

National Student Privacy Symposium

Panel Summaries – Sept. 21, 2015

Keynote Address	1
Panel 1: Student Data and Research	3
Panel 2: The Potential Risks of Student Data Collection and Use	5
Lunch: National Student Privacy Parent Survey	8
Panel 3: What is the Future of Technology in the Classroom?	10
Panel 4: The Role of Technology and Data Use for Student Rights	12
Panel 5: The Path Ahead: Areas for Discussion and Solutions	14

[Twitter comment that set the tone for the day:](#)

“For both ed+student data policy, it’s critical that when we say ‘our kids’ we mean more than just the ones in our house.” @Noellerson

Keynote Address

[Speaker:](#)

Kati Haycock, President, Education Trust

[Summary:](#)

The demographics of the country are changing. Minority communities are rapidly becoming the majority, and nowhere is this fact more evident than in public schools. We must evaluate today’s minority and disadvantaged students through the lens of social justice because “[w]hat is right for these children is right for America.”

Katie Haycock spoke of the importance of data collection and academics' access to data. She began by asserting that data can assist efforts to close the long-standing educational gaps in the student population, and identified five strategies in particular. First, data enable researchers to pinpoint and study areas where progress is most pronounced. Second, data allow researchers to identify and monitor gaps in opportunities that require remediation, including student retention, data on suspension, and teaching quality among educators. Third, Haycock suggested that data can dispel dangerous myths and stereotypes about the causes of educational successes and failures. Fourth, Haycock explained that data encourage researchers to question their own assumptions, and help determine high-performing educational strategies free from bias. Finally, Haycock asserted that good data and technology allows researchers to properly evaluate when classroom- and subject area-specific approaches are not working.

Ms. Haycock placed great emphasis on this last factor. She emphasized that researchers must watch the data as they continue to engage in more customization and determine when adjustments need to be made. She urged researchers to monitor the implementation of new technological tools so that these tools benefit all children, not just specific populations. Finally, she emphasized the importance of effective teaching. "Data and technology cannot become a silver bullet." She stressed that we cannot forget the lessons learned in education; particularly, those lessons related to the quality of teachers.

Key quotes:

"What is right for these [minority and disadvantaged] children is right for America," Kati Haycock

Panel 1: Student Data and Research

Moderator:

- **Jules Polonetsky**, Executive Director, Future of Privacy Forum

Panelists:

- **Jane Hannaway**, Professor, McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University, Institute Fellow at the American Institutes of Research (AIR), and Founding Director of CALDER
- **Macke Raymond**, Director, CREDO, Stanford University
- **Doug Shapiro**, Executive Research Director, National Student Clearinghouse Research Center

Summary:

Jules Polonetsky opened the panel discussion by asking “How do we make sure we don’t create more problems through customization,” and “What are the practical problems?” Macke Raymond responded that evidence-based research allows researchers to better determine the effectiveness of programs. She pointed to Teach for America as an example, explaining that data has shown that the organization's approach has proven an acceptable and strong source of teachers. The conversation turned to the long-standing debate about the effectiveness of charter schools as an alternative to the public school system. Panelists indicated that data from thirty charter schools shows great promise, and that further study might reveal the contributing factors.

Jane Hannaway emphasized that large-scale, administrative databases streamlines the research process, the results of which can be easily replicated thanks to the data's accessibility. Hannaway made the case that access to data enables researchers to identify performance disparities between teachers, even within the same school and state. The data, she argued, has shown that under-performing teachers are significantly worse in schools in high-poverty areas than those in low poverty schools.

The panel sought to address some critics of data gathering and analysis who state that researchers misunderstand and overstate the implications of education data and advocate one-size-fits-all approaches to reform. The panel members emphasized that many researchers do not focus on the performance of individual students, but rather on aggregate trends. In many cases, panelists said, researchers look at measures of educational success at the start of a period and evaluate fluctuations in those measures over time. Factors being evaluated during the period of study include the effectiveness of a teacher, different school programs, or parent engagement. Though the data and analysis may not be all-revealing, the panelists maintained, researchers are able to use other, non-data-driven mechanisms to corroborate their findings.

Doug Shapiro addressed the issue of mobility and non-traditional educational paths as they relate to tracking student performance. Shapiro asserted that his work has positioned researchers around the country to get a full picture of the student achievement by capturing data from state to state and including students with atypical education experiences. He

stressed that researchers benefit from data sets that count students who, for example, start in community college and transfer to four year colleges at various different stages of their educational path.

The panelists, in agreement on the benefits of data collection and research, turned to the ways in which privacy concerns may make it harder for researchers to obtain data. The point was made that negotiations for the legitimate use of academic data are becoming more difficult, even for de-identified data. Hannaway spoke of an institution whose privacy practices so far exceeded regulatory standards that it took nearly two years to obtain data after the initial request was approved. Commonplace restrictions on data use include: (1) data destruct periods, which require researchers to destroy data after a certain time period has elapsed; (2) FERPA-based rules regarding disclosure, which disallow the exchange of data between colleagues; (3) Memorandum of understanding has to be signed by an individual; and (4) data is subject to IRB process.

Hannaway and others suggested that the policy makers should evaluate the risks of data breaches differently between educational and personal data. De-identification is being done at the state and district level, they argued, and though the data contain identifiers tied to “backroom” information, the likelihood that researchers might identify individuals is low. Three additional points were made to stress this fact: first, identification presents no real incentive, and second, the risks to the researcher exceed the potential for breach. Finally, the panelists decided, data analysis requires a macroscopic view of thousands of records. Policy recommendations are more strongly made after consideration of aggregates and averages, not of personalized data.

The panelists also emphasized that hackers take little interest in educational data, because test scores and other forms of assessment are not generally profitable pieces of information. Exceptions do exist: politicians or public figures may be motivated to keep their educational performance data concealed. Generally, however, hackers will prioritize other forms of personal data to educational information.

Twitter quotes to remember:

“How do we bring this discussion out of the realm of policy & into the world of teachers, students & parents?” – Jules Polonetsky

“There is awareness today that what was just product testing in the past has ethical implications now.” – Jules Polonetsky

“Before releasing [#eddata](#) research, we talk to communities to see how it lines up w/ their experiences.” – Macke Raymond

“The fear of identifying students out of de- identified data is overstated” – Macke Raymond

“Researchers need to do a better job making their ideas readable for families and other interested people” – Macke Raymond

“Let's not constipate innovation by forcing people to jump through too many hoops out of fear.” – Jane Hannaway

Panel 2: The Potential Risks of Student Data Collection and Use

Moderator:

- **Dakarai Aarons**, Director, Strategic Communications, Data Quality Campaign

Panelists:

- **Monica Bulger**, Researcher, Data & Society Research Institute
- **Bill Fitzgerald**, Director, Privacy Review Program, Common Sense Media
- **Evan Selinger**, Professor of Philosophy, Rochester Institute of Technology and Senior Fellow, Future of Privacy Forum
- **Elana Zeide**, Microsoft Research Fellow, Information Law Institute, NYU

Summary:

The day's second panel discussed the risks associated with the collection, storage and usage of student data. Elana Zeide underlined several important dualities to consider when tackling potential risks. First, she suggested that parents are interested in education policy (like Common Core), and see privacy as a way to fight those policies. Thus, a clear distinction should be made between information practices and education policy. Secondly, Zeide pointed out that risks to educational data persist, despite FERPA. New concerns about data access, security, and third party access have little to do with FERPA when school districts are granted wide discretion over data policies without sufficient oversight or transparency. Zeide went on to state that the misuse of data in educational settings (for things like profiling or racial bias) are not the only issues in play, since parents may object to the non-educational use of data. Ms. Zeide concluded with a call for meaningful proactive reform from a parent-focused framework that concentrated on transparency and legibility.

Evan Selinger shared anecdotes to illustrate the data collection issue from different perspectives, like those of parents and researchers. Selinger then analogized the discussion on data collection to the national debate over sex education: children are actively sharing personal information online with services and people, and ignoring the issue fails to prepare children for the consequences of those actions. Because many parents' data practices depart from the advice they give their children, Selinger advocated for a national conversation to encourage parents to confront this disparity. He speculated that the conversation could expand to include discussion of cyber-hygiene outside of school, a subject Selinger views as essential.

For her part, Monica Bulger emphasized several critical concerns she viewed were overlooked in the current debate. Human error remains a serious point of vulnerability, from the engineers who design and create software and hardware to the end users and everybody in between. Bulger's next argument concerned asymmetric information and data literacy: if, as Mr. Selinger argued, parents know little of their children's online habits, educators and policy makers have a responsibility to ensure children learn about opting out and consenting to data collection themselves. Echoing the previous panelists, Bulger spoke to emerging hypothetical threats to privacy and data security by emphasizing how parents' concerns about data use have changed. The only adequate response to these concerns, according to Ms. Bulger, is a questions and to be more transparent.

Bill Fitzgerald challenged the audience, suggesting that many who claim not to know how student data is being used and misused would rather not admit that they did. He suggested that the panel's discussion had focused disproportionately on the responsibilities of individuals to safeguard their data against inappropriate use, rather than those of service providers and policy makers. Fitzgerald argued that organizations need to go farther than writing transparent privacy policies, which he claimed often go unexamined or unread. Too many policies, he said, use the future tense to reflect organizational beliefs or hopes about data practices, rather than the reality of those practices. It is Fitzgerald's position that data ethics needs to be discussed at every level of the educational world in the spirit of shared responsibility.

The ensuing discussion and audience questions covered how institutions and individuals ought to deal with both potential and extant harms. The panelists agreed that there has been enormous progress on these concerns, but that the only practical strategies for improvement will result from increased attention and the critical analysis of these issues, as well as an understanding that data collection happens at every age.

Twitter quotes to remember:

"Fear is causing parents to be realistic and honest." - Bill Fitzgerald

"Privacy isn't something we can do "to" students; they're central to the process." – Evan Selinger

"App my kid uses is implicitly encouraging consumerism mindset - need to consider these underlying messages." – Evan Selinger

"We have a history in this country of using data to close doors, rather than opening them."

"A lot of concerns that come up around student privacy are actually related to education policy-- Common Core, etc. – Elana Zeidie

"FERPA wasn't designed to address student data being repurposed for higher ed & commercial purposes." – Elana Zeide

"Very little transparency around internal uses of student data. This scares parents. FERPA reforms don't address this." – Elana Zeidie

"Parents want to know what happens to their child and most are core concerns not just helicopter parenting." Elana Zeide

"Schools not having conversations about what data students sharing from home - kids routinely violating tech TOS." – Evan Selinger

"Data privacy is the new sex ed - we can pretend kids aren't sharing online, but they are." – Evan Selinger

"We're not living in an opt-out world anymore." – Monica Bulger

"I am one of like 3 people who enjoy reading #eddata privacy policies." – Bill Fitzgerald

“What starts as educational data is one bankruptcy step to becoming consumer data.” – Bill Fitzgerald

“FERPA allowed data releases would be big news if same data was private company breach.” – Bill Fitzgerald

Lunch: National Student Privacy Parent Survey

Moderator:

- **Brenda Leong**, Senior Counsel & Director of Operations, Future of Privacy Forum

Panelists:

- **Olga Garcia-Kaplan**, Student Privacy Advocate & Parent Blogger, FERPA|Sherpa
- **Mary Madden**, Researcher, Data & Society Research Institute and Senior Researcher, PEW Research Center's Internet Project
- **Leah Plunkett**, Researcher, Fellow, Student Privacy Initiative, Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University
- **Aimee Vella Ripley**, Research Manager, Reputation Management & Public Affairs, Nielsen

Summary:

[Insert brief abstract from survey.]

The panelists identified areas of the survey results that they found both enlightening and concerning. Pointing out that the current interest in data security occurs against the backdrop of post-Snowden heightened concern over all forms of data privacy in the United States, Mary Madden noted that the survey indicates that parents are comfortable differentiating between the kinds of data at issue, and the kinds of technology being used. Leah Plunkett commented on the tension between parental support for data collection for criminal and disciplinary purposes and support of data collection along lines of race and ethnicity. She found it puzzling and concerning in light of the fact that the school-to-prison pipeline disproportionately impacts students of color.

Panelists were generally troubled about the fact that many parents are unaware of existing privacy laws, and expressed concern that those same parents who worry about ad tech are going online and posting photos of their children on Facebook. The panelists highlighted the importance of digital literacy, with Madden arguing that children begin building a digital presence at age one. Thinking ahead to the distant future, Plunkett predicted that control over our children's data points will quickly become more granular with the aid of technology. In the meantime, values-based conversations are important if individuals are to reclaim control over their digital footprint; local-level dialogue should be taking place about how technology fits into our classrooms. Olga Garcia-Kaplan asked the audience to remember that not all families are in a position to have these conversation, challenging the ed tech community, educators, and policy makers alike to find ways to help students from lower income families.

The audience responded to the survey with excellent questions. One audience member asked whether the community ought to be distinguishing between subject-related advertising (e.g., a student who struggles with math is served ads for tutoring services) and other forms of advertising. Garcia-Kaplan noted that most parents would probably not approve of such a practice, and that existing data collection practices keep parents and students from opting out of specific kinds of data use. A better system would promote conversation between parents, children, and teachers, and an opt-in standard for services over the prevailing opt-out.

Twitter quotes to remember:

“Parents more comfortable with #eddata collection & use when #edtech required to keep data secure.” – Brenda Leong re: FPF Survey

“Parents want #eddata privacy laws, better contracts, stronger #edtech company privacy policies.” Brenda Leong re: FPF Survey

“54% of parents surveyed by FPF don't know of any federal laws that currently restrict what information a public school can share.” – Brenda Leong re: FPF Survey

“Among findings of new FPF parent student privacy survey, better parent communications needed.” – Brenda Leong

“Schools not fortresses, all schools have inevitable human error, so don't say won't be breached, but prepare for breaches.” – Mary Madden

“We need to get parents from feeling resigned to feeling empowered w/r/t data use.” – Mary Madden

“Olga says no one told her the district was using all the parent portals etc to share data and they should have.” – Mary Madden

“As kids are learning to use toilet, are also learning to use tablets, so you need to start teaching privacy earlier.” – Mary Madden

Panel 3: What is the Future of Technology in the Classroom?

Moderator:

- **Chip Slaven**, Counsel to the President and Senior Advocacy Advisor, Center for Digital Learning and Policy, Alliance for Excellent Education

Panelists:

- **Diana Bidulescu**, Education Technology Specialist, Houston Independent Sch. District
- **Karen Cator**, President & CEO, Digital Promise
- **Kerry Gallagher**, Technology Integration Specialist, St. John's Prep
- **Asante Johnson**, STEM Teacher & Technology Integration Coach, D.C. Public Schools

Summary:

Panelists began the third discussion group by affirming that technology can fundamentally improve the student experience. Karen Cantor expanded on this point, suggesting that the effects of technology in the classroom are twofold. First, technology augments traditional strategies of teaching and learning; Cantor referenced research indicating that students develop stronger writing skills when they have access to word processing programs. Second, technology provides alternatives to tools that students and educators might not be able to afford. Cantor mentioned declining funding for schools' art programs to highlight how music software provides virtual access to instruments that students would ordinarily miss without a costly orchestra program. Kerry Gallagher spoke personally of the effects of technology in and out of her own classroom. With technology she can: (1) conduct stand-alone lessons and assist students outside of the classroom; (2) share and discuss documents more efficiently; (3) video chat; and (4) bring certain lessons to life with videos rather than static pictures. Taking the conversation from the topics of achievement data down to the level of students and classrooms, Gallagher argued that media creation tools allow for collaboration, and by embracing those tools, we recognize that there is more to learning than standardized tests.

Panelists were quick to add that technology may also create some challenges in the classroom. Asante Johnson worried that too much information may create confusion. In such situations, Johnson argued, the teacher is key to implementing the technology appropriately. She went on to say that educators must be made aware of the value of technology in different classes at different grade levels, and teachers need training in order to ensure the effectiveness of the technology. Making the implementation of technology a decision left to schools and localities, Johnson continued, offers students and parents the opportunity to take ownership and assist in their own development.

Diana Bidulescu expanded on this idea, stating that “[c]reativity is the answer to all of our problems, including data privacy.” She suggested that ownership and creativity can be accomplished by addressing two issues: first, technology can only enhance the learning process to extent that it is fun for students. Without student engagement and opportunities for meaningful creativity, ed tech only serves to distract from tried and true teaching strategies. Second, awareness about technology and data has to be created. We must create a system, Bidulescu emphasized, where students feel comfortable taking charge of their data footprint in and out of the classroom. Returning to points made by Selinger, Bidulescu reiterated that

students will not always be under supervision. As such, they need the proper tools to responsibly navigate an increasingly data-driven world.

The dialogue touched on the ever-growing list of open educational resources. Panelists with experience in education agreed that teachers constantly search for better teaching resources and improved ways to assess their students. Gallagher shared an example a technology that most intrigued her: an application that allowed real-time student assessment, which she called informative assessment. She expressed her belief that informative assessment proves the key to better understanding student learning. Through informative assessment, educators can share feedback with students in real time. Gallagher highlights that the technology requires a constant conversation between the student and the teacher to be effective. Other panelists spoke of the importance of similar forms of interactional data. First, tools of this kind affords teachers a better picture of the kinds of learning happening in the classroom. Second, it provides students a clearer understanding of which learning strategies work well and which need attention and improvement. Finally, informative assessment creates more opportunities for engagement between students, parents, and educators as the student becomes more involved in the learning process.

Twitter quotes to remember:

"Creativity is the answer to all of our problems, including data privacy." - Diana Bidulescu

"Does tech help improve learning? Is like asking if libraries help students learn It depends on what you do with it." – Karen Cator

"Technology is vital - allows students to access experts, primary data, folks globally. Vital for personalized learning." – Karen Cator

"Tech augments teachers' abilities, makes good teachers great and bad teachers better." – Kerry Gallagher

"We need to do a better job in teacher preparation programs to train for diverse connected educational environments." – Asante Johnson

"If you're not able to manage/vet [#eddata](#) privacy of the apps in your classroom, shouldn't use." – Asante Johnson

"I'm not sure parents know what they're opting in or opting out of." – Chip Slaven

"Technology doesn't replace an effective teacher; technology enhances an effective teacher." – video from Diana Bidulescu/Houston ISD

Panel 4: The Role of Technology and Data Use for Student Rights

Moderator:

- **Caitlin Emma**, Education Reporter, Politico

Panelists:

- **Rafranz Davis**, Exec. Director of Professional & Digital Learning, Lufkin Independent School District
- **Tomeka Hart**, VP of Programs, Southern Education Foundation
- **Melissa Perry**, Lead Information Manager, Seeding Success

Summary:

During the fourth panel discussion, participants addressed how data practices are communicated to parents, how data is used in various school districts to improve students' education, and the advantages or disadvantages of Bring Your Own Device programs in schools.

Though representative of disparate viewpoints on the subject of student data privacy, the panel members expressed agreement when asked about the importance of informing parents on what data is being collected on their children and how it is being used. Melissa Perry emphasized that improving dialogue between administrators and parents in general promotes the trust between the parent and the school essential for technology programs. Rafranz Davis concurred on the necessity of informing parents of data collection practices, noting that her school district holds regular meetings at churches to discuss student these activities with parents. Tomeka Hart reiterated the importance of discussing student data collection with parents, but called attention to communities concerned with unequal access to collected information. Where student data is collected and made available, Hart argued that it be done so equitably, in was reflective of the communities.

Discussion became more lively among the panelists when asked how student data is or should be used, particularly data that tracked achievement in minority communities. Perry voiced objections to using race as a variable in the collection of such data, and suggested that researchers examine where students live and their level of parental involvement as factors more relevant to academic performance. Hart took issue with this approach, claiming that data about race ensures that all students are being treated fairly, that "all students are improving." She went on to argue that high-performing students from privileged backgrounds should expect that their data be used to improve their performance to a similar degree as lower-performing students from difficult circumstances.

One of the panel's most salient points concerned the use of data to combat inequities in schools and classrooms, and the importance of clear communication and cooperation between parents, educators, and service-providers in delivering the highest-quality education. Davis and Hart spoke at length about areas for improvement in engaging disadvantaged communities in the educational process and ensuring the fair and equal use of data across the country. Specifically, Davis and Hart agreed that programs and policies like "Bring Your Own Device" programs promise to reduce the financial burden on schools, but stressed how "certain school

districts aren't there yet." Davis clarified, explaining that some schools struggle to get WiFi, to say nothing of architecture needed for a cross-device ed tech platform. Additionally, the cost of running devices is a concern, according to Davis and Hart. "It is not just enough to have a device," Hart added, explaining that such devices often require payment plans that can cause additional problems for members of disadvantaged communities.

In responding to audience questions, the panel expressed differing viewpoints on parental opt-outs and the need to build trust among parents in schools collecting student data. According to Hart, parental opt-outs pose challenges as a matter of trust as well as one of privacy. Hart referred to the privacy associated with parents opting-out of "free or reduced meal" forms in "fear" of their income or family's economic status being revealed. According to Hart, "the fear of disclosure keeps parents from signing kids up for [essential programs like] free or reduced lunch. Kids can't go hungry for this." Perry expressed her own concern over parental opt-outs, stating that "privacy might be trumping our right to information [about our communities]." However, in regards to parents opting-out of "free or reduced lunch" forms, Perry suggested the forms need to be more "transparent." According to Perry, the free or reduced lunch forms have more of a "technical issue" and "less of a privacy issue" in that they are not transparent on what data is collected and how it will be used.

Twitter quotes to remember:

"We are failing all our kids ... If your kid comes in smart they should leave smarter and they are not." – Tomeka Hart

"No one was arming parents with the questions to ask" (to help parents advocate for their kids)." – Tomeka Hart

"1,000 spreadsheets won't allow us to act quickly and that is not best for kids Privacy might be trumping our right to information." – Melissa Perry

"Districts can really see the inequities if districts are willing to face them." – Rafranz Davis, talking disaggregated data

"If we don't have conversations with students they will not learn what are good and bad apps to use." – Rafranz Davis

BYOD is not equitable! So many kids do not have access to a device, or no access to WiFi, etc." – Rafranz Davis

"There are two lines in school. One for the stuff you can buy, the other for free lunch." – Rafranz Davis

"Use data as a flashlight, not a hammer" – Melissa Perry

Panel 5: The Path Ahead: Areas for Discussion and Solutions

Moderator:

- **Bob Moore**, Privacy Initiative Lead, Consortium for School Networking (CoSN)

Panelists:

- **Beatriz Arnillas**, Director-IT, Education Technology, Houston Independent School District
- **Teddy Hartman**, VP, Cyber Data Privacy & Educational Practices, Axon Global and Coordinator of Data Privacy, Howard County Public Schools
- **Elizabeth Rorick**, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations & Communications, National PTA
- **Kathleen Styles**, Chief Privacy Officer, U.S. Department of Education

Summary:

The final panel focused on the future, speculating about coming challenges and best practices with an eye to both the past and the present. The panelists' diverse backgrounds and professions encouraged a robust conversation on current and preferred practices within each respective stakeholder community. Beatriz Arnillas spoke to the evolving issues at the level of school districts, speaking personally of her school district's challenge with privacy and safety. Elizabeth Rorick tried to led the perspective of a parent, and underlined the growing interest in data privacy and the need for transparency, access, and granular choices about collection and data use. Teddy Hartman emphasized the need to openly address the different values around privacy and data protection. Finally, Kathleen Styles described the emerging role of Data Privacy Officers in the educational sphere. She described her own role as Chief Privacy Officer for the Department of Education as serving three key functions: providing guidance to all parties, promoting and maintaining FERPA compliance, and assisting Congress in its effort to improve FERPA.

Questions both Bob Moore and from the audience kept discussion lively and fresh. Arnillas and Rorick agreed that parents should ask more and better questions of teachers about the place of technology in the classroom. Arnillas called attention to a short-video program in Houston that attempted to provoke an ongoing conversation on privacy and security within the student population. The conversation soon moved to the realm of policy and the divide between federal and local approaches to issues of privacy and security. Most of the panelists agreed that the action will be most observable at the state level. The panel speculated that the ed tech industry, educators, and policy makers are moving in the right direction, owing in no small part to hard work from all parties. However, Arnillas and Hartman affirmed that important work remains, particularly in promoting data literacy among teachers by making relevant ethics and law classes for necessary for teacher certification.

Audience members asked the panelists for clarification on some of the topics discussed. One alluded to the similarities and differences between FERPA and HIPPA, a comparison that Styles pushed back on. Several questions focused on policy: how FERPA could be clarified and how overlap with other data policies should be managed. Styles described the complexity

of FERPA, but argued that the law reflects only one side of the policy issue. Best practices that promote transparency and increased contact between educators, parents, and the community, she claimed, were similarly important.

Twitter quotes to remember:

“Parents want to know school house is a place where data is not being sold to the highest bidder.” – Beth Rorick

“Parents are stakeholders; they are consumers of education as much as kids are.” – Beth Rorick

“40 years after FERPA passed, we still have unanswered questions.” – Kathleen Styles

“What does it mean to take public \$\$ to pay a private firm to provide analytics & recs for public education?” – Teddy Hartman

“Make a commitment to teach privacy and security and safety every day.” – Beatriz Arnillas

“Privacy legislation will hurt urban kids and increase haves and have nots.” – Beatriz Arnillas

*“FTC views violations of the **#Student** @Privacy Pledge as actionable” – Kathleen Styles*

“Policymakers can play important role in requiring #eddata privacy/security ethics/law for certified teachers.” – Teddy Hartman