- May 2010 – Google introduces an encrypted search service located at <https://encrypted.google.com>
- October 18, 2011 – Google announces encrypted google search at <https://www.google.com> for signed in users
- Between January 2012 and Fall of 2014 - The introduction of encrypted Google and eventually YouTube encrypted and secured the searches of users but also hide the searches from web filters. This made it difficult to block keywords searches. The strategy, until fall of 2014, was to block access to encrypted Google and YouTube which forced the user to use the http (unencrypted) site. Now that Google is forcing all YouTube traffic to https (encrypted), web filters are unable to see the keyword searches and are unable to block unwanted searches.

## Our Current Options

### Option 1

Enable YouTube Safety Mode – This option uses our DNS servers to redirect Youtube traffic to 216.239.38.120 ([forcesafesearch.google.com](https://forcesafesearch.google.com)). It will result in YouTube access with safety mode locked on.

- Statement by Google - "Safety mode hides videos that may contain inappropriate content flagged by users and other signals. No filter is 100% accurate, but it should help you avoid most inappropriate content."

#### Pros

- All access to YouTube has safety mode enabled which will get rid of most of the inappropriate content.
- It removes video comments, some of which are sexually explicit and/or vulgar.

#### Cons

- Safety mode is forced "on" for everyone, including teachers, blocking many videos our teachers use.
- There is a way to bypass this option. There will be students who will figure out a way to bypass the safety mode
- It is still possible to access inappropriate content.

### Option 2

Allow unrestricted access to YouTube

#### Pros

- Seamless access to videos used in curriculum
- The filter won't break access to YouTube when Google changes

#### Cons

- Unfiltered access to YouTube
- Some/many parents will not like this; other parents send their students to school with their phones set up as hot spots so they can access educational material, creating a risk of accessing inappropriate material as well.

### Option 3

Turn on SSL decryption – This option gives us more visibility, but not full visibility, and enables the filter to force student YouTube access to [cleanvideosearch.com](https://cleanvideosearch.com).

#### Pros

- Forces student YouTube traffic to [cleanvideosearch.com](https://cleanvideosearch.com) which removes the comments and video thumbnails (suggestions).
- We are able to see the keywords used to search YouTube video content, but we're unable to see the actual videos being viewed.

## Cons

- Still can't see all the internet traffic. We are blind to much of what is going on.
- We need to touch every computer for this to work seamlessly. A "certificate" would need to be put on each computer listing all trusted sites. Without a certificate, pop-ups often appear warning the user that a site is not trusted, which can create confusion for the user.
- Because we do not have a Client Management system (yearly per-device cost), future modifications to the certificate would be time consuming to get out to the client machines.
- Could be a security risk.
- We are relying on the filtering industry to keep up with the way Google does business.
- It is still possible to access inappropriate content.

## Additional information:

- The Tech Department is currently looking at a client management system at a potential cost of \$84,000 annually. Discussions are taking place to weigh the pros/cons of hiring additional tech personnel to touch every computer vs. purchasing a client management system.
- Currently filtering everything, making it difficult to access educational content on YouTube.
- We can filter by sub net according to how schools are set up on network.
- JP believes some of the sites need to be opened for educational access.
- Parents are naive about what kids are accessing. Some Dixon students have been accessing inappropriate content late at night when they took school-issued iPads home. Parent education/management and classroom management is the key. Filtering only keeps honest kids safe. Those who are determined to get outside the filter will get out.
- There is a great risk of exposure without filtering due to the video thumbnails displayed on the side of the screen, many of which are inappropriate.
- Ray: "We need to teach students how to swim rather than telling them to stay out of the pool."

The topic is to be discussed further during the June 23 board retreat. Direction from the board regarding YouTube filtering will be sought for implementation during the 2015-2016 school year. The district is currently filtering far beyond what is required by law.

## 5. Preschool: Alex Judd, Director of Elementary Education

The current Title 1 Preschool at Provo Peaks Elementary is serving roughly 75 students. Title 1 preschool and our Special Education preschool are looking to reach out to neighborhood schools to provide more preschool access and support.

Sunrise preschool, Special Education, and Title 1 are seeking to fully integrate an inclusion model that will have both at risk and general students attending preschool in neighborhood schools. It is proposed we start with two additional Title I schools as pilots (Franklin and one other school). This would be at no extra cost to the schools or district and would eventually provide more local preschool access. Additional funding options currently untapped by the district are being explored.

The money used for Sunrise Preschool would be shared with the additional schools. The program could eventually be expanded to house preschool students in more secure portables with bathrooms and kitchen areas. Additional research is being done along that line to determine the best/most appropriate options.

Following discussion the board expressed support of moving ahead with the proposed plan.

## 6. Reading Materials Adoption: Alex Judd, Director of Elementary Education

The District Literacy Committee has been examining primary grade instructional materials from different vendors with the goal of providing teachers with resources to support student attainment of the Utah Core

Standards for English Language Arts that were revised in June, 2013. Having reviewed materials from several vendors, the committee narrowed their examination to two. During the last few months, they pursued a more intense analysis of Houghton Mifflin Harcourt *Journeys* and McGraw Hill *Wonders* literacy programs.

After an analysis of these two programs, the committee determined to continue the use of the existing MH *Treasures* literacy program in kindergarten. The committee is also recommending the purchase of MH *Wonders* for first and second grades to be implemented over the course of next year in support of Utah Core Standards. *Wonders* would include updated materials to provide a richer content experience. Implementation would be gradual.

The transfer of \$250,000 of carryover funds from the Reading Achievement Program to support this purchase was approved in the last board meeting. The anticipated cost and funding analysis of this purchase was included in the packet for board review prior to the study session.

- The program was piloted at Sunset View last year; significant achievement growth was seen.
- Staff is seeking preapproval in order to begin the purchase process. Formal approval will be sought during the May 12 business meeting.

## **B. Adjourn**

---

### 1. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the study session and move into executive session for the purpose of discussing negotiations.

Motion by Marsha Judkins, second by Jim Pettersson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

The study session was adjourned 8:47 a.m. and the board moved into executive session.

## **C. Executive Session for the purpose of discussing negotiations. Utah Code 52.4.205**

---

1. Negotiations Update: Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Jason Cox, HR Director

## **D. Motion to Adjourn**

---

### 1. Motion