

## **EdTech Leadership Group Meeting Minutes – 15<sup>th</sup> July 2019**

### **Attendees:**

- Lord Holmes of Richmond MBE, Chair (CH)
- Caroline Wright, Deputy Chair and Director General of the British Suppliers Association (BESA) (CW)
- Dominic Norrish, Group Technology Director at United Learning (DN)
- Lauren Thorpe, Head of Data & Systems Strategy at Ark (LT)
- Cat Scutt, Director of Education & Research at the Chartered College of Teaching (CS)
- Eddie Playfair attending on behalf of David Corke, Director of Education and Skills Policy at the Association of Colleges (EP)
- Duncan Baldwin, Deputy Director of Policy at the Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) (DB)
- Norbert Pachler, attending on behalf of Becky Francis, Director of the UCL-Institute of Education (NP)
- Stephen Fraser, Deputy Chief Executive at the Education Endowment Foundation (SF)
- Tom Parsons, attending on behalf of Matthew Hood, Chief Education Officer at the Ambition Institute (TP)
- James Bowen, Director of NAHT Edge at the National Association of Head Teachers (JB)
- Ian Philips, Director of Computing and ICT at Haberdasher's Aske's Boys' School and Chair Independent Schools Council's Digital Strategy (IP)
- Deborah Millar, attending on behalf of Debra Gray, Principal and Deputy CEO at Grimsby Institute of Further & Higher Education (DM)
- Nic Newman, Partner at Emerge Education (NN)
- Chris Rothwell, UK Director of Education at Microsoft (CR)
- Chris McFall, National Education Development Manager at Apple Education (CM)
- Dean Stokes, EMEA Education Adoption Lead at Google Education (DS)
- Ty Goddard, Co-Founder of the Education Foundation and Chair of EdTech UK (TG)
- Paul Feldman, Chief Executive at Jisc (PF)
- Joysy John, Director of Education at Nesta (JJ)
- Ken Wharley, Amazon Web Services (KW)
- Michael Forshaw, Founder of EdTech Impact and Innovate My School (MF)
- **EdTech Team [Amended]**
- Nancy Wilkinson, Nesta (NW)
- Amy Cochrane, Senior Parliamentary Adviser, Office of The Lord Holmes of Richmond MBE (AC)

### **Apologies:**

- Hamid Patel, Chief Executive, Star Academies
- Matthew Purves, Deputy Director for Schools at Ofsted

- Peter Twining, Professor of Education (Futures) at the Open University
- Rose Luckin, Director of UCL Educate
- Mark Lehain, Director at Parent and Teachers for Excellence
- Scott Baker, Headteacher, London Academy of Excellence

## 1. Welcome and introductions

CH thanked everyone for joining and for their input at the first meeting and led a round of introductions.

## 2. Reflections from the Chair and Deputy Chair following the first meeting

CH reflected on key messages and themes that were highlighted in the first meeting, including, ensuring there is a focus on accessibility and inclusion and a broad and diverse range of educators' perspectives are factored in. CH asked the ELG to ensure these themes are built into all their work and explained how an Educator Network (to be set up by DfE) and also the existing Assistive Technology sub-group will help facilitate these goals.

## 3. Update from the DfE on the breadth of work across the EdTech programme &

## 4. Presentation from NESTA on Innovation Funds and Testbeds

EdTech Team **[Amended]** provided an overview of DfE's EdTech programme and the partnership with Nesta. EdTech Team **[Amended]** provided more detail on the 10 EdTech challenges and how the innovation competitions, testbeds and demonstrator programme will support them. (See *Paper 2 – EdTech delivery programme overview* for more detail)

Nesta Official **[Amended]** covered Nesta's role and programmes in more detail. In particular, Nesta Official **[Amended]** explained the goals and timescales of the innovation competitions and testbeds, whilst describing how they will work. (See *Paper 2 – EdTech delivery programme overview* for more detail)

The ELG were then invited to question or comment on the programmes. Questions and issues raised included:

- **■ asked about the number of testbed schools and colleges.** Nesta Official **[Amended]** explained how various factors will affect the number of testbeds chosen, so it was too early to tell. The programme, however, is likely to start small and then expand.
- **■ asked whether a school or college could be both a testbed and a demonstrator.** EdTech Team **[Amended]** explained that it might be possible although the precise criteria haven't yet been set for either programme.
- **■ asked about the risk that the programme will embed free tech in a school which they may become reliant on and may subsequently struggle to fund.** Nesta Official **[Amended]** explained how part of the match-making process would help the schools to make sensible decisions and that ultimately the schools will have full choice over what they test.

- **■ asked about the relationship between the testbeds and the specific EdTech challenges.** EdTech Team [Amended] responded by saying that the testbed programme will be upfront about testing products that are designed to meet the EdTech challenges.
- **■ asked whether the experience of learners had been considered, especially the impact on learners and teachers with SEND.** EdTech Team [Amended] responded by saying that part of the test bed programme will be establishing how best to evaluate each product in line with each challenge, including considering the impact on all users.
- **■ asked what was being done to ensure it includes a wider audience not just those that are already technology evangelists.** EdTech Team [Amended] responded by saying that the programme will actively be targeting those that are not already using technology extensively and will aim to attract a broad range of schools and colleges. We will welcome the assistance of ELG members in encouraging their networks to consider applying.
- **■ raised the issue about those solutions that weren't yet ready for this sort of evaluation. ■ questioned whether the testbeds should be about 'test and learn' not just 'test'.** Nesta Official [Amended] responded by saying the research that they undertook indicated that the biggest need, and where they would have the biggest impact, was around creating more robust evidence.
- **■ asked how the programme will reach the traditionally non-engaged, those that don't think technology will help meet their needs or that don't think it will work in their context.** EdTech Team [Amended] responded by saying that the innovation funds and test bed programmes were only part of the solution but that we will also actively be targeting a broad range of schools and colleges.
- **■ asked how the programme was considering school improvement needs, in particular how the timings of the programme will fit into the school improvement cycle.** EdTech Team [Amended] stated how the programme wasn't planning on pushing any technology on schools. Want to engage schools that are thinking about their technology journey and how that links in with their school development plans. ■ also stressed how the programme needs to create partnerships between schools and suppliers, where suppliers are more flexible in their approach to meet the needs of a school.

## 5. Activity to progress key areas of work of the ELG

EdTech Team [Amended] gave an overview of the proposed areas of work for the ELG to take forward, split into 5 areas for the ELG to 'champion and support' and 3 more concrete projects for the ELG to lead on. (See *Paper 3 – EdTech Leadership Group Proposed Work Streams* for more detail).

CW asked the ELG to discuss the 3 proposed projects for the group to lead on in turn.

## 5.1 Support for EdTech use and implementation in schools and colleges:

Key points that came out of the discussion:

- It needs to be clear who this product is for and what it is trying to achieve before jumping straight to a solution.
- There is probably a need for different products for different audiences e.g. schools vs colleges and teachers vs SLTs
- Senior leadership teams should be the priority, as they can have the largest impact by bringing a whole school / college with them
- Areas of school improvement should be the focus to engage SLTs – i.e. start with the problem and show them the what is possible
- Headteachers want to know who has solved the same issue they are struggling with and how
- It should be clear what support is required to guide them through the strategic implementation journey / to good baseline of digital infrastructure
- Networks between teachers and between subject expertise are useful in spreading good practice and recommendations in context
- The project should limit any burdens on schools
- Anything that is produced needs to be usable and easy. The educator's perspective is essential to achieving that goal
- It should focus on providing the impartial advice necessary that allows schools and colleges to engage with others (e.g. suppliers) and to progress with confidence
- Needs to provide different levels of support. One level is to encourage everyone towards a good baseline of digital infrastructure, the next is for those to build on any of their existing practice.
- It needs to be clear on the non-negotiables e.g. cloud, accessibility etc.

Proposed solutions / ways forward:

- Signposting to support and guidance that is already out there
- Interactive guide that asks different questions e.g. what is your challenge? And feeds users through different steps
- Shortlist EdTech tools that meet the minimum requirements
- Maturity frameworks
- Staff capability frameworks
- Toolkit
- Self-audit tools

TG suggested that group could help to develop and validate the schools guide he is producing with IP that covers many of these issues.

[REDACTED]

Key points that came out of the discussion:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Proposed solutions / way forward:

[REDACTED]

### **5.3 Research project: International models of EdTech support and use**

Key points that came out of the discussion:

- This area of work should have a focus on systems rather than on products or institutions
- Recognition of the difficulty with comparing across different systems, especially around the degree of centralisation and level of autonomy within schools.
- The research question needs to be clear- e.g. Is it "which countries have gained the most from EdTech?" It needs to be narrow enough to be useful.
- One way of approaching this would be to view the project on an issue centric rather than sector design basis – i.e. what have other countries done to use technology to support X issue, which of their interventions could be applicable here?
- We could look to segment international practice to help us consider applicability to our educational ecosystem – a) things which would not be plausible for our system, things that would be desirable but not currently inline with our current system c) things which could work directly in our system.

- Any project should consider what analysis has already been done and what evidence already exists.
- Need to consider if there are any ways to 'index' who are leaders and whose interventions are working – i.e. what does good look like?
- Should also consider where it is not working and why – what are the lessons learnt from the failures.

Particular areas / countries to focus on:

- Collaborative procurement
- Assistive technology
- Wales & Scotland
- Israel
- Finland
- Uruguay
- Victoria, Australia
- Canada
- Argentina