**Topic 1** - Artificial Intelligence

**Q1 - Regarding AI in K-12 education, has there been a major noticeable or unnoticeable difference thus far, operationally, educationally and/or administratively in your district?  If noticeable, what are they?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Count -  Yes: 5      No: 1What are those differences? It has helped streamline a lot of the admin activities. Used a lot for scheduling, has helped in developing and modifying school policies. Has helped a lot in teacher certification in finding and citing resources. |
| Table 2  | Count -  Yes:  5    No: 1What are those differences? Teachers streamlining processes, translation of documents, modifying Lexile level of reading assignments, data analysis by principals of staff performance.  |
| Table 3  | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0What are those differences? Teachers use this as a tool to help with lesson plans and different viewpoints on curriculum.  Administration is starting to use it in one district, helping to drive adoption by schools/teachers.  Teaching students how to responsibly use AI. |
| Table 4 | Count -  Yes:  4    No: 0What are those differences? Uptick in curiosity, teachers using for lesson plans, students using somewhat (positively and negatively). Admin using for emails, feedback, etc |
| Table 5 | Count -  Yes:3      No: 2What are those differences? Adults use it more than kids, generative AI still has a stigma of cheating.held back by web filtering, so much so that some districts don't limit the AI with web filtering at all. |
| Table 6 | Count -  Yes:  3    No: 3What are those differences? Teachers are on board. Using for lesson plans, especially for subs. Few negative issues - no requests to block. Pushing staff to ask the questions which show that the students have engaged the content. Staff asking questions about how to use. Admin using notebook LM. |
| Table 7 | Count -  Yes:   1   No: 6What are those differences? Opening up for kids next year, staff are using it but everyone is using it.  RUP needed! |
| Table 8 | Count -  Yes:   0   No: 4What are those differences? AI training for staff is happening gradually, with privacy concerns influencing the rollout. Student use is not officially in place. |
| Table 9 | Count -  Yes: 4     No: 3What are those differences? There has been no significant impact yet. It is present and being utilized to some extent—primarily for test creation in middle and high schools. Some elementary schools have adopted it, but implementation feels unstructured and inconsistent. There are no restrictions or limitations in place. While there is some use for lesson planning, it remains minimal. |
| Table 10 | Count -  Yes:  4    No: 1What are those differences? Noticeable uptick and interest in use from the adults to gain efficiencies in operations. |
| Table 11 | Count -  Yes:   2   No: 3What are those differences? AI in education is still in the learning phase, kind of like when Google first came out and students would copy and paste stuff. Over time, things will change, and some people will embrace it while others won't. Your superintendent wants to fully integrate AI into your organization's operations and systems. |
| Table 12 | Count -  Yes:  3    No: 4What are those differences? More of an “embrace, not block” attitude at the admin/teacher level as it can be really helpful. Still concerns with the student use due to AI applications that can scan/answer questions. Still concerns as well about staff and data integrity where data is entered into an AI tool, now who have I given that data to? |
| Table 13 | Count -  Yes: 1     No: 3What are those differences? Administrators are the ones using more than others, if at all.  Students aren’t at school but likely at home. Only one district opens AI tools for staff and “students”. The others have it open for staff only. |
| Table 14 | Count -  Yes:  6   No: 0What are those differences?Open for staff and not students. Understanding FERPA, research skills and critical thinking skills. Finding someone to train teachers. |
| Table 15 | Count -  Yes:   2   No: 3What are those differences?  Tried to embrace AI yet a fine line between security and being selective.  Board made a decision to allow certain sites.  DLCs have also been part of helping staff.  Open AI for teachers (don’t really block anything for teachers).  Guiding them toward Google Gemini.  Allowing students use AI inside of a program that would keep them in a safe environment.  Even a “no” district has opened AI but isn’t sure how it is being used in the classroom.  DLCs are more so at the front of AI use. |
| Table 16 | Count -  Yes: 6   No: 0What are those differences?   Training staff and showing best practice examples of how AI can be used for instruction.  Teachers seem to be using AI more than Admin staff, admin seem to not trust AI as much as instructional staff.  Educate all users (staff & students) how to use AI in an ethically manner.  |
| Table 17 | Count -  Yes: 4      No: 1What are those differences? More teacher adoption and positive use throughout the district. Teacher/admin cohort to adopt best practices for the district and how to embed in policy and provide guided direction. Teachers are becoming more aware of benefits of using AI. Most interest seems to be coming from admins.  |
| Table 18 | Count -  Yes: 4     No: 2What are those differences? As for teachers/admin: There is a mix of embracing AI - special education departments, CAO, and offering AI PD to strictly educating for stopping the use to prevent “cheating” or teachers are not using AI for educating students (even though they use it in personal life). As for students: they understand AI is now in so many applications, they are becoming comfortable.  |
| Table 19 | Count -  Yes:  5    No: 2What are those differences?  Students are driving the use.  Concern at first it was going to be ‘major’ but it hasn’t been as huge as first thought.  Getting baked into everything. |
| Table 20 | Count -  Yes: 2   No: 4What are those differences? Most noticeable use of AI comes from tools that have AI integrated, such as Canva, Grammarly. |
| Table 21 | Count -  Yes: 3    No: 2What are those differences?  Teachers' use of AI for instruction has grown.   |
| Table 22 | Count -  Yes:  1    No: 5What are those differences? Using to create IT scripts/tools; educators using to write content; Gemini for Education licenses; using Gemini in place of traditional web search; interested in Gemini for Teens as soon as teachers ready  |
| Table 23 | Count -  Yes: 6      No: 1What are those differences?  Yes, Gemini has recently been turned on for High School students.  Principals, and Operational office staff  have started to use it.  Some would rather use Chat GPT.  The biggest concern is they want that structure, but you cannot trust AI detectors.  Teachers are getting away from lazy work.  The anxiety has come down and the benefits are being seen. |

**Q2 - Do you know or anticipate any noticeable differences of AI, operationally, educationally and/or administratively in your district over the next 12-24 months? If yes, what are they?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: 1If yes, what are they?The efficiency of utilizing AI to input a couple ideas and having it output a whole email, or plan or policy that you can go back and edit and touch up. AI has also been a blessing for things like powershell coding or cmdlets to accomplish tasks. It has been nice to lean on AI for information to help prevent calls to 3rd party vendors and to help save money and time. |
| Table 2 | Count -  Yes:  5   No: 0If yes, what are they? Targeted instruction, tech support via Gemini, data dashboards in work room, use as a learning coach, will be much harder to distinguish how written products are produced,  |
| Table 3 | Count -  Yes:  7    No: 0If yes, what are they? Operationally, it will make things more efficient.  Most new purchases will include some level of AI, so being careful with AI policy to not restrict the district.  Training teachers to help kids with using AI responsibly  AI changes so frequently, 24 months is hard to forecast. |
| Table 4 | Count -  Yes: 4     No: 0If yes, what are they? It is going to be everywhere. More student usage in the future. Maybe a purchase licenses for products, Magic School, etc |
| Table 5 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: 0If yes, what are they? Juniper networking planning is in the works or being looked at by districts. Heard good things as its AI backed, changing the name of the game for Networking assistance |
| Table 6 | Count -  Yes:   6  No: 0If yes, what are they? Concern: What will legislature do? Will they tie the hand of districts? Need for AI use policy - student, staff, etc.. Pilot projects. |
| Table 7 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: If yes, what are they? Figuring out how to incorporate AI in instruction.  Should we limit to one AI platform? |
| Table 8 | Count -  Yes: 6      No: If yes, what are they? Updates to the KSBA and district AUP/RUP documents will help give staff safe access to selected AI tools. Students will still not be allowed yet.  |
| Table 9 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0If yes, what are they? Yes, AI is being used for teacher and instructional purposes, but policies need to be established first. There is a desire to expand AI usage among students, as it is currently utilized primarily by staff. While AI is accessible, students require proper training to use it effectively. There are concerns regarding copyright and plagiarism, and efforts are underway to involve administrators in developing strategic implementation plans. |
| Table 10 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: 1If yes, what are they? More guardrails around implementation by adults and strategies for classroom implementation.  |
| Table 11 | Count -  Yes: 4      No: 1If yes, what are they? AI can make bad teaching worse, and we're looking at tools that will use AI to monitor things. It might not be a huge change right away, but since the administrative side is still new to it, it could take longer to see the effects. I think AI will end up being part of more things. |
| Table 12 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0If yes, what are they? Definitely need to educate staff about the full power of AI. Text received JUST NOW where a principal linked ChatGPT to GDrive. Any problem, CIO? Further, how do you educate when it’s such a moving target? We want to encourage the freedom to explore and yet the consequences of certain actions could be severe. The “danger of free” with AI tools is real. |
| Table 13 | Count -  Yes:  4    No: 0If yes, what are they?  Some will hear of things here and return and want to implement.  Districts are building policies to address A.I…..as soon as those are in place, they anticipate more embracing.  Operationally, I see AI more in camera systems, etc for security and safety. “I see the BOE pushing it”.  For instruction: Notebook AI,  Canva AI, Magic School AI.  Even Google search has A.I. built in and our staff and students are using it without knowing it. |
| Table 14 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0If yes, what are they?Training on proper use. Revise Acceptable Use Policy.  |
| Table 15 | Count -  Yes:   5   No: 0If yes, what are they?  AI is going to continue to grow.  You cannot ignore it whether you like it or not.  People are going to use it within the bounds you provide for.  Challenge is getting District Leadership to buy into it so it makes it hard to care about it.  It was asked if districts are using surveys to send out to get feedback on the type of parameters to put around AI.  We haven’t talked about the student side that much, but the district is talking about using AI to help monitor the health of the district network.  CIO had educated district leadership so they had bought into it.  Staff who have been there for a while are not going to change versus young staff who are more open. |
| Table 16 | Count -  Yes: 6      No: If yes, what are they?  Instructionally many resources are using AI for accommodations.  Use AI to individualize instruction so all students can have their own learning profile so we can meet the needs of all students going forward.  Build an LIM to put students' characteristics in so we can build individualized instructions for all students.   |
| Table 17 | Count -  Yes: 5      No: 0If yes, what are they? We anticipate it to be used in the classroom more now that teachers and admin are becoming more comfortable. Using AI to write codes for cleaning up user databases. Integration of AI with daily student software programs with IXL, Renaissance etc. Use of AI by teachers for reporting, data dashboards, conference summaries. Our table anticipates usage to increase by teachers for productivity, and admins for efficiency.  |
| Table 18 | Count -  Yes:  5    No: 1If yes, what are they? We feel there will be guidance and policies to educate staff and students on how to use AI. In 24 months almost every student and staff will be using AI on the daily, the mindset from “how are kids going to cheat” will shift to “how can we use AI to make \_\_\_\_\_ better?” |
| Table 19 | Count -  Yes 7:      No: If yes, what are they?  Baking into new machines.  Going all in on Copilot.  Administrative mostly.  Starting to look at feeding district data into AI. |
| Table 20 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: 0If yes, what are they? Focus around educating responsible use, using statewide and district-wide best practices and group sessions to review as AI continues to develop. |
| Table 21 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: If yes, what are they?  Educationally, student usage will and is growing.  Establishing student usage policy |
| Table 22 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0If yes, what are they? Expect greater teacher use, will need to figure out how to support them; general admin efficiency usage |
| Table 23 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: If yes, what are they?  No plan on changing anything or buying anything specific. Starting to see the power of administrative and operational tasks.  |

**Q3 - ​While AI can greatly benefit education, what are your biggest concerns and apprehensions related to AI in education and beyond education that need boundaries?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | We need to make sure that it is a helping tool and not something that does all the work for them. Fear that AI will expose teachers that will not adopt new technologies, will continue to use old lesson plans and not be up to date. We have no control over the systems or what our users input into them. |
| Table 2 | Concerned about the loss of basic skills and critical thinking because of dependency on AI. |
| Table 3 | Concerned about changing assessment objectives, more of a demonstration of learning versus a multiple choice.  Dependence on the AI model, becoming their social connection to the outside world. |
| Table 4  | False/incorrect information, PII (where is it stored, where does it go?), teaching kids that it is part of a toolbox, it’s not the only thing. You can use it to help you write an essay, but you shouldn’t have it write the essay for you. It’s not a replacement for thinking, use to brainstorm, not to do the whole thing. It can reaffirm falsities, creating an echo chamber for the end user. Kids still need basic skills and the critical thinking skills to know if it’s accurate. |
| Table 5 | Understanding that AI is a tool, Worry about content being submitted (PPI), dont lose the Human element.. Future problem solving skills lacking. |
| Table 6 | Digital Citizenship - knowing the difference between what they need to know and what they can obtain via AI. Scope of open AIs may be too wide. Teaching how to use it appropriately. How to help students to distinguish between reliable info and gobbledygook. Preventing the release of data to LLMs that shouldn’t have that data. |
| Table 7 | Information integrity (PII, loss of critical thinking |
| Table 8 | Concerns about data privacy, academic integrity, and changing instructional practices exist, AI is here to stay. Educators must adapt by finding ways to use it effectively and responsibly to support both students and staff |
| Table 9 | Concerns include a lack of independent thinking, inconsistencies, and incorrect information. Paid versions of AI tools seem to offer better accuracy and reliability. Issues such as plagiarism and data privacy, particularly regarding personally identifiable information (PII), remain significant. However, AI presents a valuable opportunity to teach and integrate digital citizenship skills, promoting responsible and ethical use. |
| Table 10 | Having access to information and a thought partner to plan out self and school-related harm. Critical thinking skills for students (how do we teach students to think with AI, not let it think for them) |
| Table 11 | Teacher support and the ability to adapt needs to improve with new learning models. There's a concern about whether this is affecting the integrity of our diploma. Additionally, the data being shared and transmitted is a major worry. |
| Table 12 | It’s the balance between encouraging use and trying to learn with the dangers that can quickly appear. Oversharing data with free tools, students being TOO willing to share with AI tools, etc can lead to significant issues quickly. Difficult to document the benefits of the AI output while properly expressing the dangers of overreliance on AI. |
| Table 13 | Afraid kids aren’t going to learn anything.  It’s not that they’re not learning, they’re learning from a different method….i.e. They’re learning skills and not necessarily content.i.e. Writing skills?  Other fear is “accuracy” of A.I. content.  Can they (the students) discern good and bad content?  My biggest concern is we won’t do the right things to get the students there…i.e. Knowing how to use the tool effectively.  We need a structured approach…i.e. Teaching for grade level appropriate tools and application (aligning with instructional standards at grade levels) |
| Table 14 | Creativity and developing new ideas will diminish because it is so easy to engage AI to think for you. Mental health, PII, students oversharing, is AI going to take over? |
| Table 15 | Worried about security and user input.  Voice AI (mimicking someone’s voice) is a concern.  A lot of overhead about being on the watch especially in smaller districts – can become an operational concern.  With proper training it can be okay but without it there is the concern of what is being input into AI or what AI on its own does.  Concerns over privacy with AI in general such as when we start asking AI to analyze score data sets – we can create a bias because we will be treating AI as a “person” to analyze.   |
| Table 16 | Is AI cheating so thats a big question to be answered.  Are students learning the content or just asking AI and is that important for students to show their work going forward?  Will AI decrease higher level thinking for students or just use AI to create their thinking for them.  Ethical use for AI and how students use AI. |
| Table 17 | How do we use caution without being fear based? It'sAl important as CIOs to encourage the proper use of AI. Moral obligation to teach students how to use it effectively- as a lifelong tool. All of the information is already out there and just one google search away so we just need to be able to inform our staff and students on proper usage to improve efficiency while protecting their own information.  |
| Table 18 | Jobs. What is the future of employment going to look like and how are we educating students on how to use AI to be prepared for the future of employer demands.  |
| Table 19 | Chatbot and companions are a concern.  Hard to gauge the use and monitor.  Concern on making malicious things easy to do.  Don’t need any skills to create malicious info. |
| Table 20 | Conversations around the lack of education for the appropriate use of AI, could lead to legislation limiting the use, leading to the loss of beneficial AI tools. |
| Table 21 | Not knowing how to use it properly.  Educating students and staff to be skeptical of what AI gives you.   |
| Table 22 | Masking/replacing critical thinking/actual learning in education |
| Table 23 | Putting things into ChatGPT with no control over it or knowing whether it is getting sold. Having an AI relationship outside of actual human connection is a concern. Also concerned with Renewable Energy not being able to keep up.   |

**Q4 - ​Over the past 2 years, we have shared with districts and KDE organizations, guidance, policy recommendations, research, studies, legislative presentations, uses in the classroom, and skills required in the workforce. Is there anything else that has a sense of urgency, that is related to AI, that districts would like KDE or some other organization to help provide to districts?**

| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| --- | --- |
| Table 1 | Most feel like we have sufficient policies and information out there, but the technology and AI is constantly changing so it’s hard to make sure that our policies and information keep up with the constantly changing environment. Also making sure that people are required to review and look at the policies that exist out there. Maybe having a very generalized policy that exists that districts can pull down and tailor specifically to their environment. |
| Table 2 | Appreciate the resources that have been provided but hard to get to the message distributed to staff - i.e. training facilitated by KDE that is designed for teachers and digital learning coaches. |
| Table 3 | KDE-level AI resource hub, showing what policies and documents other districts have built.  Fostering a collaborative environment between districts.  Also, helping other groups in KDE to share the same info about AI chatbots in meetings. |
| Table 4  | Guidance on AI Policy for districts, do we add it to the AUP, if so is it a line item? A paragraph? Should we have an “opt out” form if parents don’t want their kids using it? |
| Table 5 | Just general guidance info, maybe even examples on how to handle and manage districts using/enabling AI.Phishing guidance for AI generated Spam |
| Table 6 | Not sure due to the speed of change in the field. List of vetted tools shown to not misuse data. AI detection tools. Acceptable use - the degree to which work must be original/unique. Improve pedagogy so that teachers know to ask the questions which force students to demonstrate their knowledge and learning. Responsible use and education.  |
| Table 7 | RUP (recommend or evaluate best AI tools) |
| Table 8 | Establishing clear **guidance** rather than strict policy to help educators integrate AI effectively and responsibly. The focus is on providing recommendations, aligning AI use with existing policies, and offering talking points to support informed decision-making while ensuring AI enhances teaching and learning. |
| Table 9 | The entire group agrees that a formal policy—not just guidelines or recommendations—is necessary. Clear guardrails should be established, though the level of detail required is still a question. The policy should integrate with digital citizenship education and introduce appropriate AI use to young students. Currently, AI is not included in the Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) or Responsible Use Policy (RUP). It is also important to determine if there are specific restrictions set by KDE. Additionally, mandatory AI training for teachers is needed to ensure responsible and effective implementation. |
| Table 10 | Guidance on how to create a local AI Policy (model policy from KSBA maybe). Model AUP/RUP. Guidance on key look-fors in privacy policies from AI tools. Access to exemplars from classroom use. |
| Table 11 | It's too early to pinpoint exactly what we need, given the vast potential. Just be there for us when we need support. Recognizing and supporting early adopters will be crucial for progress. Model policy would be welcome. |
| Table 12 | Educating directly with superintendents about any policies, guidance, regulations, etc that are out there now. Ensuring good guidance is incorporated into AUP/RUP for district use. Reinforce the need to run key AI purchases past IT leadership.  |
| Table 13 | Content filter needs A.I. tools embedded to assist staff.  Things are changing so fast, even the KDE Guidance document released last year is out of date.   |
| Table 14 | KDE provided Data Privacy Agreement template and updated KSBA board policy. |
| Table 15 | We don’t know what we don’t know yet.  Possibly need better restrictions and guidance on data privacy.  We can make them sign the PII agreements all day long but what guidelines and legislation can there be to provide more security for data.  How can we hold these companies accountable who are using our data?  Maybe some policies or guidelines around what type of data can be shared..  CIOs shared that when they “flipped” blanket approval and started requiring approval of using applications, they started getting a lot of pushback, so it is the same for AI.  The CIO’s job is the “Data Police”. |
| Table 16 | Would like to see AI products on KETS contracts.  Consistent training so all teachers are teaching with AI in an ethical manner.  Technology assessment that would measure how AI is being used in all Kentucky schools.  Add AI to technology standards.   |
| Table 17 | More guidance and training for HIPPA and FERPA laws. Have been asking KSBA for updated version of exemplar AUP including AI as well as cybersecurity insurance, and privacy policies. More guidance on requesting cybersecurity insurance policy from vendors.  |
| Table 18 | Technology policies across the board - AUP/RUP, AI policy, updated. The draft policy is not enough and could be argued either way. Min KY requirements of AI for apps/companies, not just blanket data sharing agreements from various companies. KY needs a baseline for companies districts work wtih that all parties agree to for data privacy. A “KETS vendor” list-ish list of approved/vetted AI vendors (Magic School, NotebookLM, etc.). Add AI training to the beginning of the year trainings (mandatory for all KY districts). |
| Table 19 | Acceptable/Responsible Use Policy from KSBA.  Continued info in Newsletters, so we don’t miss anything. |
| Table 20 | -State-level subject matter expert for AI to help answer district questions/best practices and research. In a capacity similar to Scott Kane assistance with ERATE. - Vetted list of acceptable AI tools. |
| Table 21 | Is there an official KDE stance AI?  Best practices?  If so, share with the Districts.  Guidance on referencing in the AUP?  Would like KDE to create and share a baseline policy with the Districts.   |
| Table 22 | Guidance on best use tailored to specific populations - general educators, board members, specific educator groups (e.g., Sp Ed); AUP/RUP starting language |
| Table 23 | Waiting on KSBA. Guidance documents are used. Concerns regarding not being able to turn AI off.   |

**Topic 2** - Additional Budget Request for KETS

**Q1 - Have you shared the financial impact with your Supt and CFO of shifting certain state service costs to the district where the district will pay 50-100% more for that same shared service?
 If yes, what was the reaction?
 If no, why not?**

| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| --- | --- |
| Table 1 | Count -  Yes:  5    No: If yes, reaction? They said, “Oh it’s fantastic, we love spending more money” - They can see the writing on the wall, and while they don’t like it, they understand what is happening and why.If no, why not?  |
| Table 2 | Count -  Yes:  2    No: 4If yes, reaction? Asked to cut tech budget, realized not possible.If no, why not? Not aware |
| Table 3 | Count -  Yes: 5     No:  2 (talked with CFO, not Supt)If yes, reaction? Mixed - technology has a budget, need to work within it.  Others know they will need to make hard choices, but haven’t made it to that point yet.  OLR, Active Directory, AV Software, etc…If no, why not? Starting the discussion with CFO, but have not had the conversation with the supt yet. |
| Table 4 | Count -  Yes: 4     No: If yes, reaction? “It is what it is”-we will fund it for as long as we can internally, and then it might have to go (OLR, etc)If no, why not?  |
| Table 5 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: If yes, reaction? A Lot of “deer in the headlight” looks. Keep with realistic numbers, especially for device refreshes. Districts are falling back onto Windows Defender on A5 licensing for AV replacements.These conversations happen in real time for most decisions, not a ton of planning, especially for fund mapping.If no, why not?  |
| Table 6 | Count -  Yes:  7    No: 1If yes, reaction? Concern; Preparations are under way to adjust; Robbing peter to pay paul. State tax exemptions are problematic. Required annual subscriptions - especially during and after covid - are taking up KETS $. If no, why not?  |
| Table 7 | Count -  Yes:   7   No: If yes, reaction? Weren’t always aware of state funded stuff and now having the conversation on how to deal with the changesIf no, why not?  |
| Table 8 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: If yes, reaction? General fund is the main funding source, and KETS is for funding gap projects.  KETS is for secondary projects. Supt. focus is to get money into SEEK to pay for raises…edtech is not top priority at the moment.If no, why not?  |
| Table 9 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0If yes, reaction? Wanted to know why and how much. If no, why not?  |
| Table 10 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: 0If yes, reaction? Some reactions indicate they have other budget concerns that take priority (SEEK). Revisiting services and infrastructure in the district to see if we can save money or repurpose.If no, why not?  |
| Table 11 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: 0If yes, reaction? We have som many new people in central office, they aren’t aware of that implication. We can’t change our operations because of the loss of money. It will definitely have an effect when they get the bill. Could we get a list of all the stuff it would have bigger impact.If no, why not? N/A |
| Table 12 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 1If yes, reaction? There’s concern of course. Leaders want to know specifically what that means for them in terms of cost, what’s the timeline, any changes to existing support, etc. These are difficult for CIOs to answer as IT leaders don’t have these specifics.If no, why not? Our one ‘no’ was from a CIO not involved in the district budgeting process at all. |
| Table 13 | Count -  Yes: 3     No: 1If yes, reaction?  Haven’t given all specifics but have informed them costs may be coming.If no, why not? Wasn’t aware of specifics |
| Table 14 | Count -  Yes:  2    No: 4If yes, reaction? We’ll figure it out. If no, why not?  Didn’t know the shared services to share. Not knowing concrete numbers. |
| Table 15 | Count -  Yes:  5    No: 1If yes, reaction?  Leadership is saying, “Same thing but a different category”.  It’s happening across the board.  “That’s what always happens”.  “We have to have it so we will make it work.”If no, why not?   *The one “no” is because their counterpart does the finance portion of technology discussions with their district leadership.* |
| Table 16 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: If yes, reaction? Falling on deaf ears.  Leadership is waiting it out to see if technology can find a way through grants etc.If no, why not?  |
| Table 17 | Count -  Yes:  4    No: 1If yes, reaction? Hasn’t this been said before? More of a reality now. No alarm- used to the panic of not having enough funds. Superintendent supportive of reality that the district is going to pick up the bill. Some districts are opposite and district budgets for tech are being cut already. If no, why not?  |
| Table 18 | Count -  Yes:  2    No: 4If yes, reaction? Understanding the increase of cost for everything from devices to services. If no, why not? It is difficult to advocate for funding when it can directly be a cut for a classroom teacher, everything is getting cut and budgets are hurting across the board.  |
| Table 19 | Count -  Yes:  7    No: If yes, reaction? They understand, but they have to balance priorities.  SEEK shortfall is much bigger than KETS cuts.  KETS $ currently goes to refreshes, so not as huge as other things like SEEKIf no, why not?  |
| Table 20 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: If yes, reaction?* Responses from Supt and CFOs are aware and see it coming. CIO’s prepared documents to show the cost impact when presenting the information.

If no, why not?  |
| Table 21 | Count -  Yes:   3  No: 3If yes, reaction?  Supt to talk to other Supts.  The service can not go ahead and we will lose operational funds.to cover the cost.If no, why not? IC registration will return to in person/manual process. |
| Table 22 | Count -  Yes:    3  No: 3If yes, reaction?  They don’t have the money eitherIf no, why not? Feel they have internal plans/solutions to address |
| Table 23 | Count -  Yes: 6   No: 1If yes, reaction?  When it comes to money, it is not cheap.  Packets are used.  If no, why not?  Supt |

**Q2 - What is your known or gut feeling of your district’s Supt and CFO being very supportive of the KETS ABR in relationship to SEEK?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Feel like some supers will like to have that money in SEEK as it can be used for other things outside of KETS. Will be issues having enough devices for student testing at end of year. Its about making sure Super is on the same page with tech folks, and making sure district priorities align with technology needs. |
| Table 2 | Some will but others feel like supers are detached from the importance of tech except when it doesn’t work. ESSER funds masked the need. |
| Table 3 | Feel that the supt would rather have it attached to SEEK, to have ultimate flexibility in how to spend those funds. |
| Table 4 | No urgency to advocate, maybe when the cuts happen, they will, but not now. They always prefer it in SEEK. They seem to expect KDE/OET to be the advocates for this. |
| Table 5 | No urgency to seek funding, due to a lack of representation for the Public Education sector. Spend more time linking up needs with real dollars and relate it back to performance based funding, aka new devices needed for better education, which translates to better test scores. |
| Table 6 | Some Supts prefer SEEK (flexibility, freedom covering other costs). Others see value in KETS with the match process. Losing match will just end up reducing total funds. Need to continue to push the message to district leadership the value of KETS. |
| Table 7 | SEEK provides more flexibility so that’s the path forward, but they need a clear understanding of the impact of losing KETS funding |
| Table 8 | Any unrestricted funds are what Supt. and CFOs will always advocate for. Supt. want to find money to pay for people first (after the COVID hiring frenzy) and “things” like EdTech second. |
| Table 9 | When choosing to support KETS and SEEK, district admins will always look to fund and support SEEK funding. SEEK funds generally never support or replace missing KETS funding. |
| Table 10 | Support is low in advocating for KETS ABR compared to what seems like bigger priorities in SEEK and raising the local effort. (a specific ask for more solid numbers on the impact of shared service costs being shifted to districts) |
| Table 11 | Feel that talking to the school board president might be more effective. While the Superintendent supports technology, they prefer to allocate funds for teachers or in the least restrictive fund instead of technology. However, once they see the bill or the financial impact, it might change their perspective. |
| Table 12 | That’s a hard sell. If you frame it as “SEEK or KETS”, superintendents will say “SEEK” every time. It could be that a lack of ‘support’ could be related to not truly ‘seeing’ the damage that might have resulted from these funding cuts. Leaders still see devices, technicians, and technology all around. SEEK is seen as funding that’s at superintendents’ discretion versus KETS or anything else that might be viewed as funding at someone else’s discretion. |
| Table 13 | My Super will always say SEEK over KETS. Our bargaining power as a small district compared to a large district or statewide isn’t the same. Can KDE broker costs for us on these items being shifted to us?  |
| Table 14 | Superintendents will want it in SEEK unless KDE can show what district is going to have to take on in costs.  |
| Table 15 | Our Superintendent is going to say, “I want it in SEEK.”  District is always going to SEEK because we want the flexibility of where to spend the money.  One suggestion is the question about where the KETS Funds are going toward for things other than KETS Offers – this much is spent on A/V, this much on staffing, etc..  Otherwise it is hard to draw a comparison of what the need is for.  Superintendent is going to focus on what it does for students.  Just going to your Superintendent to say that “Hey, KETS needs more money” without the examples of where portions of KETS funding goes to pay for, does little.  Even though we have the list of shared services at the bottom of the “one pager”, the table would like to see the dollars associated with each and what it would be predicted with every district having to take over paying for them. |
| Table 16 | Districts feel like they have a seat at the table and the admin is supportive  and always match the offer of assistance.   |
| Table 17 | Superintendents will choose SEEK funding because it is more universal and Supt. don’t have control over KETS dollars. Superintendents don’t understand KETS enough to choose KETS dollars.  |
| Table 18 | Supers are not aware of the need for KETS ABR because SEEK can be use for it (if they see there is a need). The table feels there should be a KDE effort to show the annual cost of shared services if paying as a state vs paying as a single average district. |
| Table 19 | At a point now they see SEEK as more flexible.  KETS is being left behind as they don’t completely know all it’s used for |
| Table 20 | If most Supt were unaware of the impact as they take a holistic look at funding district wide and controlling that funding at district level. CIO’s do they’re very best to educate the Supts to the cost impact. |
| Table 21 | The KETS money the Supts don’t see it.  The Supts don’t know what all the money goes towards and SEEK money can go to more things whereas the KETS money has specific things it goes toward.   |
| Table 22 | 4:2 for SEEK vs KETS; but in at least a couple of districts supers are good about allocating general fund $s to EdTech |
| Table 23 | Need to have the funds to back it.  They really can’t force you to buy something. Battling budget cuts and not getting what is needed to buy Chromebooks is a concern.  Decisions made before the July 1 budget. |

**Q3 - What are your suggestions as it relates to lobbying the legislature for the KETS ABR given KDE is not permitted to hire lobbyists and districts can’t afford them?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Drop it in AI and let AI figure the best way. Seems like when supers do get facetime with folks in legislature they tend to spend 100% of their time lobbying for SEEK, and not bringing up KETS.  |
| Table 2 | When legislatures visit the district talk about tech needs, partner with community stakeholders to get them to lobby. CIO working together to lobby. Is KEA aware of the need? |
| Table 3 | Face to face meetings between Supt and legislators (not just their own legislator), and also getting behind a KySTE/3rd party lobbyist (maybe Co-ops). |
| Table 4 | State reps in person, gather school districts they cover, and present our case to them. Almost like a Town Hall, maybe Vendors there too? |
| Table 5 | Look for partners that can utilize lobbyist that are not attached to the department. There will need to be major changes in the political field for “public education” advocates. |
| Table 6 | Supts need to have direct conversations. Letters from and engagement with students. “Legislative breakfast.” Hosting town halls. Need to make it more clear the impact of lost funding - “upset the apple cart” to make clear the impact of funding losses. Strategically allow the “hard decisions” to have the negative impact, stop doing more with less.  |
| Table 7 | Get info to teachers and parents so they can help as well with Legislators |
| Table 8 | Outside of unionizing and having strikes… we could turn off the internet (joking…but how can we remind people of all the services we are providing). Investigate: can we establish a PAC? One of the most powerful things we can do is to call the 800 number at LRC with specific talking points. Don’t just call your legislator…call all of them. Target the right committee chair -- but do it away from school and school resources. |
| Table 9 | KySTE backed lobbyists. Invite lawmakers into schools.  |
| Table 10 | What about working with Coops to pool resources from districts for some collective lobbying impact? |
| Table 11 | We could consider having STLP at the capitol. The organizations KDE has MOUs/MOAs with have lobbyists, so why not ask them to promote our agenda too? School districts can send representatives on their behalf, and personal relationships can be beneficial. Should we invite them to KYSTE or STLP? Additionally, why couldn't Co-ops hire lobbyists? |
| Table 12 | Not a lobbying thing, but having the verbiage to accompany the request to “contact your legislator” would be helpful. Much like an ad that tells someone to call their legislator and say XYZ, having the exact same message received by legislators from multiple sources might be beneficial.  |
| Table 13 | What’s the relationship between OET and the K Groups? Do we talk with them?  Are they given this info?   |
| Table 14 | Talking points from OET to provide to Superintendents so Superintendents can talk to legislators with specific details. Can CoOps help?  |
| Table 15 | Approach vendors and have them lobby for us.  If the vendors know that the money will not be there, then they will be affected.  The challenge can be that the vendor knows that the district will then have to bear more of the cost so it really doesn’t incentivize the vendor to lobby – the vendor is still going to get their money no matter what.  The climate for public education in Kentucky right now is so “tenuous” that it may not matter because the Legislature may not pay attention. |
| Table 16 | We need to aggravate the paint off the wall of legislators.  Got to be factual and communicate the needs of local school districts.  Have to be a united message to all legislators.  Must have people that are knowledgeable that is carrying your message to the legislators  |
| Table 17 | Superintendents need to be made aware of the importance of KETS- they are already focused on SEEK funding and don’t see significance in fighting for KETS. Possibility of integrating KETS funding into SEEK funding. Why can’t KDE hire lobbyists? If KDE isn’t permitted to hire them but districts can- could KDE somehow funnel funding to districts? Designate a district person to be a lobbyist?  |
| Table 18 | Encourage KETS vendors to lobby for KETS and KDE (show them how much $ they make from KY schools). Educating Supers and CFOs on how the $ spend by KETS is saving districts money acrosst the state - power in shared services as compared to individual costs. (Would it be possible to shift costs from IC to Teaching & Learning, MUNIS to CFO?)   |
| Table 19 | Superintendents need to get involved, not just a technology thing.  Could coops hire lobbyists? |
| Table 20 | Superintendent education and involvement to help raise awareness of the need. |
| Table 21 | Go to Frankfort by Region to speak to the Legislator.  Can we leverage the Coops? |
| Table 22 | Encourage citizens/community members to contact legislators; ask Co-Ops to support; degradation of services may be necessary to get attention |
| Table 23 | Change the law so that anyone can use lobbyists. Let Board members know this is an issue and have them bring it to the attention of Supt.’s. |

Topic 3 - Maximizing Cybersecurity Opportunities in K-12 Districts

**Ranking #1 - Please rank the following cybersecurity options and settings that you’d like to see become part of the statewide security baseline.  Keep in mind that funding is a challenge for new and even continuation of some current services. By and large, these are SETTINGS and not ACTIONS. An ACTION would be like training users about phishing while a SETTING is more like turning on email caution banners. While Training is an ACTION, it’s important enough to add to this list.**

**RANKING GROUP 1**

1. Ongoing end-user security awareness and training (will need team to develop/find and approve)
2. Deploy Microsoft’s Local Administrator Password Solution (LAPS) even if Local Admin Permissions are removed
3. Remove/reduce Local Admin Permissions from as many Windows device users as possible. Could also separate the regular user account from Local Admin Account on device.
4. Student Password Strengthening (no more patterns/use of SSID/etc.)
5. Geo-block all authentication to KETS cloud accounts from outside the USA
6. Implement Rapid Identity’s PhishID

**Responses:**



**Ranking #2 - Please rank the following cybersecurity options and settings that you’d like to see become part of the statewide security baseline.**

**RANKING GROUP 2**

1. Implement Caution Banners for email (from unknown/untrusted senders AND could include certain common phisher keywords like “kindly,” “invoice,” or “action”)
2. Disable SMTP Authentication for email (Complete for Google Workspace districts already)
3. Add Suspicious Inbox Manipulation rule in Defender
4. Restrict student email inbound/outbound to specific domains or lists
5. Finalize DMARC/DKIM settings

**Responses:**



**Q3a - Cybersecurity is demanding more and more attention. Let’s discuss one way KDE might be able to help.**

1. **Why are you not able to keep up?  (recent feedback from districts frequently states that districts struggle with keeping up with Cybersecurity)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Just have so many other things going on it’s hard to stay focused on cybersecurity. Finding the appropriate time to least impact teaching, but to make sure all staff is available. Had a hard time finding a baseline for all security measures that exist, and for what options that were available and out there. Having best practices sessions from each of our vendors would be extremely helpful. |
| Table 2 | It’s everyone’s responsibility, including the end users, it’s difficult to focus on. Would be helpful to have a person with security has their primary function but budget prevents.  |
| Table 3 | Time.  KDE resources to help deep dive into incident response.  So many other things happening in the district, it is hard to be proactive.  KDE resources to help with tenant administration/settings (security). |
| Table 4 | Small staff (“one man show” for many), it’s unclear exactly what the process is to decide what you need. End users aren’t as concerned with phishing as we are. Also money, if we had more, we could possibly implement a solution. |
| Table 5 | Money is a big issue, because it pays for staff to be dedicated to Cyber Security. Not enough on the Leadership side of the house, seen as not important enough to pick up the tab of remaining costs after funds dry up. Even with dedicated staff, you can't retain staffers who make more money somewhere else. Still cant be competitive with other cyber security jobs. |
| Table 6 | Lack of staff; need for monitored and actionable protections for cybersecurity insurance; learning and training needed for personnel to operate CS tools; Affording the most effective tools;  |
| Table 7 | Everyone is overwhelmed and so they need step by step links for daily stuff and solving issues, especially for new CIO/DTC who aren’t familiar with security baseline |
| Table 8 | Specific detailed, small, manageable chunks of info/help. Maybe even if it came out once a month with the cyber security task of the month.KDEsk needs to be prepared to give specific and detailed info (which is tough since divestiture). We can’t hire additional cybersecurity help. |
| Table 9 | KDE conducted pulse checks for each district, offering baseline recommendations. A monthly KDE health scan is performed for each district. However, limited funding and time constraints have hindered the ability to prioritize additional cybersecurity efforts. |
| Table 10 | Information seems scattered among documents and locations. Can it be consolidated? Small district edtech leaders wear all the hats for technology plus other duties. Shared Chief Security Officer to consult with more frequently, maybe regionally like the field staff model. |
| Table 11 | Strict policies can make things less convenient, but hopefully, CUES will help. There are too many tasks to focus on properly. A recent cyber attack has made people prioritize this issue. |
| Table 12 | For one CIO, it’s the 4 classes that they still have to teach. Because of so much going on with the daily work, anything cybersecurity related and important needs to be concise and specific as to the actions to take. “Quick best practice” was a phrase used. Districts don’t really have the ability to dedicate a staff member to this, so any resources at the state level that could help “boil the ocean” to help the larger group would be nice.  |
| Table 13 | Learning who (other districts) have done what and what were the benefits would be helpful in focusing our efforts. (i.e. best practices from other districts who are successful). Not sure how to read the reports (CISSA).  Haven’t done anything extra beyond the free stuff.   |
| Table 14 | We are wearing too many hats and not enough people. |
| Table 15 | Too many other things to do.  It changes everyday and cannot keep up.  It isn’t just a K-12 issue….this is even happening in other industries.  While we would love more staff who could focus on that, it isn’t financially doable.  Is there a way or more services that could be bought that could bridge the gap of not having the staff needed.  Could there be some information shared out to district leadership other than by the technical staff that help explain this is a business continuity issue….a business problem. |
| Table 16 | KETS could setup SOC service for school districts.  Have an automated system/service that helps manage cybersecurity.  Continued support and work with USAC to expand the cybersecurity grant.    |
| Table 17 | A whole other lane of attention required in addition to all the other things we are dealing with. No one person on team can dedicate themselves to staying up to date with cybersecurity. Cybersecurity threats are constantly evolving and it is just so hard to keep up with all the new and sophisticated threats.  |
| Table 18 | Time is spent being reactive to situations, not enough time to be proactive. If we had a checklist to stay organized and also have KDE to help lift some of the items that are baseline requirements. Tracking of what districts have in place would assist in transitions of changes of leadership. Suggestion - to have additional people at the state level to help in a various of specific tools - Google, Microsoft, etc.  |
| Table 19 | Comes down to having time.  More construction projects are taking priority.  Need a dedicated security person |
| Table 20 | Other support priorities tend to interfere with preventative measures, which leads back to human capital and funding.  KDE conversations with security vendors to discuss pricing to assist districts.  |
| Table 21 | Too much coming at us at once.  We need a One Stop shop to know the cybersecurity threats at a glance.   (i.e. dashboard).  A Bob Barkout every morning or some other cadence on what is trending?  Are there any baseline tools KDE can roll out? |
| Table 22 | Unclear what’s most important; lack of detailed instructions; busy with daily break/fix |
| Table 23 | Very time consuming.  Too much going. Cybersecurity is constantly evolving and a full time job. Drowning with so much going on and everyone expects CIO’s to be the expert on absolutely EVERYTHING! |

**Q3b - Cybersecurity is demanding more and more attention. Let’s discuss one way KDE might be able to help.**

1. **Do you want KDE to do a bid for a service that districts use their local funds to obtain to help you keep up and be more proactive with Cybersecurity? Think: Security monitoring, threat detection and response; essentially Security Operations Center as a Service (SOCaaS) Yes/No**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: If it’s a requirement.. Or if we can get bulk pricing discounts yes. |
| Table 2 | Count -  Yes:  6    No:  like the services that KDE is currently providing |
| Table 3 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: 0 (doesn’t hurt to bid, no commitment to purchase though) |
| Table 4 | Count -  Yes:   5   No: 0 Could this possibly lower Cyber Security Insurance premiums? |
| Table 5 | Count -  Yes:5      No: Would like to have a suggested service from KDE, maybe even a dedicated partner, but having that would allow for better leverage for funding  at the local level. |
| Table 6 | Count -  Yes:  8   No: 0  Would be helpful just to have some that have been vetted.   |
| Table 7 | Count -  Yes:    7  No:  |
| Table 8 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: Would love to have access to cybersecurity help, even if it's in an Insurance model (pay premium locally when needed) or a retainer for emergency help. Would love a menu with associated expense for different cybersecurity exercises… so we can budget and plan. |
| Table 9 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0 |
| Table 10 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0 |
| Table 11 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0 |
| Table 12 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0 Can’t guarantee we would be able to purchase, but no way to know without a bid.  |
| Table 13 | Count -  Yes: 4     No: 0  - Nice to have the option but all four said they wouldn’t likely use it because their biggest issue isn’t “hacking” but people clicking on a link.  Would this service even impact that? |
| Table 14 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: 0 Very interested in a KDE vetted option.  |
| Table 15 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0 |
| Table 16 | Count -  Yes: 7     No:  |
| Table 17 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: 0 It would be great to have an option that is state approved.  |
| Table 18 | Count -  Yes:  6   No: 0 |
| Table 19 | Count -  Yes: 6     No: 0  As long as it not mandated and is a suggested opportunity. |
| Table 20 | Count -  Yes: 6     No:  |
| Table 21 | Count -  Yes:  6    No:  |
| Table 22 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0 |
| Table 23 | Count -  Yes :7      No: 0 |

**Q3c - Cybersecurity is demanding more and more attention. Let’s discuss one way KDE might be able to help.**

1. Would you ACTUALLY pursue this AND do you have funding?  (Partner with a service provider) **Yes/No**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table # | The ONE Big Idea |
| Table 1 | Count -  Yes: 6:      No:  Yes - assuming a feasible and bulk discounted price, hard to say without an idea of price, or services offered. |
| Table 2 | Count -  Yes:      No: 6 Feel like moving to Google would increase security |
| Table 3 | Count -  Yes: 1     No: 4  (the no was completely depending on the pricing) |
| Table 4 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: 0 (assuming of course that it was feasible to fund) |
| Table 5 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: Districts would do what they could in their own budget to fill in the needs for the cyber security budget |
| Table 6 | Pursue: Count -  Yes:  8    No:  0  Would be easier to obtain funding when seeking services from a group of vetted options. Finding legitimate, reliable providers is a challenge.        |
| Table 7 | Count -  Yes:   7   No:   depends on cost |
| Table 8 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: Easy table wide YES! Having KDE do the legwork would be vital to success. Don’t have funding right now, but this lets me have a detailed convo w/ Supt. |
| Table 9 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0 Yes, depending on the cost—interested but uncertain about the amount or the appropriate funding source. |
| Table 10 | Count -  Yes:  6   No:  |
| Table 11 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0– Would it be Erate eligible at some point? Pursue? Yes…but getting across the goal line is unknown. |
| Table 12 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0 “Pursue” would be a yes, but there is so much funding uncertainty and without knowing our own budgets nor what this would cost, we certainly couldn’t commit to anything. |
| Table 13 | Count -  Yes:  0    No: 4 - Just don’t see need to leverage (need more detail on what those services actually entail) |
| Table 14 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0Would pursue if the price was right.  |
| Table 15 | Count -  Yes:  6    No:  A comment was made that having the contract in place, AND seeing that other districts are leveraging it can help advocate for it in my own district.  We would be able to search for the funding with the state contract helping show that it is a knowledbable company familiar with KETS environment. |
| Table 16 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: Depends on the cost of the product and available funding |
| Table 17 | Count -  Yes: 5     No: 0- All would pursue but it would depend on the cost as to whether they could afford it. Superintendents respond to data- once they can see the actual threat numbers for their district. |
| Table 18 | Count -  Yes:  6    No: 0 - All want and “could” find funding if KDE made this a baseline requirement.  |
| Table 19 | Count -  Yes:   6   No: But we don’t know about the money as we don’t know how much it would cost  |
| Table 20 | Count -  Yes:  6    No:  - WIth consideration of cost and services provided, and assistance for grant writing.. |
| Table 21 | Count -  Yes:  6  No:  2nd part; depends on the cost as to whether we have the funds for it. |
| Table 22 | Count -  Yes: 6    No: 0 |
| Table 23 | Count -  Yes: 7     No: 0Right now yes, but that may change within a year or two from now.  Question is, “Will it decrease liability with Cyber insurance?” |