

SEALY
Independent School District

TECHNOLOGY REVIEW

**Conducted by SDSM, Inc. for the
Legislative Budget Board**

SEPTEMBER 2008



LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD

Robert E. Johnson Bldg.
1501 N. Congress Ave. - 5th Floor
Austin, TX 78701

512/463-1200
Fax: 512/475-2902
<http://www.lbb.state.tx.us>

September 8, 2008

Ms. Pamela Moms
Superintendent
Sealy Independent School District

Dear Ms. Morris:

The attached report reviews the management and performance of the Sealy Independent School District's (SISD) technology operations.

The report's recommendations will help Sealy ISD improve its overall performance as it provides services to students, staff, and community members. The report also highlights model practices and programs being provided by SISD's technology operations.

The Legislative Budget Board engaged SDSM, Inc., to conduct and produce this review, with LBB staff working in a contract oversight role.

The report is available on the LBB website at <http://www.lbb.state.tx.us>.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John O'Brien", written over a horizontal line.

John O'Brien
Director
Legislative Budget Board

cc: Dr. William Hermann
Mr. Mark Miller
Mr. James Lee
Ms. Amy Brothers
Mr. Dale Lechler
Mr. Rick Bauman
Mr. Alan Jamison

SEALY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY

In April 2008 the Legislative Budget Board began a review of technology in the Sealy Independent School District (SISD). The purpose of the review was to help the Legislative Budget Board gain an understanding of technology planning and usage in school districts across the state. SISD was one of three school districts selected for this review based on the size of the district and their School Technology and Readiness (STaR) Chart self assessment.

Understanding technology and developing computer skills are an important part of today's education and essential in the preparation of our children for a successful future. Almost every job in today's world—from automotive repair to open heart surgery—requires an understanding of computers. To provide this understanding and skill set, school districts must implement a broad curriculum that includes hardware, software, teacher training, and administrative support. State and federal law sets standards for technology education. Each school district decides how they will implement these directives.

GENERAL INFORMATION

SISD is located in Austin County, 50 miles west of Houston, 112 miles southeast of Austin, and 145 miles east of San Antonio. The city of Sealy, the largest city in the county, is at the crossroads of Interstate 10 and State Highway 36. The estimated population in 2006 was 5,851.


In 2007–08, SISD had 2,598 students and four main campuses: Selman Elementary School (pre-kindergarten–grade 3), Selman Intermediate School (grades 4–5), Sealy Junior High School

(grades 6–8), and Sealy High School (grades 9–12). Forty-seven percent of the students are White, 13 percent are African American, and 39 percent are Hispanic. Less than one percent of the students are Native American or Asian/Pacific Islander. The district enrollment includes 48.4 percent economically disadvantaged students, below the state average of 55.2 percent for the same period. SISD has 381 employees, with 66 percent considered professional staff.

The district's 2007 Accountability Rating is Academically Acceptable. In 2006–07, the district had 12.9 students per teacher—compared to the state average of 14.5. SISD teachers have an average of 12.5 years of total teaching experience, with 7.9 years of experience in the district. The turnover rate for teachers is 15.5 percent annually, which is close to the state average of 15.6.

SISD has a separate Information Technology Department headed by a Director of Technology who reports to the Executive Director of Business Services. The organization chart for the department is shown in **Exhibit 1**. At the time of the site visit the department had four full-time positions. One

EXHIBIT 1 SISD TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION CHART



SOURCE: SISD Technology Department, April 2008.

technician is assigned to the high school, one technician to the elementary school, and one technician is assigned to the intermediate and junior high campuses. Technicians are completely responsible for computer technology support on their assigned campuses. There are no technology support positions located on the campuses.

The Director of Technology has been with SISD for 10 years and has a technical, private sector background. The three technicians have a total of 15 years experience and all have a technical, private sector background. The Director of Technology and the staff built the district network from scratch. The Technology Department is responsible for all the district's infrastructure and hardware, but it is not responsible for instructional software except for resolution of help desk issues and has limited responsibility for administrative and Microsoft® office applications. There is one person on each campus who is responsible for updating the content of that campus on the district's website. The high school and the junior high school each have a teacher who provides limited support to the teachers on those campuses.

The State of Texas has set expectations for use of technology in the classroom. In order

to track progress toward the Texas Education Agency's (TEA) Long Range Plan for Technology 2006–20, TEA developed a campus survey tool called the STaR Chart. The STaR Chart is a self-assessment completed by teachers in the key areas of Teaching and Learning; Educator Preparation and Development; Leadership, Administration, and Instructional Support; and Infrastructure for Technology that ranks campuses at one of four levels of progress: early technology, developing technology, advanced technology, or target technology. SISD staff ranked their campuses differently based on the key areas as shown in **Exhibit 2**. The ratings were mostly in the second or Developing Technology level of technology use in the classroom.

The district uses a leased 1GB Fiber Ethernet for its local area network (LAN). A local telecommunications company provides a 1Gbps Ethernet wide area network (WAN) connection to each campus. Each campus has a 1Gbps fiber serving as the backbone for its local area network (LAN). SISD has Cisco Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) phones in every classroom and each campus has a VOIP switch for independent operations. The district has 901 computers, and all 300 classrooms have a direct connection to the

EXHIBIT 2 TEXAS CAMPUS STAR CHART SUMMARY 2006–07

KEY AREA	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL
Teaching and Learning	Developing Technology	Early Technology	Early Technology	Developing Technology
Educator Preparation and Development	Developing Technology	Early Technology	Early Technology	Developing Technology
Leadership, Administration, and Instructional Support	Developing Technology	Early Technology	Developing Technology	Developing Technology
Infrastructure for Technology	Developing Technology	Developing Technology	Developing Technology	Advanced Technology

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency Campus STaR Chart Summaries, 2006–07.

internet. There is one computer for each teacher and one computer for every three students.

The district's servers are located in-house and include a 5TB storage Array and a new 9TB storage server. The main network is located at the high school as is the generator backup and the telephone call manager.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

- **The district's help desk addresses problems on a timely basis.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Recommendation 1: Expand the Technology Plan into a true strategic plan for technology integration in the district.**
- **Recommendation 2: Build technology integration skills of teachers in the district through focused staff development opportunities and by adopting technology usage standards for teachers.**
- **Recommendation 3: Review district policy on student access to the internet to ensure adequate access for class assignments while preserving needed safeguards.**
- **Recommendation 4: Develop a disaster recovery plan that includes planning for restoring critical services in case of a site disaster.**

The four recommendations in the report have a total five-year fiscal impact of \$12,000 in costs.

DETAILED ACCOMPLISHMENT

SISD HELP DESK

The district's Technology Department staff uses help desk software to track help desk tickets and respond to problems quickly, usually within four

hours of notification. The Technology Department encourages district staff to use the tracking system but also accepts email and voice mail reporting of problems. These problems are then entered into the system so that all problems can be tracked. Participants in both the teacher focus group and the principal focus group cited the responsiveness of the Information Technology (IT) staff as effective and timely.

The district's help desk software allows IT personnel to respond quickly to reported problems, increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the entire staff, and helps demonstrate the department's real commitment to customer service. The system's reports provide a valuable management tool to monitor performance by IT staff, gain an understanding of how technology is being used or not used by individuals, and maintain a history regarding problematic equipment.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION (REC. 1)

Expand the Technology Plan into a true strategic plan for technology integration in the district.

SISD has developed a Technology Plan for 2007–10 that includes planned expenditures of \$1,314,807 over three years but has not linked this plan to the District Improvement Plan (DIP), campus improvement plans (CIPs), or the current budget. This plan was updated in February 2008 with input from a Technology Planning Committee that included the Director of Technology, the four district principals, and three teachers.

The plan is based on the following four required key components: Teaching and Learning; Educator Preparation and Development; Leadership, Administration and Support; and Infrastructure for Technology (**Exhibit 3**). Eighty seven percent

EXHIBIT 3
SISD LONG RANGE TECHNOLOGY PLAN
PLANNED EXPENDITURES BY COMPONENT

COMPONENT	BUDGET	PERCENT
Teaching and Learning	\$118,000	9.0%
Educator Preparation and Development	53,000	4.0%
Leadership, Administration and Support	0	0.0%
Infrastructure for Technology	1,143,807	87.0%
TOTAL	\$1,314,807	100.0%

SOURCE: SISD Technology Plan, 2007–10.

of the planned expenditures are for technology infrastructure including replacement of computers on a five-year cycle, replacement of obsolete equipment, purchase of smart boards, video projectors and other multi-media devices, and upgrading the district infrastructure. Approximately \$143,807 of the budget in this plan has been used to purchase security cameras. The Teaching and Learning component (9 percent) includes additional computers and infrastructure and the development of technology skill benchmarks for teachers. The Educator Preparation and Development component (4 percent) includes the creations of campus technology committees and a software review committee. The Leadership, Administration and Support component, which has no allocated funds, includes continued development of the district's web page and the use of the distance learning lab for community classes.

At the time of the site visit at the end of April 2008, the strategies for the creation of teacher technology standards, campus-based technology committees, and the software review committee had not begun. The Technology director cited the lack of appropriate staff as one reason for the lack of progress. Technology Department staff have technical backgrounds and are focused on

technical issues such as connectivity. There are no districtwide instructional technology staff.

Exhibit 4 summarizes the budgeted expenditures by type of expenditure and funding source. Approximately 42 percent of the funding for this multiple year plan is to be addressed by local or other resources. However, the district has not yet identified the resources needed to accomplish the objectives in the plan.

The superintendent confirmed that technology integration is a big priority for SISD and one that has strong board support. However, the district approach to technology has been a shotgun approach with no strategic planning process in place. For example, the district recently completed a new \$24 million high school with no capacity for wireless access. The district has purchased video presentation equipment but its use is limited in many classrooms to showing PowerPoint™ presentations on a blank wall. There is no requirement for teachers to use technology in their classrooms.

Principal and teacher focus group participants indicated that they were not aware of many of the newer technology innovations on the market and expressed a desire to learn more. Several participants in both focus groups indicated a preference to continue to use stationary labs with

EXHIBIT 4
SISD LONG RANGE TECHNOLOGY PLAN
PLANNED EXPENDITURES BY TYPE OF EXPENDITURE AND FUNDING SOURCE

TYPE OF EXPENDITURE	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	TOTAL	SOURCE OF FUNDING
Staff Development	\$20,807	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$60,807	Title IID Local Funds
Telecommunications	\$98,000	\$98,000	\$98,000	\$294,000	Local Funds
Materials and Supplies	\$253,000	\$253,000	\$253,000	\$759,000	State Allotment
Equipment	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$108,000	Local Funds
Maintenance	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$93,000	Local Funds
TOTAL	\$438,807	\$438,000	\$438,000	\$1,314,807	

SOURCE: SISD Technology Plan, 2007-10.

an assigned aide rather than the mobile labs using laptops. These participants felt that the stationary labs were more reliable because the laptop batteries would not hold a charge for extended use in the classes. The Director of Technology also stated that the mobile labs did not work very well due to inadequate batteries and the lack of electrical outlets in the classrooms.

When asked about the adequacy of district technology, student focus group participants, a group of technology knowledgeable high school students, cited the need for more current software and hardware and better prepared teachers. Books used in some of the basic computer classes such as keyboarding were first issued in 1989. Some courses, especially the agricultural classes, were up-to-date due to state grants. Basic computer classes and the computer labs used old equipment and older software.

Student expectations regarding technology rise as students become more proficient and aware users. The computers must be new enough and have enough capacity in terms of memory and speed to be able to run the latest educational software programs.

TEA has established targets for student technology access. The Texas Long Range Plan for Technology (2006-20) recommends a technology equipment target for a student-to-computer ratio of 1:1 by the year 2010, which is not addressed in SISD's latest Technology Plan. This target assumes that every student workstation will have immediate access to the internet and the best available technologies. SISD faces significant challenges as it needs both to expand technology across the district and also upgrade existing technology to meet this standard.

SISD should expand the current Technology Plan into a true strategic plan for technology integration for the district. The plan should address how to effectively integrate technology into the curriculum at every grade and in every classroom. The identification of needed teacher technology skills and capabilities should be established first by central instructional administrators as part of their curriculum planning efforts. The district and individual campus planning committees should identify strategies to achieve the needed skill levels in the annual district improvement plan (DIP) and individual campus improvement plans (CIPs).

The district's Technology Plan developed by the Technology Planning Committee and the Technology Department should support these strategies by identifying specific staff development opportunities, the funding needed to accomplish these strategies, and the technology infrastructure, including connectivity and equipment, necessary to support technology integration in the classroom.

The district's plan should address the state's long range technology objectives such as a student-to-computer ratio of 1:1. This strategic plan should be driven by instructional needs based on the technology needs identified by the superintendent and instructional administrators. The plan should identify all sources of funding, including funds in individual school budgets and any additional grant resources.

This Technology Plan should also include a fiscal spending component that is specific and identifies the costs needed to maintain current operation and costs needed to address new goals and objectives. **Exhibit 5** provides an example of how this information might be developed.

The development of a strategic plan will require outside assistance to facilitate the development of the plan based on a structured process that helps ensure that current technologies are considered for use in district classrooms through adoption in the Technology Plan. Participants in the teacher and principal focus groups indicated that they were not aware of current systems and technologies and that they wanted help in identifying them and determining if they were appropriate for SISD.

An instructional technology consultant could provide that needed knowledge and experience, helping SISD instructional staff to further educate themselves. The fiscal impact of this recommendation is a one-time cost of \$6,000 for

assistance to develop the plan and ongoing support to evaluate progress on an annual basis. The estimate assumes 60 hours of technical support to develop a structured software/hardware evaluation process and to support SISD staff in the initial evaluation and identification process. The estimate is \$100 per hour for a total initial cost of \$6,000 [60 hours x \$100 per hour = \$6,000] to establish the process.

The school review team estimates recurring costs for assistance on the evaluation of progress or updates as \$1,500 annually beginning in 2010–11. This estimate assumes 15 hours of technical assistance at \$100 per hour for the progress evaluation (15 hours x \$100/hour = \$1,500).

TECHNOLOGY STAFF DEVELOPMENT (REC. 2)

Build technology integration skills of teachers in the district through focused staff development opportunities and by adopting technology usage standards for teachers.

SISD lacks a comprehensive staff development program with specific standards and training requirements linked to personnel evaluation systems to ensure that instructional staff is proficient in the use of technology.

Goal 4, one of eight goals in the Sealy ISD Technology Plan 2007–10, addresses the issue of technology staff development and states that the district will “provide appropriate ongoing training and support for more effective use of technology within the district and community.” Technology staff development is further addressed in one objective and three strategies in the plan as shown in **Exhibit 6**. The total funding for this objective and related strategies for the three year period is \$18,000.

**EXHIBIT 5
SISD FISCAL SPENDING PLAN FOR TECHNOLOGY BUDGET
EXAMPLE**

L RTP CATEGORY: INFRASTRUCTURE FOR TECHNOLOGY	BUDGET AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE
Continuing Budget Items by Strategy		
Continue to provide LANs at every location connected by district Gigabit speed WAN.		
Leased Lines	\$XX,XXX	Current Technology Department Budget 80% E-Rate
Maintenance	\$X,XXX	Current Technology Department Budget
TOTAL	\$XX,XXX	
Expansion Budget Items by Strategy		
Upgrade infrastructure on the Selman Elementary campus.		
Equipment	\$XX,XXX	Additional Local Funding
Installation Cost (in-house)	\$X,XXX	Current Technology Department Budget
On-going maintenance	\$XXX	Current Technology Department Budget
TOTAL	\$XX,XXX	
Increase student/computer ratio to 1:1 by 2010.		
Equipment	\$X,XXX	Additional Local Funding
Installation Cost (by vendor)	\$X,XXX	Additional Local Funding
On-going maintenance	\$XXX	Current Technology Department Budget
TOTAL	\$XX,XXX	
Implement a wireless network on each campus.		
Software Purchase	\$XX,XXX	Additional Local Funding
Installation Cost (by vendor)	\$X,XXX	Additional Local Funding
On-going maintenance	\$XXX	Current Technology Department Budget
TOTAL	\$XX,XXX	
Summary by Funding Source		
Current Technology Department Budget–E-Rate	\$XX,XXX	
Current Technology Department Budget–Local Funds	\$XXX,XXX	
Additional Local Funding	\$XXX,XXX	
SUMMARY TOTAL	\$X,XXX,XXX	

SOURCE: LBB Review Team, June 2008

At the time of the site visit in April 2008, the district was aware of the need for additional staff development in technology but had not yet begun to implement strategies to address the need. Participants in a teacher focus group cited the lack of technology training in the district.

Central administrators also cited the need for more formalized staff development because SISD teachers were still focused on acquiring skills in basic software such as Work™, Excel™, and Powerpoint™. Principals identified the same need but felt that the state had to mandate the changes

EXHIBIT 6
SISD TECHNOLOGY PLAN
2007–10

OBJECTIVE/STRATEGY

Objective 4.1: Modify district training and support structure to meet benchmark requirements.

Strategy 4.1.1: Establish technology skill benchmarks (timeline: 2007–10).

Strategy 4.1.2: Conduct staff development based on survey results (timeline: 2008–10).

Strategy 4.1.3: Work with Technology Committee and the Texas STaR Chart to determine district needs (timeline: 2007).

SOURCE: Sealy ISD Technology Plan 2007–10.

by requiring an allocation of a percentage of technology resources to make it happen. They also stated that the best way to obtain tech integration is to hire teachers with knowledge and then let them share it.

Current training is limited to one hour of training on the grading/attendance software for new teachers during new teacher orientation and a one hour technology update for all teachers at the beginning of the school year during teacher in-service training.

The superintendent talked about a need for more staff development and fundamental training, and the Director of Technology cited the lack of established technology teaching standards or current requirements for teachers to use technology. Principals mentioned a need for more staff development, provided in smaller groups and campus-based. Teachers indicated that it is hard to get access to computer labs. Most labs are scheduled by the computer teachers.

SISD has identified the need for expanded staff development to accomplish its technology integration but has not assembled the necessary elements to actually make these goals and objectives a reality. Without the development of a written plan including all of the elements (standards, focused training, and evaluation) the district will not achieve its goal.

Without this element the district does not have a rigorous technology staff professional development program that establishes and incorporates technology proficiency standards into performance measurement and appraisal systems to ensure staff proficiency in technology.

The district's board policy DMA (Legal) states that staff development shall be primarily campus-based, related to achieving campus performance objectives and developed and approved by the campus-level committee. The policy further states that district-provided staff development must be conducted according to standards developed by the district and designed to improve education in the district. Technology training is one type of staff development identified in the policy.

Galena Park ISD (GPISD) developed a comprehensive technology training approach with defined proficiency requirements for all teachers, clerical staff, and administrators coupled with training in multiple formats and objective measurements. GPISD's Technology Proficiency Standards program has three levels of proficiency that are designed to build upon each other. The program has defined standards for new and returning teachers and staff, with specified completion dates for demonstrating the proficiency. GPISD measures each standard objectively through observation, testing, or submitting a project evaluated by a grading rubric.

GPISD's Technology Department offers training, but it is not mandatory if an employee can pass the proficiency test without it. The district also provides extensive training manuals online on its website.

SISD should establish a comprehensive staff development program to ensure all staff is proficient in technology. The district should form a committee consisting of the assistant superintendent, principals, the Director of Technology, and technology aware teachers. The committee should meet and develop recommended policies, proficiency standards, and evaluation measures for all teachers. In developing the standards, the committee should research models from other districts as well as identified best practices. The standards should define expected proficiency, including measures to objectively assess proficiency. The committee should also develop and specify a target timeline, such as two years, for staff to demonstrate the required proficiencies. All teachers should be included in the process regardless of experience.

In developing the program, the committee should also outline how it will link demonstrated proficiency to the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) for teachers and to the district's appraisal system for other staff. The committee should obtain technology proficiency standards and measures from other districts such as Galena Park and adapt them for SISD's use. The committee should submit the standards and measures to the superintendent for approval. After approval, the committee should develop training plans, schedules, and training formats to ensure all staff receives training within the target time period. It should consider multiple training in formats such as distance learning and online tutorials as

well as classroom training. As part of this step, the committee should research and obtain online copies of tutorials and training materials that have been developed by other districts.

STUDENT INTERNET ACCESS (REC.3)

Review district policy on student access to the internet to ensure adequate access for class assignments while preserving needed safeguards.

Student focus group participants indicated that district blocking software and district policies result in internet access that is too limited, interfering with the completion of class assignments. This limited access is particularly difficult for students that do not have access to the internet in their homes. Examples included the inability to access information on stem cell research and other controversial subjects even though these topics were assigned as research projects in class. Another example was the inability of students to download pictures due to filters to use in projects and class assignments.

Texas Education Code 32.201-202 requires a public school that provides a computer used for internet access to implement an internet safety policy. School districts typically choose to filter or block sites with subject areas that contain sexually explicit content, criminal skills, drugs, alcohol and tobacco, personal and dating websites, and violence or weapons.

It is important to keep these safeguards in place but also to allow students, especially older students, access to materials that are deemed appropriate for their age and the instructional curriculum.

The district should evaluate current policies and procedures regarding blocking of websites and limits on the downloading of images to ensure

that students are protected but also have adequate access for class assignments.

DISASTER PLANNING (REC. 4)

Develop a disaster recovery plan that includes planning for restoring critical services in case of a site disaster.

SISD lacks a comprehensive disaster recovery plan that would allow the district to maintain operations in the event of a catastrophe. Interviews with district administrators indicate there is no formal plan in place that would ensure the district could support the network and continue both its business and educational operations in the event of a significant site disaster such as a flood or fire.

The primary objective of a disaster recovery plan is to protect a school district if all, or part, of its operations and technology services become unusable. Planning minimizes the disruption of operations and ensures some level of organizational stability and an orderly recovery after a disaster.

The National Center for Education Statistics “Safeguarding Your Technology” states that essential elements in a formal disaster recovery plan include:

- Develop a complete list of critical activities performed within the district;
- Identify which systems and staff are necessary to perform the functions;
- List key personnel for each function, and their responsibilities;
- Create an inventory of all technology assets including hardware, software systems and data, documentation, and supplies that correctly identify the location and sufficient information to document loss for insurance recovery;

- Define actions to be taken when a pending disaster is projected;
- Identify actions taken to restore critical functions;
- Keep the plan simple but effective; and
- Keep the plan components in an accessible location that can be accessed in the event of an emergency.

SISD should develop a formal disaster recovery plan and include redundant backup of key systems for added security. The plan should contain the key elements to protect the district’s interest, including the following:

- Establish a disaster recovery planning committee including representatives from all functional areas of the district;
- Perform a risk analysis of possible disasters, including natural, technical, and human threats, and determine the potential consequences and effects associated with each scenario;
- Establish priorities for processing and operations, including key personnel, information processing systems, maintenance, documentation, vital records, and policies and procedures;
- Determine practical alternatives for processing in case of a disaster, including facilities, software, communications, data files, customer service, and user operations;
- Gather materials and documentation, including critical telephone numbers, hardware and software inventories, insurance policies, master call lists, master vendor lists, and data file backup and retention schedules;

- Organize and document a written plan providing detailed documentation and procedures, including methods to maintain and update the plan to reflect any significant internal, external, or systems changes;
 - Develop testing criteria and procedures to determine the accessibility of any off-site backup disaster recovery system, provide training to district staff, and demonstrate the district's ability to recover; and
 - Test the plan, including checklists, simulation tests, parallel tests, and full-interruption tests.
- Once developed, technology staff should annually review the plan to see that any changes in staff, activities, or systems are updated in the plan.

FISCAL IMPACT

RECOMMENDATION	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14	5–YEAR (COSTS) OR SAVINGS	ONE-TIME (COSTS) OR SAVINGS
1. Expand the Technology Plan into a true strategic plan for technology integration in the district.	\$0	(\$1,500)	(\$1,500)	(\$1,500)	(\$1,500)	(\$6,000)	(\$6,000)
2. Build technology integration skills of teachers in the district through focused staff development opportunities and by adopting technology usage standards for teachers.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Review district policy on student access to the internet to ensure adequate access for class assignments while preserving needed safeguards.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Develop a disaster recovery plan that includes planning for restoring critical services in case of a site disaster.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL REPORT	\$0	(\$1,500)	(\$1,500)	(\$1,500)	(\$1,500)	(\$6,000)	(\$6,000)